

Scoping Summary Report

Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement

Lead agency:
Utah Department of Transportation

September 20, 2021

Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Early Scoping.....	1
1.2	Purpose of This Scoping Summary Report	1
1.3	Summary of Scoping Activities	2
1.4	Notice of Intent.....	2
1.5	SAFETEA-LU Process and Agency Scoping	3
1.5.1	Cooperating Agencies	3
1.5.2	Participating Agencies	3
1.5.3	Agencies Consulted.....	4
1.5.4	Agency Scoping Meeting	5
1.5.5	Section 106 Consultation.....	5
1.6	Public Scoping	6
1.6.1	Notification	6
1.6.2	Public Scoping Meeting	7
1.6.3	Scoping City and County Council Presentations	7
1.6.4	Stakeholder Working Group Meetings.....	7
2.0	Guide to Comments	7
3.0	Heber Valley Corridor EIS Scoping Comments	8
3.1	Purpose and Need	8
3.1.1	Purpose and Need Statement	8
3.1.2	Traffic Congestion.....	8
3.1.3	Traffic Analysis.....	9
3.1.4	Safety.....	9
3.1.5	Growth	9
3.2	Screening Criteria	10
3.3	Alternatives – U.S. 40	11
3.3.1	Heber City Main Street	11
3.3.2	U.S. 40 (not Heber City Main Street).....	11
3.3.3	Main Street Intersections	11
3.4	Alternatives – U.S. 189	11
3.5	Alternatives – Bypass	12
3.5.1	West Bypass.....	12
3.5.2	East Bypass	15
3.6	Alternatives – Other	15
3.7	Alternatives – Active Transportation.....	16
3.8	Resource Considerations	16
3.8.1	Community and Social Impacts	16
3.8.2	North Fields, South Fields, and Open Space	17
3.8.3	Wildlife	18
3.8.4	Air Quality	18
3.8.5	Water Resources	19
3.8.6	Economics	20
3.9	Miscellaneous	20

Tables

Table 1. Heber Valley EIS Cooperating and Participating Agencies.....	4
Table 2. Attendees of Agency Scoping Meeting	5

Appendixes

Appendix A. Notice of Intent	
Appendix B. Agency Scoping Meeting	
Appendix C. Notifications of Scoping	
Appendix D. Council Presentations	
Appendix E. Stakeholder Working Group Meeting	
Appendix F. Scoping Period Comments	
Appendix G. Responses to Scoping Comments	

1.0 Introduction

The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is preparing 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 (year 2050) travel demand and to address safety concerns on Main Street.

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.

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 Section 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated January 17, 2017, and executed by FHWA and UDOT.

1.1 Early Scoping

UDOT used an early scoping process in 2020 to conduct activities in order to develop a proposal in enough detail to allow for meaningful public comment before formally initiating the Heber Valley Corridor EIS. These activities included soliciting public and agency input to develop a draft purpose and need statement, identify a preliminary range of alternatives, develop draft alternatives screening criteria, and identify potentially significant environmental issues. A separate report, the *Heber Valley Corridor 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.

1.2 Purpose of This Scoping Summary Report

This scoping summary report summarizes public and agency input gathered during the formal scoping period, which lasted 45 days from April 30 to June 14, 2021. Scoping is the first step in the NEPA process. It involves using public and agency participation to develop possible solutions and identify issues regarding a proposed project. Scoping also helps determine needs, objectives, resources and constraints, potential alternatives, and any additional requirements for alternatives screening criteria. This scoping summary report is a tool to ensure that the efforts of the EIS are focused on the appropriate issues.

The following materials developed during early scoping were available for public and agency review and comment on the project website at <https://hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov> during the formal scoping period starting on April 30, 2021:

- [Heber Valley Corridor Early Scoping Summary Report](#)
- [Heber Valley Corridor Draft Purpose and Need Technical Report](#)
- [Heber Valley Corridor Draft Purpose and Need & Screening Criteria Factsheet](#)

1.3 Summary of Scoping Activities

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 formal scoping period for this project are included in this report and will be considered during the development and evaluation of alternatives. Comments received after the scoping period and before the development of the Draft EIS will be reviewed by UDOT and considered during the development of the Draft EIS.

