

## **APPENDIX B**

---

### Stakeholder Interviews

#### Stakeholder Interview Summary Report

# **Stakeholder Interview Summary**

## **Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement**

Lead agency:  
Utah Department of Transportation

**July 6, 2020**

## Contents

1.0	Introduction .....	1
2.0	Stakeholder Meetings .....	1
3.0	Summary of Key Takeaways .....	2
3.1	Heber Main Street Corridor.....	2
3.2	Main Street Intersections .....	2
3.3	West Bypass .....	3
3.4	East Bypass .....	3
3.5	1300 South.....	3
3.6	One-way Couplet .....	3
3.7	Trucking .....	4
3.8	North and West Fields .....	4
3.9	Heber Valley Special Services District.....	4
3.10	Heber Valley Airport.....	5
3.11	Heber Valley Historic Railroad .....	5
3.12	Planned High School .....	5
3.13	Businesses.....	6
3.14	Development.....	6
3.15	Subsidized Housing and Low-income Populations.....	7

## Tables

Table 1.	Stakeholder Meetings.....	1
----------	---------------------------	---

## Appendixes

Appendix A. Stakeholder Meeting Summaries



# 1.0 Introduction

A series of stakeholder interviews were conducted for the Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) between May 27 and June 24, 2020. The purpose of the interviews was to gain a better understanding of the issues to consider in developing the need for and purpose of the project and potential alternatives as well as understanding issues important to the community.

# 2.0 Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholders were identified by the project team through experience from previous projects in area, discussions with Heber City and Wasatch County, and discussions with other stakeholders. Stakeholders included municipal governments, the local metropolitan planning organization (Mountainland Association of Governments), service providers, emergency service providers, Wasatch County School District, Heber Valley Airport, and representatives of businesses and the trucking industry. A total of 18 meetings were conducted as listed in Table 1. Meeting summaries are available in Appendix A.

**Table 1. Stakeholder Meetings**

Date	Stakeholder
May 27	Mountainland Association of Governments
May 28	Charleston
May 28	Wasatch County
May 29	Heber Light & Power
May 29	Daniel
June 2	Heber City
June 2	Emergency services
June 3	Midway
June 3	Heber Valley Airport
June 5	Heber Valley Historic Railroad
June 11	Developers
June 11	Businesses
June 15	Wasatch County School District
June 16	Utah Trucking Association
June 17	UDOT Motor Carrier Division
June 18	Heber Valley Special Services District
June 18	Developers (Sorenson)
June 24	Housing authority and housing trust (subsidized housing)

## 3.0 Summary of Key Takeaways

Stakeholders were asked about issues with the existing transportation system (today and through 2050), issues with a potential bypass, and resources that are important to stakeholders and the community. Following is a high-level summary of key takeaways relevant for the EIS. Detailed information is provided in Appendix A.

### 3.1 Heber Main Street Corridor

- Main Street is heavily congested in the afternoon commute period and on weekends during the summer.
- Vehicles use parallel corridors (600 West, 300 West, 100 West, and 100 East) to avoid Main Street.
- It is difficult to cross or turn onto Main Street. Emergency service vehicles need to cross at traffic signals.
- Pedestrian safety is a concern, mainly with east-west crossings.
- Cyclists avoid Main Street—they will ride on sidewalks, 100 West, or 300 West.
- Large-truck traffic is not conducive to a pedestrian-friendly downtown (due to noise, vibrations, and perceived safety issues).
- It is difficult for Heber Light & Power to respond to traffic signal outages or work on utilities due to congestion.
- Wasatch County School District has safety concerns with students walking to school and entering and exiting U.S. 40.

### 3.2 Main Street Intersections

- The main intersection of concern is the hub where U.S. 40 and U.S. 89 converge.
  - It is congested, especially on summer holiday weekends, resulting in backups on U.S. 189 and U.S. 40.
  - Some drivers get confused or frustrated and will make turns from the through lanes.
- 100 South (State Route [S.R.] 113) and Center Street are major east-west arterials. Their intersections with Main Street are offset by one block, resulting in substantial delays.
- 600 South is the most concerning intersection regarding auto/pedestrian/bicycle conflicts because it is frequently used by children. The second-most-concerning intersection for pedestrians is 100 South.

### 3.3 West Bypass

Note: stakeholders were informed that UDOT is not assuming that a west bypass will be constructed. There is no preconceived solution at this point.

- Heber City and Wasatch County have been preserving a corridor since 2007. It is generally 112 to 120 feet wide.
- There is substantial support for a bypass in the community; however, not all residents are supportive—especially those whose homes would be adjacent to a bypass.
- Heber Light & Power is in the process of acquiring a 60-foot-wide corridor for a transmission line parallel and adjacent to the bypass corridor. Construction is expected to be completed in 2022.
- Traffic between Utah County and Park City will use S.R. 113 and River Road as a way to bypass Main Street. Midway is constructing roundabouts as a way to discourage truck traffic and would prefer through traffic go onto a proposed bypass.

### 3.4 East Bypass

- Heber City is planning an east bypass that will run parallel to and east of Main Street, starting at Center Street and connecting to U.S. 40 near 800 North.
- Heber City has not considered extending the bypass south of Center Street.
- One of the purposes is to divert traffic from the east heading to Park City east of Main Street.

### 3.5 1300 South

- Heber City constructed 1300 South with five lanes to serve as connection between U.S. 40 south of the hub and a future west bypass.
- The neighborhood north of 1300 South has organized and is opposed to the use of 1300 South as part of a bypass.

### 3.6 One-way Couplet

- Some people would prefer a one-way couplet through downtown Heber City rather than a bypass to preserve the North Fields. Others expressed interest in a one-way couplet in addition to a bypass.
- Heber City provided a concept with Main Street northbound and 100 West southbound (between 100 South and 500 North).
- Utah State University did a study suggesting one-way streets on 100 East and 100 West to complement a two-way Main Street in addition to a bypass.

### 3.7 Trucking

- UDOT's Motor Carrier Division estimates that about 25,000 to 30,000 trucks go through the Daniels port of entry each month May through October, and about 15,000 to 18,000 each month November to March.
- The Utah Trucking Association estimates that 200 to 250 tanker trucks pass through Heber City each day from the Uinta Basin to Salt Lake City (one way).
- Any transportation improvements should accommodate oversized loads.
- Truckers get paid per mile. They would take a bypass if it saved them time.

### 3.8 North and West Fields

- The North Fields and West Fields refer to undeveloped agricultural land. They are beloved by the community as open space and scenic vistas.
- Any change to the area would be viewed negatively by the community.
- Lands are privately owned by multiple owners. Preservation efforts are underway by the Wasatch County Open Land Board.

### 3.9 Heber Valley Special Services District

- Wastewater from the sewer treatment plant must be disposed on land. The size of the sewer farm cannot be reduced without affecting operations. The sewer district does not have excess land.
- With population growth, additional land acquired to the west will be in operation by 2021.
- The sewer farm is highly valued as open space. There are no plans to change the current wastewater disposal process.
- The District's board of directors is willing to work with UDOT on the best solution. However, with any alternative that would impact the sewer farm, UDOT should recommend potential mitigation.
- Any impact to land used for wastewater disposal would need to be replaced with equal acreage.
- Replacement land would need to be connected to the wastewater pipe system.
- If the sewer farm is divided by a road, safe access for equipment to cross would need to be provided.
- Widening Southfield Road would be a concern. Relocating the pivot would decrease the radius of the area where wastewater is discharged (thereby reducing the acreage).
- There are potential replacement properties:
  - Triangular area between 2400 South, 3000 South, and U.S. 189
  - Property north of the Heber Valley Historic Railroad tracks and west of Edwards Lane
  - Property south of U.S. 189 and east of the gravel pit



### 3.10 Heber Valley Airport

- The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is considering safety improvements to accommodate larger-jet traffic; a decision is expected in the summer of 2020.
- If FAA determines that safety improvements are necessary, the runway would be widened and shifted south (away from U.S. 189). This would also require the runway protection zone (RPZ) to be expanded encompassing 1300 South. The implications of this are unclear. UDOT will need to coordinate with FAA on restrictions for highways in the RPZ.
- FAA is also in the process of updating the airport master plan, with completion planned in early 2022.
- FAA's decision on the airport master plan is separate from UDOT's decision on the bypass with realignment U.S. 189. FAA will require two options for airport planning (with and without the U.S. 189 realignment).

### 3.11 Heber Valley Historic Railroad

- The railroad requests that any future crossing be grade-separated. The road would likely need to go over the tracks due to railroad design standards.
- A trail is planned to be built in the railroad right-of-way. The EIS will need to consider bicyclist and pedestrian issues.
- Rail engineers like to have a clear line of sight for 1 to 1.5 miles. This is especially important if there will be pedestrians in the rail right-of-way.

### 3.12 Planned High School

- Wasatch County School District purchased 67 acres for a new high school north of S.R. 113 at about 1000 West.
- The new school would serve areas to the north and west.
- A bond must be approved before construction can begin. It is possible that construction could begin within the next 2 to 3 years.
- Two of three previous alignments studied by UDOT (Alignments A and B) would be compatible with the school site plan.
- A traffic study completed for the high school included a traffic signal from an access road to the property on S.R. 113.

### 3.13 Businesses

- The Community Alliance for Main Street (CAMS) generally supports a bypass to make Main Street more pedestrian-friendly. However, some business representatives worry that a bypass could reduce revenue.
- Retail businesses have a difficult time on Main Street because it is not pedestrian-friendly. Most Main Street businesses are professional services.
- Parking is difficult on Main Street. It is difficult to back into parallel parking spaces due to congestion.
- One-way traffic on Main Street is undesirable to the business community. It would encourage people to pass through rather than stop.
- A community redevelopment area is being considered for Main Street to improve the area as a destination. A grant application is in process.

