

Early Scoping Summary Report

Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement

Lead agency:
Utah Department of Transportation

November 13, 2020

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of This Early Scoping Summary Report	1
1.2	Notice of Intent	2
1.3	Agency Coordination	2
1.4	Public Early Scoping	3
1.4.1	Stakeholder Interviews	3
1.4.2	Notification	4
1.4.3	Early Public Scoping Meeting	4
1.4.4	Early Scoping City and County Council Presentations	5
1.4.5	Stakeholder Working Group Meetings	5
2.0	Guide to Comments	5
3.0	Heber Valley Corridor EIS Early Scoping Comments	6
3.1	Purpose and Need	6
3.1.1	Traffic Congestion	6
3.1.2	Traffic Analysis	7
3.1.3	Safety	7
3.1.4	Growth	8
3.2	Alternatives – U.S. 40	8
3.2.1	Heber City Main Street	8
3.2.2	U.S. 40 North of Heber City	8
3.2.3	U.S. 40 South of Heber City	9
3.2.4	Main Street Intersections	9
3.3	Alternatives – U.S. 189	9
3.4	Alternatives – Bypass	9
3.4.1	West Bypass	10
3.4.2	East Bypass	11
3.5	Alternatives – Intersections off Main Street	12
3.6	Alternatives – Other	12
3.7	Resource Considerations	13
3.7.1	Community and Social Impacts	13
3.7.2	Natural Resource Impacts	14
3.7.3	Economics	15
3.8	Miscellaneous	15

Appendixes

- Appendix A. Agency Coordination Meeting
- Appendix B. Stakeholder Interviews
- Appendix C. Notifications of Early Scoping
- Appendix D. Public Open House Meeting Materials
- Appendix E. Stakeholder Working Group
- Appendix F. Early Scoping Period Comments

1.0 Introduction

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is planning to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate transportation solutions to improve mobility through the Heber Valley and the operation of Heber City's Main Street (U.S. Highway 40). Transportation improvements are needed to address the current and projected (2050) travel demand and to address safety concerns on Main Street.

UDOT's intent with the EIS is to develop and evaluate alternative solutions that address the transportation needs in the Heber Valley and are an asset to the community. The EIS will evaluate impacts to the natural and human environments from proposed alternatives, including the no-action alternative, and will identify a preferred alternative.

Because UDOT has received National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assignment from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being or have been carried out by UDOT pursuant to 23 United States Code 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated January 17, 2017, and executed by FHWA and UDOT.

What is travel demand?

Travel demand is the expected number of transportation trips in an area. Travel demand can be met by various modes of travel, such as automobile, bus, light rail, carpooling, and bicycling.

1.1 Purpose of This Early Scoping Summary Report

NEPA scoping is a formal coordination process to determine the scope of issues to be addressed and to identify significant issues related to the proposed action. UDOT is using an early scoping process to conduct activities in order to develop a proposal in sufficient detail to allow for meaningful public comment before formally initiating an EIS. These activities include soliciting public and agency input to develop a draft purpose and need statement, to identify a preliminary range of alternatives, and to identify potentially significant environmental issues. This *Early Scoping Summary Report* summarizes public and agency input gathered during the early scoping comment period, which lasted from August 26 to October 3, 2020. The meetings constitute the initiation of NEPA scoping. This *Early Scoping Summary Report* is a tool to focus the efforts of the EIS on the appropriate issues.

Public and agency input plays an important role in identifying issues and ideas regarding future transportation improvements in the Heber Valley. Throughout the environmental review process, UDOT will facilitate and encourage involvement from the neighboring residential and business communities to help identify issues and develop solutions. UDOT will continue to work with the public to ensure that people with interests in the project understand how and why certain suggestions will be evaluated in detail and why others are being eliminated. All public and agency comments received during the early scoping period for this project are included in this report and will be considered during the development and evaluation of purpose and need and alternatives.

1.2 Notice of Intent

A notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS must be published in the Federal Register prior to initiating the EIS process. UDOT anticipates publishing a NOI in early 2021. At this time, a draft purpose and need statement and a summary of early scoping will also be published for public review and comment. The NOI to conduct an EIS will be advertised in the Federal Register. This notice, which is a requirement of NEPA, will alert federal agencies of UDOT's intent to evaluate transportation improvements in the Heber Valley.