1.4 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. The Heber Valley Corridor EIS NOI was published on May 11, 2021, providing 34 days of public comment between publication of the NOI and the end of the scoping comment period on June 14, 2021. This notice alerted federal agencies of UDOT's intent to study transportation improvements in the Heber Valley.

The NOI included information required by the Council on Environmental Quality at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1501.9(d), *Notice of Intent*. The NOI included information about the early scoping process, the draft purpose and need, and the draft alternatives under consideration; a brief summary of the expected impacts; the anticipated permits and schedule; a description of the scoping process; contact information; a request for identification of potential alternatives; and information and analyses relevant to the proposed action. A copy of the Federal Register NOI is included in Appendix A, *Notice of Intent*.

1.5 SAFETEA-LU Process and Agency Scoping

In accordance with Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), UDOT is coordinating with local, state, and federal agencies that have an interest or jurisdiction in the Heber Valley Corridor EIS project area. It's important to include these agencies during the initial scoping activities of the EIS to identify issues early so that they can be properly considered and, if necessary, avoided, minimized, or mitigated as the project progresses. More discussion regarding the agencies that have been consulted is included in Section 1.5.3, *Agencies Consulted*.

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.

1.5.1 Cooperating Agencies

The regulations that implement NEPA define a cooperating agency as “any federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” (40 CFR Section 1508.5).

A cooperating agency has a high level of involvement and responsibility for the project and works with the project team to develop solutions. Being involved as a cooperating agency allows a resource agency to better protect its resource areas but requires a commitment to remain involved and accept some responsibility for activities during the environmental review process.

1.5.2 Participating Agencies

SAFETEA-LU introduced a level of agency involvement known as participating agency. Participating agencies don't have the same level of responsibility for the project as a cooperating agency but are expected to perform the following activities in coordination with the project team:

- Attending agency coordination meetings
- Developing an agency coordination plan
- Commenting as early as practicable on the project's purpose and need statement and the range of alternatives
- Evaluating the environmental and socioeconomic resources in the project area and the general locations of alternatives
- Identifying as early as practicable any issues regarding the project's environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approval

1.5.3 Agencies Consulted

The following agencies were sent letters on April 7, 2021, requesting their involvement as a cooperating and/or participating agency:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission
- Governor’s Office, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Resource Development Coordinating Committee
- Utah Division of Indian Affairs
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- Utah State Historic Preservation Office
- Wasatch County
- Charleston Town
- Heber City
- Midway City
- Town of Daniel
- Mountainland Association of Governments
- Heber Valley Special Services District

Of the agencies and that were contacted, two agreed to be cooperating agencies, and nine agreed or were assumed to be participating agencies (Table 1).

Table 1. Heber Valley EIS Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Cooperating Agencies	Participating Agencies
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
	Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission
	Governor’s Office, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Resource Development Coordinating Committee
	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
	Wasatch County
	Heber City
	Midway City
	Mountainland Association of Governments

1.5.4 Agency Scoping Meeting

SAFETEA-LU requires that the project team hold an agency scoping meeting. An agency scoping meeting was held on April 29, 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held virtually using the Zoom platform. Table 2 lists the agencies that participated in the meeting.

A brief presentation was given that included a project overview as well as the requirements of being a cooperating and participating agency. The materials that were discussed at the meeting included a summary of early scoping, the draft purpose and need statement, potential alternatives, draft alternative screening process and criteria, and project timeline. The presentation and meeting summary are included in Appendix B, *Agency Scoping Meeting*.

Table 2. Attendees of Agency Scoping Meeting

Attendees	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Utah Division of Indian Affairs
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Wasatch County
Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission	Heber City
Governor’s Office, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office, Resource Development Coordinating Committee	Midway City
	Mountainland Association of Governments

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was unable to send a representative to the meeting. However, UDOT followed up with a discussion on May 6, 2021.

1.5.5 Section 106 Consultation

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties. The Section 106 regulations (36 CFR Part 800) encourage agencies to consider their Section 106 responsibilities as early as possible in the NEPA process.

The following tribes and organizations were sent letters on April 7, 2021, inviting them to become a Section 106 consulting party:

- Heber City Certified Local Government
- Wasatch County Chapter of the Daughters of Utah Pioneers
- Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation
- Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation
- Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians
- Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation

What is a historic property?

A historic property is any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

At the request of the Utah Division of Indian Affairs, an invitation was also sent to the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation on May 20, 2021. As of September 9, 2021, no responses had been received.

