Heber Valley Corridor
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

AND SECTIONS 4(F)/6(F) EVALUATION FOR

Heber Valley Corridor

in Wasatch County, Utah

Volume 1 of 2

Utah Department of Transportation

UDOT Project No. S-R399(310) PIN 17523

Submitted pursuant to

42 USC 4332(2)(c) and 49 USC 303

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 USC 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 26, 2022, and executed by FHWA and UDOT.

UDOT Keeping Utah Moving

April 2026

As of the publication of this document, UDOT has not reviewed, in detail, all of the comments received on the Draft EIS. Comments are essentially verbatim with personal information and rude or vulgar language redacted or removed. Be aware that some inappropriate language could have been missed. In addition, UDOT did not verify the safety or security of any hyperlinks that were included in the comments; please use caution if visiting any of these links.

The comments are separated into two volumes:

Volume 1 contains a comment matrix. The matrix includes all comments received on the Draft EIS during the 60-day comment period between January 9 and March 9, 2026, along with the commenter's name and a unique identification number for each comment. UDOT published the Draft EIS on the project website on January 7, but the official 60-day comment period began on January 9 when the notice of availability was published in the *Federal Register*. UDOT asked commenters who submitted comments on January 7 and January 8 to resubmit on or after January 9 for the comment to be included in the official comment period.

Volume 2 contains comment attachments. These comments contain the comment number found in Volume 1. Many of these comments are also found in Volume 1.

Volume 1: Redacted Comments Received during the Official Comment Period of January 9 to March 9, 2026

The table below includes comments received during the official 60-day comment period on the Draft EIS starting on January 9 and ending March 9, 2026. Comments are sorted by name.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
90	XXXXXXXXXXX (Comment translated from voicemail)	I am calling cuz Im a Hebrew (Heber*) resident and I am calling to oppose option b for the bypass my number is XXXXXXXXXXX Im in strong opposition of ruining that beautiful part of Heber by putting a road through it so I wanted to make my voice heard thank you
27	A Richardson	I would have preferred Alternative A, since I believe the growth to the North and East Side of Heber City-Wasatch County is exploding and that traffic needs a way to exit or enter Heber City and will use Hwy 40-Main and not the bypass. Noise is going to be an issue no matter the Alternative. The folks from S. Wasatch County will also still travel on Main St and not go around the city. The only ones who will use this bypass is the truckers and North to South thru traffic. By building in the North Fields you risk destroying critical wetlands and encourage development on the west side. Since my voice as a Wasatch County resident will be likely eliminated by all the developers, at least have a bike trail like Legacy Parkway, protect wildlife migration and eliminate any exits that would allow commercial buildings and more development from River Road to North Heber City. A Richardson
534	A. Marsh	I am in favor of Option B. For me, it is the obvious choice! After reading through the "Most Frequently Asked Questions" and reviewing what has been presented here are my reasons. 1. Information from UDOT's "Transportation Performance BOARD/slide" TRAFFIC BACKUPS from 500 N to SR-32. In 2019 queue (the queue is the length cars back up from 500 North, north) was 375 feet. IF NO action done by 2050, the queue will be 17,100 feet. 17,100 feet converts to 3.24 MILES!!!! From River Road/SR-32 to 500 N IS 3.2 miles. This is worse than living in the congested cities of California! We are a tiny, county town. Option A reduces the queue to 3,500 feet which is .66 of a mile or 2/3 of a mile backup. Option B reduces the queue to 700 feet which .13 of a mile or about 1/8th of a mile backup. 2. Information from UDOT's "Transportation Performance BOARD/slice" minutes and seconds to drive from SR-32 (River Road) to US-189/US-40 intersection. In 2019 drive time from River Road to Hwy 189 was 8:20 minutes. IF NO action done by 2050 it will take 20:30 minutes to drive from SR-32 (River Road) to US-189/US-40 intersection. Option A reduces the drive from SR-32 (River Road) to US-189/US-40 intersection to 11:50 minutes. Option B reduces the drive from SR-32 (River Road) to US-189/US-40 intersection to 10:15 minutes. This saves you 1:35 minutes. 3. Information from UDOT's "Transportation Performance BOARD/slide" Unstable traffic flow (failed intersections?), speed changes quickly, maneuverability is low. In 2019 "0" Unstable traffic flow/failed intersections, etc... IF NO action done by 2050 "5" Unstable traffic flow/failed intersections, etc... Option A will have "1" Unstable traffic flow/failed intersections, etc... Option B will have "0" Unstable traffic flow/failed intersections, etc... These three reasons alone Options B is IT!!!! Now.... I'd like to point out that when in Midway, looking to the East, I see all the development of what is going on in Heber City. I do not see any of the north fields. So, I can't help but think IF Option A is the one that I would NOT want to see from Midway. I would see the over passes protruding above the landscape as part of the skyline. There goes the small town that so many want. There goes a "mountain town!" I totally agree with UDOT and appreciate what UDOT is committing to on the following: -UDOT will prioritize the North Fields for wetland mitigation, protecting these areas from development in perpetuity. -To prevent unwanted development, UDOT commits to no new access points on the corridor through the North Fields between Potter Lane and SR-113. I think this is a great way to continue to protect the unused areas of the North Fields. Lastly, Alternative B MINIMIZES property disruption, requiring significantly fewer relocations, affecting only 8 properties (2 businesses and 6 homes) compared to 27 under Option A. Option A will have 27 properties relocated (12 homes and 15 business). For Option A, the number of homes and business that would have to be taken out is far more than Option B. In fact, I believe I heard IF Option A was approved, one of the businesses that would be relocated is Jersey Mikes....gone!!!! Why would the city even approve the building of business in this area if it was going to be part of the relocation of properties. Just saying?! Thank you.
561	A. Soper	As the world grows and people want to visit or move to various areas there is a reality that needs to be addressed... Just because one person wants to move or visit somewhere doesn't mean the area needs to change for that person to come to that area. The reason the area is appealing in the first place is because of how it is, not how it's going to be when we plan for millions more. We don't need to plan for 10's of thousands of more cars and people. Let it be. If it takes time to get down the road travelers can adjust their time and just know that it takes more time. Places don't need to change and adjust to the bustle, or those places lose their charm. When humans get rid of open spaces for cement those places lose their charm. The reality is not everyone gets to live in the Heber Valley. When people are going to come to visit they just need plan ahead for things to be slower traffic-wise. It is what it is! Leave the beautiful land of the Heber Valley alone. Let it be slower there. So what?! If people want to visit they can take it slower and enjoy the scenery. They don't need to drive through the city any faster with a big ole' expensive roadway that ruins the beauty of the area, damages the drinking water, and depletes the beauty of the area. Just because I love Banff Canada doesn't mean I get to drive my car to Lake Louise. I have to take the shuttle, that's just how it works when I visit there and I adjust my schedule. Banff isn't adjusting their roads to accommodate me. Just because I love Switzerland doesn't mean I need expect Switzerland to accommodate me so I can race through various 'tourist' areas in my car to get somewhere else faster. I actually have to walk in some places in Switzerland and that is part of the appeal. We need to all slow down. Let Heber City be Heber City and just be slower. The routes that are already there can stay and be properly maintained and be SLOW, so what?! Drivers can just deal with it. And someday we can all be proud that we didn't ruin farms for major roadways that are NOT necessary. We don't need to always be in a hurry. Some places can be slow. Let Heber be slow. My family members were raised in Heber. Please leave the beautiful land alone without major roadways. Don't ruin a good thing. Heber City = Slow Travels, the end.
97	Aaron Cheatwood	Please consider re-aligning the southern connection of alternative B so that the raised freeway can be avoided. If it were aligned between the hotel and the mobile homes, it could then bisect the sewer field property and achieve nearly the same connections but without the cost and safety concerns of the raised highway. Please take this into account.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
503	Aaron Cheatwood	Some people are talking about possibly asking you to move the route B alignment to the East nearer the HWY40 so that there isn't as much disruption to the farmland and it's easier to conserve the north fields from development. Please consider doing so!
510	Action Financial Insurance	As a Utah taxpayer, I strongly urge UDOT to reconsider NOT carving a bypass through Heber Valley. Several proposed alternatives could be implemented that do not disrupt our water supply. Using the already proposed alternatives that do not fail to meet NEPA, clean water act and LEDPA requirements. The alternatives would keep our aquifer intact and preserve the nature our valley holds so dear. A Bypass would disrupt tourism and cost out valley millions in revenue A Bypass would pollute our water and create a problem for all those outside this valley that depend on that water A Bypass does not solve the local traffic problem A Bypass only costs money to tax payers that doesn't need to be spent PLEASE reconsider -- Action Financial Insurance phone: XXXXXXXX fax: XXXXXXXX site: XXXXXXXXXXXX email: XXXXXXXXXXXX address: XXXXXXXXXXXX
626	Adam Bodily	To the UDOT Heber Valley EIS Project Team, We write as engineering students at the University of Utah who are being trained under the highest standards of engineering ethics, public safety, and environmental stewardship. Our education emphasizes that engineers must protect the public, defend scientific integrity, and refuse to endorse projects that lack transparency or violate federal law. After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), we cannot support Alternative B. The proposal raises profound ethical, technical, and legal concerns that contradict the standards we are expected to uphold as future licensed engineers. 1.Ethical Breach: Withholding Critical Hydrologic and Groundwater Data The DEIS fails to disclose the hydrogeologic modeling necessary to evaluate impacts to the shallow aquifer that supplies drinking water to the Wasatch Back. Under the NSPE Code of Ethics, engineers must base decisions on complete, transparent, and accurate information. UDOT has not provided: contaminant transport modeling groundwater mounding analysis recharge-rate impacts spring and wetland connectivity data high-water-year field measurements Proceeding without this information violates the ethical requirement to “hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public.” When the resource at risk is a sole-source aquifer, withholding data is not just a technical oversight — it is an ethical failure. 2.NEPA and LEDPA Violations: Selecting the Most Damaging Alternative Alternative B crosses the most wetlands, most irrigation systems, and the most aquifer recharge zones of any alignment. Under NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332) and the Clean Water Act’s LEDPA standard, agencies must select the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. Alternative B is the opposite. The DEIS does not explain how the most destructive alignment could possibly satisfy LEDPA. Nor does it justify the dismissal of lower-impact alternatives proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company — a clear procedural deficiency. 3. High-Speed Design Without Legal or Engineering Justification The proposed 65 mph design speed is unjustified, unsafe, and inconsistent with surrounding roadways. A high-speed rural corridor: increases wildlife and livestock mortality widens the roadway footprint increases noise and pollution raises collision severity expands spill-risk into the aquifer NEPA requires agencies to evaluate reasonable alternatives, including lower-speed designs. The DEIS does not do this. The only apparent purpose of the 65 mph design is to manufacture a marginal time-savings benefit — approximately one minute — which is not a lawful or rational basis for selecting a high-impact alternative. 4. Induced Growth Ignored Despite Clear Federal Requirements Alternative B is classified as a Class III facility, which allows future access points at half-mile intervals. This is a growth-enabling design by definition. Yet the DEIS claims the project is “not intended to induce growth.” This contradiction violates NEPA’s requirement to analyze indirect and induced growth impacts (40 CFR §§ 1508.1(g), 1508.1(h)). The DEIS does not model:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		west-side development pressure east-side approved growth increased water demand long-term traffic generation land-use conversion infrastructure expansion Failure to disclose foreseeable impacts is grounds for an arbitrary and capricious finding under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 706). 5. Loss of Federally Funded Conservation Easement UDOT blocked a federally funded NRCS conservation easement that would have preserved nearly 300 acres and brought a halt of federal preservation funds to the community. This action contradicts: the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. § 4201 et seq.) local rural preservation plans the public interest The DEIS does not explain why UDOT chose to sacrifice irreplaceable farmland rather than adjust the project boundary. 6. Failure to Address Main Street Congestion — the Actual Problem Main Street congestion is driven by local trips, not regional through-traffic. Alternative B does not fix: failing intersections between 100 North and 100 South congestion at the Hub (Hwy 40 & 189) east-side growth impacts A bypass that does not solve the core problem is not a solution — it is a diversion of public funds. 7. Elevated Structures and Long-Term Maintenance Liabilities Alternative B introduces elevated structures that: increase cost increase noise increase maintenance burdens reduce property values expand environmental footprint The DEIS omits full lifecycle cost analysis, which is required for responsible public finance and transparent decision-making. At grade options were initially offered but then reversed. 8. Irreversible Environmental Damage Wetland mitigation cannot replicate the ecological function of existing wetlands. Aquifer contamination cannot be reversed. Farmland lost to development cannot be restored. NEPA requires agencies to avoid irreversible commitments of resources before completing a lawful analysis. Alternative B violates this principle. Conclusion: Ethical and Legal Standards Require Removal of Alternative B As engineering students at the University of Utah, we are being trained to uphold the law, protect the public, and defend scientific integrity. Alternative B fails every one of these tests. We formally request that UDOT: remove Alternative B from consideration comply fully with NEPA, LEDPA, and the Clean Water Act disclose all hydrologic and groundwater modeling evaluate lower-speed, lower-impact alternatives respect farmland protection laws and conservation easements prioritize solutions that address Main Street congestion commit to at-grade designs that protect rural character and public safety We will not accept a transportation project that compromises water security, violates federal law, and disregards the ethical obligations of the engineering profession. Sincerely, Engineering Students of the University of Utah (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
332	Adam Garff	To the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project Team: I am submitting this comment to express my personal opposition to both bypass alternatives — Alternative A and Alternative B — and to urge UDOT to reconsider whether any bypass is the right solution for Heber Valley. I also support the formal comments submitted by the North Field Irrigation Company (NFIC), which identifies 96 specific deficiencies in the DEIS — 34 of which are independently sufficient to invalidate the document's conclusions. Alternative B should be rejected; however, my concerns go even further: I believe the DEIS has asked the wrong question from the beginning. --- A BYPASS WILL GENERATE THE TRAFFIC PROBLEM IT CLAIMS TO SOLVE The DEIS frames the bypass as a solution to congestion. But a new freeway-style corridor through the North Fields will do what new highway capacity always does: generate new traffic. This is not speculation — it is the well-documented principle of induced demand, which UDOT's own traffic model fails to adequately account for. The DEIS itself acknowledges that Alternative B will "facilitate westward urban expansion" of Heber City. New development means new vehicle trips, and new vehicle trips will fill the new road — returning the valley to congestion, but at a permanently higher baseline and with irreversible environmental damage already done. --- THE BYPASS INVITES I-80 REROUTING THROUGH HEBER VALLEY This is the risk I believe the DEIS has entirely failed to study, and it may be the most consequential long-term impact of this project. Today, westbound I-80 traffic from the Wasatch Back destined for Salt Lake City travels through Parley's