1.3 Agency Coordination

UDOT is coordinating with state and federal agencies that oversee the management of natural resources in the Heber Valley. It is important to include these agencies during the initial scoping activities to identify issues early so that they can be properly considered and, if necessary, avoided, minimized, or mitigated as the project progresses.

An agency coordination meeting was held during the early scoping period. Formal agency scoping will be conducted after publication of the NOI. Cooperating agencies and participating agencies will be formally identified, and a SAFETEA-LU coordination plan will be finalized at that time.

The agency coordination meeting was held on August 27, 2020, at 10:30 AM. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held virtually using the Zoom platform. The following agencies participated:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

These agencies were identified because there is a large wetland complex northwest of Heber City, and it is possible or likely that these agencies would have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to the environmental impacts of the project. A larger group of federal and state agencies, local governments, and Native American tribes will be consulted with during the EIS process when the purpose and need statement and the project study area are more clearly defined.

During the agency coordination meeting, UDOT gave a brief presentation that included an overview of the project, the background of the project, a preliminary project need, and preliminary findings regarding resources in the project area. Agencies discussed whether they were interested in being a cooperating or participating agency. The agencies wanted a higher level of involvement if there would be alternatives in the northwest quadrant of the Heber Valley where there is a large wetland complex. All agencies would be interested in a higher level of involvement at the onset of the project, but they could scale back their involvement if there are no alternatives in the northwest quadrant. The agencies were asked to fill out a scoping environmental checklist, which helps UDOT identify natural, cultural, and historic resources in the

What is SAFETEA-LU?

SAFETEA-LU—the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users—is a 2005 federal law that established new provisions and requirements for transportation projects. Under SAFETEA-LU, state, local, and tribal agencies with jurisdiction or interest in a project have an opportunity to formally participate in the environmental review of that project.

project area. The presentation, meeting summary, and checklists are included in Appendix A, Agency Coordination Meeting.

1.4 Public Early Scoping

Public scoping is a key component of the environmental review process. Scoping helps UDOT prepare a comprehensive and focused EIS that will help inform the decision-making and permitting processes. UDOT relies on public comments to help identify issues, gather input on a reasonable range of alternatives, and gauge public sentiment about the proposed improvements. Early scoping can help refine project definition and identify stakeholders and potential concerns to streamline the environmental review process. This in turn helps ensure that the EIS can be completed within the goal of 2 years from NOI to Record of Decision. A combination of measures was taken to ensure that the public was notified about the project and invited to participate in the process.

1.4.1 Stakeholder Interviews

A series of stakeholder interviews were conducted to help UDOT understand and obtain technical information related to transportation, planned development, and resources that are important to the community. A total of 18 interviews were conducted between May 27 and June 24, 2020. Stakeholders were identified by UDOT and its consultant through experience with previous projects in area, discussions with Heber City and Wasatch County, and discussions with other stakeholders. Stakeholders included municipal governments, the local rural planning organization (the Mountainland Association of Governments), service providers, emergency service providers, the Wasatch County School District, Heber Valley Airport, and representatives of businesses and the trucking industry. A summary of the stakeholder interviews is included in Appendix B, Stakeholder Interviews.

1.4.2 Notification

The early scoping period was initiated with the early scoping public meeting on August 27, 2020, and ended on October 3, 2020. A 30-day comment period was originally intended to run through September 26. However, UDOT was made aware that some people experienced technical difficulties submitting a comment through the form on the website. Because UDOT is committed to a comprehensive public involvement process for the EIS, the public comment period was extended by one week to October 3.

The following methods were used to notify the general public of the public scoping meeting and activities:

- Advertisements were placed in the following publications:
 - *Deseret News*, August 11 and August 18, 2020
 - *The Salt Lake Tribune*, August 11 and August 18, 2020
 - *The Wasatch Wave*, August 12 and August 19, 2020
 - *Heber City Newsletter*, September 1 and October 1, 2020.
- Information regarding the public meeting and the early scoping comment period was posted on the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project website and UDOT social media sites (Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter) on August 18, 21, 26, 27, and 31; September 10, 18, 21, and 25; and October 1 and 3, 2020.
- Email notices regarding the early scoping public meeting and comment period were sent to the UDOT mailing list on August 12, 20, 27, and 28; September 10, 17, 24, and 25; and October 1 and 3, 2020.
- A UDOT press release was sent to local media outlets on August 18, 2020, as a reminder of the public meeting on August 27, 2020.