1.6 Public 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. A combination of measures was taken to ensure that the public was notified about the project and invited to participate in the process.

1.6.1 Notification

The scoping period began on April 30 and ended on June 14, 2021. The following methods were used to notify the general public of the public scoping, the materials available for review, and how to comment:

- Advertisements were placed in the following publications:
 - *Wasatch Wave*, April 28, May 12, and May 26, 2021
 - *The Salt Lake Tribune*, May 16, 2021
 - *The Deseret News*, May 14, 2021
- Notifications and reminders were posted on the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project website: <https://hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov>.
- Notifications and reminders posted on UDOT social media sites:
 - Facebook on April 30; May 4, 5, 7, 11, 26, and 28; and June 8, 11, and 14, 2021
 - Instagram and Twitter on April 30; and May 7, 21, and 28, 2021
- An email notice was sent to the UDOT Heber Valley Corridor mailing list on April 28 and 30; May 11 and 28; and June 14, 2021.
- Printed fliers were hung at the following locations:
 - 7-Eleven
 - Dairy Keen
 - Heber City Offices
 - Heber City Police Department
 - Lee's Marketplace
 - Natural Grocers
 - Sinclair
 - Smith's Grocery Store
 - Wasatch County Administrative Building
 - Wasatch County Library
- A UDOT press release was sent to local media outlets on April 26, 2021.

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

1.6.2 Public Scoping Meeting

A public scoping meeting was not held during the formal scoping period because one was held during the early scoping process on August 27, 2020. Details about this meeting are available in the [Heber Valley Corridor Early Scoping Summary Report](#).

1.6.3 Scoping City and County Council Presentations

During the scoping process, UDOT presented at one city council meeting, one county council meeting, and one interlocal government meeting. UDOT presented to the Heber City Council on May 4, 2021; the Wasatch County Council on May 5, 2021; and the Wasatch County Interlocal Meeting on May 26, 2021. The presentations for the Heber City and Wasatch County Council meetings were the same and included an overview of the process, draft purpose and need statement, draft screening criteria, and how to comment. The presentation for the Wasatch County Interlocal meeting was condensed—it included the draft purpose and need, a summary of comments received to date, and how to comment. UDOT encouraged councils and the public to submit early scoping comments. A copy of the presentations is available in Appendix D, *Council Presentations*.

1.6.4 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 third SWG meeting was held on April 27, 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held virtually using the Zoom platform.

Ten SWG members and eight project team members attended. A presentation was given including a summary of early scoping, draft purpose and need statement, draft screening criteria, and how to comment. After the presentation, SWG members asked questions and provided comments. The presentation and notes from the meeting are included in Appendix E, *Stakeholder Working Group Meeting*. 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 scoping period for the Heber Valley Corridor EIS began on April 30 and concluded on June 14, 2021. All comments that were received between April 30 and June 14, 2021, are included in Appendix F, *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 Scoping Comments*. 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 Scoping Comments

During the scoping process, UDOT received just over 90 individual comment submissions from the public and agencies. Many comments were related to congestion and safety on Main Street, walkability and business impacts in downtown Heber City, and truck traffic. Suggestions for solutions included improvements to U.S. 40, improvements to other existing roads, and new bypass roads. The most common concerns included impacts to neighborhoods and natural resources (open space, water resources, natural scenery, and wildlife).

UDOT developed responses to frequently asked questions (FAQ) and comments. The FAQ is available in Appendix G, *Responses to Scoping Comments*. Formal scoping comments were submitted by one cooperating agency (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) and two participating agencies (Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission and Wasatch County). UDOT provided a response to the cooperating and participating agencies, which is also available in Appendix G, *Responses to Scoping Comments*.

The following sections summarize all the comments that were received.

3.1 Purpose and Need

3.1.1 Purpose and Need Statement

- Project is not needed.
- Purpose and need is too vague.
- Purpose and need should not focus solely on Heber City; it should focus on all communities in the Heber Valley.
- Purpose and need statement should include active transportation (multi-use trail systems) as a primary purpose rather than as a secondary objective.
- Recommend UDOT determine whether rerouting of truck traffic should be included as a primary project purpose.
- Add “and to maintain the environmental quality and natural scenic beauty of the area” to the purpose and need statement.
- Add “maintain planned and protected open space and parks, and preserve viewsheds” as a secondary objective.
- Purpose and need refers to the preservation of “historic Main Street” but ignores the citizens’ request to preserve open space.

