

Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #2
Date:	Monday, October 19, 2020
Location:	Zoom

Stakeholder Working Group

Present	Name	Representing	Role
✓	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
✓	Charles Allen	HVC Team	Traffic Lead
✓	Justin Smart	HVC Team	Public Involvement Lead
✓	Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement
✓	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	Farming
	Brady Flygare	Residential	South resident
✓	Thom Wright	Residential	East resident
	Jessica Thurman	Residential	West resident
✓	Phillip Jordan	Residential	North resident
✓	Laren Gertsch	Landowner	Landowner
✓	David 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. This second stakeholder working group meeting was offered as a follow-up to questions about traffic analysis at the first meeting on August 20, 2020.

2. Charles Allen gave a presentation about how traffic is and will be analyzed for the Heber Valley Corridor EIS. The presentation included the following topics:
 - a. Traffic analysis process
 - b. How traffic data is collected
 - c. Hourly and seasonal traffic variation
 - d. Determining design traffic (what day/hour to design for)
 - e. Overview of traffic models (what goes in, what comes out)
 - f. Traffic model results (level of service, travel time, and queue length for current and future 2050 conditions)
 - g. Comparison of traffic analysis to previous study
 - h. Safety analysis results
3. Discussion
 - a. SWG members indicated the presentation was responsive to comments and questions from the first stakeholder working group meeting.
 - b. There were comments and discussion regarding the percentage of oil-tanker trucks.
 - i. One group member noted that it seems like there are more than 1% to 3% oil-tanker trucks based on visual observations. After counting the vehicles, however, he acknowledged the statistics are probably right. He noted it feels like there are more oil-tanker trucks because of their length. When there is an oil-tanker truck next to you, it feels trucks are 100% of the traffic.
 - ii. A suggestion was made to report the amount of oil-tanker trucks on Main Street differently. Tanker trucks take up as much space as several personal vehicles. Instead of reporting the tankers as a percentage of the number of vehicles, consider reporting them as the percentage of the space they take up. Do they take up 35% of the space? If they were removed from Main Street, would there be room for 35% more personal vehicles?
 - c. Questions were raised regarding oil-tanker truck noise.
 - i. Does UDOT study the noise caused by tanker trucks? The tanker trucks cause more noise than regular traffic. Do we know what percent of the noise they are responsible for? UDOT response: Federal Highway Administration regulations dictate how UDOT studies noise. A noise analysis is required for Type 1 projects (projects that add capacity). If an alternative proposes to add a traffic lane to Main Street, UDOT would evaluate noise levels, determine whether there are impacts, and evaluate noise abatement measures.
 - ii. Members noted that noise from oil-tanker trucks create inhospitable conditions. Restaurants can deal with regular traffic noise, even with congestion. It is difficult to have outdoor activities on Main Street because of noise levels. It is also difficult to have indoor activities if

the windows are open because you cannot hear people talking. These concerns have been raised in previous studies.

- iii. One member stated it would be impossible to solve the noise problem with trucks on Main Street, but it would be possible to address the noise problem elsewhere. Berms have been effective in other locations to reduce traffic noise.
- d. One member requested a more structured way to facilitate information sharing with the group they represent.
 - i. Would it be possible to hold another Zoom meeting? Provide materials to distribute? Could the traffic presentation be recorded and posted on the website? UDOT response: there are several opportunities for information sharing: a.) website, b.) Facebook page, and c.) emails. UDOT is not opposed to holding additional meetings but needs to be judicious due to budget and schedule needs. UDOT will evaluate the possibility of recording the traffic presentation for public distribution.
 - ii. A suggestion was made that more frequent communication is better. Don't wait until early 2021 when substantive updates are available.
4. Next steps
 - a. Stakeholder working group summary and presentation will be posted on project website.
 - b. Team will take comments and suggestions into consideration and evaluate how to best facilitate conversations beyond the stakeholder working group. There are already public engagement opportunities planned at study milestones.
 - c. Team is currently reviewing comments received during the early scoping public comment period and drafting a purpose and need.
 - d. UDOT anticipates publishing a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in early 2021. The draft purpose and need will be published for public review and comment at that time.
 - e. The next stakeholder working group meeting will be in early 2021 when the draft purpose and need is available for review.