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Canyon — a route with far greater infrastructure capacity. A new high-speed bypass through Heber Valley would make US-40 through Heber a faster and more attractive alternative for regional and even interstate traffic currently using I-80 via SLC. GPS navigation systems and trucking dispatchers optimize for travel time. Once a faster route exists, they will use it. Salt Lake City's I-80 corridor was built to handle regional freight and interstate traffic loads. Heber Valley's road network, the North Fields aquifer, Spring Creek, the Provo River Blue-Ribbon fishery, and the community's rural character were not. Routing even a fraction of I-80's westbound volume through a newly expanded Heber corridor would overwhelm local infrastructure, accelerate development pressure, and permanently transform the character of the valley — outcomes that 77% of Heber Valley residents said they did not want when surveyed for the Envision Heber 2050 General Plan. UDOT's traffic model does not appear to have studied this scenario. The DEIS uses a model labeled "Not Calibrated" for summer traffic — the season when regional travel pressure is highest. There is no analysis of how the bypass would affect routing decisions for long-haul trucks, tourism traffic, or GPS-optimized travel patterns on a regional scale. --- THE DEIS HAS NOT STUDIED THE RIGHT ALTERNATIVES Neither Alternative A nor Alternative B answers the question: what is the least impactful way to manage congestion in Heber City without triggering the regional traffic shift described above? The DEIS failed to perform a rigorous analysis of the 100 East/100 West One-Way Couplet, which Heber City formally supported (Resolution 2023-14). Demand management strategies, intersection improvements, and access management on existing US-40 were not given a fair comparison. Building a $760+ million freeway-style bypass — one that costs more than Alternative A, destroys 140% more wetlands, threatens the municipal drinking water supply for three communities, eliminates 160-year-old senior water rights, and contradicts the community's own general plan — to save 70 seconds of travel time is not a defensible public investment. It is especially indefensible when the bypass itself may attract the very regional traffic volume that overwhelms the solution. --- MY REQUESTS I urge UDOT to: 1. Study the "no bypass" alternative with the same rigor applied to Alternatives A and B, including a serious analysis of intersection and demand management options on existing US-40. 2. Commission an independent regional traffic study examining whether a Heber bypass would divert I-80 westbound traffic away from Salt Lake City's higher-capacity infrastructure and onto US-40 through the valley. 3. Refuse to issue a Record of Decision on the current DEIS, which does not meet NEPA's "hard look" standard and omits critical analyses of induced demand, regional rerouting risk, aquifer impacts, and true project costs. Heber Valley's character, water, farmland, and long-term quality of life are worth more than a 70-second reduction in drive time. Please get this right before it cannot be undone. Respectfully, J Adam Garff XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
680	Adrienne Clyde	Why does UDOT and Heber City want the option that cuts through so much agricultural farm land, ruins the water system - that you haven't even looked into or don't want to look into- making a land grab for hundreds/thousands of acres to put into wetlands and would cost millions of tax payer dollars more than option A??. And the traffic on Main Street isn't going to be fixed because everyone is going to the east side of Heber and not going to Provo. This is the problem with to much grown and not planning correctly to create a bypass that gets to the EAST side of Heber. Every developer didn't want to spend the money with creating a bypass to help lessen the traffic on Main Street (AKA HWY 40- a main traffic route that goes all the way across the country). Everything comes back to Hwy 40. You will ruin the last bit of agricultural land and water ways just so Heber City can make something fit into their master plan to make us be like Park City….. news flash if we wanted to live in Park City we would move there. We are a 7 generation Cattle ranch and this will make it impossible to continue farming the land and moving our cattle in the area. There has been no discussion on the impact and distribution on how water will be moved to our fields and where overpasses will be placed so that the Livestock Corridor will be preserved. Option B is Poor poor planning and greedy land grab from Heber City and UDOT. Both A or B are terrible options and people will have land taken away that have been in their families for generations but Option A is less of an impact on lively hoods and the over all benefit of keeping the North Fields a viable agricultural area for Wasatch County. Sincerely, Adrienne Clyde
608	Ahdena Clark	I'm writing today to urge you to please choose Route A. Looking at all of the facts produced by DEIS and UDOT - at a macro level - Route B cannot truly be "The least environmentally damaging practicable alternative." - UDOT's own stormwater model shows deicing salt concentrations would exceed the legal limit for the Class IA pristine shallow aquifer beneath the North Fields - From UDOT's own data. UDOT's preferred Alternative B is worse than Alternative A in every measurable environmental category: •140% more wetlands destroyed (53.92 acres vs. 22.52) • 24% more regulated farmland converted (223 acres vs. 179) • 225% more Agriculture Protection Area damaged (38.4 acres vs. 11.8) • 56% more historic canal severed (15,971 linear feet vs. 10,206) • 910% more Rock Creek canal infrastructure impacted • Higher cost We, the long-term, permanent residences of the Heber Valley want UDOT to show proof before any Record of Decision, on the following: - WATER- Stormwater and municipal drinking water. How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources, especially in consideration to contaminants such as de-icing agents? Additionally, please provide evidence of Section 408 consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation regarding interference with the Provo River federal water project. - AG, Irreplaceable Farmlands- Please provide evidence that UDOT contacted the Utah State Commissioner of Agriculture and Food regarding modifications to protect Agriculture Protection Areas, as required by U.C.A. § 17-41-307. - Truck diversion. Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year - 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. Being a resident, and personally have spoken to some truck drivers in passing at the Maverick near 500 N, unless mandated, they will continue to use Main Street as their last "pit stop" before heading over the pass to Duchesne county. Please choose Route A. We need to preserve our water aquifers, farmlands and open spaces. Route A is clearly the preferred route by Heber Valley residents and those who come to enjoy the valley's open spaces. Only developers want to build more roads, not the people who live and thrive on the land. Sincerely,
540	Aimee Wetzel	Please. This is something we can't undo. Please save this gorgeous water sacred area. This is not something to take lightly Aimee wetzel Sent from my iPhone
17	Alejandro Chavez	I personally feel that in future decades plan b would best. That seems like the one that'll happen. My only concern are the intersections will they have lights or just signs ? Besides that how long is the process going to take? Wouldn't a trail near it cause more problems? With lots of biker issues ?
391	Alex Olson	I think something needs to be done. After reviewing the two different alternatives, I believe alternative A will get the least amount of push back and I think is the best route to go. How much of a third alternative of going on the east side of Heber been considered? The LDS Temple is being built on the east side, maybe consider a corridor. It's too bad some of the planning of corridors wasn't thought about ahead of time given the growth in the area. I hope UDOT and local leaders can learn from this in other parts of the state.
309	Alex Whetmore	The north fields bypass will be detrimental to the rural character and ecosystem stability of our area. Agricultural producers are facing pressure on all sides to sell their land for development, restrict their water rights, or have land taken from them such as in this proposal. The producers of the north fields make an enormous impact on their local community. Food that is grown locally provides an economic boost (and buying local is often cheaper), protects prairie lands which are a carbon buffer (and sequester vast levels of carbon in soil), require far less trucking (and in so, less fuel use and wear on our roads) and help to maintain our clean water sources. This bypass does none of that. Once farm land is gone, it's gone forever. No one is tearing down developments in order to make more farm lands. UDOT likes to use mitigation land as a talking point but that isn't actually creating any more

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		productive land. So, the net loss is still the same. Plus, this land can often be taken via imminent domain. This solution is short sighted at best. Alex Wetmore, Ph.D.
120	Alexandra Folmer (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Good evening, everyone. My name is Alexandra Folmer. I'm very passionate about the North Fields, and I wanted to say I also come from -- I also come from a 20-year background in tech and data. I have consulted for many state agencies. And I've been running through the EIS, through the projections, through the traffic numbers, and they just don't make sense to me. I think they are overbloated. For those of you that are living in any of the new areas in Heber or close to, you know what I'm talking about -- empty homes, everything's for rent, you don't see your neighbors, your kids don't have anyone to play with. That's what all of our new developments look like here in Heber. The developer at the slopes was just quoted this past January in the record saying, out of all of those units they will be building, they only expect 20 percent full-time residents. I'm going to say it again. I think the numbers are wrong. Google Maps on the Chrome browser just did something very exciting this past week. Told you I'm in tech. I'm a total geek. Okay? I'm going to encourage everyone to open up your browser in Chrome to Maps.Google.com throughout the week, and they're now offering live traffic feeds for the Heber City Valley. We do not register for high traffic on the national stage. All right? They are getting realtime data from all of your phones, from all of our GPS locations. The algorithms are processing the data against the benchmarks across the country. There's no biases. There's no political interests. It's just straight data. Yes, do we have some traffic. I agree we do. It is not worth a $1 billion project. We can take that money. We can be more effective. We can increase throughput on Main Street. It was already widened for what we are today. So I'm committing to this -- to this community to continue to make GRAMA requests, pull the data, and get a different perspective on where we are today with this bypass. So I don't vote for Option B, Option A. I don't think they're needed. Thank you.
140	Alice Hicken (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	I'm glad to be here tonight, and I want to tell you this is about the third UDOT meeting that I have attended since I have lived in Heber City. There has been -- there has been proposals in the past to provide a bypass, and this is my third one. So let's hope something can be done. I'm going to give you a little history lesson. Thomas Todd traveled to Heber Valley in 1860 with his family and lived in a log cabin for many years. He homestead -- he homesteaded 150 acres of ground, and he was given a deed to the property, as mentioned before -- my son said this -- when Utah was a territory, and the deed was signed by Ulysses S. Grant. The North Fields is a special spot of ground. The water table is close to the surface, and it is called a wetland. Cattails grow there. Cranes feed there. As far as we know, the meadow hay was not planted. It's just always been there. Thomas Todd lived in newly formed Heber City. He had to ride a horse to his field and drive a team of workhorses to work the land. He was fortunate to have a stream run through his piece of ground. Over the years, he harvested using horses, cutting with sieves, pulling hay cutters and hay rakes. Derricks were used to stack the loose hay into big piles. Pitch forks were handy tools. He put up fences. Probably some of the posts and bailing twine still exists today. It took days to harvest the hay. Then, in winter, he fed his cattle in the field using the sleigh pulled by two workhorses. Thomas Todd's daughter married my husband's grandfather. Got to hurry here. Anyway, our family still own this piece of property today. The proposed highway basically runs through this Todd field. There used to be a sign coming into the valley from Salt Lake saying "Beautiful Heber Valley." We are proud to live here. We look at the valley and see Timpanogos towering in the distance, and we pass beautiful green fields before reaching the town. Yes, our valley is being filled with homes and apartments. We welcome these good people. Please do not destroy these beautiful fields with a superhighway that will basically destroy the fields.
318	Allison Larsen	To whom it may concern, Neither option is acceptable! With only 20% of the traffic being passed through it, it is not worth ruining and losing our heritage in this valley. I don’t care how much it is denied, absolutely this will ruin the aquifer, farms, wildlife, pollution, on and on and on! It is naïve to believe that there will be no urban sprawl extend from these bypasses. Which will only create a denser population that will be using Main Street and any “ Benefit” will be negated and we will have lost the jewel of the valley! I urgently ask that you understand that neither option is viable. But option B is just plain unbelievably horrible! Respectfully, Allison Salisbury. Sent from my iPad
324	Allison Salisbury	UDOT… This is a postcard of the beautiful valley of Heber, which will be totally destroyed if any bypass is put in. With a bypass, among aquifers, wild life, farming, pollution, etc. issues, this will actually bring in more population that will attend from these roads into urban sprawl and our main street will lose any advantage that the less than 20% traffic taken off of it will. Please don't put in option B. I don't believe in A either, but it is the lesser of 2 evils. Allison Salisbury (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
482	Amanda Bitner	UDOT Evaluation Team, My name is Amanda Bitner and I live in Heber City at XXXXXXXX. I am submitting comments regarding the Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor project. My comments focus on the south end of the proposed plan, which seems to be the same under either alternative. After reviewing the materials and videos provided by UDOT, I strongly disagree with the proposed alignment that follows 1300 South. This route would divide my neighborhood and significantly reduce convenient access to nearby commercial services that I currently rely on, including the car wash, bank, and dentist. Today these services are easily accessible for me, but the proposed alignment risks cutting off or complicating access. I agree with the position expressed by the Heber City Council, which stated: “Heber City would have preferred to see the South Highway 40 leg – planned to run along 1300 South – located further south through the undeveloped area to reduce impacts on residential and commercial properties along 1300 South.” I strongly encourage UDOT to reconsider routing this segment further south through currently undeveloped land. Doing so would reduce disruption to established neighborhoods and existing businesses. Additionally, the current proposal risks creating an isolated triangle of residential and commercial properties between two freeway corridors. This configuration will make access significantly more difficult and will negatively affect the long-term viability of businesses in the area, as customers may find it inconvenient or confusing to reach them. I think the concept of a raised freeway through this relatively tight residential and commercial area does not seem appropriate given the surrounding land uses and community character. The design of the south end of the project, as currently proposed, does not appear to reflect the preferences expressed by many residents in my neighborhood and throughout the valley. I would also like to address speed and noise impacts associated with the Highway 40 expansion. The maximum speed for this corridor should not exceed 55 mph. Increasing the speed limit to 65 mph would significantly increase traffic noise in nearby neighborhoods. From my home, which is approximately 0.62 miles from Highway 189, I can already hear traffic despite the current 55 mph speed limit. UDOT should consider incorporating noise-mitigation strategies similar to those implemented on Legacy Parkway. These measures could include maintaining a 55 mph speed limit, installing quieter pavement surfaces, constructing sound walls where appropriate, and using landscaped berms to help reduce noise impacts on surrounding communities. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during this process. I encourage UDOT to carefully reconsider the alignment of the south segment and prioritize solutions that minimize impacts to established neighborhoods, maintain access to local businesses, and reduce long-term noise impacts for residents. Sincerely, Amanda Bitner XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
334	Amber	Please reconsider destroying the North fields. We already have a huge highway on the north side of town that is more than capable of continuing to support the traffic. If we have to sacrifice the beauty of the fields at least only destroy half of them south and choose Option A instead of B. It makes no sense to build a road that is more expensive and more disruptive than the alternative is. If more people are affected by Alternative A then maybe just leave the North portion of the road as just a road and not put in "walking trails" as who wants to walk next to a really busy highway. Save that money and the land you would have to take from currently land owner and do something more productive with it...to me if anything is going to go through the North fields it should only be a trail and never a huge highway. Please think about the impact to the community, the environment, the wildlife, and the reason most of us moved here and don't destroy it. I would rather have no bypass than Option B.
179	Ambrie Gordon-Carroll	Good afternoon, I am writing as a resident of Heber Valley to share my concerns regarding the bypass project that is currently planned for our community. While I understand that this project may move forward, I respectfully ask that its impacts be carefully reconsidered and mitigated. One of my greatest concerns is the overall visual and environmental impact this bypass will have on Heber Valley. The construction of elevated roadways and twenty foot sound walls next to quiet working farms will dramatically alter the landscape. These structures will tower over land that has remained open and agricultural for generations, changing the experience of the valley in a way that cannot be reversed. There is also the very real cost to local families. The loss of farmland and the use of eminent domain to remove farm homes represents more than property acquisition. It represents the removal of history, livelihood, and identity from a place that many of us deliberately chose because of its rural character. I also ask that the Council carefully consider who this bypass is intended to benefit. From a local perspective, Heber Valley functions well with its existing road network. Many residents did not move here to support commuter traffic or become a pass through corridor. We chose this valley for its small town roads, open space, and agricultural way of life. It is difficult to see how this project primarily serves the people who actually live here rather than commuters passing through. Given the estimated cost of approximately 720 million dollars, I believe there remains an opportunity to invest in solutions that better reflect the values of this community. One alternative worth serious consideration would be improving Heber Main Street itself. The road could be widened to better accommodate traffic while maintaining safety and efficiency. Existing buildings could have their primary entrances reoriented to face away from the main roadway, allowing for pedestrian friendly walkways and gathering spaces. Those buildings could be backed by a substantial wall designed to control noise and improve safety, creating a more efficient commute route without sacrificing farmland or altering the valley landscape. If the bypass is to be built, I urge the Council to take every possible step to reduce its visual intrusion, protect remaining farmland, and ensure that local residents are not the ones paying the highest price for a project that primarily benefits commuters. Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community. Ambrie Gordon-Carroll Sent from my iPhone
103	Amelia Charles	As a fourth-generation Heberite, please go with option A. Far less of the agricultural area would be damaged. We have lost so much farm land over the last 20+ years, please let's prevent anymore.
399	Amy Bates	I live in Provo and am concerned about the proposed Alternative B. It will impact over 50 acres of Heber Valley's North Fields and wetlands. It will affect aquifers supplying water to over 1 Million residents - including Provo where I live. I'm concerned about the disruption to soil, water, and wildlife. Thanks, Amy Bates
338	Amy Nelson	: Amy Nelson Address: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To the UDOT Heber Valley EIS Team, I am writing to formally submit my opposition to the proposed Heber Valley Corridor, specifically the preferred Alternative B. As a Utah resident, I am deeply concerned that this project prioritizes "disgusting growth" over the preservation of our state's most critical natural resources. My opposition is based on the following: Watershed Protection: The proposed route threatens the integrity of the Heber Valley watershed. Paving over these lands risks permanent contamination and disruption of the water supply that residents across the region—including those downstream in the Salt Lake Valley—rely on. Impact on the Provo River: The Provo River is an irreplaceable ecological and recreational treasure. A major highway corridor in such close proximity will cause irreversible damage to the river's health, aquatic life, and the surrounding ecosystem through toxic runoff and habitat fragmentation. Loss of Quiet, Private Lands:This project destroys the "quiet and private" nature of the North Fields. We should be protecting these open spaces and the rural way of life they support, rather than allowing them to be

