

APPENDIX 3A

Induced Growth Meeting Notes

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Induced Growth Discussion – Wasatch County
Date:	Wednesday, November 02, 2022
Time:	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Location:	Webex

Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email
✓	Craig Hancock	UDOT	Project Manager	chancock@utah.gov
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	nkisen@utah.gov
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Project Manager	Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com
✓	Sarah Rigard	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	Sarah.Rigard@hdrinc.com
✓	Lacey Wilder	HVC Team	Environmental	Lacey.wilder@hdrinc.com
✓	Dustin Grabau	Wasatch Co.	Manager	dgrabau@wasatch.utah.gov
✓	Doug Smith	Wasatch Co.	Planning Director	dsmith@wasatch.utah.gov

Meeting Topics

- 1. Induced growth (changes in the location, magnitude, type, or pace of future development that result from changes in accessibility caused by the project)**

Other conditions necessary for development

- Zoning and other land use controls and policies
- Suitable available land
- Economic conditions that support development
- Other infrastructure that supports development (water and sewer)
- Amenities

- 2. Alternatives**

UDOT discussed access locations for alternatives

Change in Access Locations

Alternative	North US-40	Bypass	1300 South
No-action	No change to existing access		
WA1	Access consolidated (category 5)	Category 1 Interchanges at SR-113, 1300 South (no other access)	Remove connection to Industrial Parkway, 300 West

Alternative	North US-40	Bypass	1300 South
WB1	Access consolidated (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
WB2	Access consolidated (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
WB3	No change (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South, 900 North (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
WB4	No change (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South, 900 North (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
Access category 1 – access at interchanges only Access category 3 – access at signalized intersections only (0.5-mile min spacing) Access category 5 – access at signalized intersections (0.5-mile min spacing), side streets (660 feet min spacing), driveways (350 ft min spacing)			

a. Wasatch County asked if access category 3 was negotiable for the bypass portion of the B alternatives

- The alternatives might be more acceptable to the community if there is no access.
- Dustin believes the county would support no access for a highway type facility.
- Additional signals would increase travel time, defeating the purpose to some degree.
- Craig replied access category 3 it is just one step down from freeway access. UDOT is trying to balance mobility with access.
- Category 3 would allow additional signalized intersections with a minimum half-mile spacing. However, if there is no development to serve, additional intersections would not be needed.
- UDOT will provide examples of other facilities with access category 3 to help educate the public.

- Access categories can be found on UPlan here:
<https://uplan.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=0c9f352cffdd4aef81fbe6513d429dfa>

3. Zoning / land use controls

Constraints on growth include factors such as lack of demand, lack of available land, lack of water and sewer infrastructure, land use controls, regulatory constraints, and public opposition to development.

a. Annexation boundary:

- i. Alternatives WA1, WB1 and WB2 generally follow the preservation corridor that Wasatch County and Heber City have been discussing for years. Under these alternatives, the bypass would provide a boundary between the City and County. Heber City would annex land east of the bypass; land west of the bypass would remain under County control.
- ii. Alternatives WB3 and WB4 were not contemplated in previous discussions regarding an annexation boundary. It is unclear what boundary would be used for annexation under these alternatives.
 1. It is possible that Heber City could annex land east of the bypass in the North Fields. This would be concerning for the County because they have always intended for this land to remain agricultural (A-20 = agricultural 20 acre lots). There are concerns with building in this area due to high groundwater.
 2. Alternatively, it is possible that the annexation boundary would follow the bypass up to 900 North, and US-40 would serve as the boundary between 900 North and SR-32.
 3. UDOT should ask Heber City what they are thinking about annexation under WB3 and WB4.

b. Zoning changes:

- i. There would be no change in zoning to land in the north fields for land under County authority, regardless of alternative. Land that is currently zoned A-20 would remain zoned A-20.
- ii. Zoning in the sewer fields would only change if the County changes how they manage wastewater.
- iii. RA-5 zoning in the south fields could creep up to RA-1 if there is sewer and water service (independent of EIS alternatives).
- iv. The school district is developing a high school where 1130 W meets the bypass. This area will be annexed by Heber City and rezoned to allow the school (independent of EIS alternatives).
- v. UDOT asked if the County would rezone any of the land around the proposed interchange at SR-113 under Alternative WA1. Land near interchanges is frequently zoned as commercial.
 - vi. Wasatch County responded there were no plans to rezone land around either an interchange or intersection at SR-113. No plans for commercial zoning in this area regardless of alternative.
 - vii. The land directly west of Southfield Park is planned to be a public facility, regardless of alternative. This land would be rezoned to accommodate a public facility even under the No-action alternative.

- c. Proposed Access for Alternatives WB3 and WB4:
 - i. Dustin stated that less access is preferable.
 - ii. There may be some kind of land preservation corridor along the bypass. The County believes a preservation corridor could help make alternatives WB3 and WB4 more acceptable for the community. There would be no need for access if there is a preservation corridor.
 - iii. If there is access in the north fields, there will be pressure from developers.
- d. Terminology
 - i. The boundary between the North and South Fields is generally understood to be somewhere around SR-113, which serves as an unofficial dividing line. However, different people have different ideas of what is included in the north fields.
- e. Changes in rate of development:
 - i. Under Alternatives WB3 and WB4, it is likely the north fields would be subdivided at a quicker rate. These alternatives could affect agricultural operations enough to encourage more residential use. The area would still be zoned as A-20, but large residential developments could happen more quickly.
 - 1. Alternatives WB3 and WB4 would have the biggest impact on the transition of land use compared to other alternatives.
 - 2. The pressure to develop/rezone would likely come from construction of alternatives WB3 and WB4 (as opposed to selection as the preferred alternative).
 - ii. There is pressure to rezone the area south of SR-133, west of the bypass, from A-20 to RA-5 (regardless of alternative). However, the Council has been very deliberate about zoning. There has not been an up-zone in years.

Action Items

✓	Action Item	Responsible	Date
	Follow up with John on access to 1300 South on the WB1 Alt.	Andrea	
	Provide Dustin with examples and definitions of category 3 intersections.	Craig	
	Fix the colors on the online map we used, some are very similar and hard to tell the difference.	Travis – if we need the online map again	

Summary

Project:	Heber Valley Corridor EIS
Subject:	Induced Growth Discussion – Heber City
Date:	Monday, November 14, 2022
Time:	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Location:	Webex

Attendees

✓	Name	Representing	Project Role	Email
✓	Craig Hancock	UDOT	Project Manager	chancock@utah.gov
✓	Naomi Kisen	UDOT	Environmental Manager	nkisen@utah.gov
✓	Andrea Clayton	HVC Team	Project Manager	Andrea.clayton@hdrinc.com
✓	Sarah Rigard	HVC Team	Environmental Lead	Sarah.Rigard@hdrinc.com
✓	Lacey Wilder	HVC Team	Environmental	Lacey.wilder@hdrinc.com
✓	Matt Brower	Heber City	City Manager	mbrower@heberut.gov
✓	Tony Kohler	Heber City	Planning Director	tkohler@Heberut.gov

Meeting Topics

1. Induced growth (changes in the location, magnitude, type, or pace of future development that result from changes in accessibility caused by the project)
 - a. Other conditions necessary for development
 - b. Zoning and other land use controls and policies
 - c. Suitable available land
 - d. Economic conditions that support development
 - e. Other infrastructure that supports development (water and sewer)
 - f. Amenities
2. Alternatives
 - a. Change in Access Locations

Alternative	North US-40	Bypass	1300 South
No-action	No change to existing access		


**Heber Valley Corridor
ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT**

 PIN 17523
S-R399(310)