Copies of the notification materials listed above are included in Appendix C, Notifications of Early Scoping.

1.4.3 Early Public Scoping Meeting

UDOT held an early public scoping meeting on August 27, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM virtually using the Zoom platform.

The early public scoping meeting included the following elements:

- A participant guide for the virtual public meeting was posted on the project website in advance of the meeting. This guide explained how to use the technology, how the meeting would work, and how to ask questions from a phone, computer, or mobile device.
- The public was encouraged but not required to sign in to the meeting through publicinput.com.
- The UDOT project manager presented project information including: project background and overview, stakeholder working group, preliminary traffic information, and how to submit a formal public comment. A video explaining the NEPA process was included in the presentation.
- Following the presentation, questions and comments were accepted during the meeting through the chat box and verbally. The presenters made it clear that comments submitted during the meeting through the chat box and verbally were useful but would not be considered official public comments.

- Participants were encouraged to submit their official comments regarding the transportation needs, possible solutions, and issues to consider through the project website, email, voicemail, or postal mail.
- The meeting was live-streamed via Facebook to the UDOT Heber Valley Corridor EIS group.
- The meeting was recorded and posted on the project website.

About 50 people attended the early public scoping meeting. Copies of the materials presented at the meeting are included in Appendix D, Public Open House Meeting Materials.

1.4.4 Early Scoping City and County Council Presentations

During the early scoping process, UDOT presented at one city council meeting, one county council meeting, and one interlocal government meeting. UDOT presented to the Wasatch County Council on September 9, 2020; the Heber City Council on September 15, 2020; and the Wasatch County Interlocal Meeting on September 30, 2020. The presentation was a condensed version of that given at the early public scoping meeting and included information regarding the project background and overview, the stakeholder working group, and preliminary traffic information. A high-level summary of the public comments received to date was provided. UDOT encouraged councils and the public to submit early scoping comments.

1.4.5 Stakeholder Working Group Meetings

UDOT developed a stakeholder working group (SWG) that includes 18 representatives for trucking, agriculture, open lands, emergency services, schools, residents, developers, local government staff, and businesses. The group serves as a communication conduit to the community and helps inform the decision-making process. The first SWG meeting was held on August 20, 2020, from 6:00 to 7:30 PM. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held virtually using the Zoom platform. Thirteen SWG members and 8 project team members attended. A presentation was given including SWG objectives and expectations, project background and overview, overview of NEPA process, and preliminary need. After the presentation, SWG members asked questions and provided comments.

Based on the number of questions related to preliminary traffic, UDOT decided to hold an additional, traffic-focused SWG meeting. The second SWG meeting was held on October 19, 2020, from 6:00 to 7:30 PM virtually using the Zoom platform. Nine SWG members and eight project team members attended. A presentation was given including an overview of process and methodology used for traffic analysis, and results for the Heber Valley Corridor EIS existing and 2050 No Build analysis results. After the presentation, SWG members asked questions and provided comments. The presentation and notes from the meetings are included in Appendix E, Stakeholder Working Groups Presentation and Notes. The SWG will continue to meet throughout the EIS process at major milestones.

2.0 Guide to Comments

The public will continue to have opportunities to provide input throughout the Heber Valley Corridor environmental review process, and public comments will continue to be solicited throughout the project. The

early scoping period for the Heber Valley Corridor EIS concluded on October 3, 2020. All comments that were received by October 3, 2020, are included in Appendix F, Early Scoping Period Comments.

Each comment was reviewed by UDOT as it was received and assigned a number. Appendix F includes a list of commenters presented chronologically and the corresponding comment number. A single comment might include several issues. A summary of the comments is included in Section 3.0 Heber Valley Corridor EIS Early Scoping Comments. Comments will also be accepted during the formal public scoping period, after the NOI is published and when a draft purpose and need statement is available for public review. Comments received after the formal scoping period and before the development of the Draft EIS will be reviewed by UDOT and considered during the development of the Draft EIS. All issues raised will be considered in the EIS.