### 3.14 Development

- Heber City just annexed land to the northeast for the Sorenson development. There will be 5,770 homes in the 10,000-acre development over the next 30 years. Access from U.S. 40 will be provided at Coyote Lane, College Way, Moulton Lane, and Wasatch Commons.
- Five developments in addition to the Sorenson development north of Heber City are requesting annexation.
- There is development pressure south of the hub. Some developments (for example, the Blue Rooster) are on hold until a decision is made for this EIS, while some developments (for example, Turner Mill) are proceeding based on the previous bypass plan.
- Ingress, egress, and visibility are important for developments.
- Heber Light & Power will construct a large substation at 650 South and south of Southfield Road. The site design would accommodate a bypass on the east side of property.

### 3.15 Subsidized Housing and Low-income Populations

- Mountainlands Community Housing Trust and Wasatch County Housing Authority provide subsidized housing in the Heber Valley. There are five subsidized housing units:
  - Parkview Place (planned): 49 properties on Southfield Road with land set aside for a bypass
  - Prestige 1 and Prestige 2: 62 units for independent seniors near 1200 South and 640 East
  - Elmbridge Apartments: 76 units near 100 West and 700 North
  - Liberty Station Apartments: 55 units near 300 West and 1000 South
  - Timbermill Station Apartments: 26 units near 675 South and 100 West
- Existing low-income neighborhoods could include:
  - The mobile-home park south of the hub
  - The neighborhood along 3000 South in Daniel
  - The neighborhood between 200 East and 200 West



## **Appendix A. Stakeholder Meeting Summaries**

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview - MAG
Date:	Wednesday, May 27, 2020
Time:	10 AM – 12 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Vern Keelsar	HVC Team	Traffic	<a href="mailto:vkeeslar@parametrix.com">vkeeslar@parametrix.com</a>	801.307.3400
✓	Shawn Seager	MAG	Planning Director	<a href="mailto:sseager@mountainland.org">sseager@mountainland.org</a>	801.824.1066
✓	Bob Allen	MAG	Rural Planning Organization Director	<a href="mailto:rallen@mountainland.org">rallen@mountainland.org</a>	801.836.2823

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - b. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - c. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
2. Bypass History
  - a. MAG has been helping Heber City and Wasatch County for many years on a potential bypass – evaluating potential alignments and corridor widths. Wasatch County and Heber City planners noted that subdivisions are coming in and need to have better identified corridor.
  - b. Some farmers asked about alignment because of potential impacts to their operations. Mostly in the North Fields area. The initial alignment tried to avoid impacts to the farmland.
  - c. Wasatch County passed a vehicle registration fee to acquire parcels from willing sellers for corridor preservation.

- d. Need for a bypass has been expressed by local government. Traffic on Main Street is around 25-30 K which is about at capacity. Road is about 9 feet from front door of businesses. People have difficulty making left turns on to Main Streets. Businesses can feel vibration from trucks.
  - e. US-40 does not experience typical peak travel times due to recreation traffic. There can be more traffic on a weekend compared to a weekday PM peak. The previous travel demand model did not account for this.
  - f. More second homes in Wasatch County. People come up on the weekend.
  - g. New Wasatch/Summit County travel demand model (WFRC, MAG, and Summit County) accounts for weekend sensitivity of recreation traffic. Team plans to use new model for HVC EIS, but there have been delays. Team will also use statewide model (USTM).
  - h. Previous bypass studies available on RPO website <https://mountainland.org/rpo>
3. Main Street / U.S.40 / U.S. 189 issues (issues with existing transportation system)
- a. Interaction between SR 113 and bypass. SR 113 (E-W road) has a dedicated pedestrian and bike lane which is very important to community. In the future 113 may be a five lane section (2030-2040). Three lane in phase 1 (add center turn-lane).
  - b. 200 S does not have a signal but is very busy intersection and people want to access the park at the intersection. Not safe for pedestrians to cross Main Street. Need to make Heber Main Street more walkable.
  - c. Could make 100 W or 200 W better through streets to take traffic off of Main Street.
  - d. Center Street is primary access to Timber Lake and girl's camp. Most eastside traffic uses Center Street.
  - e. Center Street offset with 100 South (SR-113) causes issues for east-west traffic.
  - f. Heber City has an eastside collector planned north of Heber on US 40. Need to figure out where the collector will be located to determine if bypass could connect at the same location.
  - g. Daniel does not want Little Sweden Road to become a bypass.
  - h. Wal-Mart important destination area.
4. Bypass Issues
- a. Daniel has expressed concerns with how a bypass could impact their community. Concerns about mobile home community.
  - b. Some members of Wasatch County Council have raised questions about the need for a bypass and whether it could be detrimental. Some people don't want traffic pulled from Main Street as it could cause economic impact from people going around the city.
  - c. Heber Power and Light/Rocky Mountain Power wanted to follow the corridor. They just completed an EIS for a new terminal substation, shifted alignment if effort to accommodate bypass.

- d. The North Fields are loved by community and perceived as open space. The area is privately owned with multiple owners, parcels range from 5 – 30 acres, zoning of 1 resident per 20 acres.
    - i. RCLCO did study of North Fields area to preserve it. Most of the land is private. The parcels are owned by various owners who might want to sell.
    - ii. North end bypass could have limited access so not to induce development. Bypass could limit development west of the project (will not provide access to areas west).
    - iii. Desire to connect bypass to US-40 close to urban area to minimize impacts to North Fields, keep US-40 as primary corridor.
    - iv. Wetland impacts could be an issue in the North Fields area.
  - e. MAG has not evaluated an east bypass, the area has been and continues to develop.
  - f. Sewer farm created by BOR. Will need to replace acre for acre impact nearby where they could still farm.
  - g. North of the sewer field the neighborhood got highly organized against the project. Concerned about bypass near their homes.
  - h. Crossing at grade with Heber Creeper could be an issue because the train moves very slowly which could disrupt traffic.
  - i. Traffic analysis shows that even with a bypass, Main Street from 200 N to 200 S has heavy traffic. This should be pointed out as an economic benefit to the community.
  - j. Mobile Home Park south of US 40 and US 189 intersection is concerned about bypass coming through their area. Could be an environmental justice community.
5. Planned Development
- a. New high school is planned north of SR 113.
  - b. Developer wants to build 1000+ unit development and may want to be included into Heber City. This is north of Heber City on the eastside of US 40.
  - c. North Village development is new near Utah State University. Doug Smith at City may have more information.
  - d. Town of Independence has plans for future development with a City of about 8,000 people.
  - e. Southeast Quadrant of Heber City is planned for future development. Not much area left for a corridor.
  - f. Land immediately south of US 40 and US 189 intersection may be developed although the City would like to have available for the bypass.
6. Additional Stakeholders
- a. May want to meet Forest Service / Heber Ranger District – they have a building off of US 40.
  - b. May want to talk with Senator Kevin VanTassel and Senator Ron Winterton.



- c. May want to talk to Laurie Wynn at Wasatch Wave.
  - d. May want to talk to part-time trail planner Don Taylor, he works for Doug Smith at Wasatch County in the planning department.
  - e. Tony Kohler may be resident at mobile home park – Need to get a point of contact to include on the stakeholder committee. This would be important for environmental justice issues.
7. Preferred Communication
- a. Wasatch County quarterly interlocal meeting
  - b. email
8. Other
- a. Wasatch County Transit Plan just completed. Need identified for routes between Heber and Park City, Heber and Utah County, and within Heber.
  - b. Heber City recently completed a new master plan (Heber City Envision 2050) that should be used as a guiding document. The City’s vision for Main Street is more walkable and pedestrian friendly. Main Street should be a more walkable street.

**Action Items**

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
✓	Send email regarding travel demand model – stress importance of schedule and offer resources	Shawn	
✓	Distribute Wasatch County Transit Study to team	Andrea	
✓	Distribute Heber City Envision 2050 (General Plan) to team	Andrea	
	Distribute Heber Power and Light EIS info to team	Jeremy	
	Send North Fields preservation study to Jeremy	Bob	
✓	Send project overview/timeline flyer to MAG	Andrea	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview - Charleston
Date:	Thursday, May 28, 2020
Time:	10 AM – 11:30 AM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Brenda Kozlowski	Charleston	Mayor	<a href="mailto:mayorkozlowski@gmail.com">mayorkozlowski@gmail.com</a>	435.671.2500
✓	Vaughn Rasband	Charleston	Council Member	<a href="mailto:vaughn.diane@gmail.com">vaughn.diane@gmail.com</a>	435.671.2700
✓	Wes Johnson	Charleston	Town Engineer	<a href="mailto:wes@horrocks.com">wes@horrocks.com</a>	435.654.2226

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - b. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (what problems need to be solved?).
  - c. There is no pre-determined solution at this point. Solutions will be data driven and will depend on the purpose and need.
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
2. Issues with existing transportation system
  - a. US-189 intersection with SR-113: safety concern with conflict between vehicles travelling southbound on US-189 and vehicles turning from SR-113 onto US-189. Southbound 189 transitions from 2 lanes to 1 lane at this intersection—outside lane is right-turn-only; however, vehicles will travel through in the turn lane and then merge left after intersection. Does this intersection meet warrant for signal?
  - b. Widening US-189 west of Charleston into Provo Canyon programed for fiscal year 2022, construction likely in 2023.