Alternative	North US-40	Bypass	1300 South
WA1	Access consolidated (category 5)	Category 1 Interchanges at SR-113, 1300 South (no other access)	Remove connection to Industrial Parkway, 300 West
WB1	Access consolidated (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
WB2	Access consolidated (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
WB3	No change (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South, 900 North (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
WB4	No change (category 5)	Category 3 Intersections at SR-113, 1300 South, 900 North (additional intersections possible)	No change to existing
Access category 1 – access at interchanges only Access category 3 – access at signalized intersections only (0.5-mile min spacing) Access category 5 – access at signalized intersections (0.5-mile min spacing), side streets (660 feet min spacing), driveways (350 ft min spacing)			

b. Comments on access

i. UDOT Access Category Identification map:

<https://uplan.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=0c9f352cffdd4aef81fbe6513d429dfa>

(1) Examples:

- a. I-15 and Bangerter Highway are access category 1. Access category 1 is limited access, freeway.
- b. 10 is the highest access category and allows for frequent driveways and intersections.

(2) Access management will help control growth. If built, the city prefers that UDOT designate the bypass as a lower access category road to limit development pressures and maintain the transportation facility (access category 1 or 3 is preferable to 5).

3. Annexation Boundary

- a. There is a general understanding that a western bypass would serve as the annexation boundary between Wasatch County and Heber City (based on the corridor the city and county

have been working to preserve). West of the bypass would remain under Wasatch County control and Heber City would annex everything east of the bypass.

- b. If a bypass is approved/constructed, it draws a line and creates certainty for future annexation and land use. Without a bypass, it would be less clear how the area would develop and annex.
- c. Without a bypass (No-action Alternative), city annexation will continue as it has been and would generally follow the existing bypass preservation corridor.
- d. Alternatives WA1, WB1, WB2 (generally follow preservation corridor)
 - i. West of the bypass would be under Wasatch County control and Heber City would annex everything east of the bypass. US-40 would generally serve as the boundary between city and county north of 900 North.
- e. Alternatives WB3, WB4 (new alignment through north fields)
 - i. Heber City does not intend to annex lands in the north fields. Heber City's annexation boundary would be similar under Alternatives WA1, WB1, and WB2. The county would maintain jurisdiction over land on both sides of the bypass north of 900 North. US-40 would generally serve as the boundary between city and county north of 900 North.

4. Zoning / land use controls in the Heber Valley

- a. Constraints on growth in the valley include factors such as lack of demand, lack of available land, lack of water and sewer infrastructure, existing land use controls, regulatory constraints, and public opposition to development.
- b. Zoning Changes
 - i. As traffic increases, city starts to get pressure to rezone an area as commercial.
 - ii. City expects to receive requests to rezone land as commercial near the preferred alternative once a preferred alternative is identified.
 - iii. It is easier for the city to say no to rezoning if UDOT does not allow access.

5. Induced growth potential due to bypass alternatives:

- a. Growth pressures in general
 - i. The assignment of a low access management category (category 1 or 3) would help the city control growth near a new bypass road. The city's preference is to limit growth along the bypass and within the north fields.
 - ii. If UDOT assigns the road as access management category 5 then the city will likely receive a lot of pressure to put driveways every 350 feet from landowners.
 - iii. Zoning between bypass and city limits is 1 unit per 20 acres (A-20). If a bypass is constructed, there will be pressure to allow the city to develop everything east of the bypass at a higher density than A-20.
- b. Growth pressure along Alternatives WA1, WB1, and WB2