3.0 Heber Valley Corridor EIS Early Scoping Comments

During the early scoping process, UDOT received nearly 300 individual comment submissions from the public and one from an agency. Many comments were related to congestion, safety, Main Street, and a potential bypass road around Heber City. Many concerns were related to natural resources and community impacts, especially related to a potential bypass. Other common topics included relocating U.S. 189, intersection improvements, truck traffic, business impacts, and social/community resources.

The following sections summarize the comments that were received.

3.1 Purpose and Need

3.1.1 Traffic Congestion

- Main Street is congested, especially on the weekends.
- Viability of downtown Heber depends on removing traffic from Main Street.
- Downtown businesses are suffering from traffic congestion.
- It is difficult to turn onto Main Street.
- Desire for walkable/bikeable/business-friendly Main Street.
- Desire for pedestrian improvements on 100 South.
- Desire to remove oil tanker trucks from Main Street (due to noise, safety, congestion).
- Existing traffic congestion is underestimated.
- Congestion is due to recreation traffic passing through.
- Locals do not want to go into downtown Heber City any longer because of congestion.

3.1.2 Traffic Analysis

- Congestion is due to local traffic, not through traffic. Heber City should address the local traffic instead of UDOT.
- There are more tanker trucks than reported; UDOT is not counting at the right time of the day.
- Travel time delays in 2050 are negligible or not enough to warrant impacts from new road construction.
- Traffic projections are not reliable.
- Projections in general are unreliable due to climate change and world crises.
- Vehicle use per capita will decrease in the future due to more transit options, shifting freight to rail, working from home, and shifting political directions on issues such as climate change and renewable energy.
- UDOT is inflating traffic to justify a bypass.
- UDOT should not use traffic data collected during the busy season.
- UDOT should design for peak traffic.
- UDOT should not design for peak traffic.
- Truck traffic will diminish when oil pipelines are placed, a rail is constructed to the Uinta Basin, or when people are using less oil in the future.
- 2050 traffic analysis should account for planned improvements (Red Ledges bypass, widening of U.S. 40 north of Heber City, etc.).
- 2050 traffic analysis should account for regional traffic from Salt Lake City, Provo, and Park City, as well as traffic to state parks.
- 2050 analysis should account for self-driving cars.
- The length and operational characteristics of tanker trucks should be taken into account. They take longer to accelerate and decelerate.
- Data on traffic patterns needs in the Heber Valley need to be defined in more detail and then comprehensively analyzed.
- A “no oil truck” scenario should be considered (loss of oil production in the Uinta Basin as a possible product of a Biden presidency; potential for rail line from Duchesne to Helper).

3.1.3 Safety

- Trucks on Main Street are hard to see around and unsafe.
- It feels unsafe to walk on Main Street.
- Safety concerns with a potential bypass alternative located next to existing neighborhoods where kids play.

- Comments related to safety at specific intersections are noted under Section 3.2 Alternatives – U.S. 40 and Section 3.5 Alternatives – Intersections off Main Street.

3.1.4 Growth

- Development is out of control.
- Heber City should stop annexing and permitting development.
- Heber City should not allow development without proper infrastructure in place.
- There will not be enough water to support 2050 projections.
- Growth is going to be on the east side of Heber City.

3.2 Alternatives – U.S. 40

3.2.1 Heber City Main Street

- Trucks should be routed away from Main Street.
- Main Street should be left as is; restaurants and businesses should move to neighborhoods.
- Speed limit on Main Street should be raised.
- Speed limit on Main Street should be lowered.
- Main Street should be widened to six lanes.
- Parking should be moved from Main Street to side streets.
- Pedestrian-activated crossings should be converted to overpasses or underpasses.
- Trucks should be forced to use the center lanes.
- Build a second-story bridge over Main Street for through traffic (like in Playa del Carmen, Mexico).
- Build a flyover on Main Street rather than a bypass (similar to I-90 in Wallace, Idaho, or I-70 from Denver to Dillon).
- Consider a tunnel under Main Street instead of a double-decker overhead road.
- Add a crosswalk for the high school at 800 South.

3.2.2 U.S. 40 North of Heber City

- Add a center barrier or rumble strips to prevent crashes.
- Add a signal at U.S. 40/Coyote Lane; the intersection is dangerous.
- Add a signal at U.S. 40 and 3000 North (UVU Wasatch); the intersection is dangerous.
- Add a climbing lane north of Heber City to get around slow-moving trucks.