- c. Traffic signal planned for 3000 S and U.S. 189. Alignment is problematic, especially westbound – evaluate with signal project.
  - d. Bikes frequently use US-189 in Provo Canyon and SR-113. Bike use not frequent on US-189 between Charleston and Heber.
  - e. Concern regarding large trucks turning left from US-189 into Staker Parson gravel pit.
  - f. Traffic in Heber increasing on 100 E and 100 W as Main Street gets more congested.
  - g. Hub intersection (US-189 and US-140) is problematic. People will turn from through lanes (heading from Provo to Heber). Traffic backs up on US-189.
3. Bypass Issues
- a. People will use SR-113 and River Road as a bypass to Heber Main Street (especially traffic between Utah County and Park City). This bypass traffic increases as Main Street gets congested.
  - b. Coordinate with Heber Valley Special Services District on 400 acre sewer farm.
4. Planned Development
- a. Charleston has a goal to develop a commercial district for a tax base. They are interested in annexing 99 acres from Wasatch County north of and adjacent to US-189 between 2400 S and 3000 S. If a bypass were to go through that property, Charleston would be interested in what type of access would be allowed. Commercial access could increase value.
  - b. There is no designated open space or protected areas. Charleston is fairly open and would like to keep it that way.
5. Preferred Communication
- a. Wasatch County Council of Governments Interlocal quarterly meeting
  - b. Regular email updates (stakeholder database)

## Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
	Update Charleston on schedule/timing of signal project at US-189 and 3000 S	Jeremy	
	Get back to Charleston about potential for signal at US-189 and SR-113	Jeremy	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Wasatch County
Date:	Thursday, May 28, 2020
Time:	3 PM – 4:30 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Charles Allen	HVC Team	Traffic Lead	<a href="mailto:callen@parametrix.com">callen@parametrix.com</a>	801.319.8271
✓	Dustin Grabau	Wasatch Co.	County Assistant Manager	<a href="mailto:dgrabau@wasatch.utah.gov">dgrabau@wasatch.utah.gov</a>	435.657.3310
	Mike Davis	Wasatch Co.	County Manager	<a href="mailto:mdavis@wasatch.utah.gov">mdavis@wasatch.utah.gov</a>	435.657.3180
✓	Doug Smith	Wasatch Co.	Planning Director	<a href="mailto:dsmith@wasatch.utah.gov">dsmith@wasatch.utah.gov</a>	435.657.3205

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling.
  - b. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - c. Stakeholders and public will have an opportunity for input on purpose and need. Intent of meeting today is to collect information on transportation needs/issues. Preliminary plan for stakeholder working group meeting in July and public open house in August.
  - d. There is no pre-determined solution at this point. Solutions will be data driven and will depend on the purpose and need.
  - e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 Issues
  - a. Heavy traffic on Memorial Day. Signals at some intersections on Main St. would turn red and vehicles would still be in the intersection.
  - b. Seeing 5% growth per year and traffic is getting worse. Kem Gardner Institute 2050 estimates may be off.

- i. Heber City is approving lots of density and aggressive about annexation.
  - c. Pedestrian safety is an issue. Workers at the County don't feel safe to cross Main Street at Center Street and at 100 North.
  - d. The main pedestrian issues are east-west crossings.
  - e. Not comfortable to walk on Main Street with the heavy traffic and related noise.
  - f. Most cyclists avoid Main Street. Some cyclists ride on Main Street sidewalk.
  - g. 100 West and 300 West are the main north-south bike corridors.
  - h. PM peak / afternoon signalized intersections begin to fail.
  - i. Intersection at SR 113 and Main Street does not have a dedicated right turn for EB approach. Causes vehicles to back up.
  - j. Parking on Main Street is difficult because of the traffic. Can't back in, need to have space to pull forward.
3. Bypass Issues
- a. North Fields is an important area to the community, especially view across fields to Timpanogos. Visual impacts are a concern. Citizen referendum overturned zoning change to 10 acre lots (back to 20 acre lots). Development is partially limited due to high groundwater in the area, difficult to get sewer line in. Any change to the North Fields is viewed negatively.
  - b. Impacts to wetlands in the North Fields area is a concern.
  - c. If there is another way to handle N-S traffic it should be considered.
  - d. There is a lot of support for a bypass, it has been discussed/planned for about 25 years. However, some residents don't want N-S bypass.
  - e. No specific resources are important to community outside of preserving the North Fields.
4. Planned Development
- a. Between Heber City and County, majority of parcels for previously planned corridor have been purchased. Ownership is identified as City or County on interactive parcel map.
  - b. The biggest new developments are north of Heber in the Jordanelle Basin. Build out for MIDA development near the Mayflower exit could be 15,000 people and could affect travel demand model.
  - c. Planned high school north of SR-113 and east of South Field Road
    - i. High school put on hold until bypass is figured out
  - d. Sorenson development was annexed by Heber City. City will have updated numbers.
  - e. Petition to annex area near River Road and US-40 into Heber City.
5. Additional stakeholder recommendations

- a. Heber Valley Hospital is an important destination, access to hospital is important to community. Contact Si Hutt (si.hutt@imail.org) Heber Valley Hospital Administrator.
  - b. Wasatch Mountain State Park, Jordanelle State Park, Soldier Hollow
6. Preferred Communication
- a. Regular email updates
7. Other
- a. Elm Bridge apartments at north end of City (750 N) are subsidized and potential low-income community.
  - b. Apartments near Wal-Mart (1000 S 300 W) may be subsidized housing.
  - c. Walmart (1000 S 300 W) and Health Department (500 East and Center St) may be facilities frequented by low-income and minority populations.

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Heber Power and Light
Date:	Friday, May 29, 2020
Time:	9 AM – 10:30 AM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Jason Norlen	Heber Power & Light	General Manager	<a href="mailto:jnorlen@heberpower.com">jnorlen@heberpower.com</a>	435.671.2063

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling.
  - b. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - c. Purpose is defined by a transportation need. Overview of timeline - looking to reach out to the general public in the next month, along with developing a stakeholder working group. Working towards a public meeting late in the summer to gather input on community needs.
  - d. There is no pre-determined solution at this point. Solutions will be data driven and will depend on the purpose and need.
  - e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 Issues
  - a. Heber Power & Light would like to work with UDOT regarding power outages on the 40 corridor, especially at intersections that maintain traffic flow. In the past, a car hit a light and caused an outage, it took crews 40 min. to get to the incident to begin repair work.

- b. Main Street can't handle weekend demand. Traffic on weekends is very congested which makes working on utilities very difficult. HPL does most maintenance work at night because of the heavy traffic.
- c. Would like better coordination with UDOT when electrical maintenance impacts signalized intersection.

### 3. Bypass Issues

- a. Planning horizon is through 2050. Not assuming a bypass is needed but also evaluating solutions on both east and west side, if one is determined.
- b. Heber Power & Light acquired property off of 650 S and west of South Field Road to construct a large electric substation that will take up much of the property. Their design does include the option for a road on the east side of the property. The property west of church acquired by the City for a bypass may not be wide enough so HPL's design includes land on east side of their property for the road corridor. HPL purchased the home on that property as well. HPL assumes the sheds on the property would be impacted by the corridor.
- c. Heber City and Wasatch County have acquired a substantial amount of property for a west bypass. Heber Power & Light is in the process of acquiring a 60-foot-wide corridor for the transmission line parallel to bypass corridor (acquiring land north and west of the corridor preservation for the bypass; south of SR 113 acquiring land east of the corridor preservation). Heber Power & Light understands plans for a bypass are not final, but their project could not wait.
- d. Completion of the transmission line in 2022, permitting process has been completed. Not sure if it was a NEPA document that was signed. Have shared wetland delineation information in the past with UDOT. Jeremy will locate information for team.
- e. Rocky Mountain Power did the environmental clearances for the project in Heber Valley. Benjamin Clegg of Sigma did the environmental clearances for Rocky Mountain Power. Jason will provide contact information for Sigma and Rocky Mountain Power.
- f. HPL will provide environmental contacts for Sigma and Rocky Mountain Power.

### 4. Planned Development

- a. Tying RMP 138 KV line near Jordanelle to Midway bench
- b. The Heber Power & Light project is in litigation for Midway portion of the project.
- c. Transmission lines have been a polarizing topic in the community, as there is quite a bit of opposition to the new lines.
- d. Dual circuit transmission lines near UVU campus, proposed to continue to Jordanelle.

### 5. Additional Stakeholders

- a. May want to contact Sorensen Development (recently annexed by Heber City).

### 6. Preferred Communication



- a. Preferred communication is by email.
- b. Jason will add Andrea/Bri to the power company email list

7. Other

## Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
	Provide link to ESRI system map to Andrea	Jason	
	Distribute wetland delineation information to team (find on ProjectWise or reach out to others at UDOT)	Jeremy	
	Provide contact information for Sigma and Rocky Mountain Power to Andrea	Jason	
	Add Andrea and Bri to Heber Power & Light stakeholder email list	Jason	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Daniel
Date:	Friday, May 29, 2020
Time:	10:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Eric Bunker	Daniel	Planning Director	<a href="mailto:ericbunker@danielutah.org">ericbunker@danielutah.org</a>	435.654.5062
✓	Ryan Taylor	Daniel	Town Engineer	<a href="mailto:rtaylor@to-engineers.com">rtaylor@to-engineers.com</a>	435.315.3168
✓	Chip Turner	Daniel	Mayor	<a href="mailto:chipturner@danielutah.org">chipturner@danielutah.org</a>	

## Meeting Topics

### 1. Project Overview

- a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling.
- b. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
- c. Stakeholders and public will have an opportunity for input on purpose and need. Intent of meeting today is to collect information on transportation needs/issues. Preliminary plan for stakeholder working group meeting in July and public open house in August.
- d. There is no pre-determined solution at this point. Solutions will depend on the purpose and need. First phase is focused on identifying needs.
- e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).

### 2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 Issues

- a. The roads in Daniel are in good shape. UDOT is installing a signal at the intersection of US 189 and 3000 S which should solve delay issues. The intersection does not align well which causes issues.
- b. 1200 E and US 40 intersection movements are difficult because of the alignment is skewed with US 40. Traffic backs up and there is a high number of accidents.