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		ruined by a bypass. Once this land is paved, the rural character of Utah is lost forever; there is no "mitigation" that can replace a centuries-old agricultural landscape. Failure to Prioritize Existing Infrastructure: I urge UDOT to exhaust all options for optimizing the existing US-40/Main Street corridor before considering the destruction of pristine greenfield land. We should be investing in smart technology and transit on existing roads rather than subsidizing sprawl through the heart of our valley. I request that these concerns be formally addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and that UDOT reconsider options that do not involve the destruction of the North Fields. Sincerely, Amy Nelson Sent from my iPhone
248	Amy Tuddenham	Subject: Public Comment on Heber Valley Corridor EIS – Support for Option B Dear UDOT Heber Valley Corridor Project Team, I am writing to submit my public comment regarding the Heber Valley Corridor EIS. I strongly support Option B for the future alignment and growth of Wasatch County. As a resident of the valley since 2000, I have seen discussions about a bypass stretch on for decades. While growth has changed the valley I love, it is clear we need the right infrastructure to manage that growth responsibly. Preservation of the North Fields – Our Most Pressing Priority Above all, I want to emphasize the critical importance of preserving the North Fields—one of the defining environmental, agricultural, and scenic assets of this community. I deeply appreciate that UDOT has listened to residents' concerns and has taken concrete, enforceable steps to ensure that the North Fields are protected in perpetuity. Based on UDOT's commitments as of January 2026, these protections include: • Perpetual Conservation: Wetland mitigation sites created for this project will be legally protected in perpetuity, meaning these areas cannot be developed. • 2:1 or Greater Wetland Mitigation: UDOT is required—and has committed—to preserving or restoring at least two acres of wetland for every acre impacted. This secures long term ecological protection of sensitive areas. • Prevention of Future Sprawl: Option B is a limited access facility, with no additional interchanges allowed beyond those already identified. This restriction is specifically designed to prevent development pressure in the North Fields. • Direct Mitigation in the North Fields: UDOT has stated that mitigation sites will be prioritized in the North Fields, directly preserving the very land residents are concerned about. These commitments represent the strongest preservation tools available. While some city leaders have expressed distrust about future enforcement, delaying this project or shifting to Option A will not produce better protections—only greater costs and impacts. Our path forward must be to move ahead with Option B and hold all stakeholders accountable for honoring these preservation commitments. Project Costs and the Importance of Acting Now I recognize that the financial investment required is significant. However, continued delays—often due to misinformation or political resistance—will only increase costs. The need for a functional bypass has been clear for decades, and postponement has already created unnecessary financial and community impacts. Option A does not provide meaningful relief for Main Street traffic. It funnels vehicles into existing problem areas like 900 North, Main Street, and Heritage Way, which are already heavily congested. Choosing an option that fails to address the core transportation problem will only push costs higher while delivering little benefit. Option B, by contrast, creates: • A true four-lane limited-access corridor, • A direct connection between US 189 and US 40, • A free flowing route for heavy trucks and through traffic, and • A safer, calmer, more welcoming Main Street. Olympic Timing – A Critical Opportunity It is essential that this project be completed well before 2050—and ideally before the 2034 Winter Olympics. The Heber Valley will face massive increases in traffic, visitors, and regional mobility demands. If construction is underway during the Olympics, the effects on emergency response, resident mobility, and overall congestion could be severe. We have a rare window right now: • Strong state-level support, • The ability to coordinate with local Olympic organizing groups, and • Access to potential Olympic transportation funding. Securing alignment and momentum now gives us the greatest chance of completing this bypass ahead of the Games, protecting both residents and visitors while ensuring the valley functions well during a global event. I want to express my sincere appreciation for the thoughtful, thorough work UDOT has undertaken throughout this EIS process. I trust the knowledge and expertise your engineers and planners bring to this complex project. I am especially grateful for the careful attention to landowners who this will impact, the commitment to permanent preservation of the North Fields, and the selection of an option that affects only 8 homes and businesses, compared to the 27 under Option A. Thank you for recognizing the human impact behind every displaced resident or business. I hope the eight affected property owners will receive fair market value and compassionate support throughout the process. Thank you again for your thorough, data-driven approach to this study and for your commitment to the long-term wellbeing of the Heber Valley. I strongly urge UDOT to move forward with Option B so we can finally reduce Main Street congestion, protect our cherished North Fields, and secure the infrastructure our community urgently needs. Sincerely, Amy Owen Tuddenham (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
380	Andrea Garland	Dear UDOT, As an Utah taxpayer I urge you to remove Alternative B from consideration. It violates NEPA and the Clean Water Act and infringes on an NRCS conservation easement. I understand Heber is congested—I notice it every time I drive through Heber. But so what? I plan for it. Alternative B will only alleviate congestion for, at most, 2 years before the extra traffic congests that too. Don't wreck a beautiful valley over congestion b/c congestion will be there no matter what. Don't waste taxpayer money making the world worse. Sincerely, Andrea J. Garland Salt Lake City, Utah
590	Andrew Dudik	Option B is the reality we are all stuck with, as Option A is not a serious solution to the problems facing Heber Valley. The development heading north from Heber, approved by the County and City, will be dense enough that we must move as much through traffic as possible off the existing corridor. I agree with the analysis that the longer a free-flow section of road is, the more likely we are to move the super tankers out of downtown. However, there are ways to further capitalize on these gains and better support the valley while we sacrifice portions of the North Fields for super tankers and super commuters. We must be forward-looking about preventing the traffic situation in the valley from getting more out of hand than it already is. 1) Non-motorized trails MUST be completed from the Coyote Ridge area into Heber along the existing US-40 corridor. The more non-motorized commuting options we provide, the more traffic we can reduce through the valley's choke points. There is currently no defined plan to complete the final mile of connection from Coyote Canyon Parkway into downtown Heber City. That connection would reduce car trips and is necessary to complete Heber City's master plans. 2) Non-motorized trails also need to continue down River Road to complete east-west connections in the valley. As traffic increases, River Road will become even more dangerous for non-motorized users trying to access the Provo River, Dutch Hollow, and the trail systems planned by UDOT heading north along State Route 32. These plans do not currently include a defined connection for trail users in the northern part of the valley. 3) There must be codified, permanently protected lands that prevent ANY connections to the free-flow road and restrict additional access from the west to the existing US-40 corridor. The state should support wetland mitigation and preservation of the remaining land in the North Fields. If we are supporting the state transit network by giving up part of the North Fields, the state should support preserving what remains of this environment. Just as the GSL supports the health of the

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Salt Lake Valley, the North Fields in their current state support the health of this valley. UDOT should take steps beyond the mandated minimum to protect this area. 4) A greenbelt initiative and/or noise-reduction measures should be implemented along the length of the new free-flow, high-speed highway. UDOT owes it to the character of this valley. Similar initiatives have worked well in other places where highways were built close to occupied properties. These measures would also improve safety during winter storms with blowing snow. High winds are common in the valley, and the last thing we need is large trucks traveling 65 mph, pushed by 40 mph wind gusts while sliding on blown snow and ice, crashing and blocking the new bypass. Reasonable greenbelt measures to block wind would also reduce noise. Option B is a reasonable path forward, but it must be implemented as a complete solution that supports both north-south and east-west connections while preserving the remaining North Fields. Otherwise, within 10 years of completion, the project will face the same problem as many others in these states, it will be unable to support the traffic volumes it helped create.
50	Andrew Ivie	Dear Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I am writing to express my strong support for Alternative B as the preferred alternative in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor project. As a 7th generation member of the Heber Valley, with deep familial ties to this community, I have witnessed its evolution and am committed to decisions that ensure its long-term prosperity. I currently reside in Midway, and I believe Alternative B represents the most forward-thinking approach to addressing our growing transportation needs. My family of six shares my enthusiasm for this option. We have discussed the project at length, and we unanimously agree that Alternative B's design—offering shorter travel times, better diversion of regional and truck traffic from downtown Heber, and fewer relocations of homes and businesses—will minimize immediate disruptions while providing the infrastructure resilience needed for sustained growth through 2050 and beyond. This alternative aligns perfectly with Heber City's vision for a revitalized, pedestrian-oriented historic core, fostering economic vitality, tourism, and community well-being without sacrificing our cherished open spaces and natural resources. The mitigation strategies outlined in the Draft EIS further reassure us that environmental impacts can be managed effectively, preserving the valley's agricultural heritage for future generations. We appreciate UDOT's thorough evaluation process and the emphasis on a long-term outlook in selecting Alternative B as the preferred option. This choice not only alleviates current congestion but also positions the Heber Valley to thrive amid increasing population and development pressures. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input during this public comment period. We urge the team to advance Alternative B as the final selection. Sincerely, Andrew Ivie Midway, Utah
29	Andrew Jolley	Rural land is what makes the Heber Valley -- and the State of Utah – special. We need to be more creative and imaginative about how we solve our “traffic problems." We should tax the oil companies whose high risk trucks are congesting our roadways and build a tunnel. If we cannot afford to do that, then its not worth doing. We are killing the Golden Goose -- economically and environmentally -- by turning the very thing that makes Utah, Utah (beautiful and preserved agriculture land) into a polluting, noisy, dirty highways. Say no to oil trucking and say yes to preserving what makes this Valley, State and Country special. Companies, profits, politicians, oil rigs and traffic will come and go, but the majesty, peace, wildlife and essence of this valley should protected from big city, short-term, profit-driven thinking. PLEASE DO NOT DESECRATE THE NORTH FIELDS BY TURNING IT INTO A HIGHWAY!
30	Andrew Jolley	Please accept my OPPOSITION to the proposed North Fields highway as part of the Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): My name is Andrew Jolley and I live at XXXXXXXXXXX in Midway. Rural land is what makes the Heber Valley -- and the State of Utah – special. We need to be more creative and imaginative about how we solve our “traffic problems.” If we really need to expand traffic flow, then tax ther oil companies and build a tunnel. If you can’t do it right, THEN DON’T DO IT! We are literally killing the Golden Goose – economically and environmentally -- by turning the very thing that makes Utah, Utah (beautiful and preserved agriculture land) into a polluting, noisy, dirty highway. Say no to oil trucking and say yes to preserving what makes this Valley and State special. Companies, profits, politicians, oil rigs and traffic will come and go, but the majesty, peace, wildlife and essence of this valley should protected from short-term, profit-driven thinking. PLEASE DO NOT DESECRATE THE NORTH FIELDS BY TURNING IT INTO A HIGHWAY! -Andrew Jolley

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Resident of Wasatch County XXXXXXXXXXXX
188	Andy Bedingfield	To whom it may concern, I am strongly in favor of the proposed bypass alignment. While none of the proposals are perfect, UDOT has done ample due diligence and will mitigate many of the effects. Traffic congestion is the number one issue in our community, due largely to the huge growth within Wasatch and Summit counties. To the extent possible, I hope the new road project can be built soon to help our community thrive. Andy Bedingfield Heber City resident (20 years)
545	Angela Jones	To whom it may concern, I understand the need for a bypass road, however the options we have been given are not bypass roads, they are highways. This road is to give commuters from Utah county a faster way to get to summit county for work. There is no need for multiple on and off ramps of the road. For people who live in the heber valley and have to commute to summit or Utah counties for work (as I did for nearly ten years) there are already options that completely bypass Main Street/highway 40 to do so. If you still want to spend the money that it would cost for those on and off ramps you could invest it in the secondary arteries that locals use to avoid Main Street such as 300west or 400east in heber. As a wasatch county residents we have worked to preserve the north fields from development and to preserve agricultural land in our valley; but now it seems we have signed its death warrant as it is now the only open land left. So how many more counties and towns have to sacrifice their land to pay the fine for Park Cities lack of responsibility in building affordable housing? Thank you for taking my comment into consideration. Sincerely, Angela Jones XXXXXXXXXXXX XXX Sent from my iPhone
301	Ann Zimmerman	Ann Zimmerman XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXX February 28, 2026 Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR Engineering XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX RE: Formal Comments on the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Thank you for the oportunity to review the EIS on the Heber Valley Corridor project. In my review I have identified what I believe are shortcomings in the analysis, primarily regarding Alternative B. 1. Failure to properly characterize the aquifer as "unconsolidated" or "unconfined". Appendix 3K, Water Quality Technical Report fails to recognize, report, and analyze the character of the aquifer and how the aquifer's unconsolidated character lends itself to rapid infiltration. Omissions occur elsewhere in the EIS. Hydrology of Heber and Round Valley, Utah Department of Natural Resources, 1991, Technical Publication 101, characterizes Heber Valley as an unconsolidated aquifer and

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		highly vulnerable to infiltration of pesticides and other pollution. It further states that the unconsolidated valley-fill deposits are exposed at the land surface throughout most of the valley and these exposed conduits are avenues for pollutants to enter the aquifer as the area urbanizes. Without adjusting the model for this higher rate of infiltration and analyzing the specific conditions in the affected portions of the Northfields encompasses by the alternatives, this analysis in Appendix 3K appears incomplete and inadequate. Similar failures to characterize the aquifer as "unconsolidated" or "unconfined" occur. This is significant because of the associated vulnerabilities of the aquifer to pollution and deterioration. Also, there is no physical analysis for fracturing or conduits specifically in the areas of the alternatives: • 3.12 Water Quality and Water Resources • 3.13.2.14 Ground Water Quality and Discharges • 3.13.3.3 Ground Water Resources and Quality • Section 3.24 References It appears the research is inadequate. There is no mention in Section 3.24, References, of Hydrology of Heber and Round Valley, Utah Department of Natural Resources, 1991, Technical Publication 101. 2. Failure to recognize that alternatives may interfere with the success of implementation measures included in the approved Heber Valley Watershed Plan to remove pollutants impairing water quality from Spring Creek and other Provo River tributaries. Page 3 of Appendix 3K notes that "Spring Creek and other tributaries to the Provo River are impaired for pH and Escherichia coli (E. coli)." However, there is no mention of ongoing efforts to address stream cleanup and limiting the algal blooms in Deer Creek Reservoir as part of the implementation efforts of the approved Heber Valley Watershed Plan. As this plan works with farmers and landowners to gain commitments to rechannel and meander watercourses and to create livestock barriers and inhibitors, any removal of farmland for road construction should consider whether the alternatives interfere with recommended remediation measures and full implementation of the plan. It should also address what the implications there are for surface water quality if pollutants are not removed as planned, specifically as affected by the alternatives. Other pertinent references that support the omission of approved remediation efforts: • 3.13.3.2 "TMDL for E.coli in Spring Creek lists the nonpoint sources of E.coli as livestock, unregulated stormwater, on-site septic systems, pet waste, and irrigated pastures." • Table 3.16-6 Impaired Surface Waters in the Water Quality and Water Resources Evaluation Area. • 3.13.4.5 Mitigation Measures: Does not mention mitigating any interference to surface water cleanup. • 3.24.3.4 Aquatic Resources: Does not discuss the importance of the wetlands in the project area for mitigating surface water pollutants and the effects of destroying these wetlands on surface, subsurface, and stream water quality. • 3.14.4.5.3 Mitigation Measures for Aquatic Resources Impacts: The wetland loss mitigation measures fail to state where the replacement wetlands would be located. If not in the North Fields, further water quality deterioration would ensue. Further, if any new wetlands planned in the Heber Valley Watershed Plan fail to be developed because of the project alternatives, the beneficial water purification by the wetlands would not occur.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		• 3.24 References: It appears the research is incomplete. There is no mention of the State of Utah Heber Valley Watershed Plan nor contacts with the Department of Agriculture, Division of Water Quality nor the Provo River Water Council regarding this plan and its implementation and the effects of the alternatives on its successful implementation. 3. Failure to recognize and analyze flood water irrigation as a strategy for recharging the aquifer in the North Fields. Historically and currently, farmers in the North Fields flood irrigate with the intent of recharging the aquifer. Per the Hydrology of Heber and Round Valley report previously cited, the aquifer was in balance (pumping out versus recharging in) in 1991. Also, per the report, recharge sources are precipitation, stream infiltration, subsurface flows from upstream consolidated rocks, and (primarily) unconsumed irrigation water, including flood irrigation in the Northfields and unlined canal leakage. Since 1991, pumping has dramatically increased (State of Utah, Utah Lake Basin, Planning for the Future, June 2014) and recharging is decreasing (lower snowpack, drought, diversion, and less land flood irrigated). Preservation of recharge efforts to maintain aquifer balance has increased in importance. The EIS fails to address important aquifer recharge through flood irrigation. Also, the EIS does not reference any consultation with the North Fields irrigation district, farmers, and the Provo River Water Council and its advisory group (comprised partly of landowners in the North Fields). Pertinent references: • 3.3.2.1 States 11Most of the county is under sprinkler irrigation," and misleadingly omits the intentional flood irrigation for aquifer replenishment in the North Fields. • 3.3.3.4 Mitigation Measures Does not address mitigating the effects of lost flood irrigation for benefitting recharge. • 3.4.3.6 Utilities Omits the reliance on recharge for water for continuing water availability. Does not address flood irrigation and stream remediation efforts for water quality. • 3.14.3.2 General Overview of the Ecosystem In the discussion of resources in the evaluation area, the EIS states, 11Seasonal water level fluctuation of up to 30 feet occur primarily because of changes in recharge from unconsumed irrigation water." The discussion carelessly omits that this is an intentional practice and interference with this practice will reduce recharge. The omission compromises understanding the actual conditions. 4. Reference to the Heber City Envision 2050 General Plan in Section 3.2.3.2.1 omits the Plan's analysis and policies specifically toward preservation of the North Fields. Pertinent references in the Heber City Envision 2050 General Plan: • In the section, what do Heber Residents Value? Cited is this language, 11The desire to preserve open space and Heber's rural character is not a new idea, but it was a loud and clear message, especially in regard to the Northfields." • Page 53, "Community interest in open space preservation is focused on the Northfields:' • Page 54, "Prioritizing the countywide bond funds to purchase the Northfields' development rights is a logical step." As someone who has been personally involved in protecting open space, I would like to

