

Summary

Project: Heber Valley Corridor EIS

Subject: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1

Date: Thursday, August 20, 2020

Location: Zoom

Stakeholder Working Group

Name	Representing	
Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team		
Jeremy Bown	UDOT	Project Manager
Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager
Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager
Vince Izzo	HVC Team	Project Manager
Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Environmental Lead
Kyle Stahley	HVC Team	Traffic
Justin Smart	HVC Team	Public Involvement Lead
Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement
Stakeholder Working Group Members		
Bart Mumford	Heber City	City Engineer
Dustin Grabau	Wasatch Co.	County Assistant Manager
Ryan Taylor	Daniel	Town Engineer
Justin Keys	Open Space	Wasatch County Open Lands Board
David Booth	Emergency Services	Heber Police Chief
Paul Sweat	School District	Superintendent
Shawn Seager	Rural Planning Organization	MAG Planning Director
Terry Smith	Trucking	UT Trucking Assoc. Safety Director
Addison Hicken	Agricultural	Farmer
Brady Flygare	Residential	South resident
Thom Wright	Residential	East resident
Jesse Thurman	Residential	West resident
Phillip Jordan	Residential	North resident
Laren Gertsch	Landowner	Landowner
Dave Nelson	Development	Millstream Group
Dallin Koechner	Business	Heber Valley Chamber Executive Director
Tom Stone	Business	CAMS Chairman
Jeffery Bradshaw	Housing	Wasatch County Housing Authority

Meeting Topics:

1. Stakeholder Working Group objectives
 - a. Facilitate communication between project team and stakeholder groups

- b. Share viewpoints representing individual stakeholder groups
 - c. Exchange viewpoints among different stakeholder groups
 - d. Help UDOT make informed decisions
2. Stakeholder Working Group responsibilities and expectations
- a. Bring community concerns to the project team
 - b. Ensure project information is being reported to the communities you represent
 - c. Listen respectfully to other stakeholders/members, consider their viewpoint with an open mind
 - d. Represent your community interest rather than your self-interest
 - e. Address misinformation, direct your community to official information sources
3. Project Background
- a. Heber City and Wasatch County have been considering a bypass road for more than 20 years, included in the Heber City General Plan and Wasatch County Master Plan.
 - b. Some right-of-way for a western corridor has been acquired.
 - c. UDOT completed the Heber Valley Parkway Corridor Planning Study in 2019, no recommendations came out of the study as further study was warranted.
 - d. Previous studies will inform the EIS, but there is no predetermined solution.
4. Project Overview
- a. UDOT's mission is to keep Utah moving while enhancing quality of life through transportation improvements.
 - b. UDOT is conducting an EIS to evaluate transportation solutions to improve mobility through the Heber Valley and the operation of Heber City Main Street (U.S. 40).
 - c. Timeline and Process:
 - i. Currently in early scoping phase, collecting information on transportation needs (problems), potential alternatives, and issues to consider in the EIS.
 - ii. Public meeting scheduled for August 27, with a 30 day public comment period running from Aug. 27 to Sept 26.
 - iii. Plan to formally begin the EIS process in early 2021 with publication of draft purpose and need.
 - iv. Public engagement opportunities at key milestones in the environmental process:
 - (1) Scoping
 - (2) Purpose and need
 - (3) Alternatives development
 - (4) Draft EIS

- v. Anticipate final decision on preferred alternative in early 2023.
- vi. Construction timing is unknown.