3.1.2 Traffic Congestion

- Main Street is congested.
- Congestion will continue to get worse with growth.

- Main Street is uninviting and not walkable due to congestion and noise.
- Congestion is due to offset traffic signals at 100 South and Center Street.
- Congestion is due to lack of protected/dedicated left-turn phase at all traffic signals.
- Tankers are ruining our town.
- Turn lights added to Main Street traffic signals slow down traffic. Adding new signals between 600 North and River Road will make things worse. Heber City needs to think through traffic issues related to projects they are approving.
- Oil industry is waning with projected transition to renewable energy, and the number of tankers will decline. There are rumors a pipeline might be built from the Uinta Basin.
- Traffic delay is not bad, not worth cost and impacts of highway project.
- Don't do anything; people will figure out alternate routes if traffic gets bad enough.
- Travel time from Heber Valley Corridor EIS scoping summary is not that significant and well below what drivers from most other urban areas are accustomed to.
- EIS should be centered around moving traffic, not commerce.

3.1.3 Traffic Analysis

- Reassess traffic once the new Red Ledges access road is in full use.

3.1.4 Safety

- U.S 40/S.R. 32 intersection is dangerous due to high speeds and trucks.
- Main Street is not safe for autos or pedestrians.
- It is dangerous to make left turns off of Main Street due to lack of protected phase at traffic signals.
- Crash rates are well below Logan and Moab.

3.1.5 Growth

- Growth is significant; consider how future developments affect U.S. 40.
- Need to complete this project soon because of growth.
- Need to re-evaluate development and limit or foster smarter growth to minimize traffic and environmental impacts.
- Opposition to all high-density developments in the area called the North Fields Overlay Zone, as well as in the North Village Resort on the southwest corner of River Road and Highway 40 and the Heiner property to the north.
- Blue Sky Ranch Homeowners Association requests input and approval for construction on developments east of U.S. 40, and widening U.S. 40 that would impact the subdivision.

- Most of the growth will continue on the east side.
- New roads will just further spur on new growth and only alleviate congestion temporarily.

3.2 Screening Criteria

- Ensure that primary criteria do not inadvertently screen out feasible alternatives, especially if there is potential for a Clean Water Act Section 404 individual permit which will require selection of the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, or LEDPA.
- Recommend Draft EIS include amount/percentage of land acquired for a west bypass. If the number of remaining land acquisitions is minimal and results in a lower cost, this could artificially narrow the range of practicable alternatives (level 2 screening criteria includes right-of-way impacts and cost).
- Many projects have secondary project screening criteria, which represent desirable outcomes, but these criteria typically are narrower in scope than the overall project purpose. Incorporating criteria that are not part of the overall project purpose limits alternatives analysis and is not consistent with Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines.
- To determine a reasonable cost range, the project should consider the industry norm for projects in that area. If an alternative falls within the standard industry norm for constructing the alternative at that site, it might still be practicable.
- Only if the cost of an alternative makes a project infeasible should the alternative be considered not practicable.
- Recommend cost-effectiveness and rights of way be consolidated and used to determine the practicability of an alternative, but not as alternative screening criteria.
- Add screening criteria:
 - Conduct viewshed analyses from and toward any roadway proposal.
 - Identify lands under current or pending conservation easement protections and eliminate them from consideration for any new road.
 - Consider the Envision Heber Plan's open-space protections for the North Fields.
 - Document wetlands according to the Clean Water Act definitions; do not rely solely on the Army Corps of Engineers mapping.
 - Document contiguous aquifer and shallow groundwater and evaluate any possible sources of contamination or deterioration related to the project affecting the valley's class 1 aquifer.
 - Evaluate the aesthetics of any design proposal.
- What is the process for the level 2 screening of each bypass alternative in terms of continued engagement of the stakeholders advisory members BEFORE any potential solution is no longer reviewed or rejected?