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		comment on UDOT's claim that as a State agency, eminent domain restrictions for condemning land with an APA do not apply. I believe that this is an example of being right under the letter of the law, but inherently wrong ethically. This is not the high ground. The people placing land under protection and the many people who support and donate for open land conservation are not aware of this exemption. We do not work and contribute to preserve land for roads, but rather for the future of our community and state. I understand that in the case of the High Ute Ranch, the community's views were respected, and I hope that UDOT and the State of Utah will again respect the views of those who protect land. Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Ann Zimmerman Heber City (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
497	Anna Ziebarth	Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Heber Valley Bypass UDOT, I have both appreciation and concern when it comes to your work. I would first like to thank you for the job you do keeping our roads and drivers safe. In particular, I appreciate the effort that goes into maintaining the roads during winter. Having lived in several other states, I truly believe Utah does one of the best jobs managing winter driving conditions, and for that I am grateful. That said, I am deeply concerned about the proposed bypass that would be placed quite literally in my backyard in Heber Valley. From what has been presented, this project will cost millions of dollars and, according to your own projections, will only reduce Main Street traffic by about 25%. Despite the enormous financial cost, it does not appear to offer a meaningful long-term solution to congestion. Beyond the financial aspect, the personal and environmental costs would be significant. This bypass would dramatically impact my home and the surrounding properties. It would replace the peace, quiet, and natural beauty of our valley with increased air pollution, water pollution, noise, and light pollution. Many of us choose to live in Heber Valley because of the open spaces, farmland, and ranchland that define this community. There is a reason we live here instead of in Salt Lake City or Provo. For me, this isn't just about protecting the North Fields—it's about protecting the South Fields and the valley as a whole. I am also concerned that building this bypass would open the door to additional development that is not compatible with the agricultural heritage of this valley. Heber prides itself on being dark-sky compliant, yet a bypass would require lighting along the roadway. Would that also lead to illuminated signage or billboards? Those changes would permanently alter the starry skies that residents value so deeply. It also appears that many of the people advocating most strongly for the bypass are not full-time residents and often live on the east side of Main Street. They may not fully appreciate the visual, environmental, and community impacts this project would have on the families and landowners directly affected. Is Main Street occasionally congested? Yes. But it is also manageable, and I believe there are several improvements that could help alleviate traffic without permanently altering the valley: • Timed traffic lights to improve traffic flow • Dedicated green arrow signals instead of yield arrows at key intersections to move more vehicles through during peak times • Converting on-street parking to travel lanes during peak hours (for example, 7–10 AM and 4–7 PM) with alternative parking located off Main Street • Staggered school start times to reduce concentrated traffic during morning hours These kinds of practical adjustments could help address congestion while preserving the character of our community. The proposed bypass would cut through generations of ranches and farmland. Once land is paved over with concrete, it will never again be open pasture or productive farmland. For families like mine, this land represents not only our home but also our hopes for future generations—to raise children, care for animals, and continue the agricultural traditions that define this valley.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The idea of this bypass is heartbreaking. It threatens to permanently change the landscape and the lives of many residents. Finally, I cannot help but question why this project is being pushed so strongly. From a resident's perspective, it appears that the greatest beneficiaries would be developers and future development interests rather than the people who currently live here. I urge you to carefully reconsider this proposal and explore solutions that improve traffic while preserving the rural character and agricultural heritage of Heber Valley Anna Ziebarth Heber Valley Resident
199	Annee Price	Good Afternoon, I received the attached correspondence addressed to Carlos via the public email address. I was hoping to reach out to you all to respond to Annee's email as you see fit. Please let me know if you feel this should be directed differently. Thank you for your help regarding this matter. Tessie Lords ---------- Forwarded message --------- From: Annee Price XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Date: Sat, Jan 31, 2026 at 3:39 PM Subject: Request to Reconsider Alternative A for U.S. 40 Alignment To: contactudot@utah.gov <contactudot@utah.gov> Dear Director Braceras, I am writing as a concerned resident and stakeholder to respectfully urge the Utah Department of Transportation to give renewed consideration to Alternative A, which would maintain traffic on U.S. 40 until 900 North. I appreciate the complexity of transportation planning and the many competing priorities UDOT must balance, but I believe Alternative A offers a more sustainable, cost-effective, and community-friendly solution than other proposals. Preservation of Community Character and Livability One of the most compelling reasons to support Alternative A is its ability to preserve the character and cohesion of existing neighborhoods. By keeping traffic on the current U.S. 40 alignment for a longer stretch, this option minimizes the need for new roadway construction through residential areas and sensitive open spaces. This not only protects the integrity of established communities but also helps maintain property values and the sense of place that residents cherish. Traffic Flow, Safety, and Accessibility Extending the route to 900 North allows for a more gradual and predictable distribution of traffic, reducing congestion at key intersections and improving safety for both drivers and pedestrians. The existing roadway infrastructure is already designed to handle significant traffic volumes, and with targeted improvements, it can continue to do so effectively. This approach also provides better access to local businesses and services, supporting economic vitality in the area. Cost-Effectiveness and Fiscal Responsibility Alternative A leverages existing infrastructure to a greater extent than other options, which could significantly reduce construction costs, land acquisition expenses, and long-term maintenance obligations. In an era of constrained budgets and competing infrastructure needs, it is prudent to prioritize solutions that deliver strong transportation outcomes without unnecessary financial burdens on taxpayers. Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability By limiting the amount of new roadway construction, Alternative A reduces the environmental footprint of the project. This means less disruption to wildlife habitats, fewer impacts on wetlands and open spaces, and a smaller contribution to greenhouse gas emissions during construction. Protecting these natural resources aligns with Utah's broader goals for environmental stewardship and sustainable growth. Alignment with Long-Term Transportation Goals UDOT's mission emphasizes safety, efficiency, and quality of life for all Utahns. Alternative A supports these objectives by balancing mobility needs with community preservation and environmental responsibility. It also provides flexibility for future transportation improvements without locking the region into a costly and disruptive alignment that may not serve long-term needs as effectively. I understand that transportation planning requires difficult trade-offs, and I appreciate the extensive work your team has done to evaluate all options. However, I believe Alternative A represents a thoughtful compromise that addresses mobility challenges while respecting the values and priorities of the communities it serves. I respectfully request that UDOT revisit this option with fresh consideration, incorporating updated traffic modeling, cost analysis, and community feedback before making a final decision. The long-term success of this project depends on choosing an alignment that not only moves vehicles efficiently but also safeguards the social, economic, and environmental health of the region.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you for your leadership, your dedication to public service, and your willingness to listen to the voices of Utah residents. I look forward to seeing a transportation solution that reflects both the needs and the values of our state. Sincerely, Annee Price Resident of Park City If you'd like, I can also prepare a data-supported appendix with traffic projections, cost comparisons, and environmental impact summaries to attach to this letter for even greater impact. Would you like me to create that? -- Contact UDOT Shared Account | Administration Office UDOT | UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Tessie Lords Phone 801.965.4224 Email tlords@utah.gov | www.udot.utah.gov Jennifer Kirkham / Gwen Avila Phone 801.965.3883 Email jrkirkham@utah.gov/gavila@utah.gov | www.udot.utah.gov
467	Annee Price	I am writing to express my strong opposition to Alternative B in the Heber Valley Corridor Project. As neighbor and advocate for Heber Valley, I am deeply concerned that this alternative threatens one of our valley's most iconic and irreplaceable landscapes. The area affected by Alternative B encompasses productive farmland, vital wetlands, and a shallow aquifer that is essential for both irrigation and drinking water. These resources are not only fundamental to our agricultural heritage and local economy but also play a critical role in the environmental health of the valley. Disrupting this landscape would jeopardize the livelihoods of farmers, diminish wildlife habitats, and threaten the quality and availability of our water supply. Farmland in Heber Valley represents generations of stewardship and is integral to our community's identity. Wetlands provide unique habitat for native species and support biodiversity, while the shallow aquifer sustains both agriculture and residential needs. Any project that endangers these resources risks permanent loss and irreversible damage, undermining the sustainability of our valley. I urge UDOT to reconsider Alternative B and prioritize options that protect our farmland and wetlands. Preserving these landscapes ensures the long-term well-being of Heber Valley's residents, environment, and economy. While I truly question that the benefits ANY form of bypass justify the potential environmental impact and the COSTS, I think Alternative A is a much better option. Thank you for considering my concerns. I respectfully request that UDOT seek solutions that safeguard the natural and cultural assets of Heber Valley for current and future generations.
511	Annelise Slack	To the Utah Department of Transportation, I am writing to express strong opposition to the proposal to spend roughly one billion dollars on a highway bypass project. At a time when transportation funding is limited and the needs across Utah are substantial, committing such an enormous amount of public money to a single road expansion is difficult to justify. A project of this scale demands clear, transparent evidence that it will provide long-term benefits that outweigh its costs. Historically, large highway expansions have often failed to deliver the congestion relief they promise, instead encouraging more driving and quickly recreating the same traffic problems they were meant to solve. Spending a billion dollars only to repeat that cycle would be an irresponsible use of taxpayer funds. There are far more practical and fiscally responsible investments that could improve mobility across the state: maintaining existing infrastructure, improving safety on current roads, strengthening public transportation options, and addressing local bottlenecks where smaller investments could make a real difference. These approaches would benefit far more residents and businesses than a single massive bypass. Equally concerning is the opportunity cost. Once a billion dollars is committed to this project, those funds will not be available for other transportation priorities that communities across Utah urgently need. Responsible stewardship of public resources requires careful prioritization, not the pursuit of costly megaprojects with uncertain outcomes. I urge UDOT to reconsider this proposal and redirect planning and funding toward solutions that are more cost-effective, equitable, and sustainable for Utah's long-term transportation needs. Taxpayers deserve transportation investments that maximize public benefit, not projects that consume extraordinary sums while delivering questionable value. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Annelise Slack Utah Tax payer and Heber Valley resident

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
386	Annette Anderson	Absolutely NO to Alternative B I support the letter submitted by NFIC and oppose alternative B!Protect our aquifers at all costs- the North Fields is the ONLY source of surface water left. We demand fiscal responsibility from UDOT- they have intentionally refused cheaper alternatives presented by several entities and refused to realign the bypass to allow funding of a conservation easement. This will greatly affect our taxes without solving the problem!” Annette and David Anderson
109	Annette McRae (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	My name is Annette McRae. Chair and members of the panel, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am also running for -- I'm candidate -- I'm a candidate for the Utah Senate District 20 that covers this area, and it was just chance -- it just happened that I signed up first. They didn't pick me. I promise. So why I'm here today is to speak about public safety and not ideology. If we plan transportation in isolation from air quality, water protection, housing, and emergency safety, then we are not planning for the future. We're exporting risk to the people who live here. Right now, hazardous materials are being transported by truck through mountain highways that already carry commuters through mountain highways -- that already carry commuters, tourists, families. With -- in winter traffic, they have limited emergency access. This is not a hypothetical risk. This is a predictable one. By 2034, with the Olympic-level demand added to the corridor, the question is not if the system fails, but where. My position is simple. Hazardous material should not be sharing mountain highways with families and visitors. We already have rail infrastructure in this region that can help solve this problem. The Uinta Basin Railway provides a path to move the hazardous freight out of the Uinta Basin by rail instead of by truck. The Heber Valley Rail -- Railroad corridor, often referred to as, that I loved from childhood, is the Heber Creeper. It isn't -- it has an existing right-of-way through Provo Canyon that can potentially hook into Orem and go all the way to Park City by widening that can be upgraded and hardened for modern use. The Heber Valley Rail -- that's -- already read that part. Before widening highways or assuming continued truck traffic through Heber valley, this EIS should fully analyze a rail-first hazardous materials diversion alternative using these existing and finishable rail corridors. Passenger rail also matters for safety and congestion. A passenger rail connection through Heber Valley towards Park City would reduce pressure, not only on Highway 40, but on SR-248, cut daily congestion, reduce winter accident risk, and improve reliability for residents and emergency services, especially during peak tourist time and Olympic-level demand. Transportation decisions must reduce risk, not merely shift it from one neighborhood or watershed to another. Rail can be safer than trucking if it is engineered and governed correctly through hardened tracks, fill containment, emergency response integration, and clear operating railroad standards. I'll hang around for a bit out there -- out yonder.
251	Annette McRae	Good afternoon, I am submitting this supplemental comment in addition to my prior submission regarding the Heber Valley Corridor Final Environmental Impact Statement. Since earlier phases of project analysis, substantial additional residential and commercial development approvals within the Heber Valley bowl and surrounding Wasatch Back communities have accelerated baseline growth conditions. The scale and pace of this development materially affect long-term traffic demand assumptions, evacuation modeling, and cumulative corridor load. US-40, US-189, and SR-248 operate within fixed geographic and environmental constraints. As growth velocity increases — and in light of anticipated Olympic-related demand and evolving freight patterns from the Uintah Basin — it is prudent that implementation of the selected corridor framework incorporate adaptive management, ongoing monitoring, and preservation of long-term flexibility. This comment is not intended to reopen alternative selection, but to emphasize that rapid land-use change may warrant continued evaluation to ensure that corridor design, mitigation measures, and right-of-way decisions do not foreclose future multimodal or safety-oriented adjustments should conditions continue to evolve. Continued coordination between transportation planning, land-use approvals, freight routing strategy, and emergency management will be essential to maintaining long-term resilience in the Heber Valley bowl. Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional input. Best regards, Annette McRae