- c. Port of Entry – truck traffic backs up there, left turn movements are difficult but it at least slows traffic.
  - d. There was substantial traffic backup on US 40 on Memorial Day weekend. Backup starts at hub intersection and is mostly a problem during summer holiday weekends.
  - e. Numerous accidents on US 40 in Daniel Canyon.
3. Bypass Issues
- a. Little Sweden Road/3000 S/ Daniel Rd is used as a short-cut by some motorist going from US 40 to US 189. However, it does not actually save any time (it's about 5 minutes longer). Not a safe road for shortcut. More people may try to use shortcut with signal going in on US 189.
  - b. Daniel is in favor of bypass. Main Street through Heber has heavy congestion in the afternoon and on holiday weekends. Daniel has contributed to the corridor fund as well, to help purchase. Would like to see something happen in the future, as they have observed how congestion has increased over the years.
4. Planned Development
- a. Some commercial developments are being considered along US 40 and US 189. Independence is working with Daniel on the 40 corridor.
  - b. Any fields in town larger than 5 acres have the potential to be subdivided to residential development.
  - c. Currently have 4 active development permits which is a busy year for Daniel.
  - d. Most of the community is zoned 5-acre minimum for development. Goal is to keep community rural.
5. Additional Stakeholders Recommendations
- a. Staker Parson - they have large gravel pits at both ends of the valley
  - b. Provo River water users/environmental groups
  - c. Port of Entry (part of UDOT motor carriers)
6. Preferred Communication
- a. Email updates and phone calls
7. Other
- a. There is no specific areas in Daniel that are low-income or minority; however, there are low-income and minority residents in the community. The areas could be along 3000 S or along Daniels Creek. Wheeler Park is out of the town but has some lower income families
  - b. Environmental sensitive areas along Daniels Creek and there is also a floodplain associated with the creek.
  - c. Drinking water comes from spring area and up the canyon, source protection zones.

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Heber City
Date:	Tuesday, June 02, 2020
Time:	9:30 AM – 11:00 AM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Charles Allen	Parametrix	Traffic Lead	<a href="mailto:callen@parametrix.com">callen@parametrix.com</a>	801.319.8271
✓	Matt Brower	Heber City	City Manager	<a href="mailto:mbrower@heberut.gov">mbrower@heberut.gov</a>	435.654.0757
✓	Bart Mumford	Heber City	City Engineer	<a href="mailto:bmumford@heberut.gov">bmumford@heberut.gov</a>	435.657.7892
✓	Tony Kohler	Heber City	Planning Director	<a href="mailto:tkohler@Heberut.gov">tkohler@Heberut.gov</a>	435.657.7900

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 Issues
  - a. US-40 Corridor
    - i. The current volume of traffic on Main Street causes traffic congestion in the afternoon and on weekends. The bypass would keep future traffic at current levels on Main Street.
    - ii. Main Street has a high number of accidents. Most accidents are caused by vehicles trying to access Main Street. Heber City will provide an accident map.

- iii. Truck traffic on Main Street is a concern.
- iv. Cyclists avoid Main Street because of traffic; 100 E and 100 W are preferred. Bike races and marathons occur on 1200 W and 1200 E to avoid congestion.
- v. 100 W and 100 E are used as alternate routes to avoid congestion on Main Street. Some increased traffic is also seen on 300 W (signal being installed) and 600 W. Mill Road is an alternate route but the access with Center Street is difficult because of heavy congestion.
- vi. Traffic studies show that US 40 may need to be a seven lane road in the area north of Heber. S.R. 32 would need to be a five lane road.

b. Intersections

- i. Center Street and 100 South intersections with Main St. have substantial delay with traffic backup for blocks. Some intersections on Main Street may require two or three cycles to move through the intersection. The congestion does deter people from visiting downtown.
- ii. Crossing or accessing Main Street from east-west streets at a non-signalized intersections is difficult, there is long delay to find a gap.
- iii. The hub intersection becomes very congested on holiday weekends. Labor Day weekend traffic on US 189 was backed up from the hub to the dam at Deer Creek Reservoir southwest of the City.
- iv. A conceptual overpass is being discussed for the connection of US 40 and S.R. 32 (River Road)

3. Bypass Issues

- a. UDOT is not assuming that a bypass is needed, or if it is needed, that it will be on the west side. The east side will also be under evaluation.
- b. US 189 is not being considered for realignment as a result of airport improvements. Airport decisions are separate. The airport master plan open house will be in the July timeframe. The plan will detail the proposed airport improvements.
- c. West Bypass
  - i. The new high school will service both Midway and Jordanelle Basin. The traffic from these locations to the high school should be considered with respect to a bypass. Previous traffic studies show school would cause LOS E or F at the connection with S.R. 113. A bypass near that location could be a major congestion point and will require a traffic engineering solution.
  - ii. Should the west side bypass connect to S.R. 32 instead of connecting into U.S. 40 immediately north of the City? Challenges with this, especially the North Fields.
  - iii. Sewer farm was purchased with federal funds which may limit the ability for a new road to go through the property. Currently no plans to change the operation of the sewer fields.

iv. The bypass corridor has preserved a 112 to 120 feet wide corridor but could be less in some areas.

v. The North and West Fields are important to the community as a conservation area.

d. East Bypass

i. An east bypass is planned to connect to US-40 north of the City (north of 750 N) and connect to Center Street. The east bypass would be built by both the City and developers and will likely be two travel lanes. One of the purposes of the east bypass is to divert traffic from the east heading to Park City before Main Street.

ii. The City has not looked at east bypass south of Center Street but it should be considered.

e. East-west bypass (connection between west bypass and US-40 on south end)

i. Potential connection between US 40 and US 189 through Daniel was considered to handle the Strawberry/Provo traffic. Politically charged.

ii. 1300 S is a five-lane road that has been planned to be part of the bypass. The neighborhood to the north is against the bypass. The neighborhood does not want truck traffic on 1300 S because of safety concerns. The homes along 1250 S don't want any new road to the south.

iii. There is pressure to develop the area south of the hub where a potential bypass could be located. A road is being developed in conjunction with UDOT in this area.

4. Planned Development

a. The county park area will continue to develop and generate traffic. Community re-development area (CRA) may be created near the county park area which could generate traffic.

b. A CRA is being considered for Main Street to improve the area as a destination and to become more pedestrian friendly. This process will start sometime this year.

c. City annexed Sorensen land north of Heber City with the potential for 6,000 homes. There are also five other developments north of Heber City (North Village area) requesting annexation which will likely cause and increase of traffic on US 40.

d. For all of the new developments to the north Heber City will be the primary area for shopping.

e. The area south of the mobile home park south of the hub is going to be developed this year. The development north of the mobile home park is on hold pending the bypass study. This development is part of the Blue Rooster/Cross Road development.

f. See also item 7b.

5. Additional Stakeholder Recommendations

a. Scott Loomis of the Mountain Land Housing Trust should be contacted regarding environmental justice. Also may want to contact the Parkview Place development.

b. Mike Bradshaw – Sorenson Development

- c. HOAs for stakeholder working group – Tony will send contact information
- 6. Preferred Communication - Email. Make sure elected officials are informed.
- 7. Other
  - a. North Fields are sacred to the community, want to keep them untouched and unscarred. West Fields as well (south and to the west of Midway Lane)
  - b. One idea is making Main Street a one-way couplet with 100 W being the other leg. Heber City will send a figure showing that concept to UDOT for review.
  - c. The City is completing a master trails and park plan.
  - d. Rail to carry oil out of Uinta Basin is proposed. Need to be informed of proposal, evaluate whether that would reduce truck traffic on US 40 through Heber.
  - e. Potential Environmental Justice communities:
    - i. Between 200 E and 200 W may be a low-income area.
    - ii. A mobile home park south of the hub intersection is a low-income area.
    - iii. On Southfield Road is a new 42-unit affordable house development (Parkview development). Land on the south of this development has been preserved for the bypass.
    - iv. New development west of the church (Kimball Village) will be a 55 plus development with assisted living housing.
    - v. The new Southfield Development will be 80% of income affordable housing for low-income residents. This may cause environmental justice concerns if the development is built before the corridor.
    - vi. Need to consider impacts to the Mountain View church.
    - vii. The Nearfield development is approved as affordable housing area and the residents will be concerned about the bypass.
    - viii. Mountain Land Housing Trust has a tax credit apartment development east of 600 West near Murfield Park.

## Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
✓	Send development plans	Tony	
✓	Send one-way-couplet figure	Tony	
✓	Send HOA contact info for potential stakeholder working group	Tony	
✓	Send traffic studies to team	Bart	
	Send Main St accident information to team	Bart	
✓	Send corridor preservation map/GIS data to team	Bart/Tony	
	Send trails master plan to team (when available)		



## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Emergency Services
Date:	Tuesday, June 02, 2020
Time:	2:00 – 3:30 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	David Booth	Heber PD	Police Chief	<a href="mailto:dbooth@heberut.gov">dbooth@heberut.gov</a>	435.657.7912
	Jared Rigby	Wasatch County	Sheriff	<a href="mailto:sheriff@wasatch.utah.gov">sheriff@wasatch.utah.gov</a>	435.657.3560
✓	Ernie Giles	Wasatch Fire	Chief	<a href="mailto:chief@wasatchcountyfiredistrict.com">chief@wasatchcountyfiredistrict.com</a>	435.940.9636

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 Issues



- a. Law enforcement tries to stay off Main St. Will use 100 E or 100 W instead (“Main St East” and “Main St West”), especially when school gets out and weekends. Grid system makes it easier. With new annexation, emergency services will have to use US 40, 189, and SR 113. Highway Patrol and Sheriff will use main routes, it is a challenge when traffic is slow. It is a concern. Worried about accidents, getting around accidents.
  - b. Crossing Main Street E-W is difficult. Law enforcement tries to cross at signals. Will use backstreet with lights/sirens, but have to cross Main at signal unless early in morning or late at night.
  - c. Main St and 600 S intersection is the most concerning regarding auto/pedestrian. Kids frequently cross for McDonalds, the snow shack, or head west to the fairgrounds and ball parks. Heber PD sees a couple of bike accidents a year, also conflicts between vehicles turning traffic conflicting with ids/pedestrians in sidewalk.
  - d. Second most concerning intersection for auto/pedestrian accidents is Main St and 100 S.
  - e. Hawk signal at Main Street Park is working well. Only results in minor traffic backup, cars will move through on flashing lights now they are used to it.
  - f. Verify with crash data, but would expect high number of crashes with injuries at the hub intersection. Some drivers get confused. Speed could be a factor. Complaints are common.
  - g. Concerned about where developers will tie roads into US 40 north of town. Would like to connect at planned signals, keep to corridor agreement. Unsignalized intersections are a safety concern. Now that City has annexed land north of town, and will likely annex more, corridor agreement should be revisited with City and UDOT. UDOT will support County and agreement to maintain the integrity of US-40.
  - h. Happy to see a signal going in on SR 113 and 300 W. It helps with school crossing. 300 W used by emergency services as an alternate to Main Street. Southbound travel is heavy on 300 W south of SR-113 - major route for emergency as well as citizens. Speed enforcement and complaints.
  - i. 600 S/Main to 1200 S section is another important area to look at. High school students use this area for access, including Mill Rd area. When there are school events, it creates a lot of traffic impacts on Main St.
  - j. Rural Planning Organization’s long range plan shows widening SR-113 to 3 lanes in phase 2, 5 lanes in phase 3. Widening 113 is not on UDOT’s STIP yet (programmed for funding).
3. Bypass Issues
- a. Residents have raised concerns about a west bypass, there would likely be more concerns about an east bypass because it is more built out on the east side.
  - b. What happens at SR-113? Allowing access could influence traffic on local network. 300 W is busy now because it is kind of like a bypass.
  - c. If bypass is constructed, critical to connect to US 40 north of town at planned signal.