3.3 Alternatives – U.S. 40

3.3.1 Heber City Main Street

- Construct bridge over U.S. 40 like I-70 in Wheatridge, Colorado.
- Route through traffic on an overpass above Main Street.
- Construct roundabouts instead of traffic signals.
- Make Main Street walkable and desirable.
- Don't allow gas stations.
- Remove truck traffic from Main Street.
- Need manicured roads with bike paths, sidewalks, trees, and landscaping (like St. George).
- Widen Main Street.
- Reduce the speed limit.

3.3.2 U.S. 40 (not Heber City Main Street)

- State Route (S.R. 32/U.S. 40 intersection should have wider turn lanes to buffer high-speed vehicles.
- S.R. 32/U.S. 40 interchange should be constructed in Phase 1.
- U.S. 40 should be a freeway from Mayflower through Daniel's Canyon (including on Main Street).

3.3.3 Main Street Intersections

- Realign Center Street and 100 South intersections so there is only one traffic signal.
- Add a protected/dedicated left-turn phase to all traffic signals.
- Keep Main Street the same but replace the traffic signals with roundabouts.
- Improve traffic signal placement and timing on Main Street.

3.4 Alternatives – U.S. 189

- Opposition to rerouting U.S. 189.
- Support for rerouting U.S. 189.
- Don't reroute U.S. 189 on 1200 South; it is too close to residential homes and parks for it to be a high-speed road.

3.5 Alternatives – Bypass

- Support for bypass.
- Opposition to bypass.
- Bypass should be grade-separated with interchanges end to end, so trucks don't need to stop at any signals.
- Bypass should not have entry/exit points, only through traffic.
- New corridor should be in unpopulated area and should minimize change in current landscape.
- No commercial zones along bypass, like Legacy Highway but in perpetuity.
- Bypass would alleviate congestion for Main Street businesses but would create congestion in neighborhoods.
- Bypass would not solve Main Street traffic problems.
- Bypass would create safety concerns in neighborhoods.
- Don't create a bypass with more traffic signals than what it is bypassing.
- Use existing roads for a bypass.
- Route the bypass through open land instead of through existing neighborhoods.
- Bypass should follow current highway footprint on the south end and continue farther north on the north end where there is less impact to residents, and most of the growth will occur on the northern portion of the city.
- Plan for bypass to expand into a freeway in the future.
- Don't put bypass on 1200 South; it is too close to residential homes and parks for it to be a high-speed road.
- Bypass should include bike paths, sidewalks, trees, and landscaping.
- Alternative designs should blend into the natural environment.

3.5.1 West Bypass

- Support for western bypass.
- Opposition to western bypass.
- Start the bypass before River Road so vehicles don't need to stop at future signals between River Road and 500 North.
- West bypass should extend from River Road to the gravel pit.
- West bypass is the best option because that was the original plan and there is property available.
- Make the west bypass a parkway with trails, trees, and open space.

- West bypass should include (1) interchange on U.S. 40 just south of S.R. 32, (2) grade separation at S.R. 113, railroad tracks, U.S. 189, and U.S. 40, and (3) skirt around the airport (see attachment to comment #76 in Appendix F).
- Trucks won't take a west bypass because it is out of the way.
- West bypass should be as close to the current western and northern boundaries of Heber City as possible.
- Original bypass proposal was for an arterial, not rerouting a U.S. highway. Now Heber City and Wasatch County are trying to pass the buck to UDOT for their failure to complete.
- Original bypass proposal bypasses too small an area and would create congestion at 850 North.
- Heber City traffic is primarily due to the huge growth on the east side. A western bypass will not solve this.
- The social, environmental, safety, and financial costs of a west bypass far outweigh the benefits of saving a few blocks of a mixed-up main street and reducing traffic from one end of town to another by a few minutes.
- Don't allow access from a western bypass to S.R. 113.
- Roundabouts on the west bypass would be difficult to navigate for trucks, snow plows, recreational vehicles, and vehicles towing boats.
- Station a highway patrol unit along this corridor to maintain the speed limit and sound from Jake brakes.