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Candidate, Utah State Senate – District 20 XXXXXXXXXX mcraeforsenate.com "Not Left, Not Right, Forward!"
254	Annette McRae	To the UDOT Heber Valley EIS Project Team: Please accept this formal submission of "The Safety Commitment" and the "BackRunner Framework" as a technical rebuttal and supplemental record for the Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). As the author and intellectual architect of these frameworks, I am submitting these documents to ensure that the NEPA process addresses critical system failures and "glossed over" alternatives that directly impact the safety, health, and liberty of the residents of the Uinta Basin and the Wasatch Back. 1. Failure to Evaluate the "Design-Safe" Rail Alternative Under NEPA's requirement to evaluate all reasonable alternatives, the current EIS is fundamentally incomplete. It ignores the BackRunner Rail Spine—a regional medical and passenger rail corridor utilizing existing rights-of-way from Orem to Ogden (via the Provo Canyon/Heber Creeper branch). • The Standard: Section 2 of the attached Safety Commitment establishes that safety achieved through Design (Rail/Trails) is superior to safety achieved through Enforcement (Highway Bypass). • The Requirement: I am formally requesting a full evaluation of an integrated rail and trail system as the only alternative that satisfies the Safety and Liberty Decision Standard by reducing human exposure to risk without increasing coercive enforcement. 2. Systematic Underestimation of "Exposure-Based Harm" The current EIS focuses on traffic volume while ignoring Exposure Duration. • The Technical Record: My framework defines harm as the cumulative time residents, professional drivers, and patients spend in hazardous congestion and trapped basin air inversions. • The Challenge: A highway bypass predictably increases the duration and frequency of this exposure. I demand that UDOT calculate the Exposure Profiles for all proposed alternatives, including the "Hidden" Rail Spine, which reduces exposure to near zero for the traveling public. 3. Missing 2034 Olympic "Stress Test" The 2034 Games are not merely a "event"; they are a fixed temporal lens for system stability. • The Requirement: The EIS must analyze whether the proposed "Fixed Capacity" bypass can withstand a peak demand surge during a major weather event. The BackRunner Framework identifies rail as the only Expandable Capacity system capable of surviving this "Stress Test" while preserving "Upstream" assets like emergency response and air quality. 4. Disclosure of Upstream Impacts and Sprawl The proposed bypass is a "Downstream" project that will predictably break "Upstream" systems (Section 6 & 8 of the attached). This project acts as a "Developer Driveway" for high-density sprawl (e.g., the 885-unit Kimball Junction and Mayflower projects) that destroys the "farmhouse feel" and watershed integrity of the North Fields. Closing Mandate: The people of Utah deserve an infrastructure that protects the mother on the ice and the farmer in the field. I insist that these frameworks be integrated into the formal record and that the BackRunner Rail Spine be given the full evaluation required by federal law. Respectfully submitted, Annette McRae Candidate for Utah State Senate, District 20

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Intellectual Architect, The Safety Commitment & BackRunner (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
506	Annisha Pangan	Dear UDOT, As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. 1. Non-Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. Lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company, were not properly advanced as required under LEDPA standards. 2. Foregone Conservation Opportunity - UDOT refused to adjust the project boundary to accommodate a federally funded NRCS conservation easement, disrupting plans to permanently protect nearly 300 acres of prime farmland. 3. Incomplete Cost Disclosure - The EIS omits substantial costs, including utility relocation, irrigation reconstruction, agricultural crossings, stormwater infrastructure, and long-term maintenance — obscuring the project's true fiscal impact. 4. Understated Growth and Traffic Impacts - Induced growth is under-modeled. Highways generate development, and development generates traffic. Main Street congestion is largely local and will not be meaningfully solved by a bypass that simultaneously accelerates growth and doesnt account for the mass East-side developments. 5. Irreversible Agricultural Loss - Alternative B converts prime farmland to pavement at the highest rate among options, fragments working farms, and relies on vague mitigation measures inconsistent with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and state land-use policies. 6. Water and Air Risk - The route cuts through aquifer recharge zones and wetlands that naturally filter runoff. A 65-mph design increases pavement width, noise, dangerous wildlife accidents, and the pollutant load running into groundwater and the Provo River. 7. Misaligned Public Purpose - The alignment prioritizes regional through-traffic and resort access over local mobility, contrary to adopted city and county preservation goals. Alternative B maximizes environmental harm, fiscal exposure, and long-term development pressure while offering limited traffic relief. UDOT must select the least damaging, fiscally responsible alternative — one that protects water, farmland, air quality, and the rural character that defines the Heber Valley. Sincerely, -A
226	Armin Efendic	Hello and to whom it may concern, I am writing to voice my opinion on the preferred design for the Heber Valley Corridor Draft. Alternative B is my preferred plan as it best alleviates the traffic pressure driving into Heber City. More homes are being built which will very quickly add to the congestion. In additional, there have been a couple accidents in the past few months alone in the section between UVU and downtown Heber City. The current road and traffic condition is a safety issue that I see only getting worse. Thank you, Armin
227	Arta Coy	February 10, 2026 Hello U-DOT team, I must applaud and thank you for such a thorough and thoughtful study of the impacts of the new Highway 40 bypass in the Heber Valley. You have made the right decision, clearly, alternative B is by far the superior choice for the long haul. I would like to address just one point that I feel is very important to this discussion, the cost of the project. As I hope you all know, cheap is not acquainted with the best. After paying taxes for a lifetime and seeing my dollars go to other parts of the State to the benefit of others. We would all like to see our money come back to the benefit of the Heber Valley and Wasatch County. Our growing community and region deserve nothing less than safe roads that work. Thank you again for your diligent work as we look forward to the start of construction. Sincerely, Arta Coy
296	Ashley Swapp	Hello, I'm writing concerning the proposed UDOT bypass through the north fields in Heber. I support the letter submitted by NFIC and oppose alternative B. Protect our aquifers at all costs - the North Fields is the ONLY source of surface water left. We demand fiscal responsibility from UDOT. They have refused cheaper alternatives presented by several entities and refused to realign the bypass to allow funding of a conservation easement. This will greatly affect our taxes without solving the problem.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Ashley Swapp
350	Ashley Swapp	Good evening, Please take into consideration the plan put forth by the Lythgoe Group. Their work takes into consideration several complex issues regarding the bypass and helps to solve the problem in a way that keeps our small town feel, preserves the beauty of our valley and still meets the task of improving the flow of traffic. Their research on other cities that have successfully incorporated roundabouts into their bypass plans is especially compelling. Thank you. https://www.lythgoedesign.com/post/roundabouts-in-the-heber-valley-corridor-bypass-project Sincerely, Ashley Swapp
591	Ashlianne Drewry	I strongly oppose the bypass in our valley. I have lived here all my life and I definitely have concerns with what I am seeing. First, I don't believe a bypass would fix the traffic concerns. I believe most of the traffic is local so we would still have the problems we do now, but with an ugly bypass going through our valley. I drive Main Street often and I truly believe most the of the traffic is local. I just don't think it will solve the problem. I am in favor of having things take a little longer to get around than to add a bypass. I think it will take longer to get around either way, so why add a bypass? Again, I just don't see it solving the traffic problems. I think the amount of growth of people moving here is the problem with the traffic, not the trucks driving through. Secondly, I don't want to see our North Fields ruined. I believe the concern regarding water and aquifers and I think they are valid, but personally, I believe once we lose the North Fields to a bypass, there will be no turning back. Owners will have no options but to sell (I would if I had property there with a bypass!) and it will be developed so fast and make our brand new high school less desireable. It will go downhill so fast. Most notably, I am in favor of thinking of other solutions, like the Lythgoe Design group came up with adding roundabouts. I realize this is a tricky challenge to think outside the box but I believe if we can create other roads like 300 W and Mill Road as other options to get places, that the bypass would be unnecessary. I am in favor of the roundabouts or other solutions that get rid of bypass options. Thank you for allowing my comment to be heard.
592	Aspen Mascherino	Hello, I am sending this email in regards to the potential bypass situation. It would break my heart to see any of the north fields taken up by more asphalt. I also can’t even begin to imagine the issues that would come along with some of the planning. Doing anything out of greed and selfishness is wrong, but when it potentially de-homes citizens and wildlife, it’s purely unacceptable. Thank you, A concerned citizen and nature lover.
674	Athina Koum	I am Opposed to Alternative B – North Fields Bypass Submitted by: Athina Koumarela Midway, Utah Thank you for the opportunity to express my opposition to Option B of the Heber Valley bypass There are some transportation challenges in the Heber Valley during rush hour times. The proposed Option B is a costly option that does not address the primary source of the congestion and would destroy our beautiful north fields, impact our water and aquifer and the historical use of the land for agriculture and the beautiful landscape entering the valley. Below are the reasons why I urge you to take Option B OUT as an alternative route 1. The Bypass Does Not Address the Main Cause of Traffic UDOT’s own analysis indicates that approximately 70% of traffic on Heber City’s Main Street is local “intra-valley” traffic, meaning trips that both begin and end within the valley. A bypass around Heber City will do little to reduce these trips because they are local trips, not through traffic. 2. A $1 Billion Highway Should Not Be the First Solution The bypass is projected to cost approaching or exceeding $1 billion. Before committing to such an expensive and irreversible project, lower-cost solutions should be implemented first implement demand - management solutions a valley-wide bus system (Midway to Heber) (Jordanelle to Heber) East Deer Valley to Heber) (Schools to commercial areas)

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		intersection improvements (there are ideas from local contractors that would create a beautiful downtown and reduce traffic congestion). traffic signal coordination 3. A Highway Through the North Fields would influence future land use with further pressure to increase development in one of the valley's most important agricultural. The North Fields are one of the most beautiful scenic landscapes and views of the Heber Valley and provide with productive farmland, wetlands, wildlife habitat it's what we love about living in our valley Once a highway corridor divides this landscape, it cannot be restored. Transportation should serve all aspects of the community not simply a solution to shorten time travel by 1 minute per person going through main street Heber. Respectfully submitted, Athina Koumarela
110	Athina Koumarela (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hi. Thank you all for giving me this opportunity to speak today. Thank you. It looks like we got a full house. So I'm a long time resident in this valley. I've witnessed the rapid growth -- and I don't do good with public speaking. So I'm doing this -- rapid growth and its impact on our environment and community infrastructure. One of your stated goals of the bypass was to help Heber achieve its vision of historic -- of a historic center. However, over time, Heber has made deliberate land use decisions to heavily develop along the collector roads that were originally planned to support the bypass. So now we're here collectively trying to save some of those past decisions. My focus tonight is to ask about the environmental impact statement that was compiled on -- in the first part of January, which I listened to the online portion last night, and several questions were directed to go to Chapter 3 of the report. And so today I did that, but I feel a lot of the questions were not answered for me in the Chapter 3. It only brought up more questions. My questions and my concerns are with the wetland mitigation of ratio two to one or maybe higher. I mean, that still is a big question mark for me -- for me. Yesterday, somebody replied that that would be made with a -- by the Army Corps of Engineers; is that correct? Okay. And I think that part of it should already have been included in the analysis of the environmental impact statement. The other part that concerned me is the mitigation land exchange for the wetlands, and that is also very vague to me. It was stated that, yeah, that could be mitigated somewhere in the north field again, or it could be even out of this county. That's the way the mitigation of lands can happen. So -- and that also will be provided by the Army Corps of Engineers -- I think was stated yesterday. So my question is why is that the not part of -- already part of the impact statement that was just devised two weeks ago? And then my second -- and I do believe that -- my second part of it is that -- the protection for the agricultural area protection, which is part of our Utah Code, and I would like to have more details in that environmental study about how that would be protected. Besides that, I mean, it's a beautiful piece of land. We will never get it back. So --
490	B. Price	Here's a rephrased version: "I commend UDOT for conducting a thorough and comprehensive review of the Heber Valley Corridor. While this process has been prolonged — largely due to pressure from residents and local governments — it has been a necessary one. At the first open house, I raised concerns that the optimal route was absent from the options presented. To truly achieve the corridor's intended goals, the bypass needed to extend as far north as possible. Heber City has continued approving high-density residential developments and commercial centers along Highway 40, which will substantially increase traffic volumes. Meanwhile, population growth has surged and shows no signs of slowing, affecting both the east and west sides of Heber Valley. While I understand that city and county leaders favor Option A, the reality is that this concern comes far too late. For over 15 years, local officials were aware that traffic flow was becoming a critical issue. During that time, they had ample opportunity to develop alternative traffic solutions, designate corridor pathways, and guide development accordingly. They did not. Although an Eastern Bypass was on the table, neither the city nor the county made meaningful planning efforts to align future development with that possibility. I respect that local leaders have expressed a preference for Option A, but their track record of delayed and reactive decision-making speaks for itself. I strongly urge UDOT to follow the data and move forward with Option B."
245	Barabara Games (Comment translated from voicemail)	hello Barbara games XXXXXXXXX I just wanted to make a short statement about the Ruby and how disruptive that is to not only just the whole atmosphere of the valley but the wetlands the safety being so close to the school and like to know what the disaster plan is if something happens of school is in session and anyway there could be a mess anyway totally against it totally totally totally against it thank you
146	Barb Clark (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	In my opinion, I would vote for Alternative C - do nothing. My justification: 1) both Alt A and B would impact existing business, home, wetlands. 2) Alt B would dramatically impact the wetlands of the No. and So fields, we are already shorting water and our aquiifers are shrinking. 3) the impact to generational farming lands will kill farms and grazing lands. 4) there are numerous communities, esp around the west where traffic is slowed through the center of town following a main highway. 5) The financial cost to taking land from homeowners is extrememly high - why not use theat money for beautification vs taking land. 6) my property value will drop - who is going to compensate one for that? 7) Has a study been done on what will happen when the aquifers shrink and the overpasses drop and sink? Also how is UDOT going to address the earthquake mitigation of all of these elevated areas of the road? (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
294	Barb Murdock	I say build the bypass and get it done soon. this has been going on way too long. Interesting that people are now complaining when they have had years to give their comments. We have been promised a by-pass for 40 plus years.
463	Barbara Coe	Dear UDOT: As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. 1. Non-Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. Lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company, were not properly advanced as required under LEDPA standards. 2. Foregone Conservation Opportunity - UDOT refused to adjust the project boundary to accommodate a federally funded NRCS conservation easement, disrupting plans to permanently protect nearly 300 acres of prime farmland. 3. Incomplete Cost Disclosure - The EIS omits substantial costs, including utility relocation, irrigation reconstruction, agricultural crossings, stormwater

