

Summary

Project: Heber Valley Corridor EIS

Subject: Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #5

Date: Thursday, June 09, 2022

Location: Zoom

Stakeholder Working Group

Name	Representing	Role
Craig Hancock	UDOT	Project Manager
Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager
Geoff Dupaix	UDOT	Communications Manager
Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Project Manager
John McPherson	HVC Team	Environmental
Charles Allen	HVC Team	Traffic Lead
Justin Smart	HVC Team	Public Involvement Lead
Bri Binnebose	HVC Team	Public Involvement
Tony Kohler	Heber City	Planning Director
Dustin Grabau	Wasatch Co.	County Manager
Ryan Taylor	Daniel	Town Engineer
Justin Keys	Wasatch County Open Lands Board	Board Member
David Booth	Emergency Services	Heber Police Chief
Kirsta Albert (for Paul Sweat)	School District	Superintendent
Bob Allen	Rural Planning Organization	RPO Director
Don Taylor	Non-motorized Transportation	MAG Trail Planner
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 Koecher	Heber Valley Chamber	Executive Director
Tom Stone	Business	CAMS Chairman
Jeff Bradshaw	Housing	Wasatch County Housing Authority
Christi Judd	Friends of Heber	Executive Director
Beka Grulich	UVU	Director
Dan and Trudy Simmons	Friends of Heber	Co-Executive Director

Meeting Topics:

1. The objective of this fifth stakeholder working group (SWG) meeting was to provide an update on the results of the screening process, listen to comments, answer questions, and facilitate a transfer of information between the EIS team and community groups.
2. Reminder that purpose and need statement sets the foundation for alternative development and screening:

The purpose of the Heber Valley Corridor EIS is to improve regional and local mobility on US-40 from SR-32 to US-189 and provide opportunities for non-motorized transportation while allowing Heber City to meet their vision for the historic town center.

3. Alternative development and screening overview:
 - a. The No-action alternative is required as a baseline for comparison. It describes the conditions in 2050 if this project is not implemented.
 - b. UDOT received multiple comments regarding growth in northeast Heber City. Commenters wanted to make sure this growth was taken into consideration. Some suggested bypass alternatives should tie into US-40 at SR-32 to bypass this growth. UDOT met with Heber City, Wasatch County, and MAG to compare planned development with the approved travel demand model. There are more households planned in the area north of downtown Heber City and east of US-40 than are in the travel demand model. However, this development could occur after 2050. After careful consideration, UDOT determined the travel demand model uses the best information available and did not make any changes (did not add additional households in this area).
 - c. UDOT presented 17 alternatives to the public in fall 2021 and developed 6 new alternatives based on comments received during the alternative comment period. Bypass alternatives that tie into US-40 at 800 North were modified to include improvements to the existing US-40 corridor between SR-32 and 800 North. New bypass alternatives that extend all the way to SR-32 on a new alignment were developed. A new one-way-couplet was developed as well. A total of 23 alternatives were evaluated in the screening process.
 - d. There are three steps where alternatives were eliminated in the screening process:
 - i. Preliminary evaluation – eliminate alternatives that have fatal flaws (e.g., not technically or financially feasible) which are not reflected in Level 1 or Level 2. Two alternatives were eliminated at this step.
 - ii. Level 1 – eliminate alternatives that do not meet the project purpose: improve local mobility, allow Heber City to meet their vision for a historic town center, improve regional mobility. Fifteen alternatives—including all east bypass alternatives and all Main Street alternatives—were eliminated at this step.
 - iii. Level 2 – eliminate alternatives that would perform similarly with respect to the purpose but would result in additional impacts to key resources. One alternative was eliminated at this step due to extensive wetland impacts.

- e. Five alternatives passed through screening and will be evaluated in detail in the DEIS. All are west bypass alternatives. They have been renamed for brevity and to make the names more descriptive.
 - i. WA1: Freeway with North US-40. Bypass is a freeway facility at 65 mph with grade separated interchanges connecting to US-40 at 800 North. A continuous frontage road system would be added to the existing US-40 corridor on both sides between SR-32 and 800 North.
 - ii. WB1: Highway with North US-40. Bypass is a highway facility at 55 mph with at grade signalized intersections connecting to US-40 at 800 North. A discontinuous frontage road system would be added to select sections of the existing US-40 corridor to consolidate existing accesses between SR-32 and 800 North.
 - iii. WB2: Highway with North US-40 and Realigned US-189. Same as WB1 except US-189 would be realigned on the south end (from about Edwards Lane to 1300 South).
 - iv. WB3: Highway to SR-32. Bypass is a highway facility at 55 mph with at grade signalized intersections connecting to US-40 at SR-32. No improvements would be made to the existing US-40 corridor. Note there are three planned signals on north US-40 and a future interchange at US-40 and SR-32 that are planned as separate projects and will be constructed regardless of the outcome of this project.
 - v. WB4: Highway to SR-32 and Realigned US-189. Same as WB3 except US-189 would be realigned on the south end (from about Edwards Lane to 1300 South).