PARKWAY

- PARKWAY is a specific proposal for a west bypass that generally runs north-south between about 1300 West and 1130 West. It would connect to U.S. 189 near the airport, and to U.S. 40 at River Road and 3000 North (see attachment to comment #53 in Appendix F).
 - Includes five "turbo" roundabouts at (1) U.S. 189 and 850 West, (2) 1200 South and Southfield Road (accommodating the rail crossing), (3) S.R. 113 and Southfield Road, (4) 1200 North and Southfield Road, and (5) 2400 North and Southfield Road. Turbo roundabouts are safest than regular roundabouts, which are considered some of the safest means of natural traffic flow.
 - Provides bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian access linking both lakes (Jordanelle and Deer Creek reservoirs).
 - Creates a safe and direct passage, helping to minimize pedestrian/vehicular conflicts in residential neighborhoods.
 - Provides opportunities for direct transit to cross the valley, and out of the valley.
 - Reduces travel delays and congestion with roundabouts.
 - Reroutes large freight haulers around the Heber City limits, removing the present "Main Street conflict" among small residential vehicles, pedestrians, and large haulers.

- Maintains a proper buffer from the western edge of Heber City and keeps noise, fumes, and construction impacts away from residential areas.
- Keeps hazardous materials out of Heber City.
- Provides an opportunity to establish a “parkway” bypass with trails (including lake-to-lake trail).
- Captures land available for use by the public for traffic, as well as outdoor and recreation opportunities.
- Reduces emergency medical services (EMS) time from the newly located EMS building on 1200 South to areas north and west of Heber City (direct corridor from U.S. 189 roundabout north to Midway).
- Provides access to Southfield ball diamonds, Wasatch County equestrian complex, Heber Valley Railroad complex, proposed new high school, and Provo River.
- Would not uproot existing municipality infrastructure (water, sewer, power lines).
- Would have no traffic lights or vehicles idling (air quality benefits).
- Would have less detrimental impact on wildlife, threatened and endangered species, and North Fields wetlands areas because it is aligned with existing asphalt and gravel roads (thereby preserving “native” areas).
- Provides enhanced vegetation and habitat with native shrubs, trees, and grasses (fed by Wasatch County sewer management system, allowing for green belt corridor).
- Improves residential/pedestrian atmosphere downtown, spurring economic growth.

Spring Creek

- Spring Creek Park Environmental Recommendations is a specific proposal for a west bypass generally based on the corridor approved for right-of-way preservation (see attachment to comment #82 in Appendix F).
 - Includes a five-legged roundabout at the intersection of Southfield Road and S.R. 113 (combining the intersection of the bypass with the existing Southfield Road/S.R. 113 intersection).
 - Centers the west bypass along the centerline of the Rocky Mountain Power easement (combining bypass right of way with the power line easement). Power poles would be located between northbound and southbound lanes.
 - Includes a bike path on the east side of the bypass.
 - Includes a land trade with proposed zoning changes:
 - Spring Creek Park would donate land for the roundabout.
 - Spring Creek Park would put 20.3 acres of agricultural land east of the bypass (less 7 acres for the bypass) in a perpetual agricultural easement. If Heber City and Wasatch County would do the same, about 70 acres of agricultural land could be protected.

- Spring Creek Park proposes zoning changes on the east side of the bypass, north of S.R. 113, from agricultural to multifamily residential/vacation rentals/medium density residential townhomes/single family detached residential.

3.5.2 East Bypass

- Support for east bypass.
- Opposition to east bypass.
- East bypass would work better for getting trucks off Main Street.
- Consider bypass through wilderness to Duchesne.
- East bypass will make congestion from three schools near Mill Road worse and make it unsafe for students.
- East bypass is better because all the growth will be on the east side.

3.6 Alternatives – Other

- Don't do anything, let trucks and traffic use U.S. 40.
- Route hazmat [hazardous materials] truck traffic around town.
- Restrict truck traffic to nighttime hours.
- Make trucks use the right lanes on Main Street and enforce speed.
- Commercial use of the corridor results in wear on the pavement, and air and noise pollution. Profit-making users of the road should pay in proportion to their use and impact.
- To minimize traffic and earn revenue, toll tanker trucks that use Main Street.
- Consider reversible lanes on Main Street.
- Reroute trucks outside downtown Heber City, like in Jackson Hole.
- Improve other roads in the valley instead of building a bypass.
- Allow trucks coming from westbound I-80 to travel southbound on U.S. 40 through town. If trucks are coming from Salt Lake City and west, make them use Provo Canyon.
- Build an oil pipeline to reduce truck traffic.
- Build a train to transport oil to reduce truck traffic.
- Make 100 West and 100 East the place for restaurants and stores (leave traffic on U.S. 40).
- Consider a tunnel under U.S. 40 for east-west traffic.
- Build a gondola from Wasatch golf course to a center station that can provide access to Park City, Deer Valley, Brighton, and Solitude.
- Build a new highway from U.S. 40 through Kamas to Duchesne and Vernal.