3.2.3 U.S. 40 South of Heber City

- U.S. 40/Airport Road intersection is difficult and trucks run the red light. It needs a flashing signal to warn of signal change.
- Widen to five lanes from hub intersection to Mill Lane (extend planned widening farther south).
- Corridor agreement includes future signal locations.

3.2.4 Main Street Intersections

- Need dedicated left-turn signals for all signalized intersections on Main Street.
- Need signal coordination between intersections on Main Street.
- Remove signal on Center Street and align with 100 South. These intersections are offset by one block and get congested due to heavy east-west traffic.
- 1200 South (hub) is confusing and dangerous.
- 100 North needs a traffic signal.
- 1000 South and Main Street intersection is dangerous.
- 500 North and Main Street intersection should be more pedestrian-friendly.
- Improve 600 South intersection for school. Intersection is dangerous, especially when the school day starts or ends.

3.3 Alternatives – U.S. 189

- Use existing U.S. 189 for the bypass.
- Don't move U.S. 189 into neighborhoods or to allow airport to expand. It works where it is and would be a waste of money.
- Don't reroute U.S. 189 onto 1300 South.
- Widen U.S. 189 to four lanes near Deer Creek.
- Add a center divider to prevent head-on crashes.

3.4 Alternatives – Bypass

- Truck traffic should be rerouted off Main Street, similar to Jackson Hole.
- Add bike trail and berms/landscaping; provide trail connectivity.
- Consider rubberized asphalt and reduced speeds to reduce noise.
- Bypass should be “through only” with limited or no intersections with local roads. Bypass should be grade separated (no stop lights).
- Need to figure out how a bypass will work with east-west roads.

- Don't allow commercial development along bypass.
- Roundabouts would be difficult for trucks to navigate on bypass.
- Need a bypass on both the east and west sides of Heber City.
- Bypass will not solve the congestion problem; traffic is local.
- Traffic is not that bad; don't need a bypass.
- Speed limits should be high on bypass to encourage traffic to stay out of residential neighborhoods.
- If a bypass is built, it should be linked to open space preservation without commercial exits.
- Bypass alternatives should be compared against non-bypass alternatives instead of the status quo.
- A truck-only bypass with low speeds should be considered.

3.4.1 West Bypass

- Support for or opposition to specific alternatives from previous studies.
- Use the corridor preserved by Wasatch County. Local governments have been working on this for 20+ years collecting fees to secure land before it is developed.
- Use South Field Road.
- West bypass should connect to U.S. 40 farther north at Potter Lane or River Road.
- Build along existing roads and property lines (minimize potential for additional development or property impacts).
- Bypass should have an interchange at S.R. 113.
- Make bypass more direct between Provo and Park City.
- Edwards Lane is the best place to tie bypass into U.S. 189.
- Connect to U.S. 40 south of the junction with U.S. 189 (north of 1300 South).
- Don't connect to U.S. 40 using 1300 South.
- Opposition to roundabouts on a west bypass in general. Concern that a roundabout would require too much space and would not work for trucks or snow plows.
- Make the bypass like an interstate freeway with an interchange at River Road, S.R. 113 (and U.S. 189 and Southfield Road).
- A bypass could be an asset to the community by creating a parkway with bike paths linking to the rail trail and lakes.
- Bypass proposal with turbo roundabouts, running from U.S. 189 up Southfield Road/1130 West, connecting to U.S. 40 at College Way (3000 North) and S.R. 32.

- Use North Field Road. Run from U.S. 189 parallel to South Field Road to S.R. 113, wrap around proposed high school, and connect with 600 West, which becomes 525 West (North Field Road) to 3000 North (Potters Lane), and connect to U.S. 40 at College Way.
- Begin the northern entrance of the bypass at Potters Lane, then connect to 1130 West and then to 1750 West in a diagonal before getting to Midway Lane, S.R. 113, and S.R. 189.
- Need to maintain access to the Wasatch County Events Center.
- Concern that bypass would increase truck traffic in Provo Canyon.
- Concern that bypass would be lined with commercial and industrial development.
- West bypass should go through Midway.
- Desire for the bypass to go through the proposed high school property (so a high school could not be built there).
- Agreements for bypass have changed through the years; bypass has moved farther west.
- Need to figure out how a bypass would connect to existing roads and cross the Heber Valley Historic Railroad.
- Don't connect bypass to local roads (only for traffic going through Heber City).
- Road for local traffic should be built along bypass route. Improve U.S. 40 for through traffic.
- Bypass should be east of the current Heber Light and Power property where they intend to construct a large electrical substation.
- A bypass located entirely on undeveloped land would be better than one that would require a costly and lengthy land acquisition process.
- Bypass should have a speed limit of 40 mph.
- Bypass should be constructed below grade (for connectivity of local roads and to mitigate noise impacts).