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		infrastructure, and long-term maintenance — obscuring the project's true fiscal impact. 4. Understated Growth and Traffic Impacts - Induced growth is under-modeled. Highways generate development, and development generates traffic. Main Street congestion is largely local and will not be meaningfully solved by a bypass that simultaneously accelerates growth and doesnt account for the mass East-side developments. 5. Irreversible Agricultural Loss - Alternative B converts prime farmland to pavement at the highest rate among options, fragments working farms, and relies on vague mitigation measures inconsistent with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and state land-use policies. 6. Water and Air Risk - The route cuts through aquifer recharge zones and wetlands that naturally filter runoff. A 65-mph design increases pavement width, noise, dangerous wildlife accidents, and the pollutant load running into groundwater and the Provo River. 7. Misaligned Public Purpose - The alignment prioritizes regional through-traffic and resort access over local mobility, contrary to adopted city and county preservation goals.Alternative B maximizes environmental harm, fiscal exposure, and long-term development pressure while offering limited traffic relief. UDOT must select the least damaging, fiscally responsible alternative — one that protects water, farmland, air quality, and the rural character that defines the Heber Valley. Sincerely, Barbara Coe
476	Barbara Games	You have heard all the reasons to not pick this plan B. I beg you not to choose it. You don't have to live here but I do. Don't ruin the view corridor that we are known for. Open space has been the number one reason on every survey we have taken for years as to why we love living here. Don't ruin it. Barbara Games Sent from my iPhone
44	Barbara Hansen (Comment translated from voicemail)	my name is Barbara Hanson my email address is XXXXXXXXXXXXX I tried to leave a comment on your website but kept getting thrown out I just want to voice my support for Plan B in the Heber Valley bypass we have waited way too long for this and I think that plan B is the most sensible one thank you
452	Barbara McElhinney	I have tried to comment twice on your website regarding routes for Hwy 40 through Heber Valley. It does not seem to have gone through either time? Please choose Alternative A! We do not want a freeway destroying our Valley with a "highway runs through it"! Udot does not need to be concerned about efficiency. Please concern yourselves with the more important matter of our valleys environment and beauty which is irreplaceable! I have been a Heber Valley resident for 41 years and live in a historic home in Midway. Barbara McElhinney My other email XXXXXXXXXXXXX
532	Beau McDonald	Hi, my family has been in Heber for many generations. I grew up in the North Fields and as an adult, I again lived in the fields just off of Potter Lane for just short of 15 years as a caretaker. I just recently moved away in December '25, but cumulatively, I lived in the North Fields for approx 25 years. Being one of a few lucky people to live and sleep in the fields, I am concerned about the unanticipated effects of the bypass to the water in the valley and state. We had a sump pump in our crawl space which I observed was dramatically influenced by the irrigation. When an irrigation turn began, the sump pump would kick on (intermittently) and would run for about a week before it stopped until the next turn. As I irrigated these fields all these years, I also observed how the watering of the fields is more of a collective effort. How I watered our fields directly affected the neighbors fields and the groundwater. In the spring, the fields were very dry and the water table was low and I couldn't get water across the field during the first turn of the season. However, after a few turns, I could water the entire fields with much less time and water than the beginning. If many landowners stop watering the fields, they will dry up. Building the highway in the proposed location, will require the soils to be dug down quite a distance and the base built back up to support the loads of the highway. By putting this dike or dam in the middle of the fields and down into the water table, I anticipate it will dramatically inhibit the natural flow of waters and not only make the fields much more difficult to water, but it will result, over time, in the fields drying up. From my experience in living in and irrigating these fields, I truly believe that there will be unanticipated and irreparable damage done to our aquifers and waterways. I anticipate that the effects will be more dramatic and damaging to not just our valley, but the state. The valley has proven that they deeply care about the North Fields and want to preserve them. The citizens consistently show up and vote for preservation and have stopped zone changes, when most changes in the valley go unnoticed. Due to the water concerns and due to the demonstrated general desire of Heber citizens, I implore you to reconsider going with Alt A in lieu of Alt B. At a minimum, please do a valley wide water study to ensure we do not compromise the valley and the states already strained water supply with this route. Thank you for your time and consideration. I appreciate your efforts in improving the traffic and safety in the valley. Thanks,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Beau McDonald
142	Becky Rambo (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Okay. First of all, let me just say you guys are between a rock and a hard place, and I appreciate all the things that UDOT has done, try to get something going here, being requested to build a bypass and then we say, no, not here, and, no, not there, and we don't want it here either. However, I agree with almost everything people before me have said about the environmental impacts of Plan B, and I just feel like this is an opportunity for us, as a community, as a county, as a region, as a valley, to come up with something completely different that utilizes public transportation, rapid bus lanes, things that might be a model to other counties in Utah that might, you know, help other people not end up with just building another road that's going to end up having to have additional lanes built onto it. And as much as we like to say that things won't get developed, we all know that, given the right circumstances, things will get developed. And so, you know, not -- not now, but future generations of county planners and city managers -- they're going to have to look at things completely different from us, and they will have to say I think we're going to have to sacrifice this other little place now and build something there. So I see this as an opportunity for -- for us to, you know, think big. And instead of just building more roads, which is the traditional answer for everything, let's look at how can we get cars off the road by -- by making easy access, frequent bus routes, frequent shuttles to the ski areas, frequent ways to get fishing gear and -- and hiking gear and dogs and bikes to our trail heads that might help get just some of the local traffic off the road too. So, you know, I've really been watching the Park City -- they're having to rebuild a lane onto Highway 224 to get a rapid bus system in down there. We could do that from the start and have something already built in to get a rapid bus system that goes from our valley to Quinn's Junction or our valley to Soldier Hollow or all kinds of places. So we could do something like that and then have shuttles -- local shuttles and things like that that will actually get people off the roads instead of just building more and more highways. Thank you.
228	Becky Rambo	I believe your draft EIS does not adequately address the noise, light, and air pollution impacts given the topography of our valley. Those impacts will be significant at distances much further than the defined "area of potential effects". Light and sound reflect and get amplified by hillsides and gulleys. Air pollutants gather and disperse in those same areas. I live over 2 miles west of Hwy 40, and the lights from Smith's Marketplace and the UVU campus shine like bright headlights through our windows at night. The noise from construction projects that are more than a mile from our house are loud enough to cause constant impact to us. The DEQ installed an air quality monitor in Heber Valley in 2024, but I see no mention in your draft EIS about using data from it. I suggest you conduct more in-depth analysis of these impacts before moving forward. Thank you, Becky Rambo
247	Becky Rambo	I originally submitted this comment on Feb. 7 through the "comment" link, but I got a voicemail from Hannah and Andrea letting me know that that it was not received. I just tried to send it again through the UDOT "comment" link, and I was not able to enter comments in the comment section: UDOT pursued Alt. B with the full knowledge that many of the landowners in the North Fields were in the process of pursuing conservation easements for their properties. These owners have the foresight to think beyond the next 30 years. UDOT states a commitment to protect the wetlands forever through wetlands mitigation processes. However, history shows that such protection is rarely permanent. Wetlands are "traded", filled, and somehow determined to no longer warrant protection. Conservation easements are the only way I know of to truly permanently protect land. If UDOT will not consider using Alt. A, I make this suggestion: that UDOT allocated funds and set up a system where it will pay for conservation easements on all the remaining properties in the North Fields whose owners wish to do so. Thank you for taking my comment and for following up with phone calls. Becky Rambo
408	Becky Rambo	The estimated cost of this project has increased by almost $2M in about one year. For $760M+ I think our tax dollars would be better spent on an option that has more impact on solving the problems of the area than either Alt B or Alt A. I suggest spending that money on a combination of the options that were previously rejected (transit, east side travel ways, etc.) A combination of other alternatives would likely have more long-term benefits to the region for the same costs as one byway.
223	Becky Rambo	It makes absolutely no sense to remove any opportunity by landowners to permanently preserve their private land, to limit business owners' potential ability to expand and modernize their operations, and to upend the priorities and commitments of the people of Wasatch County for a project that might never exist! Representatives of UDOT have stated clearly at public meetings and city council/county council meetings that this project does not have funding to move past this EIS and DOR phase, and that it might not get built at all. They've also made clear that this project will not resolve the majority of traffic problems associated with Main Street. The Farmland Assessment score in the Draft EIS is only 4 points below the requirement to realign the project. Do it anyway. It's the right thing to do. UDOT knew of historic and current efforts to preserve and protect the North Fields by private landowners when they started developing options for this bypass. An additional 165 acres would already have conservation easements were it not for this potential project. The Draft EIS acknowledges this project does not comply with county and city goals that include preserving agricultural lands and environmentally sensitive areas. Local communities and private land owners have committed millions of tax dollars, years of negotiations, and tens of thousands of private donations and land concessions to protect this area. Respect them. If you must record a DOR for a potentially imaginary project, please make it Alt A. Becky Rambo Interlaken

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
325	Belinda Power	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated?

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name Belinda Power Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
190	Ben Taylor	Hello, I was born and raised in the Heber Valley, and have seen the dicussion of where to put a bypass dragged out over three decades. I'm sure your organization is feeling the pressure to make something happen for highway 40 now that years of development has come to a head with so much traffic on Heber main street. However, all the good options for a bypass higher on the hillside are all gone, and all that remains is the precious remaining open space and farmland in the valley that used to be everywhere. Putting the highway bypass through this last piece of remaining open space would effectively be putting a final nail in the coffin of this once beautiful valley. It would only alleviate 20-25% of traffic and that's if trucks voluntarily use it. It seems like an incredible sacrifice for such a minuscule gain that I'm amazed we are even considering it. Thank you from a concerned citizen, Ben Taylor
184	Benjamin Ailshie	Alternative B is clearly the best option. Traffic times are fastest, and the majority of people residing in the valley are not negatively affected. Those North Fields don't honestly serve more than a few dozen people. Let's finally put them to good use. Traffic along 40 would finally be at a level I'm comfortable even considering using that stretch of highway. We need it to be safer. Alternative B also gives the best opportunities for proper and healthy commercial growth! We want alternative B. Please!
298	Beth Lawrence	Hello, I DO NOT want ANY Bypass, whether A or B in the Heber Valley.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		It is insanity and the height of irresponsibility for UDOT to even consider putting a bypass through or near the pristine North Fields. These are not only sensitive lands where necessary aquifers and wetlands still exist, but these are some of our remaining open lands in this County which are being destroyed by over development. Even though traffic on HWY 40 through downtown Heber is very congested, I am willing to put up with it rather than have a FREEWAY with SOUND WALLS cut through the beautiful valley and ruin it. It's through no fault of my own that this County is over developed. I put that on our City and County planners and the State Legislature. But I prefer, and will live with congestion through Downtown Heber to forfeiting the aquifers and wetlands by putting a 4 LANE FREEWAY through those areas which should be under protection. NO TO ANY BYPASS THROUGH THE NORTH FIELDS. It's too late and it will not make an impact on traffic going through Downtown Heber. Make hwy 40 safer. Do the best you can with what development has created in this Valley. But NO BYPASS A OR B THROUGH THE NORTH FIELDS. Cheers, Beth Lawrence Beth Lawrence Music Offering Unique Entertainment Experiences and Specialty Music XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX All About Voice Voice Enhancement and Rehabilitation for Singers & Presenters Diva Training Confidence, Clarity, and Charisma Coaching for Women XXXXXXXXXX
400	Beth Lawrence	I support the letter submitted by NFIC and oppose alternative B! Protect our aquifers at all costs- the North Fields is the ONLY source of surface water left. We demand fiscal responsibility from UDOT- they have intentionally refused cheaper alternatives presented by several entities and refused to realign the bypass to allow funding of a conservation easement. This will greatly affect our taxes without solving the problem! NO BYPASS. Come up with a better plan working with what we have through downtown. Cheers, Beth Lawrence Beth Lawrence Music Offering Unique Entertainment Experiences and Specialty Music XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX All About Voice Voice Enhancement and Rehabilitation for Singers & Presenters Diva Training Confidence, Clarity, and Charisma Coaching for Women XXXXXXXXXX
403	Bettejo McLelland	BetteJo McLelland XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Proposal A, please.
147	Betty Brandner (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I don't want a walking trail in front of my house (Privacy and security reasons). There is a walking, hiking trail above the hill behind us coming from the train behind the college. If the developers building behind us need open area for trails let them have back there more scenic and not in front of private property. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
396	Betty Brandner	I strongly recommend Alternative A. For years we have voted to keep the NF as rural. If Alternative B is put in Heber City will keep encroaching out as they will allow development along the bypass. Just like they did on the East side where the bypass was originally to go. There is also the concern of disruption to irrigation and most importantly contamination of the water of runoff of oil & tar residue From the bypass. Also, it can be build sooner due to lower cost and less burden on the tax payers. I am for Alternative A for bypass. Thank you
422	Bill Obermeier	A proposed use of roundabouts by the Lythgoe Design firm has such proven, obvious benefits to the entire Heber City community, that if you care at all about doing the right thing rather than just doing a thing, must be addressed. There are many other examples of roundabouts that have been integrated into US and State HIghways and Routes, especially in Washington, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. There are some municipalities, like Carmel, Indiana, that have fully embraced the roundabout, and have seen incredible benefits as they have converted traditional intersections into roundabouts. A recent study, “Livable Streets and Quality of Life,” from the University of Utah’s Metropolitan Research Center reports that “well designed traffic calming saves lives, improves safety, and enhances, not diminishes, the quality of life.” Please compare the benefits of this revised design to the flyovers, ramps, and elevated roads you have planned. If you, for whatever reason believe your original plans are a superior solution, please be prepared to detail the reasons and data that demonstrate that. We deserve more than a bureaucratic easy-way-out opinion. Thank you.
243	Bill Spiker	I've long had concerns re: Heber Valley bypass, and have registered those concerns with UDOT and others via web-sites comments, correspondence, and at prior bypass meetings. Although my thoughts likely mirror the more explicit descriptions in the attachment above. It appears UDOT is predisposed to not only proceed with the bypass,but also with a preferred route which is the most disruptive. I respect that I'm "small potatoes" in the grand scheme of things (having only a 5.5 acre home site and ag property at XXXXXXXXX, on XXXXXXXXXX heber city in XXXXXXXXX the northfields). However, I'm certainly concerned given the bypass may be within XXXXXX of my XXXXXXXXX property boundary. I'm especially concerned about our high water table impact, given my pasture has always remained green (even in summer) with natural high water table and gravity flow. If/as this condition is impacted, reducing the quality/volume of natural water I've long enjoyed; at minimum, UDTO needs to include funds to mitigate such impact to land owners who are affected (i.e. providing water shares,and installed pressurized irrigation systems to replace water that is taken from land owners). Additionally, my parcel has long hosted a year round stream, a quiet rural environment, and great view across the northfields onto Snake Creek Canyon and Wasatch State Park. At minimum, UDOT should plan walls along the bypass to minimize road noise; rubberized asphalt to lessen road noise, and burms planted with trees and bushes to block unsightly traffic noise, and traffic lights. Even with construction improvements outlined above, the bypass will still negatively impact the feel, the views, and the value of my property. How will UDOT mitigate my property value loss? Hopefully Wasatch County, and Heber City will influence UDOT, and at minimum assure that fair mitigation occurs for affected land owners. Please let me know if you have observations, ideas, or comments. Best Regards, Bill Spiker XXXXXXXXXX
86	Blanca Howell	I am a resident and taxpayer of Heber City, and I am writing to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor. After reviewing the information provided, I do not support Alternative B (off US-40 alignment). My concerns focus on the environmental impacts, the effects on neighborhoods along 1300 South, and the overall cost of this project compared to the benefits it provides. According to the Draft EIS, Alternative B would impact 54 acres of wetlands, 223 acres of federally protected farmland, and 38 acres of agricultural protection areas. These impacts would permanently change the character of our valley, and once these resources are lost or disturbed, they cannot realistically be replaced. While congestion may be reduced on Main Street, traffic impacts are shifted to other parts of Heber, particularly along the 1300 South corridor, which is close to Heber Valley Elementary School, Rocky Mountain Middle School, and the future Deer Creek High School. Increased traffic, noise, and higher speeds near schools and residential neighborhoods raise serious safety and quality-of-life concerns. I am also concerned about the cost of this project. The estimated $760.5 million cost is exceptionally high for a community of our size. This project primarily benefits drivers moving through the valley by reducing travel times by about 15 to 17 minutes, while placing long-term environmental and neighborhood impacts on the people who live here year-round. In my opinion, the cost of this project is out of proportion to the benefit it provides, particularly given the permanent impacts it would have on a small community and its surrounding environment. Heber City is a small mountain community, and seasonal and inevitable peak-hour congestion are a regular part of living in and visiting the area. I would rather spend additional time in traffic than see our valley permanently transformed. I encourage UDOT and local leaders to focus on lower-impact alternatives, such as additional roundabouts and improvements to existing roads, that reduce congestion without causing significant environmental and

