

Summary

Project: Heber Valley Corridor EIS

Subject: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #3

Date: Tuesday, April 27, 2021

Location: Zoom

Stakeholder Working Group

Name	Representing	Role
Craig Hancock	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
Wendy Casey	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. The objective of this third stakeholder working group (SWG) meeting was to provide a summary of early scoping, present the draft purpose and need and alternative screening criteria, and describe the public scoping process.

2. Early Scoping Summary

- a. Public and stakeholder input received during early scoping helped UDOT develop the draft purpose and need, which is the foundation for the EIS.
- b. The early scoping report and draft purpose and need will be posted on April 30 on the project website <https://hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov/>. We are soliciting comments on the draft purpose and need.
- c. Comments from the public and stakeholders during early scoping identified interest and/or concern with wetlands, the Provo River, wildlife, noise, air quality, visual, water quality, property impacts, agriculture, safety, and growth.
- d. Project needs identified by the public are generally related to congestion on U.S. 40, travel delays, and related impacts in downtown Heber.
- e. Alternatives identified in early scoping include improvements to U.S. 40, improvements to other existing roads, one-way-couplet system, west bypass, east bypass, and transit. Other alternatives that come up during the formal scoping period will also be considered.

3. Notice of Intent (NOI)

- a. UDOT submitted a NOI to the Federal Register. This will officially kick-off the EIS process.
- b. A 45-day public comment period will run from April 30 to June 14.

4. Draft Purpose and Need. The purpose is the guiding statement for development of the EIS. UDOT's currently proposed purpose and need:

The purpose of the Heber Valley Corridor EIS is to improve regional and local mobility on U.S. 40 from S.R. 32 to U.S. 189 through 2050 while allowing Heber City to meet their vision for the historic town center.

5. Project Need

- a. Traffic analysis conducted during early scoping shows problems today that will continue to get worse by 2050 if nothing is done.
- b. Intersection level of service (LOS) is based on how long it takes to get through them. Intersection LOS is currently at moderate levels during the PM peak hour, but is are expected to fail by 2050 with anticipated growth.
- c. Corridor LOS is based on speed. There are currently problems on a few segments of U.S. 40, and operations are expected to get worse by 2050. More segments will operate at failing conditions, especially during the PM peak hour in the southbound direction.
- d. Travel time from S.R. 32 to U.S. 189 will double by 2050 if nothing is done.
- e. Vehicles queue (back-up) waiting to get through the intersections during the PM peak hour. By 2050, the southbound backups from 500 North will almost reach S.R. 32. This raises safety concerns because the speed limit is 55 mph and sight distance is limited by curves.

- f. One member asked if the traffic results presented are consistent with what was shown at the last SWG meeting. Response – yes, this is what was presented earlier.
- g. One member asked if the traffic analysis assumed additional traffic signals constructed on U.S. 40 between 500 North and S.R. 32. Response – no, not under no-action conditions. Additional traffic signals might provide intermittent breaks, but the queuing might get longer.
- h. One member asked about the traffic split at the U.S. 40/U.S. 189 intersection. How much is going to U.S. 189 and how much is going to Daniels Canyon? Response - in the southbound direction, more is going down U.S. 189.

6. Alternative Screening Process

- a. The alternative screening process is a series of steps to narrow down alternatives to be studied in detail in the Draft EIS.
- b. Level 1 screening determines which alternatives meet the purpose and need.
 - i. The ability to improve mobility is measured by level of service, travel time, queue length, number of conflicts.
 - ii. Heber City’s vision is based on the *Heber City Envision 2050 General Plan*. Allowing Heber City to meet their vision for the historic town center is measured by how an alternative can avoid/minimize impacts to historic buildings and valued places on Main Street (i.e., planned urban gathering centers at Main Street Park, Tabernacle Square and the public safety property). Alternatives should not preclude Heber City from implementing strategies to achieve their vision.
- c. Level 2 screening evaluates impacts to resources that have regulatory protection: Waters of the U.S., Section 4(f) historic and recreation properties, and Section 6(f) properties that have received funds from the Land and Water Conservation Act. Property impacts and cost are also considered, although alternatives are not generally eliminated solely on cost.

7. Discussion

- a. One member requested clarification on the SWG members’ role in reviewing documents and providing feedback. If feedback is desired at the SWG meeting, it would be good to get the documents ahead of the meeting to read and digest them. UDOT clarified the intent of the SWG is not to provide advanced review of public documents or greater involvement in decision making. Rather, the intent is for the SWG members to represent their constituents’ point of view and help communication between the project team and constituents. SWG members should not feel responsible to have answers to all the questions and can direct individuals to the website or the project team.
- b. One member noted there have been multiple comment periods already, and people are getting frustrated with copying and pasting the same comments again. UDOT clarified comments submitted during early scoping were captured and do not need to be submitted again. We are specifically looking for comments on the draft purpose and need and screening criteria, which

will be new for public review. However, we are also accepting comments on the scope of the EIS and alternatives.

- c. One member commented that Heber City is more of a bedroom community than a destination. There has been discussion about improving downtown, but not much has happened yet. Perhaps saving a couple blocks of downtown should not be the highest priority given the impacts from a potential bypass road.
 - d. One member commented that Heber City is a destination for those wanting to come and recreate in the mountains, lakes, and rivers. It has been difficult to make improvements to downtown because of parking restrictions. Heber City needs to look at the economic viability of downtown because it depends on the revenue. Changes are needed for the City to become more vibrant.
 - i. UDOT indicated these types of comments – about Heber City’s economy and efforts to revitalize downtown – are great examples of the types of comment sought during the public comment period.
 - e. One member commented that there needs to be a balance between mobility and downtown viability. Downtown businesses depend on traffic, but congestion is detrimental. How will we get traffic off Main Street while meeting the vision for historic downtown? Can we just get commercial traffic off Main Street?
 - i. UDOT pointed out a nuance in the purpose and need statement, “while allowing Heber City to...” means that UDOT is not trying to implement Heber’s vision with this project. However, UDOT does not want to select an alternative that would preclude Heber City from implementing their vision.
 - f. One member requested clarification on who determines the outcome of alternative screening. Response – the HVC team (UDOT) does. The process will be transparent and the public will have an opportunity to review the results and comment. Comment – anticipate a lot of comments on Level 2 screening; that is where the rubber hits the road.
8. Next steps
- a. Public comment period runs from April 30 to June 14. Please help get the word out to constituents.
 - b. After the public comment period, UDOT will compile, review, and sort comments. Comments and responses to frequently submitted comments will be developed and included in a scoping summary report. This report will be published on the project website.
 - c. UDOT will finalize the purpose and need and screening criteria. Based on comments, these may change between draft and final.
 - d. Next SWG meeting is anticipated in summer when conceptual alternatives will be presented.