- d. In general, many citizens recognize something needs to be done and are in support of bypass. Not all are supportive. Businesses may be nervous about losing business. Semi-trucks will use businesses on Main St, last good opportunity when traveling from Uinta Basin to refineries in SLC.
- 4. Preferred Communication.
  - a. Emails. Make sure to communicate with elected officials to keep them updated.
- 5. Other
  - a. Heber PD has a very active Facebook page with 12 K followers. They would be happy to help push information out, get information to Dave Booth in a format that can be easily posted.

### Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
	Review US-40 corridor agreement, see if City participated	Jeremy	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Midway City
Date:	Wednesday, June 03, 2020
Time:	10:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Celeste Johnson	Midway	Mayor	<a href="mailto:cjohnson@midwaycityut.org">cjohnson@midwaycityut.org</a>	435.645.3223 x 102
✓	Michael Henke	Midway	Planner	<a href="mailto:mhenke@midwaycityut.org">mhenke@midwaycityut.org</a>	435.654.3223 x105
	Cory Lott	Midway	Public Works	<a href="mailto:clott@midwaycityut.org">clott@midwaycityut.org</a>	435.654.3223 x 117
✓	Wes Horrocks	Midway	City Engineer	<a href="mailto:wes@horrocks.com">wes@horrocks.com</a>	435.654.2226

## Meeting Topics

### 1. Project Overview

- a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
- b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
- c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
- d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
- e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
- f. Mayor Johnson asked for clarification on the environmental process, what is meant by “environment”

(1) Studying impacts to the natural and built environment, such as cultural resources, wetlands, along with property/community impacts.

(2) Undertaking through National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), requirement to evaluate if there are potential significant impacts anticipated.

## 2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 / S.R. 113 Issues

- a. Would like to keep Midway roads narrow and posted at 25 mph, with ped/bike access. Would prefer to not have large connector roads. Michie Lane is one of the few roads that is wider and more developed road.
- b. Speeding is a common complaint; residents want all traffic to be moving slower. River Road, Center Street, 250, Main Street are the connector roads for the community and those are the biggest speeding problems.
- c. Some concern with through traffic from Provo to Park City going through Midway via SR 113 and River Road. Would prefer the traffic go onto a proposed bypass. Two roundabouts are planned on River Road, the intent is to reduce speeds and encourage thru traffic trucks to use other roads
- d. SR 113 and 1750 W intersection is a safety issue because of speed on SR 113. SR 113 is the main connection to schools in Heber. SR 113 could use a center turn lane. Speeds on SR 113 are too fast.
- e. Safety concerns on SR-113 on east end of Midway, but don't want signalized intersections. The turn lanes are helpful (e.g. Michie Ln) but prefer to not have the signals as it makes the town feel less rural.
- f. Intersection on SR 113 with access road to sewer plant has safety concerns. Desire to abandon connection to SR 113 and connect to Michie Lane instead.
- g. SR 113 and fisherman access has safety concerns.
- h. Weekend traffic is greater than during the week.

## 3. Bypass Issues

- a. Mayor Johnson is interested in one-way couplet option instead of bypass. Would like to preserve North Fields area. If a bypass, the west side would make the most sense but would prefer the one-way couplet.
- b. Heber Main Street is congested which could cause concerns in Midway. Some improvements are needed to reduce congestion on Main St.
- c. The bypass, if selected, should look like the Legacy Parkway (blend into environment).

## 4. Planned Development

- a. Homestead Resort is planning on expansion.
- b. Mountain Spa is proposing some residential and resort development. Could be 100 residential units.

- c. Heber has developments on website. Also MAG has the information which was included in the travel model.
- d. Wasatch State Park is looking at expanding the campground.
- 5. Additional Stakeholders
  - a. Consider talking to Interlaken and Independence.
- 6. Preferred Communication
  - a. Add to general stakeholder update list.
- 7. Other
  - a. Most important thing to the Midway residents is to keep the rural nature of the community. The City passed a \$5 M bond to protect open space. Midway is purchasing 47 acres east of SR 113 south of town and another 34 acre parcel on the western boundary. Midway posts the conservation lands on the City website.
    - i. They have an open space committee, which follows a process
      - (1) Submit proposal to Utah Open Lands and Summit Land Conservancy to assist with appraisal process.
      - (2) Criteria: viewshed, agricultural land, entry corridor, etc.
      - (3) All easements require a public hearing, once the process has reached that stage.
  - b. Looking to annex the Albert Kohler Farm from the county, easement in progress. City is committing \$ 1 million; easement is worth \$7 million (1:7 leverage)
  - c. Bicycle and pedestrian trails are very important. In the future, the community hopes to be able to bike safely all the way from Midway to Deer Creek. Looking to put in a trailhead near Tate lane/Center St intersection, want to work with UDOT on a safe trail crossing in the area.

## Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
	Request open space maps from Michael	Andrea	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Heber Valley Airport
Date:	Wednesday, June 03, 2020
Time:	3:30 PM – 5:00 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Travis Biggs	Heber Valley Airport	Manager	<a href="mailto:tbiggs@heberut.gov">tbiggs@heberut.gov</a>	435.671.1459

## Meeting Topics

### 1. Project Overview

- a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
- b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
- c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
- d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
- e. Airport and UDOT will share information but are following independent processes for the respective outcomes. Each agency needs to make the best decisions for each agency. US 189 will not be realigned for airport improvements.

### 2. Main Street / U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 Issues

- a. Access to the airport is either from Daniels Road or from 3000 S if coming from Provo.
- b. Airport Rd goes all the way through to 40, access to hospital. AirMed is stationed there. Fixed wing air ambulance lands there.

- c. US 89 does not create any substantial issues. US 89 does provide some benefit because it makes the airport visible from an economic perspective.
  - d. Congestion on surrounding roads is not an issue for access to the airport.
3. Bypass Issues
- a. A bypass would not impact airport operations.
4. Airport Master Plan
- a. Will probably be finished before the EIS, 16-24 months from now. An airport layout plan needs to be completed.
  - b. When the airport was built and the cost agreements were signed, the type of aircraft was much smaller than it is now. Currently aircraft are wider, heavier and faster. It is a public airport so they can't restrict the traffic coming in.
  - c. FAA is considering safety improvements to accommodate larger jet traffic. FAA will make a decision on the safety upgrade in the next 3 months. Safety improvements would include widening the runway from 75' to 100', which would impact the runway protection zone (RPZ) and the object free zone.
    - i. If runway is expanded, the US 189 would be in the object free zone, so the runway would need to be shifted south, away from the road. This would require relocation of hangers and maintenance buildings. Hangar owners do not like this option.
    - ii. RPZ is restrictive on what can be built and what is inside it. Houses on 3000 S would also need to be removed.
    - iii. If RPZ is expanded, 1300 South would be inside - this could be an issue. Unclear whether a road could be within the RPZ. May be different for new road compared to existing road which could be grandfathered. UDOT will need to talk to FAA on restrictions for highways in RPZ.
    - iv. FAA has eminent domain and that property becomes part of the airport. However, 3000 S area is not part of Heber City, it is part of Daniel. Need legal guidance on this.
  - d. FAA will want two options for airport planning, one with US 189 realignment and one without. They know UDOT will not consider the FAA issues as part of the road improvements.
5. Preferred Communication
- a. Best way to contact Travis is use his cell phone.
  - b. Jeremy McAllister from TO Engineering has detailed knowledge of the timelines and process.
  - c. Katie Franco – PR manager for Flightpath. Good resource for information.
6. Other
- a. Phase 2 study being conducted for historic landfill near the airport. May be an old landfill near the intersection of US 189 and Southfield Road.



## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Heber Valley Historic Railroad
Date:	Friday, June 05, 2020
Time:	9:00 AM – 10:30 AM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Vern Keeslar	HVC Team	Traffic / Freight / Rail	<a href="mailto:vkeeslar@parametrix.com">vkeeslar@parametrix.com</a>	801.307.3400
✓	Mark Nelson	Heber Valley Historic RR	Executive Director (also on Wasatch Co. Council)	<a href="mailto:mark@hebervalleyrr.org">mark@hebervalleyrr.org</a>	801.376.8028
✓	Mike Manwiller	Heber Valley Historic RR	Chief Mechanical Officer/Operations Officer	<a href="mailto:mmanwiller@msn.com">mmanwiller@msn.com</a>	

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
2. Issues with existing rail and road network



- a. Existing right-of-way (ROW) is jointly owned by Utah State Parks and UDOT, leased back to the Heber Valley Historic Railroad (RR) in 15 year increments. Width varies from 50' to 150'.
  - b. Trails in RR ROW
    - i. Existing trail from Soldier Hollow to Deer Creek dam. Likely the segment from Vivian Park to the dam will be funded next year.
    - ii. Segment from Soldier Hollow to depot (end of tracks) likely to be constructed in the next 5-6 years. Need to consider bike/pedestrian issues in addition to rail issues.
  - c. RR has more than doubled the number of trains and passengers in past 5 years. Growth forecasted to continue. Last year - 600 trains/120,000 passengers.
    - i. When trail system is constructed, they expect an increase in the number of the riders on the train. In the future, transporting people and their bicycles will probably be a factor
    - ii. Looking to add dining and reception cars. Frequency and length of trains will continue to grow.
  - d. Safety
    - i. RR follows UP standards (e.g., vertical clearance). Rail speed 25 mph.
    - ii. Primary safety concern is the existing crossing at 650 S near the depot where there are schools and community facilities. Area is congested now and will get more congested with growth.
    - iii. No crossing arms currently at intersection with South Field Rd. Low-income housing development planned at this intersection. Someday, there will need to be crossing arms here.
    - iv. There are trespass concerns at the depot. People walking from the event center/rodeo grounds to the west into Heber sometimes will hop the fence and vandalize property. Currently working to address this, it would be helpful if future alternative would not make this problem worse.
  - e. As the population continues to develop, RR will likely explore quiet crossings.
3. Concerns with potential bypass
- a. Request any future crossing be grade separated, especially for a highway facility. Likely the road would have to go over the rail, there isn't sufficient track length or ROW for rail to go over road.
  - b. ROW width at crossings should provide space for rail maintenance.
  - c. Line of sight is very important. RR engineers like to have clear line of sight for 1-1.5 miles, especially with trail users in the ROW. Overpasses with large fill can impact line of sight; need to evaluate – especially if there are other road crossings in the area.
    - i. Previous bypass alignments cross RR near sewer fields—concerns with line of sight, especially important because of pedestrians and fisherman access.

- d. Open space and rural character are very important to the community and the RR.
    - i. Passenger survey indicated scenery/views are what they enjoy most. Want to preserve the character and charm of the area, don't want it to look like Orem or Sandy.
    - ii. Green space from sewer farm to North Fields is the crown jewel of the valley. RR corridor is beautiful, overpass could cause visual impacts. Community is discussing/evaluating how to preserve this area.
  - e. An overpass within the first 1-1.5 miles would be less problematic from an operational standpoint, and would not impact views as much.
4. Preferred Communication
- a. Add to stakeholder list
  - b. Email is best way for updates
5. Other
- a. RR is frequently used for filming. Brings in revenue for RR and community.

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Developers
Date:	Thursday, June 11, 2020
Time:	10:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Bryce Baker	DB	Developer	<a href="mailto:bryce@dburbancommunities.com">bryce@dburbancommunities.com</a>	
✓	Dustin Holt	DB	Developer	<a href="mailto:dustin@dburbancommunities.com">dustin@dburbancommunities.com</a>	
✓	Brad Lyle	MG	Developer	<a href="mailto:brad@mgutah.com">brad@mgutah.com</a>	
✓	Ben Pike	MG	Developer		
✓	Robert Muir	MG	Developer		
✓	Robert Nelson	MG	Developer		
✓	Dave Nelson	MG	Developer		
✓	Scott Verhaaren	Boyer	Developer	<a href="mailto:sverhaaren@boyercompany.com">sverhaaren@boyercompany.com</a>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DB = dbURBAN Communities</li> <li>2. MG – Millstream Group</li> </ol>				

## Meeting Topics

1. Introductions
  - a. dB Urban projects in the area: Turner Mills (36 acres south of hub)
  - b. Millstream Group projects: New London (50 acres on north end / east bypass), Blue Rooster (8 acres south of Holiday Inn)
  - c. Boyer projects: Valley Station (includes Wal Mart)
2. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.

- b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
3. Issues with existing transportation system
- a. Boyer Company was concerned about connections to the Wal Mart development. Boyer Company wants to ensure ingress/egress traffic to the development and visibility. They prefer more traffic signals.
  - b. Boyer Company does not want traffic on Main Street to be reduced to the point that there would be less traffic to their development.
  - c. Developers are okay with removal of trucks from Main Street but don't want to limit shoppers into Heber City. Also okay with through traffic going around Main Street.
  - d. Large developments north of Heber (Mayflower, Sorenson) will increase traffic into Heber. Heber will be the main shopping area for these developments. Improvements are needed.
4. Concerns with potential bypass
- a. An eastern bypass road will be in place on US 40 by the time the EIS is completed (City road, location is determined). The East Bypass will connect to US 40 about 1,100 feet north of Heber Appliance. The Bypass is similar to the City Master Plan and will go through the Millstream Group New London Project. MG to send plan showing road.
  - b. Is the western bypass still be considered? Yes, but will be looking at the western bypass along with other alternatives.
  - c. The advantage of the previous west bypass alignment in the planning study - it was using 40 as a diversion and only restricting some types of traffic (truck). Regular vehicle traffic would still be allowed and continue to patronize businesses.
  - d. An Eastern Bypass would cause more congestion on Main Street. Traffic between Utah County and Summit County would not want to travel out of direction (farther east).
  - e. The Bypass should not have a negative effective to the Wal-Mart retail area. This shopping center is important to the community.
  - f. Need to treat residents who might be adversely impacted fairly but overall a new route would be good for the community.
5. Development

- a. Important to know where transportation improvements will go. Where is more important than when, although sooner is preferable. Delays make planning difficult.
  - b. dB Urban Turner Mill project (36 acres around the Silver Eagle). Will have a new road connection at about 1500 S. They don't want the bypass through the 36 acre development with 400 residential units and 400K of commercial space. Would make the northern part of the property useless. The development is proposed as a mixed-use walkable community. The developer would allow the City a 72 foot road on the north part of the property. Expect to start construction in fall 2020.
  - c. Millstream Group Blue Rooster project (south of Holiday Inn Express) is okay with the bypass going through their property. The closer to the Holiday Inn Express the better. Project on hold until bypass decision.
  - d. Millstream Group will be expanding the RV park near Center Creek Road from 150 stalls to 200 stalls. This is a 5 acre expansion to the south of the existing property.
  - e. Just south of MP 20 will be a Millstream Development with access to US 40 which will be the main entrance into Independence. The road will be 110 feet.
  - f. Difficult to put roads on airport property.
6. Preferred Communication – add to stakeholder email
7. Millstream group will participate in stakeholder working group, will identify one representative.

## Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
	Send HVC team plan showing eastern bypass connection with US 40	MG	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Business
Date:	Thursday, June 11, 2020
Time:	3:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Dallin Koechner	Heber Valley Chamber	Executive Director	<a href="mailto:dallin@gohebervalley.com">dallin@gohebervalley.com</a>	
✓	Tom Stone	CAMS	Chairman	<a href="mailto:tstone@guildmortgage.net">tstone@guildmortgage.net</a>	435.671.3400
	CAMS = Community Alliance for Main Street				

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Following National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) because of potential for significant impacts.
  - b. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - c. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - d. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - f. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
2. Issues with existing transportation system (now and through 2050)

a. Main Street

- i. Volume, speed and type of traffic is a big concern. The large tanker trucks and the speed they travel creates an uninhabitable Main Street for pedestrian traffic. It feels dangerous and uninviting. Outside dining for example is not feasible because of the noise created by traffic.
- ii. Traffic on Main Street during the morning and afternoon peak periods is very congested. For the remainder traffic volumes are also high and deter people from visiting downtown.
- iii. Most services on Main Street are professional. People that visit the professional services offices don't tend to visit other stores because Main Street is not walkable. Retail has had a difficult time on Main Street. Professional businesses are more stable.
- iv. Parking is a problem on Main Street. Most parking associated with businesses are full. The City allows for parallel parking on Main Street. It is difficult to parallel park when traffic is heavy.
- v. 100 E and 100 W are currently used by residents because Main Street is so congested.
- vi. Pedestrian crossings are a safety concern.

3. Concerns with potential bypass

- a. Some businesses are worried that removing traffic will impact their businesses. However, traffic isn't necessarily stopping at those places now and improvements would likely entice more visitors. Most of the businesses are professional services but there isn't currently a lot of retail walkability. Making Main Street more walkable should increase business.
- b. The truck traffic is not supporting local businesses mostly pass through traffic. The trucks do make some purchases but typically at the gas stations as they are passing through.
- c. Some towns like Ephraim and Richfield were used as examples of negative impacts due to a bypass but Heber is different because it is a tourist destination and people are coming there for a reason, not just a pass thru. Other members of CAMS feel very similar to this based on their own experiences.
- d. Concerned that western bypass may not alleviate traffic. Thought eastern bypass would have been a better choice. Mill Road could have been a good east Bypass before the area was built out.

4. Businesses/Community

a. Historic Downtown

- i. Working on beautification in the historic downtown area. Want to encourage more visitors to that area. The historic areas are between 200 N and 300 S is the main focus area. This needs to be preserved and even some businesses such as the Dairy Keen.
- ii. Would oppose the widening of Main Street as that is not the goal of the community. The goal of the community is to make Main Street more walkable.