3.4.2 East Bypass

- Bypass should be on the east side. It is more direct and on the side of Heber Valley with the majority of the residential population.
- Use Mill Road (1200 East).
- Connect to Red Ledges bypass.
- Concern that Red Ledges bypass keeps getting delayed.
- Put bypass in the sage flats to the east.

3.5 Alternatives – Intersections off Main Street

- 600 South/270 East intersection needs a signal. The intersection is dangerous, especially during school start and end times.
- 1200 South/500 East intersection needs signal so kids can get safely to school; a crosswalk is not enough.
- Center Street/100 East needs a roundabout. During peak hours, east-west traffic is too heavy for north-south traffic to cross. This dissuades drivers from using 100 East, which would reduce congestion on Main Street.
- 600 West/S.R. 113 intersection needs pedestrian crossing light to get to the beginning of the trail. It is dangerous.
- 1200 East/Center Street intersection needs roundabout or traffic signal. It is congested and dangerous, especially during school start and end times.
- 100 South/100 West intersection is dangerous and needs improvements.
- A traffic signal is needed at Old Mill Road and 500 East for students walking to school and vehicles trying to drop kids off.

3.6 Alternatives – Other

- Build a one-way couplet system on 100 West and 100 East.
- Build a one-way couplet system on 100 West, 100 East, 200 West, and 200 East.
- Opposition to one-way couplet system; it would harm downtown businesses.
- Improve roads parallel to Main Street (500 East, 300 West, and Mill Road) to carry more traffic.
- Divert trucks to 100 East and 100 West.
- Restrict and/or incentivize trucks on Main Street to overnight hours.
- Restrict the speed that trucks can travel.
- Prevent oil tankers from coming into the Heber Valley.
- Need transit options (bus or light rail).
- Charge commercial vehicles more to use the roads. Toll recreational vehicles and trucks.
- Need chairlift access to Brighton instead of driving 90 minutes each way.
- Add shoulders and center turn lane to S.R. 113; it is narrow and difficult to turn onto and off of.
- Need crosswalks on all north-south roads; they are difficult to cross.
- Use existing roads rather than building new roads.
- Need sidewalk improvements or wider shoulder on South Field Road.

- Concern that Heber Valley Corridor EIS decisions are related to airport expansion decisions.
- Build a train to carry oil from the Uinta Basin instead of trucks.
- Community resources (shopping, restaurants, and community buildings) should be spread throughout Heber City instead of concentrated on Main Street.
- Will alternatives consider (a) tolling; (b) potential use of U.S. 40/U.S.189 as an alternative to I-80/I-15 for trips between Wyoming/northeastern Utah and Provo; (c) alternative transportation modes for freight or passengers; (d) intelligent transportation systems; (e) future freight patterns analysis; (f) modal diversion strategies that would reduce freight demand on highways?

3.7 Resource Considerations

3.7.1 Community and Social Impacts

- Desire for landscaping and multi-use trail along bypass connecting to other regional trails.
- Desire for vibrant, walkable downtown where community can gather.
- Concern that removing trucks from Main Street will not result in a walkable, quaint downtown because most of the traffic is local. Create gathering space off Main Street.
- It is not realistic that Heber City will have a walkable downtown like Park City. It was built on a highway, and there are already a lot of auto dealerships, hardware stores, and food stores.
- Concern about impacts to Wasatch County Park.
- Concern regarding safety for Wasatch County Park users (traffic and crime).
- Concern about neighborhood impacts, especially neighborhoods on the north, west, and south sides of Heber City that would be affected by a west bypass.
 - Concern about property devaluation
 - Concern about noise impacts
 - Desire for noise abatement (reduced speeds, walls, and noise-reducing pavements)
 - Noise walls should be designed to not reflect sound
 - Concerned about light pollution
 - Concerned about litter and trash
 - Concerned about safety of children and pets playing
 - Concerned about impacts to culinary wells and water quality
 - Concerned about access into neighborhoods
 - Concerned about crime and accessibility for devious people
 - Concerned about impacts to park at 1300 South and Industrial Parkway