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		neighborhood impacts. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Sincerely, Blanca Howell A Heber City Resident and Taxpayer
21	Blayde McIntre	As a civil engineer and Heber City resident, I applaud the route choice. The chosen alternative is the best for reducing traffic, especially heavy truck traffic, on Heber's Main Street, which was my primary hope for the project. Thank you!
449	Bob Turner (Comment translated from voicemail)	hi this is Bob Turner XXXXXXXXX Im calling to comment on the bypass and Heber Valley you go guys its a great plan I know youre catching push back from the tree huggers but go for it it needs to happen its past due its the best alternative Im 100 behind it
306	Bobby Davidson	Formal Statement Regarding the Proposed UDOT Heber Valley Bypass (Alternative B) To: Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Wasatch County Council, and Heber City Council. Subject: Opposition to Alternative B – Irreparable Environmental Damage to North Fields Wetlands and Aquifer. Deadline for Comments: March 9, 2026 Executive Summary As a concerned resident/stakeholder, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the selection of Alternative B as the preferred alignment for the Heber Valley Corridor project. While the need for traffic relief is recognized, the destruction of 53.92 acres of irreplaceable Class 1A pristine wetlands, crucial waterways, and agricultural land in the North Fields is unacceptable. The proposed alignment introduces severe, long-term risks to the high-quality, shallow aquifer beneath the North Fields, which serves as a critical, pristine water source for the entire valley and contributes to the Provo River blue ribbon fishery. Key Concerns Destruction of Prime Wetland Ecosystems (53.92 Acres): Alternative B destroys 53.92 acres of wetlands, streams, and ditches, a 140% increase in wetland impact compared to alternative routes. These wetlands are not just empty spaces; they are vital to the biodiversity, flood control, and water purification of the Heber Valley. Contamination of Pristine Aquifer & Water Supply: The North Fields sit atop a shallow aquifer that serves as a primary source for drinking water and irrigation for thousands in Wasatch County. Placing a four-lane highway with direct, untreated, or inadequately treated runoff directly over this shallow, porous ground is an unacceptable risk to public health and ecological safety. Migration of Pollutants into Aquatic Ecosystems: Runoff from the highway—comprised of winter deicing salts, heavy metals from brake dust, petroleum residues, and tire particulates—will migrate directly into the groundwater and surrounding waterways. This pollution poses a direct threat to the Provo River, a blue-ribbon fishery, and subsequently to Deer Creek Reservoir, which supplies drinking water to over 1 million people along the Wasatch Front. Irreversibility of Damage: Once the North Fields wetlands are filled and the aquifer is compromised, they cannot be restored. Mitigation efforts (such as the promised 2-to-1 ratio) cannot replace the unique, locally adapted, and high-quality habitat of the existing North Fields. Conclusion and Request for Action The environmental and long-term water quality risks posed by Alternative B far outweigh the projected traffic benefits. We cannot sacrifice the pristine natural resources that define the quality of life in Heber Valley for a highway. Therefore, I request that: UDOT reject Alternative B and reevaluate alternatives that do not cut through the heart of the North Fields. A fully independent, specialized hydrogeological study on the impact of road run-off on this specific shallow aquifer be completed. The protection of the Class 1A aquifer and the North Fields wetlands be prioritized above, not alongside, transportation capacity. Signed

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Robert Davidson Street Address: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Mail Address: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX February 28, 2026
381	Bonnie Moffat	I do not want to see our North Fields with a four lane road down the middle of it. The fields ARE Heber's identity. Once they're gone there's no coming back. Please. We don't want to look like Orem. Bonnie Moffat XXXXXXXXXXXXX Midway Utah Sent from my iPhone
42	Brad Burgess (Comment translated from voicemail)	hello this is Brad Burgess I just wanted to make a comment on the plans for the Heber Valley bypass Im a residence since 2021 Ive seen the traffic really increase a lot and especially on Main Street so I know a lot of people just dont drive on Main Street they try to do all that can to avoid it and because the big trucks and I think this bypass is sorely needed and I hope we dont you know put it off too long I agree that the the route B I think is the best route because it has actually less environmental impact and movement making you know you know less fewer houses have to get moved you know less impact that way and more permanent solution for the north fields to actually preserve them from and protect them from development in the future and I think also its a longer term solution because I think if we do the other alternative that you know its going to have to be redone in a few years which is going to be even more expensive at that time and so I totally agree that plan B is the best and you know hope it can move forward my phone number is XXXXXXXXXX my email is XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX thanks
525	Brad Winegar	Public Comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Study Opposition to Alternative B – North Fields Bypass Submitted by: W. Brad Winegar Midway, Utah Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding UDOT's proposal to construct the Heber Valley Bypass and the designation of Alternative B as the preferred route through the North Fields. While addressing transportation challenges in the Heber Valley is important, the proposed bypass represents a very costly solution that does not effectively address the primary source of congestion and would permanently impact one of the valley's most valuable agricultural landscapes. For the reasons outlined below, I respectfully urge UDOT to reconsider Alternative B. 1. The Bypass Does Not Address the Main Cause of Traffic UDOT's own analysis indicates that approximately 70% of traffic on Heber City's Main Street is local "intra-valley" traffic, meaning trips that both begin and end within the valley. Examples include: Midway–Heber travel school trips local shopping and services recreation within the valley A bypass around Heber City will do little to reduce these trips because they are local trips, not through traffic. 2. A $1 Billion Highway Should Not Be the First Solution The bypass is projected to cost approaching or exceeding $1 billion. Before committing to such an expensive and irreversible project, lower-cost solutions should be implemented first, including:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		a valley-wide bus system intersection improvements improved local connectivity traffic signal coordination Transportation planning best practice is to implement demand-management solutions before building major new highways. 3. Transit, Bicycle, and Electric Bike Solutions Have Not Been Attempted The Heber Valley currently has no meaningful public transit system. A modest bus network connecting: Midway Heber City Jordanelle / Mayflower Deer Valley East Village schools and commercial areas could significantly reduce the short trips that dominate traffic patterns. The valley is also unusually well suited for bicycle transportation due to its relatively flat terrain. A mobility strategy could include: protected bike lanes connecting Midway and Heber safe routes to schools regional trail connections rental electric bike systems similar to those used successfully in Park City These lower-cost investments should be implemented and evaluated before constructing a new highway through farmland. 4. A Highway Through the North Fields Would Create Development Pressure Transportation infrastructure strongly influences future land use. Constructing a major highway through the North Fields would likely increase development pressure on one of the valley's most important agricultural landscapes. Historically, rural highways often become the catalyst for: residential subdivisions commercial development land speculation

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The North Fields are one of the defining landscapes of the Heber Valley and provide: productive farmland wetlands and wildlife habitat scenic viewsheds the rural character that residents value Once a highway corridor divides this landscape, it cannot be restored. 5. The Bypass May Primarily Serve Regional Through Traffic and Airport Access The proposed bypass would create a faster corridor connecting: Park City / Jordanelle Utah County the Wasatch Front Heber Valley Airport Provo Airport This raises an important policy question: Should one of the valley's most valuable agricultural landscapes be sacrificed primarily to facilitate faster regional travel or airport access? Transportation investments should primarily serve the needs of local communities, not simply regional through traffic. Conclusion The proposed North Fields bypass represents a high-cost project with significant environmental and agricultural impacts, yet it does not directly address the primary source of congestion in the Heber Valley. Before moving forward with Alternative B, UDOT should: implement transit and local mobility solutions develop bicycle and electric-bike infrastructure improve local road connectivity and intersections fully evaluate lower-cost alternatives The North Fields are one of the defining landscapes of the Heber Valley. Once a highway is constructed through them, the character of the valley will be permanently changed. For these reasons, I respectfully urge UDOT to reconsider Alternative B and pursue transportation solutions that preserve the agricultural and scenic resources that make the Heber Valley unique. Respectfully submitted,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		W. Brad Winegar Midway, Utah
484	Bradley Colton	To the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project Team: My family has lived in the Heber Valley area for generations and having farmland with a clean water supply was critical for my early ancestors to ranch and farm. I moved back to the area to enjoy this atmosphere and support the local ranchers and farmers who want to continue this lifestyle and work. I am submitting this comment to express my personal opposition to bypass alternative B — and to urge UDOT to reconsider whether any bypass is the right solution for Heber Valley. I also support the formal comments submitted by the North Field Irrigation Company (NFIC), which identifies 96 specific deficiencies in the DEIS — 34 of which are independently sufficient to invalidate the document's conclusions. Alternative B should be rejected. A BYPASS WILL GENERATE THE TRAFFIC PROBLEM IT CLAIMS TO SOLVE The DEIS frames the bypass as a solution to congestion. But a new freeway-style corridor through the North Fields will do what new highway capacity always does: generate new traffic. This is not speculation — it is the well-documented principle of induced demand, which UDOT's own traffic model fails to adequately account for. The DEIS itself acknowledges that Alternative B will "facilitate westward urban expansion" of Heber City. New development means new vehicle trips, and new vehicle trips will fill the new road — returning the valley to congestion, but at a permanently higher baseline and with irreversible environmental damage already done. THE BYPASS INVITES I-80 REROUTING THROUGH HEBER VALLEY This is the risk I believe the DEIS has entirely failed to study, and it may be the most consequential long-term impact of this project. Today, westbound I-80 traffic from the Wasatch Back destined for Salt Lake City travels through Parley's Canyon — a route with far greater infrastructure capacity. A new high-speed bypass through Heber Valley would make US-40 through Heber a faster and more attractive alternative for regional and even interstate traffic currently using I-80 via SLC. GPS navigation systems and trucking dispatchers optimize for travel time. Once a faster route exists, they will use it. Salt Lake City's I-80 corridor was built to handle regional freight and interstate traffic loads. Heber Valley's road network, the North Fields aquifer, Spring Creek, the Provo River Blue-Ribbon fishery, and the community's rural character were not. Routing even a fraction of I-80's westbound volume through a newly expanded Heber corridor would overwhelm local infrastructure, accelerate development pressure, and permanently transform the character of the valley — outcomes that 77% of Heber Valley residents said they did not want when surveyed for the Envision Heber 2050 General Plan. UDOT's traffic model does not appear to have studied this scenario. The DEIS uses a model labeled "Not Calibrated" for summer traffic — the season when regional travel pressure is highest. There is no analysis of how the bypass would affect routing decisions for long-haul trucks, tourism traffic, or GPS-optimized travel patterns on a regional scale. THE DEIS HAS NOT STUDIED THE RIGHT ALTERNATIVES Building a $760+ million freeway-style bypass — one that costs more than Alternative A, destroys 140% more wetlands, threatens the municipal drinking water supply for three communities, eliminates 160-year-old senior water rights, and contradicts the community's own general plan — to save 70 seconds of travel time is not a defensible public investment. It is especially indefensible when the bypass itself may attract the very regional traffic volume that overwhelms the solution. MY REQUESTS I urge UDOT to refuse to issue a Record of Decision on the current DEIS, which does not meet NEPA's "hard look" standard and omits critical analyses of induced demand, regional rerouting risk, aquifer impacts, and true project costs. Heber Valley's character, water, farmland, and long-term quality of life are worth more than a 70-second reduction in drive time. Please get this right before it cannot be undone. Respectfully, Bradley Hugh Colton XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Midway, Utah XXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
535	Bradley Lowder	Bradley J. Lowder XXXXXXXXX Heber UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX March 8, 2026 Utah Department of Transportation c/o Heber Valley Corridor DEIS Comment Team Subject: Comment on DEIS – Opposition to Option B due to Groundwater, Watershed, and Hydrologic Impacts Dear UDOT Project Team, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed U.S. Highway 40 bypass in the Heber Valley. I am writing to express opposition to Option B due to its potential impacts on groundwater resources, watershed function, and long-term water quality within the valley. The Heber Valley functions as an important groundwater recharge basin within the Upper Provo River watershed. The valley floor is characterized by permeable alluvial and lacustrine sediments that allow significant infiltration from snowmelt, irrigation return flows, and precipitation. These processes support groundwater recharge that sustains municipal and agricultural wells, springs, and baseflow contributions to local streams and canals. Because recharge occurs broadly across the valley floor, the conversion of agricultural and open land to transportation infrastructure can significantly reduce infiltration capacity and alter the valley's hydrologic balance. Option B would introduce a large amount of impervious surface area across lands that currently function as infiltration and recharge zones. Pavement, interchanges, shoulders, and associated infrastructure reduce soil permeability and increase the runoff coefficient of the landscape. This shift results in reduced groundwater recharge and increased peak stormwater flows. Over time, these changes can alter shallow groundwater gradients and reduce aquifer replenishment that supports both wells and surface water baseflows. In addition, highway corridors represent a well-documented source of nonpoint-source pollution. Stormwater runoff from high-traffic roadways typically contains petroleum hydrocarbons, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), suspended sediments, tire-derived microplastics, and heavy metals including zinc, copper, and cadmium. In cold climates, winter maintenance can also contribute elevated chloride concentrations from road salt or other deicing compounds. Without robust pretreatment and infiltration design, these contaminants can migrate into shallow groundwater through infiltration basins or enter nearby surface waters through drainage systems. Given the relatively shallow groundwater conditions present in many areas of the valley floor, infiltration of untreated roadway runoff could pose a long-term risk to groundwater quality. Once contaminants enter an aquifer system, natural attenuation can take decades or longer, and remediation is extremely costly. Protecting recharge zones from contamination is therefore far more effective than relying on post-construction mitigation. Option B also raises concerns related to alteration of natural drainage patterns and floodplain processes. Road embankments, culverts, and channel crossings can fragment hydrologic connectivity, disrupt shallow groundwater flow paths, and increase localized erosion or sediment transport. These modifications can degrade wetlands and riparian corridors that currently provide critical ecosystem services, including sediment trapping, nutrient removal, and natural stormwater filtration. From a watershed-scale perspective, the DEIS should more thoroughly evaluate cumulative impacts associated with incremental increases in impervious surface and hydrologic fragmentation. Even relatively small reductions in recharge or increases in runoff can compound over time as development expands along transportation corridors. A more robust cumulative impacts analysis would help clarify how the proposed alignment may interact with future land use changes and long-term water demand in the valley. In addition, I encourage UDOT to incorporate the following considerations into its evaluation: • Detailed mapping and avoidance of high-value groundwater recharge areas on the valley floor. • Hydrogeologic analysis of shallow groundwater flow paths that could transport roadway contaminants. • Stormwater treatment systems that include pretreatment (sediment forebays, oil-grit separators) prior to infiltration. • Distributed green infrastructure approaches such as vegetated swales and biofiltration to reduce runoff velocity and promote natural filtration. • Monitoring of groundwater quality near infiltration structures associated with highway drainage systems. • Evaluation of potential impacts to wetlands, irrigation return flows, and seasonal drainage features that contribute to recharge. From both a hydrologic and long-term resource management perspective, avoiding impacts to key recharge areas and minimizing new impervious surface on the valley floor should be a central principle guiding corridor selection. Based on these considerations, I urge UDOT to reconsider Option B and instead prioritize alternatives that reduce watershed disturbance and better protect groundwater resources.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The Heber Valley's groundwater and watershed systems are foundational to the region's long-term sustainability, agricultural viability, and ecological health. Transportation planning decisions made today will shape these systems for generations. Protecting the valley's hydrologic integrity should therefore remain a primary consideration in selecting the preferred alternative. Thank you for considering these comments and for your continued work on this project. Sincerely, Bradley J. Lowder
89	Brady Flygare	I am a homeowner whose XXXXXXXXXXXXX 1300 South in Heber City, and I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor Project. I want to be clear at the outset that I am not opposed to improving traffic flow through Heber City. Congestion along Main Street and U.S. 40 is real, particularly during peak periods, and long-term transportation planning is necessary as the valley grows. I support transportation solutions that improve mobility for residents, visitors, and regional traffic while making responsible use of public funds and minimizing permanent harm to existing neighborhoods and businesses. My concern is specific. I oppose the proposed grade-separated flyover and frontage road system along 1300 South. After reviewing the Draft EIS and supporting technical materials, it is not clear that this alignment and level of infrastructure are necessary to meet the project's stated purpose and need. It is also not clear, in plain terms, how the project moved from identifying mobility issues on U.S. 40 to selecting a new elevated facility immediately adjacent to homes and businesses along 1300 South. The Draft EIS describes the 1300 South segment as an elevated facility with one travel lane in each direction, combined with a one-way frontage road system intended to facilitate local traffic movements. It also states that the Industrial Parkway intersection would be removed and replaced with right-in, right-out access to frontage roads in order to consolidate access points and improve regional mobility. The intersection at 300 West would be grade-separated, and the Draft EIS explains that this is important because it would allow corridor traffic to move unimpeded. That explanation describes a design approach, but it does not clearly demonstrate why this approach is required rather than simply preferred. This design would place highway-scale elevated infrastructure immediately adjacent to existing homes and businesses. The Visual Resources Technical Report acknowledges that elevated structures in this area would be prominent and highly visible, creating adverse visual impacts where none exist today. These impacts are not temporary. They are permanent operational changes that would affect daily life along 1300 South for decades, including sustained noise exposure, visual intrusion, and continuous traffic activity. While mitigation measures are discussed, mitigation does not change the fundamental character of an elevated roadway or restore the existing neighborhood environment. The flyover and frontage road configuration would also affect existing businesses along 1300 South. While the Draft EIS characterizes frontage roads as preserving access, it also shows that direct intersections would be removed or limited to improve corridor mobility. In practice, this means fewer access points, longer travel paths, and reduced visibility from through traffic. Many businesses along this corridor rely on direct east-west access and pass-by visibility. Frontage roads may preserve technical access, but they do not necessarily preserve the same level of convenience, visibility, or customer awareness. These foreseeable operational effects are not fully evaluated in the Draft EIS, particularly for small and service-oriented businesses. A central issue in reviewing the Draft EIS is that the decision pathway leading to the 1300 South flyover is not clearly explained in plain language. The Draft EIS states that the needs assessment evaluation area is focused on U.S. 40 from SR-32 to U.S. 189 and also includes portions of U.S. 189 and U.S. 40 near the hub intersection to account for system operations and provide logical termini. The project purpose and need focuses on improving mobility on U.S. 40 and allowing Heber City to meet its vision for a historic town center, while also providing opportunities for non-motorized transportation. Given that U.S. 189 is expressly included in the evaluation area and recognized as part of the regional system influencing corridor operations, the Draft EIS should clearly explain why improving or optimizing existing state highway infrastructure was not advanced as a primary approach before selecting a new grade-separated facility through a residential and business corridor. The Draft EIS explains why grade separation and access consolidation are desirable for unimpeded traffic flow, but it does not clearly document what performance thresholds require a grade-separated solution at this location, why less intrusive at-grade or access management strategies would fail to meet the stated purpose and need, or when and how the permanent impacts to the 1300 South corridor were deemed acceptable. The Preferred Alternative technical materials include cost estimates for the action alternatives in the hundreds of millions of dollars, including engineering, right-of-way, construction, utilities, drainage, and mitigation. Elevated structures and grade-separated facilities also carry long-term inspection, maintenance, and future replacement obligations that extend for decades.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		At the same time, the Draft EIS evaluates congestion and operations primarily using weekday peak-hour metrics and recognizes seasonal variation in traffic volumes. Designing a permanent elevated facility with permanent neighborhood impacts to address peak-period conditions raises reasonable questions about proportionality and long-term cost responsibility. The Draft EIS also emphasizes the goal of allowing Heber City to achieve its vision for a historic town center, including reduced traffic volumes on Main Street and improved walkability. These are legitimate policy objectives. However, when a local vision objective is embedded directly into the project purpose and screening criteria, the Draft EIS should clearly explain how that priority was balanced against permanent impacts to adjacent neighborhoods, business access, and long-term public cost. At present, that balancing explanation is not clear in the record. For these reasons, I respectfully request that UDOT provide clearer responses to the following: • How the 1300 South flyover and frontage road configuration were determined to be necessary rather than simply beneficial? • What specific criteria or performance thresholds required grade separation at this location? • Why less intrusive options were not sufficient to meet the project's stated goals? • How long-term public costs and maintenance obligations were weighed in selecting this design? • How permanent neighborhood and business impacts were balanced against benefits that primarily serve corridor through traffic. I also request a clear, side-by-side comparison between an approach that prioritizes improvements to existing state highways within the project evaluation area and the proposed grade-separated flyover and frontage road design along 1300 South. This comparison should address traffic performance, construction and long-term costs, right-of-way needs, and permanent impacts to nearby homes and businesses, including noise, visual effects, and access. Without this information, it is difficult for the public to fully understand both the tradeoffs involved and the decision process that led to the selected alignment. Brady Flygare Homeowner XXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah
528	Brandon O'Brien	Please use this letter instead of the previous drafts. After consideration, I wish for this to be my own opinion and voice and not that of Provo City. Thank you. To the UDOT committee: I submit this comment to provide a technical, GIS-based, and legally grounded analysis demonstrating that Alternative B intersects the highest concentration of regulated environmental, hydrologic, agricultural, and flood-hazard resources in Wasatch County. These conflicts are visible in the Wasatch County GIS Portal and trigger multiple federal and state regulatory requirements. The spatial evidence shows that Alternative B cannot satisfy NEPA, the Clean Water Act, the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA), or Utah water-quality and water-rights protections. When the Groundwater Depth layer is activated, the entire corridor of Alternative B lies within 0–5 ft and 5–10 ft groundwater polygons, with no segment exceeding 10 ft depth. These conditions indicate minimal soil attenuation, high vulnerability to contaminant transport, and infeasibility of infiltration-based stormwater controls. The Aquifer Recharge Zones layer shows that the alignment directly overlies the Primary Recharge Area and High Recharge Potential polygons, meaning the highway would sit on the valley's principal drinking-water recharge system. These conflicts trigger Utah Code §19-5-107, Utah Admin. Code R317-2-3, Clean Water Act §402(p), and NEPA's groundwater-impact requirements. The Wetlands (NWI) layer identifies PEM, PSS, and PUB wetlands intersecting the corridor, while the Hydric Soils layer confirms wetland indicators and seasonal saturation. These conditions trigger Clean Water Act §404, the LEDPA requirement under 40 C.F.R. §230.10, and Utah water-quality standards. Because feasible alternatives exist that avoid these mapped wetlands and hydric soils, Alternative B cannot legally qualify as the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative. The Streams & Ditches layer shows that Alternative B intersects multiple irrigation laterals, private ditches, historic conveyance routes, and seasonal drainage channels, triggering Utah Code §73-1-15, Utah Constitution Article I §22, and NEPA's requirement to evaluate impairment of existing water-rights infrastructure. These crossings create direct impairment of vested water rights and require detailed engineering analysis that has not been provided. The Agricultural Preservation Areas and Open Space Priority Zones layers show that Alternative B bisects protected agricultural land, while the Prime Farmland (NRCS SSURGO) layer shows that nearly the entire corridor consists of Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. These conflicts trigger FPPA (7 U.S.C. §4201), Utah Code §17-41-101, and NEPA's land-use consistency requirements. Under FPPA, conversion of prime farmland is prohibited when feasible alternatives exist, and the GIS evidence clearly shows that such alternatives do exist. The FEMA Flood Zones and Local Flood Hazard layers show that Alternative B intersects Zone A floodplains, seasonal inundation areas, and shallow flooding polygons, triggering FEMA compliance, NEPA flood-hazard analysis, and Utah Code §19-5-107. These conditions create major stormwater feasibility and long-term maintenance concerns. Across all relevant Wasatch County GIS layers, Alternative B intersects four hydrology layers, three wetlands/soils layers, four agricultural/preservation layers, and three floodplain/hazard layers, for a total of fourteen