- b. What is the trend of the businesses on Main Street? Professional services is dominant, as retail has been challenging for tenants in the past. New tenant applications are more retail/service focused and seeing a greater demand for this. Not there yet but the tide is shifting towards more retail focused.
  - c. Parking for Main Street is a huge problem for the businesses. Looking at other tourist cities like Jackson and Steamboat Springs, people don't seem to have a problem walking to where they want to go. Parallel parking on the road is allowed and helps but it doesn't solve the problem. when traffic is bad, it causes safety concerns when people are trying to park
  - d. The north part of Main Street has a more industrial/urban sprawl feel. This area has higher noise levels because of higher speeds.
  - e. North Fields is a huge community asset, the bypass could a scenic byway and could be a pleasant drive for travelers. However, it would be best to keep it closer to the city.
5. Preferred communication
- a. Add to email stakeholder database. Tom OK with texts.
6. Stakeholder working group
- a. Tom would like to be on the stakeholder working group.
  - b. Other options include Brian Balls, Lane Lithgow (professional service business owners), Danny Labrum (Ford/Chevy on the south end of town), Perry Dickson (Slim & Knobby's bike shop) and Dairy Keen owner.
7. Other
- a. One-way-streets
    - i. The U of U did a Main Street study that looked at one-way streets. Felt one-way streets might work on 100 E and 100 W (should complement Main Street with walkable connections to Main Street). Basically makes Main Street three roads.
    - ii. Feel Main Street should not be one-way street. Making Main Street one-way might encourage people to pass through rather than stop. Not desirable, want people to stop an visit – community goal.
  - b. Solutions for main street should be all encompassing, such as landscaping, parking type, utilizing other side streets as alternative corridors, such a 100 E/100 W. Mid-block walkways and side streets should be complementary to Main Street.
  - c. Potential CRA investment on the west side by the Depot to make it more of a tourism destination. No firm plans, still conceptual. Working putting together a grant application. Downtown is also putting in a CRA



## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Wasatch County School District
Date:	Monday, June 15, 2020
Time:	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Location:	Webex

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Paul Sweat	Wasatch Co. School Dist.	Superintendent	<a href="mailto:paul.sweat@wasatch.edu">paul.sweat@wasatch.edu</a>	
✓	Stacey Moore	Wasatch Co. School Dist.	Administrative Assistant	<a href="mailto:stacey.moore@wasatch.edu">stacey.moore@wasatch.edu</a>	435.654.0280

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in August.
  - b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
2. Wasatch County School District
  - a. Has been collaborative with municipal governments and other players through previous efforts, would like to continue to work collaboratively with UDOT.

- b. New high school
  - i. Purchased 67 acres for new high school north of SR-113 and about 900/1000 W. District feels this is the best location after studying for several years.
  - ii. Need bond to pass before construction can begin, could be within the next 2-3 years.
  - iii. Wetland delineation completed, permit application would go in when ready to build. District feels they can get approval from the USACE. There is a small chance that the school district may not get approval from the USACE and if so they would sell the property and move to another site.
  - iv. Met with UDOT during previous study when three bypass alignments were under evaluation. Alternatives A and B would be compatible with school site plan, Alternative C would interfere.
  - v. Traffic study was completed for high school. Included traffic signal at SR-113.
  - vi. School would serve areas to the north and west. Wasatch High School is currently over capacity.
- 3. Issues with existing transportation system
  - a. Current transportation system is unsafe for students to walk to school, or get on/off of US-40. US-40 is a concern at all times. The school district feels a bypass would help with student safety.
  - b. District would not locate a school near US-40 due to safety concerns.
  - c. What is plan for US-40 in the future? There is a corridor agreement between UDOT and Wasatch County from 500 North to SR-32 that stipulates where traffic signals would be located based on speed limit and access category. Signals would not be constructed until they meet signal warrant requirements.
- 4. Concerns with potential bypass
  - a. Believe a bypass is needed to improve student safety now and into the future as the area grows.
  - b. If bypass were to follow Wasatch County corridor preservation plan, bypass would work well. Details like signal location would have to be coordinated with UDOT.
  - c. District would like to continue conversation about alternatives at the appropriate time.
- 5. Preferred Communication
  - a. Add to stakeholder email database.
  - b. Inform of public meetings so District can have a representative present.
- 6. Other
  - a. District can provide information on low-income and minority populations.
  - b. District can help with public meeting venues.

- c. District will provide locations of potential other future schools.

## Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
✓	Share new high school site plan with HVC team	Stacey	
	Share potential future school locations with HVC team	Stacey	
	Share traffic study for future high school with HVC team	Stacey	
✓	Provide District contact for low-income and minority population information	Stacey	
✓	Follow up with traffic team to see if school student demographics would help (they would not help – too detailed for model)	Andrea	
	Work with District through Stacey for open house location	Bri	

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Utah Trucking Association
Date:	Tuesday, June 16, 2020
Time:	3:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
	Charles Allen	HVC Team	Traffic Lead	<a href="mailto:callen@parametrix.com">callen@parametrix.com</a>	801.319.8271
✓	Vern Keeslar	HVC Team	Traffic / Freight / Rail	<a href="mailto:vkeeslar@parametrix.com">vkeeslar@parametrix.com</a>	801.307.3400
✓	Jon Boyer	UT Trucking Assoc.	Communications/Admin. Director	<a href="mailto:jon@utahtrucking.com">jon@utahtrucking.com</a>	
	Rick Clasby	UT Trucking Assoc.	Executive Director	<a href="mailto:rick@utahtrucking.com">rick@utahtrucking.com</a>	801.243.6521
✓	Terry Smith	UT Trucking Assoc.	Director of Safety	<a href="mailto:terry@utahtrucking.com">terry@utahtrucking.com</a>	801.560.1687

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in late August.
  - b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.

2. Issues with existing transportation system

- a. Main concern is regarding truck traffic coming from the Uinta Basin to refineries in Salt Lake. I-80 is the quickest route. The drivers get paid per mile so any delay impacts their pay check. Utah Truckers Association keeps drivers informed regarding potential delays so drivers can change routes.
- b. There are 200 to 250 trucks one-way from the Basin through Heber City heading to Salt Lake per day. They run 7 days a week. Traffic from the Basin is dependent on the price of oil, higher prices leads to more traffic.
- c. The crude coming out of the basin is quite thick, so a pipeline won't work, that's why the crude is still being hauled via tanker trucks.
- d. Truckers typically fuel in the Basin and don't necessarily stop in Heber.
- e. No significant safety concerns to note. The drivers are very aware of the Heber community and try to do their best to avoid being a nuisance.
- f. Provo Canyon is not widely used by trucks out of the Basin because it is about 45 miles out of the way, they would need to travel all the way back up to North Salt Lake. The main reason that there are trucks going down Provo is because that is their destination, or they are heading southbound on I-15.

3. Concerns with potential bypass

- a. Truckers would use a bypass if they were aware of it. It would not matter where it is, as long as it saved them time. They would love not having to stop as many times as they do now.
- b. Bypass should be designed to highway standards.

4. Preferred Communication

- a. Utah Trucking Association regularly meets with the eastern trucking groups (Uinta Basin). They want a safe road and the ability to maintain a safe, consistent speed. Meeting with this group would be beneficial to get their input. There are probably 45-50 carriers out there.
- b. Best way to communicate is through Utah Trucking Association. They can help arrange meetings.
- c. Terry will be the representative for the trucking association on the stakeholder working group.

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – UDOT Motor Carriers
Date:	Wednesday, June 17, 2020
Time:	10:00 AM – 11:30 PM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Vern Keeslar	HVC Team	Traffic / Freight / Rail	<a href="mailto:vkeeslar@parametrix.com">vkeeslar@parametrix.com</a>	801.307.3400
	Travis Bowen	UDOT Motor Carriers	Daniels Port of Entry Supervisor	<a href="mailto:tbowen@utah.gov">tbowen@utah.gov</a>	435.654.1091
✓	Aubrey Hauser	UDOT Motor Carriers	Super Load Coordination Team	<a href="mailto:ahauser@utah.gov">ahauser@utah.gov</a>	801.965.4340
	Jacob Glover	UDOT Motor Carriers	Customer Relations Supervisor	<a href="mailto:jglover@utah.gov">jglover@utah.gov</a>	801.965.4261
	Chad Sheppick	UDOT Motor Carriers	Director	<a href="mailto:csheppick@utah.gov">csheppick@utah.gov</a>	801.965.4156
✓	Stephen Goodrich	UDOT Motor Carriers	Operations Manager	<a href="mailto:sgoodrich@utah.gov">sgoodrich@utah.gov</a>	801.965.4637
✓	Daniel Hunter	UDOT Motor Carriers	Program Manager	<a href="mailto:danielhunter@utah.gov">danielhunter@utah.gov</a>	

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in late August.
  - b. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - c. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).

- d. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - e. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
2. Port of Entry
- a. At the port of entry need to have capability for weigh-ins. About 20,000 trucks per month come through the entry. Trucks over 10,000 lbs must stop. There is a limited bypass going eastbound (trucks don't need to make left-turn into port), this is mainly oil tanker trucks returning empty from a trip to the refineries in Salt Lake. Truckers need to apply for permit.
  - b. Don't keep track of who is coming through the port (don't have data on the percentage of tanker trucks coming from the Basin).
  - c. Checks at the port include: weight, measurement, load bridging, safety inspection (e.g., brakes, tires, hydraulics, driver qualifications, insurance). Can't inspect every truck, Port staff will identify trucks for inspection based on experience. Inspection takes about an hour.
  - d. New inspection building built within the last two years. No plans for future improvements to Port.
  - e. Travis Bowen is Port Supervisor.
3. Issues with existing transportation system
- a. Need space to handle oversized loads. When additional features are added to facilities (e.g., roundabouts, pedestrian facilities) it limits the space for oversized loads to use that area.
  - b. Have you noticed any reduction in oil trucks with the decrease in oil prices?
    - i. Tanker traffic is seasonal, can't see a trend yet. There are generally 25,000 to 30,000 trucks per month May to October, and 15,000 to 18,000 trucks per month November to March. February to May this year was within that range, don't have June numbers yet. Don't track tankers specifically, could be other traffic making up for decrease in oil tankers.
    - ii. Eastbound bypasses are mostly oil tankers, they are down 500-600 in March.
  - c. Oversized loads are restricted US-189, must use US-40 and I-80.
  - d. Pilot car needed at 12-feet-wide; two pilot cars needed at 14-feet-wide or 16-feet-tall. Police escorts needed for loads 17-feet-wide. Have seen an increase in oversized loads requiring police escorts in the last few years.
  - e. Parking and chain up areas are a big challenge, need to maintain those. Truck parking areas needed for drivers to pull over to meet driving hour regulations (can operate 14 hours/day, 10 hours behind a wheel). Truck stop areas help meet this need, not sure if this is preferred but drivers do pull over in all areas and typically park for 10 hours. Do trucks stop/park in Heber? Question for Travis – depends on where they come from and how long they have been driving.
4. Concerns with potential bypass