5. Preliminary Traffic Information

- a. Heber Valley population expected to nearly double by 2050. Increase in population and employment leads to increase in traffic. Vehicle miles travelled projected to increase by 80%, daily trips by 95% in the Heber Valley by 2050.
- b. Vehicles travelling north-south through the Heber Valley will increase from 45,000 vehicles per day to about 63,000 vehicles per day by 2050.
- c. Most of the vehicle trips that pass through Main Street at Center Street are internal to the Heber Valley (50%). About 30% of the traffic is just passing through the valley today; by 2050 that percentage is expected to decrease to about 25%.
- d. Level of service (LOS) measures how well a road can handle traffic. LOS A indicates free flowing conditions and LOS F indicates failing conditions with excessive delay.
 - i. UDOT considers LOS D or better adequate in urban areas. It would be too expensive and cause too many impacts to get to LOS A.
 - ii. Currently, the intersections on Main Street are operating at LOS B - LOS C during the PM peak hour. There are arterial segments on Main Street around Center Street that are currently failing at LOS E – LOS F.
 - iii. By 2050, intersections are expected to operate at LOS E – LOS F if no improvements are made (No Build conditions). Arterial segments are also expected to fail, especially in the southbound direction. Southbound traffic is projected to back up at 500 North during the PM peak with an average queue length of 6,300 feet and a maximum queue of about 12,000 feet. Only about 80% of the total vehicles travelling southbound are actually able to make it through (the rest are stuck in a queue waiting to get onto Main Street).
- e. During the PM peak hour, 92% of the traffic is private vehicles, 4% is private vehicles with trailers and RVs, and 4% is heavy trucks (1% gas tankers, 1% multi-unit semis, and 2% single unit trucks)
- f. Crash data indicates a higher number of crashes compared to the statewide average but less severe crashes compared to the statewide average on US-40 in downtown Heber.

6. Discussion

- a. In general, the group wanted more information regarding traffic numbers and methodology.
- b. Questions were raised regarding the percentage breakdown by vehicle type during the PM peak hour. Several members noted that 1% seemed too low for oil-tanker trucks, counter to experience. UDOT response: the percentage was based on counting vehicle types in a video taken during the peak hour. The group requested more information: What month and day of the week the video was taken? What is the percentage on other days? What is the percentage during non-peak-hour times (perhaps truckers are avoiding the peak hour congestion)? The

group suggested adding some clarifying info to the graphic and in the explanation (as noted above) before presenting to the public at large to avoid confusion.

- c. Questions were raised regarding the traffic numbers. Some thought the numbers were too low, others thought they were too high.
 - i. Was enough data collected to really understand the traffic?
 - ii. Request to see traffic distribution over time to show the monthly variation. Why was July and August selected to take traffic counts instead of March? UDOT response: the previous study used traffic counts taken in March, there was a concern that data did not capture the seasonal issues with recreational traffic. Between the two data sets, the picture is clearer.
 - iii. One member noted the traffic volumes on the slide showing travel flows through a point on Main Street are lower than numbers provided by UDOT previously. UDOT needs consistency in traffic numbers for credibility. UDOT response: traffic volumes were based on counts taken in July and August 2019. The slide is showing traffic through a single point on Main Street, not necessarily a good representation of traffic volumes on Main Street, need to make that more clear in the future.
 - iv. Surprised that the existing intersection LOS was not worse than LOS C, it is borderline non-functional now. UDOT response: LOS for an intersection averages out all movements so if there is one movement that is failing, and other movements that are operating OK the LOS for the whole intersection could average out to an acceptable LOS.
 - v. Do the traffic projections take into account the annexations and planned development? If we only have a problem during a small period now, that may not be the case in the future. UDOT response: the Summit Wasatch County travel demand model accounts for planned growth. It is the best available information.
- d. Questions were raised regarding what type of traffic problems the project should address.
 - i. What are the goals? What are we trying to accomplish?
 - ii. Do we want to build a solution for the peak hour in July? Or should we build a solution for a winter day?
- e. Questions were raised why Vernal, Moab, and Logan were selected as a comparison for crash analysis. UDOT response: these are similarly sized cities with a state highway that is also functioning as a local Main Street.
- f. Suggested goals:
 - i. Heber City has developed a vision for Main Street to be a slower, walkable corridor.
 - ii. Devise a system to help traffic get around Heber if they do not want to conduct business, but is not a problem for those who want to do business in Heber.
- g. Misinformation circulating
 - i. Heber City approved a road south of Burton Lumber, there is a rumor that is the bypass connection.

7. Next steps

- a. Public open house (August 27) and public comment period August 27 – September 26. Please provide comments.
- b. Stay connected through the website, email, social media. Feel free to reach out to team with questions.
- c. Help engage community.
- d. Follow up stakeholder working group meeting will be scheduled to provide more traffic information as requested.