- Construct a one-way-couplet system on 100 East and 100 West.
- In addition to the No Action alternative and the no bypass alternative, UDOT should consider an exit intersection from U.S. 40 south of S.R. 30 (N. River Road), perhaps at 3000 North.

3.7 Alternatives – Active Transportation

- Need bike paths, sidewalks, and walkways. Get people walking and cycling.
- Construct a trail along the bypass route (per *Wasatch County Trails Master Plan*).
- If the EIS determines that a bypass route is the preferred option, the Wasatch County Council supports and recommends a nonmotorized trail along the bypass route. A 10-foot-wide paved trail is included in the *Wasatch County Trails Master Plan*, which was adopted by the Wasatch County Council.
- The Heber Valley Corridor Project might represent the best option for achieving the vision of a “lake-to-lake” trail. The Provo River Restoration Project does not authorize use of a trail along the Provo River in lands managed by the Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission.
- A bypass would put pedestrians’ and cyclists’ lives at risk.
- Make bike and pedestrian tunnels to connect Midway and Charleston roads.

3.8 Resource Considerations

3.8.1 Community and Social Impacts

- Local input is critical; local and elected leaders should be involved.
- Consider smaller local municipalities’ preservation.
- Address impacts of induced new traffic and growth, and the socioeconomic impacts that go with both.
- Assess impacts to recreation.
- Maintain railroad tracks.
- Maintain access to recreational resources like Southfield Park and the Wasatch County events center.
- Stop building homes in the Heber Valley.

Downtown Heber City

- Concern with truck traffic downtown.
- Concern regarding noise downtown.
- Concern regarding construction impacts on downtown businesses (congestion, noise, dust).

- Downtown Heber City should be walkable.
- Downtown is not pleasant; businesses can't stay open due to congestion and safety concerns.
- Main Street will never be a tourist magnet.

Neighborhoods

- Concern with impacts from bypass:
 - Safety (for example, safety of students getting to/from school, kids playing, dogs)
 - Quality of life
 - Noise
 - Use noise-reducing pavement
 - Need specific targets for noise reduction and mitigation
 - Increased pollution
 - Light pollution
 - Decreasing property values
 - Impacts to community resources (for example, park at 1300 South and Industrial Parkway)
 - Access to homes

3.8.2 North Fields, South Fields, and Open Space

- North Fields are a treasure for the community and add to quality of life.
- North Fields are a fragile ecosystem and provide habitat for wildlife.
- North Fields' scenic value is a tourism draw.
- Concern regarding impacts to North Fields.
- Concern regarding impacts to visual resources (natural beauty).
- Visual resource analysis is necessary to evaluate alternatives.
- Community supports preserving open space and passed a bond to do so (\$10 million in 2018). During the bond election, the North Fields was referenced as the most important area to preserve.
- Concern regarding impacts to open space.
- Open space is disappearing quickly.
- Don't put a bypass through the North Fields just because there isn't as much development.
- Ensure maximum preservation of farm land/open space, protection of wetlands, and wildlife.
- EIS should consider right to farm (valued by Wasatch County).

3.8.3 Wildlife

- Concern regarding wildlife impacts.
- Provo River Restoration Project should be protected and preserved; indirect impacts to wildlife and water quality should be evaluated in the EIS.
- Don't destroy the natural habitat of numerous species of wildlife in the North Fields.
- The western fields of the valley including South and North Fields are home to many species including nesting and migratory areas for sandhill cranes, geese, and many species of raptors. This does not include the foxes, deer, toads, and other wildlife that live in these areas.
- Assess impacts on habitats and migratory routes for sandhill cranes, Canada geese, bobolinks, and other avian species.
- Concern regarding impacts to fish and other species in the Provo River.
- Constructing a bypass will drive the snakes and mice from the fields into neighborhoods.
- Ensure maximum preservation of wildlife.
- Assess impacts on wildlife from increased traffic noise, pollution, and animal strikes by autos and trucks.