4. Questions and Discussion:

- a. One member asked how the bypass alternatives will connect to US-40 at 800 North. Was a roundabout considered?
 - i. A traffic signal would provide better flow and is planned where bypass alternatives connect to US-40. Commercial trucks could not navigate roundabouts well.
- b. One member asked if trucks could be restricted from using Main Street. How do we know trucks will take the bypass if it is easier for them to stay on Main Street?
 - i. If there is a jurisdictional transfer (the bypass becomes US-40 and Heber City takes control of Main Street) trucks traveling through could be restricted. Trucks would still be allowed for deliveries and services. If there is a jurisdictional transfer, Heber City could also implement changes that would discourage truck traffic such as reducing the speed limit. One member noted it is germane to the Heber City vision to reduce the speed limit.
 - ii. The regional travel time is quicker on the bypass than on Main Street for most alternatives. Note the regional travel time is calculated on US-189 which carries more traffic than US-40 south of Heber City.
- c. One member commented that if most traffic is local, it seems unrealistic it will just disappear from Main Street. Where can I find the most recent traffic studies?

- i. About half of the traffic on Main Street is local traffic, the other half is passing through or starting/ending in Heber City. The travel time is representative of all vehicles, regardless of origin/destination.
 - ii. The traffic analysis is based on 2019/2020 traffic data. Links were provided to the latest traffic analysis reports on the project website: <https://hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/HVC-EIS-Alternative-Scrnng-Appendix-J-Traffic-Memo.pdf>
- d. One member asked how open space and preservation was taken into consideration. Preserving open lands is included in Heber City's vision (Envision Heber 2050).
- i. One member commented that nobody cares about downtown Heber City, but the north fields are a prize. UDOT encourages all comments and has heard a range of opinions. Some commenters feel the north fields are more important, others feel downtown is more important, some feel both are important.
 - ii. Wasatch County bonded for \$10M to preserve open space. This provides evidence of how important open space is to the community. Residents also passed a referendum to overturn a change in zoning that would allow more development. Will there be more discussion with UDOT on how this project could affect preservation efforts? One member offered to facilitate a meeting with the Wasatch Open Lands Board.
 - iii. Open space, visual/viewshed impacts, ecosystems, and water quality will all be evaluated in the Draft EIS. For the EIS, undeveloped publicly owned land and/or publicly accessible land will be considered open space; privately owned land is not considered open space.
- e. There has been substantial growth in the areas recently annexed by Heber City. One member commented that the growth is in the City, but the burden for a bypass road is on Wasatch County. Heber City has a responsibility to provide infrastructure to accommodate the growth.
- f. Another member commented that growth entitlements in northeast Heber City date back to when the land was under Wasatch County jurisdiction. A bypass is a way to handle that growth; not necessarily to accommodate more growth. It will be up to the local governments to figure out what happens at the signalized intersections. Development is controlled/managed through local zoning. Consider Price as a good example where trucks use a bypass to get around the City so downtown can be better preserved.
- g. One member brought up the importance of water rights in the north fields and recommended UDOT coordinate with the North Fields Irrigation Board to understand how the project could affect hydrology and water rights.
- h. Landowners in the north fields have been impacted by several projects (Provo River, power line, now UDOT). One member suggested that repeated impacts can make the issue emotional.
- i. One member commented that UVU likes to be on the main thoroughfare because it opens the opportunity for future transit. The existing access on US-40 is important.
- j. When will we see the active transportation components? One member commented there are efforts to get a trail system in the Heber Valley including the trail to Soldier Hollow, along S.R.

113, and the Provo River Trail. There is hope that a trail could run along the bypass to get around the City to north US-40; there is no benefit for a trail running through the north fields.

- k. One person asked why the freeway alternative has a long queue, it seems like it should be short with a freeway.
 - i. In general, queue length goes down when traffic volumes on Main Street go down. Each alternative does a slightly different job of taking vehicles off Main Street depending on speed and access. Alternatives with less access can't pull as many vehicles off Main Street.
 - l. One member commented that the economic value of downtown is important. Heber City would like to have jurisdiction of Main Street to make a walkable downtown that will become a destination.
 - m. Who should members contact for additional information?
 - i. The project email is best hebervalleyeis@utah.gov. Questions will be reviewed by the team and routed to the appropriate team member for response.
5. Public comment period
- a. A 45-day public comment period will run through July 22.
 - b. Please encourage community members to use official channels: website, email, telephone call or text. Point people to the project website <https://hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov/>.
 - c. If you are aware of people without internet, please direct them to paper copies of factsheets (available at locations listed on the website).
 - d. UDOT is specifically looking for comments about the screening report, screening criteria as they relate to the project purpose and key resources, and screening process. UDOT wants to know if there is new data or if anything was missed that could affect results of the screening process.
 - e. Comments about how alternatives affect water quality, wildlife, visual impacts, etc. will be more appropriate when the Draft EIS is released for public review and comment (because the Draft EIS will present an analysis of these impacts which is not available yet).
 - f. Even if some alternatives are unpopular or controversial, UDOT needs to evaluate them to make informed decisions.
6. Next steps:
- a. UDOT will present screening results at council meetings during the comment period.
 - b. UDOT will review all comments and determine if any changes need to be made to the screening results.
 - c. The Draft EIS is anticipated to be published in early 2023, with a decision in fall of 2023. The Draft EIS will include a detailed impact analysis and identify a preferred alternative.