- i. The city was asked about the potential for induced growth with Alternatives WA1, WB1, and WB2 (follow similar alignments to the preservation corridor) and compare to the no-action scenario.
 - (1) No induced growth expected along US-40 north of 900 North. The east side of US-40 is already developing and will continue to develop.
 - (2) City does not want to see development on the west side of US-40 and does not intend to annex land on the west side. Development on the east side of US-40 is funding conservation on the west side through a preservation fee. It is important for the city to preserve the land and maintain view corridors.
 - (3) There is one planned resort development on the west side of US-40 at River Road. It is entitled to 330 ERUs, but there has not been any action lately.
- c. Growth pressure along Alternatives WB3 and WB4
 - i. The city was about the potential for induced growth with Alternatives WB3, WB4 (alignment through the north fields) and compare to the no-action scenario.
 - (1) Land north of 900 North and west of US-40 would remain under county jurisdiction. County does not want to see development here.
 - (2) Landowners between the bypass and US-40 (north of 900 North) would be surrounded by roads on two sides. There could be pressure to provide access.
 - (3) The planned resort development at River Road would be bisected by the bypass, which could change the type of development.
- d. Growth pressure around SR-113 (Midway Lane) and future high school
 - i. Pressure to develop along SR-113 (high density residential and commercial).
 - ii. North of SR-113
 - (1) Future high school planned north of SR-113, between about 1000 West and 800 West. Mountainland Technical College (MTECH) is a vocational school planned south of the future high school (between high school and SR-113).
 - (2) City is in the process of annexing land for high school.
 - (3) City is unsure if the bypass itself would change land use (between the bypass and 600 West), but land use would change with the combined effects of the bypass, high school, and MTECH.
 - (4) There will be increased pressure to develop the area east of the high school (with or without bypass).
 - (5) City Transportation Master Plan shows 500 North extending west to connect to 1100 West. City does not want to promote growth north of here.
 - (6) North of SR-113 would have less pressure to develop due to the high school and wetlands compared to south of SR-113.

- (7) City does not want to develop north of Spring Creek.
- iii. South of SR-113
 - (1) There will be increased pressure to develop around the bypass, especially south of SR-113.
 - (2) There is sewer in the southwest quadrant.
 - (3) The pressure in this area would be for commercial development, potentially a truck stop.
 - (4) WA1 would not have as much pressure as the other alternatives because there would be no driveway access. However, there would still be pressure for access off SR-113.
- e. Growth pressure around railroad / 1200 South:
 - i. Council is resolute in preventing development that could preclude/hamper a bypass
 - ii. Area sandwiched between bypass and high-density housing would likely develop once a bypass is constructed.
 - iii. Under No-action, the city would not gain anything by annexing
- f. Growth pressure around US-189
 - i. Alternatives that realign US-189 (WB2, WB4)
 - (1) There is a perception the city wants to expand the airport (unfounded).
 - (2) UDOT does not know what would happen to the existing road if US-189 is realigned
 - (3) If US-189 is realigned, the area bounded by US-189 and the airport would be more isolated. There would be less people travelling from the north. These properties could be less desirable for retail.
 - (4) There could be less pressure for the sewer fields to develop.
 - (5) City has a desire to clean up this area, keep it from going to industrial.
 - (6) Charleston needs revenue and has looked at annexing land adjacent to the sewer fields for a commercial base. Could increase pressure for Charleston to annex land west of bypass and build a gas station or a truck stop.
 - ii. Alternatives that do not realign US-189 (WA1, WB1, WB3)
 - (1) No change in land use or development anticipated between 1300 South and airport
 - iii. New intersection or interchange in the sewer fields (all alternatives)
 - (1) Could increase pressure to develop sewer fields
- g. Growth pressure south of the hub intersection
 - i. Could be difficult for school district to maintain operations if their buildings are removed. Could maintain the area north of the airport RPZ as open space.
 - ii. No change to area bounded by US-189, bypass, and Daniels Road.

- iii. Area bounded by US-40, bypass, and Daniels Road is valuable for development. Redevelopment is already happening in this area.
- 6. Jurisdictional transfer
 - a. City has expressed a desire for a jurisdictional transfer if a bypass is built. Envision Heber 2050 contemplates US-40 being relocated on a bypass, and Main Street being transferred to Heber City.
 - i. City would like to take jurisdiction of US-40 in downtown.
 - ii. There has been no discussion at the city regarding a jurisdictional transfer north of 900 North.
 - b. UDOT does not know if a jurisdictional transfer would occur if a bypass were built. Decision regarding jurisdictional transfer is separate from EIS process.
 - c. City commented it is harder to hold the line (prevent development) along a local road compared to a UDOT road. It depends on the local political climate at the time.