3.8.4 Air Quality

- Concern regarding air quality impacts.
- Comments on air quality analysis:
 - Recommend Draft EIS describe baseline air quality conditions for criteria pollutants and air quality related values (AQRVs) including the following:
 - Summary of background air quality and current design values based on National Ambient Air Quality Standards
 - Summary of existing trends in AQRVs including any Class I or Class II areas with sensitive resources of value
 - Estimates of current vehicle emissions based on traffic data and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's latest version of the MOVES modeling system
 - Recommend that emissions for each alternative be presented for construction and post-construction. Include criteria pollutants, hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), and greenhouse gases (GHGs). Recommend including the following for each alternative in the Draft EIS:
 - Equipment and construction sources using MOVES modeling system for mobile sources and appropriate emission factors for stationary sources
 - Inventory of mobile-source emissions from traffic after construction using MOVES
 - Analysis of impacts that discloses impacts based on level of emissions and receptors of interest (quantitative or qualitative)

- Cumulative impacts to criteria pollutants, HAPs, and GHGs
- Recommend that Draft EIS consider emissions inventory of mobile-source air toxics (MSATs) for no-action and action alternatives. Compare post-project conditions to baseline conditions, and whether there are human health concerns with those emissions and concentrations (if a quantitative analysis is conducted). Recommend that MSATs analysis includes:
 - Proximity of highway to homes, schools, and businesses
 - Potential impacts to these areas from MSAT exposure
 - Summary of available, relevant MSAT monitoring data and MSAT studies
 - Analysis of baseline and post-project diesel truck traffic and MSAT emissions
- Recommend that Draft EIS consider mitigation for negative air quality impacts, including the following:
 - Construction-related activities
 - Mitigation details (how, when, where, and effectiveness)
 - Design features to minimize population exposure of emissions from heavy freight diesel traffic
 - Consider vegetation as a barrier to reduce pollutants
- Recommend that Draft EIS include a discussion of real-time air quality monitoring during construction if air quality impacts of concern appear near residences or occupied structures. Consider proximity of construction to sensitive populations, soil disturbance, and duration and magnitude of emissions.
- Concern with air quality impacts to residential areas along bypass, versus current impacts on commercial corridor.
- Want to see specific targets to reduce vehicle pollution.

3.8.5 Water Resources

- Provo River Restoration Project should be protected and preserved; indirect impacts to water quality should be evaluated in the EIS.
- Project has potential to impact hydrology, water quality, and wildlife habitat of the creek and other water resources.
- Recommend that Draft EIS further delineate existing aquatic resources including wetlands and waters of the United States such as the northwest wetland complex and Provo River Restoration area. Recommend that Draft EIS include:
 - Clear maps showing rivers, creeks, springs, private wells, and groundwater interfaces
 - Baseline description of aquatic resources that discuss abundance, distribution, function, and condition; identify waters with total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)

- Analysis of direct impacts and hydrological impacts spatially removed from construction. Include impacts from changes in hydrology, water quality, impacts to aquatic organisms and wildlife; and aggregate impacts from future development scenarios
- Analysis of additional development to the degree that the project could enable or induce development which is already accounted for in land use, economic, and transportation plans
- Wetland delineation and functional analysis
- Address Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting
- Identify best management practices for water quality protection and possible mitigation
- Opposition to impacts (impedance or contamination) of Rock Creek or First Rock streams which are used for irrigation and stock watering. HOA requests input and approval for construction on lands impacting Rock Creek.
- Don't disrupt the natural flow of groundwater that provides the nourishment for the North Fields.
- Ensure maximum protection of wetlands.
- Avoid or mitigate impacts to water quality.

3.8.6 Economics

- Construction will impact downtown businesses (and should be avoided).
- Main Street businesses are suffering from traffic congestion.
- Concerns regarding project cost.
- Address impacts of induced new traffic and growth, and the socioeconomic impacts that go with both.

3.9 Miscellaneous

- Process is taking too long.
- Bypass should have been built a long time ago.
- Project costs too much and is a waste of money.
- How will you assure the public of an unbiased selection?
- All private proposals by Heber City officials with UDOT preceding, after, or outside this public comment period should be made public.
- Information presented at the February 20 open house at Heber Valley Elementary was confusing and misleading.
- UDOT needs to maintain the existing roads in Wasatch County before new projects are started.
- Roundabouts are not understood or driven well by Utahns.
- Any overpasses would disrupt the viewshed.