- a. Any bypass should be designed to accommodate large loads.
  - b. Bypass should split from US-40 after Daniel Port of Entry, or would have to relocate Port of Entry. New facility on US-6 cost \$11 M.
5. Preferred Communication
- a. Add to email list: Steve, Dan, Travis, Lane Murphy (lmurphy@utah.gov)



## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Heber Valley Special Services District
Date:	Thursday, June 18, 2020
Time:	9:00 AM – 10:00 AM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Dennis Gunn	HVSSD	Manager	<a href="mailto:hvssd@aol.com">hvssd@aol.com</a>	435.654.2248

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Working on solving the transportation mobility issues and needs of the Heber Valley, mainly focused on the US 40 corridor.
  - b. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in late August.
  - c. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - d. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - f. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.
2. HVSSD facilities and operations

- a. The Sewer District does not have a discharge permit to discharge to the Provo River due to water quality issues and thus must dispose waste water on land. The sewer farm is where the waste water from the plant is disposed by sprinkler system.
  - b. The farm has 85 acres but can only dispose waste water on about 65 acres. Some areas are not useable for multiple reasons:
    - i. Roads
    - ii. Safety buffer zones (sprinkler drift area). The District is trying to reduce the size of State required buffers. One option being considered is walling around the fields. Drip irrigation could minimize drift.
    - iii. Pivot sprinkler systems cannot reach corners of square areas. A swing span could be used to expand distribution into corners.
  - c. Because of expanding populations the Sewer District needs more land for discharging. The sewer farm just acquired an area west of the current sewer farm and will likely be operational next year. The Sewer District is purchasing new land with District fees.
  - d. The sewer farm is highly valued as open space so there are currently no plans to eliminate the current waste water disposal process.
3. Issues with existing transportation system
- a. No concerns with moving equipment around with existing transportation system. Southfield road is the only road that needs to be crossed, it is only 2-lanes and traffic is minimal.
  - b. Widening Southfield road would be a concern; relocating the pivot would decrease the radius of the area where wastewater is distributed (thereby reducing the acreage).
  - c. Currently no need to cross 2400 S or US-189 – these roads are outer boundaries of the sewer farm.
4. Concerns with potential bypass
- a. Any impact to land used for wastewater disposal would need to be replaced with equal acreage. Any replacement land would need a waste water pipe to the land and the land would have to meet certain requirements. If the sewer farm is divided by a road the equipment would need to be given safe access across the road.
  - b. There are a handful of properties the District has looked at for possible sewer farm expansion:
    - i. The triangular land between 2400 S and 3000 S may work as a replacement parcel. That property has a similar use and is near the existing sewer district waste water system.
    - ii. Property just north of the Heber rail line west of Edwards Lane. The Sewer District currently has a waste water line near the property.
    - iii. Property south of US189 and east of gravel pit; would require extension of the waste water system. Would also have to figure out access across US-189.
  - c. Land in Heber Valley is limited commodity, lands are highly desired for multiple reasons.

- d. The sewer farm was purchased with grant money from the US EPA. UODT would need to look at the grant to determine if the land can be used for transportation purposes. The Bureau of Reclamation is not involved in the land at the Sewer District.
  - e. The Sewer District Board is willing to work with UDOT on best solution. The best path forward is to provide any proposed alignment to Dennis to present to the Sewer District Board. With any alignment UDOT should recommended potential mitigation. The Board does not have a preferred route, but they want to be kept/made whole.
5. Preferred Communication
- a. Make sure the Board stays informed of all project updates, consists of elected officials from all the neighboring communities.
  - b. Dennis is the conduit to the Board for communications.

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Developers (Sorenson)
Date:	Thursday, June 18, 2020
Time:	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
	Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager	<a href="mailto:gdupaix@utah.gov">gdupaix@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8000
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
	Michael Bradshaw	Sorenson (Momentum Development)	Developer	<a href="mailto:mike@mdevg.com">mike@mdevg.com</a>	
✓	Brian Watson	Sorenson (Momentum Development)	Developer	<a href="mailto:brian@mdevg.com">brian@mdevg.com</a>	

## Meeting Topics

### 1. Project Overview

- a. Working on solving the transportation mobility issues and needs of the Heber Valley, mainly focused on the US 40 corridor.
- b. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in late August.
- c. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
- d. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
- e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
- f. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.

2. Sorenson Development

- a. Brian Watson will provide the 2017 traffic study for their proposed development.
- b. The next phase of the development will be from Coyote Lane just north near the Wasatch Canal. The preliminary design will be submitted this year. From this location development will expand north and east.
- c. There will be about 5,770 homes built in the 10,000 acre development. The development will occur over 30 years.
- d. The four access points from US 40 currently exist: Coyote Lane, College Way, Moulton Lane, and Commons
- e. 14 access points from S.R. 32 have been granted.
- f. Traffic study shows intersections with SR-32 and US-40 would fail without improvements in the future.

3. Concerns with potential bypass

- a. A bypass on the east or west side of the valley would not impact current development plans.
- b. Generally support a bypass, would be interested in seeing alternatives.

4. Preferred Communication

- a. Add Brian to email database.

## Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Interview – Mountainlands Community Housing Trust & Wasatch Community Housing Authority
Date:	Wednesday, June 24, 2020
Time:	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Location:	Google Meet

## Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email	Phone
✓	Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:jrbown@utah.gov">jrbown@utah.gov</a>	801.227.8034
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	<a href="mailto:nkisen@utah.gov">nkisen@utah.gov</a>	385.226.7614
✓	Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager	<a href="mailto:Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com">Vincent.izzo@hdrinc.com</a>	406.396.6223
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	<a href="mailto:Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com">Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com</a>	801.815.0259
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement	<a href="mailto:bbinnebose@pennapowers.com">bbinnebose@pennapowers.com</a>	801.597.5128
✓	Scott Loomis	MCHT <sup>1</sup>	Executive Director	<a href="mailto:scott@housinghelp.org">scott@housinghelp.org</a>	435.602.1882
✓	Jeff Bradshaw	WCHA <sup>2</sup>	Executive Director	<a href="mailto:jeffbcpa@gmail.com">jeffbcpa@gmail.com</a>	435.654.2053
	1. MCHT = Mountainlands Community Housing Trust 2. WCHA = Wasatch Community Housing Authority				

## Meeting Topics

1. Project Overview
  - a. Working on solving the transportation mobility issues and needs of the Heber Valley, mainly focused on the US 40 corridor.
  - b. Currently in pre-scoping, meeting with stakeholders and doing travel demand modeling. Preliminary plan for open house in late August.
  - c. Still evaluating options for the open house based on COVID-19 situation. Considering online open house and possibly a limited number open house to provide for social distancing for those that do not have internet access.
  - d. Intent of pre-scoping is to gather information on purpose and need (why the project is needed, what problems need to be solved).
  - e. Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021, decision in 2 years (early 2023).
  - f. No predetermined solutions. We are not assuming a west bypass will be built; we are aware of the previous planning efforts and corridor preservation, but we will consider all options including an east bypass.

- g. Website <https://hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov/>
- 2. Issues with existing transportation system
  - a. Traffic is congested and continues to get worse. Something must be done to address.
- 3. Concerns with potential bypass
  - a. Most of the community is aware a bypass is being planned and is in support
  - b. Communities adjacent to potential bypass have concerns regarding quality of life.
- 4. Low-income / subsidized housing
  - a. Parkview Place currently being developed by Mountainlands Community Housing Trust (MCHT) near 1200 South and Southfield Road, north of the railroad.
    - i. There is a total of 49 properties. Heber City and has right-of-way preserved for a bypass. The home buyers will be made aware of the bypass when the home is purchase.
    - ii. Priority given to essential workers. Applicants need to submit income information and one household member needs to be established as an essential employee (firefighter, teacher, etc.)
    - iii. The homes will be deed restricted to limit the percent increase in price over the years.
    - iv. To qualify, buyer's income can only be 80 to 120 percent of the Wasatch County median income depending on the property.
  - b. Prestige 1 and Prestige 2 near 1200 South and 640 E (independent senior apartments)
    - i. Prestige 1: 23 units for independent seniors, Prestige 2 is just south: 39 units. There are income limitations: Prestige 1 is between 40-50% Wasatch County median income, Prestige 2 is 60-80% of median income. Applicants for Prestige 1 qualified, but could not make rent payment (probably 20-40% median income).
    - ii. Most residents came from outside Wasatch County, but have a tie to the County.
    - iii. Units are completely full.
  - c. Elmbridge Apartments near 100 West and 700 North
    - i. The Elm Bridge Apartments is 76 units (1-3 bedrooms). To qualify the residents must be below 50% of county median income. Most renters are around 40%. The renters receive a tax credit for low-income individuals. There is a waiting list for the apartments.
  - d. Liberty Station Apartments near 300 West and 1000 South
    - i. 54-56 units is also a tax credit complex for people at 50-60% median income. There is a waiting list for the apartments.
  - e. Timbermill Station Apartments near 675 S and 100 W
    - i. Set aside under a federal program for low-income. About 26 housing units. Funded under a USDA rural development program.

- f. There is no Section 8 housing in Heber City although the Mountainland will accept vouchers at some developments.
5. Other
- a. Demographic information
    - i. School would be a good source for info
    - ii. Minority populations:
      - (1) About 4,000 Hispanic in the valley. There are several business that are focused to the Hispanic community.
      - (2) Park City Christian Center has a food pantry in Wasatch County. They have a store in Park City and may have better information about underserved communities.
      - (3) There is also the People Health Services in Park City that serves uninsured from Wasatch and Summit Counties.
  - b. Jeff would be interested in being on the stakeholder working group.
  - c. Scott can post project information at the apartments to get the word out.