- Concern about changes to rural, small-town feel.
- Concerned about impacts to sewer farm.
- Desire for curb/barrier separation between multi-use path and vehicles on S.R. 113.
- Concerned about impacts to 650 South (rural road that people walk, bike, and ride horses on).
- Concern for impacts to Heber Valley Historic Railroad.
- Concern about impacts to 600 West (multi-use cattle and recreational corridor).
- Will EIS evaluate for social justice for economically diverse neighborhoods around Heber City?
- Will EIS monetize effects of each alternative on property values, health, social justice, safety, wetlands, and riparian habitats?
- Will EIS consider effects on school segregation and employment opportunities that might be changed by roadway bifurcations?
- Will EIS consider effects of alternatives on induced demand for existing and expanded residential areas and commercial areas?
- Will EIS consider the effects on agriculture and livestock production?
- Will EIS consider effects (air, noise, vibration, safety) to the mouth of Provo Canyon, to the I-80 interchange, and eastward on U.S. 40 to Duchesne?
- Uncertainty with potential impacts to residences during the planning process makes it difficult or impossible to sell property.
- Salt spray could potentially result in flashovers or arcing with the soon-to-be-constructed Rocky Mountain Power and Heber Power and Light electrical substation at 1500 West and 750 South. This should be analyzed.

3.7.2 Natural Resource Impacts

- Provo River Restoration Project impacts not allowed; consider indirect impacts to the Provo River.
- Concern about impacts to the North Fields; the North Fields open space is the crown jewel of the Heber Valley.
- Concern about impacts to open space, especially related to a west bypass. A bypass would reduce the value of open space.
- Concern about impacts to wetlands, especially related to a west bypass.
- Concern about impacts to water quality, especially related to a west bypass.
- No plan has been presented regarding how wetlands impacts will be mitigated, or how much more it would cost to construct a road through wetlands.

- Concern about impacts to wildlife, especially related to a west bypass (migratory routes and habitat for sandhill cranes, Canada geese, bobolinks, deer, foxes).
- Concern that impacts to bird habitat would push them toward the airport and result in conflicts with airplanes.
- Concern about impacts to farmland, especially related to a west bypass.
- A west bypass would violate County Ordinance 16.06.01 agricultural zone A-20.
- Concern about impacts to visual impacts, especially related to a west bypass.
- Minimize impacts to the natural resources in the northwest quadrant; put the bypass as close to the developed area as possible.
- Concern about impacts to air quality.
- Air quality should be evaluated on a smaller area (adjacent to high capacity roads). The Utah Division of Air Quality should be consulted.
- Concern about impacts to mature trees.

3.7.3 Economics

- Concerned about impacts to downtown businesses.
- Concerned about project cost and wasting tax dollars.
- Potential project is a lower priority for UDOT and federal funding than projects needed in Salt Lake and Utah Counties (a large project expenditure is unjustified in the Heber Valley).

3.8 Miscellaneous

- Tired of studying – just do it. It will cost more and there will be more impacts in the future. Greater opportunity for amenities like trails if we do it before development.
- People will be affected and should be treated fairly.
- Sewer fields previously condemned by federal government – illegal to use sewer fields.
- Concerns with wasting taxpayer money.
- UDOT just needs to spend money; they should spend it on other projects.
- Concerned that U.S. 189 is being moved for airport expansion.
- Airport expansion should not play a role in this project.
- Distrust of UDOT and project representatives based on previous studies (different answers from different people; misleading graphics and data).
- Concern that UDOT does not listen to public input.
- Problems leaving comments on the project website.

- Should not accept federal funds in exchange for loss of local control.
- Concern that there are not enough women in the stakeholder working group. Concern the group is not representative of a cross section of Wasatch County citizens.
- The west side of Heber City is being sacrificed for the east side with power transmission lines, airport expansion, and a bypass.
- All land use decisions made between Heber City, Wasatch County, Rocky Mountain Power, Heber Power and Light, and certain landowners should be disclosed in the EIS.