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		distinct regulated or sensitive GIS layers. This is the highest concentration of environmental and regulatory conflicts anywhere in the valley. The visual patterns in the county GIS portal confirm that these conflicts are cumulative and overlapping, forming a dense mosaic of blue, green, yellow, and orange polygons representing shallow groundwater, primary recharge zones, wetlands, hydric soils, prime farmland, preservation areas, and flood-prone land. The alignment appears as a single line cutting through the most environmentally constrained area of the Heber Valley. Under NEPA, agencies must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, avoid or minimize environmental harm where feasible, and base decisions on high-quality information and accurate scientific analysis. The mapped evidence shows that less damaging practicable alternatives exist, and therefore Alternative B cannot lawfully be advanced. Under the Clean Water Act §404(b)(1) Guidelines, UDOT must select the LEDPA, and because feasible alternatives exist that avoid mapped wetlands and hydric soils, Alternative B cannot be the LEDPA. Under FPPA, conversion of prime farmland is prohibited when feasible alternatives exist, and the GIS evidence shows that Alternative B unnecessarily converts high-value farmland. Under Utah water-rights and water-quality statutes, the alignment impairs vested water rights, threatens water-quality protections, and occupies flood-prone land inconsistent with state law. The combined evidence demonstrates that Alternative B is not legally defensible under NEPA, the Clean Water Act, FPPA, or Utah water-rights and water-quality statutes. The spatial, hydrologic, agricultural, and regulatory conflicts documented in this submission are not speculative; they are visible in the county's own GIS datasets and carry direct legal consequences. Alternative B is the most environmentally damaging and legally vulnerable alignment. It cannot be advanced without violating multiple federal and state requirements. A lawful, defensible, community-aligned alternative must avoid the mapped conflicts documented in this submission. Very Respectfully, Brandon M. O'Brien -B.S. in Environmental Science University of Phoenix -Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator III -Certifications Grade IV Wastewater Operator Grade IV Wastewater Collections Grade III Plant Maintenance Grade II Biosolids Land Applier (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
660	Brandy Cichocki	I would like to voice my opinion against option B. I think there could be a third alternative to combine A and B so that an on ramp is not at a light. Consider starting the on ramp prior to Coyote Crossing and have it follow 40 until it reaches Coyote crossing and then goes along the route drafted. We should be minimizing the impact to the environment and option B, in my opinion, results in more damage. Kind regards, Brandy
271	Brantley Eason	Please change the southern route of the Heber Valley Bypass off of 1300 South. The current proposal would affect established businesses and homes where many children live. Please consider moving this section to the South on to Highway 189. This road is already an established thoroughfare and would have less impact on businesses and children. Thank you
456	Braxton Schindler	No to bypass!!! This is a terrible, terrible idea. Don't mess with the north fields!
459	Brenda Gemmell	I am for "B"
148	Brenda Wilcox (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Please do NOT build either A or B. Most traffic on Main is local and this bypass will only cost a bazillion dollars and not make a difference on Main. -Option B will destroy our N. Fields -Cost is crazy -Destroying the N. Fields -Our smalltown charm is gone -Height is too high - adds noise and destroys beauty NO to all!! Preserve our small valley charm. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
642	Brent Crittenden	I prefer alternate A. Here are 3 reasons for my opinion on this. 1. Option B will cut farmer's land into 2 parts and discourage continued farming in the area. Growing up in Summit County, I witnessed this firsthand, when farmer's lands were cut in 2 by the I-80 freeway construction. In that case, the impact could have been mitigated by skirting around most of these areas. 2. Option B has a greater negative impact to the aesthetic beauty of this valley. The north fields have always been an iconic feature of this valley. Once destroyed, you will never get that beauty restored. 3. Option B has a greater negative impact to the wetlands in this area. This also negatively impacts the water quality for the farms in this area. Clean water should be a high priority for all Utahns. You have acknowledged that either solution will not substantially reduce traffic on Heber City's Main Street. It may take big trucks on Main Street, but this could more easily be accomplished by the proposed train route from Myton to Price. This bypass project feels more like an expressway to the Heber City Airport where billionaires arrive in their private jets and are quickly transported to their luxury accommodations in Park City.
666	Brent Crittenden	Neither is desirable Option A is less impactful I hate seeing farmer’s property being sliced in half and thereby complicating their work. I hate the negative aesthetic impact on our valley. I hate the impact this will have on the wetlands. NO ON ALTERNATIVE B Regards, Brent Crittenden Sent from my iPhone
639	Brent Haight	Brent Haight, long time Midway & Heber resident. I strongly urge UDOT to realign the bypass road impact as little of the north fields as possible. Choosing alternate B is a huge mistake. Don't disrupt the beauty of the area, not to mention the likely implication of ground water contamination, and impact on the grazing and agricultural practices that are a mainstay of our beautiful valley. Keep the trucks out of the north fields and closer to the city, where they belong. Don't ruin what we can to the valley to enjoy.
270	Brent Whipple	Hello, As a local resident of Heber City, myself and many local friends are heavily opposed to the highway proposal through the North Fields. The Heber Valley is one of, if not the most, pristine areas left in Northern Utah. To develop it further, through wetlands no less, to accommodate big rigs and through traffic at the expense of locals is a shame. Certain areas of natural beauty should simply be preserved. We would not build a bridge across lake Tahoe so we could cross it faster. While traffic is a nuisance, building more roads will simply invite more development and more traffic, an endless issue. Can we not enforce a local ordinance banning big rigs during the daytime, allowing them to pass through at night only? Why build a four lane highway, adjacent to an existing four lane highway, when some trucks will opt to go through town anyway? Adding a third lane to the 40 would also go a long way to alleviate backup in town without further scarring the valley. Thank you for your time, Brent
220	Brett Heimburger	Attn: UDOT Heber Valley Corridor Project Team We submit this letter as a formal comment on behalf of a coalition of Heber Valley residents in strong opposition to any bypass alternative that would route the Heber Valley Corridor through the North Fields of Heber Valley. This comment is intended to identify substantive deficiencies in the Draft EIS analysis, previously unaddressed impacts to important environmental, cultural, and community resources, and reasonable alternative approaches that better meet the project’s stated purpose and need while avoiding unnecessary and irreversible harm. 1. Inadequate Analysis of Visual and Aesthetic Impacts The Draft EIS significantly understates the importance of visual quality and scenic integrity as core resources in the North Fields area. Heber Valley’s open agricultural landscape, unobstructed mountain viewsheds, and rural character are not incidental amenities—they are defining features of the valley and primary drivers of tourism, property values, and overall quality of life. The visual impact analysis does not adequately account for: The permanent loss of uninterrupted open-space viewsheds across the North Fields. The introduction of large-scale transportation infrastructure (including roadway cuts, embankments, bridges, lighting, signage, and continuous traffic movement) into an area currently defined by visual quiet and rural openness. The cumulative impacts of the corridor when combined with foreseeable secondary development pressures that typically follow new highway infrastructure. NEPA requires meaningful consideration of scenic and visual resources, particularly where those resources are central to a community’s identity. The Draft EIS treats aesthetic impacts as secondary or readily mitigated, which does not reflect the irreversible nature of introducing a major transportation corridor into this landscape. 2. Failure to Fully Evaluate Community and Land-Use Impacts The Draft EIS does not sufficiently analyze how a North Fields alignment would fundamentally alter existing land-use patterns. The North Fields represent some of the last remaining contiguous agricultural and open-space areas in Heber Valley. Routing a bypass through this area would: Fragment agricultural land and disrupt ongoing farming operations. Create development pressure inconsistent with current zoning and long-term community planning goals. Permanently alter the rural character that residents and visitors value.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		These are not temporary construction-related effects; they are permanent structural changes to the valley. The analysis should more clearly acknowledge that mitigation measures cannot restore the pre-project condition of these lands. 3. Purpose and Need Can Be Met Without Routing Through the North Fields The Draft EIS does not demonstrate that a North Fields bypass is necessary to meet the project's transportation purpose and need. Congestion relief, safety improvements, and mobility can be addressed through alternatives that prioritize: Improvements to existing transportation corridors. Context-sensitive upgrades that reduce congestion without opening new, previously undeveloped areas. Transportation demand management strategies and phased improvements aligned with realistic growth projections. Routing a new highway through one of the most visually and culturally significant areas of the valley represents an unnecessary tradeoff when less damaging options exist. 4. Reasonable Alternatives Not Fully Evaluated A refined alternative that avoids the North Fields entirely—by concentrating improvements within or adjacent to existing developed corridors—should be fully developed and evaluated as part of a reasonable range of alternatives. Such an alternative would: Better align with community values and adopted land-use plans. Avoid the irreversible loss of scenic and agricultural resources. Reduce long-term growth-inducing impacts in currently undeveloped areas. More appropriately balance transportation needs with environmental and community preservation. The Draft EIS does not explore this approach at a comparable level of detail, limiting meaningful comparison by decision-makers and the public. Conclusion The North Fields are not simply vacant land; they are a critical environmental, visual, and cultural resource that defines Heber Valley's character and appeal. While weekday travel in Heber Valley is largely local, weekend visitation increases significantly and is driven primarily by the valley's scenic quality and open landscapes, of which the North Fields are an integral component. Once a bypass is constructed through this area, the loss is permanent and cannot be mitigated through landscaping or design treatments. A resulting decline in visitation would likely have significant negative impacts on the local economy. For these reasons, we strongly urge UDOT to eliminate any North Fields alignment from further consideration and to revise the EIS to more accurately reflect the full scope of visual, land-use, community, economic, and cumulative impacts, while fully evaluating reasonable alternatives that avoid these irreplaceable resources. Thank you for the opportunity to provide formal comments on this project. Sincerely, Brett Heimburger On behalf of concerned Heber Valley residents
91	Brian Andrews	No reason to add the on and off ramps to the intersection at 113. This will only encourage future development. Trucks exiting or entering can take other routes. Cars save very little time and this is NOT the point of the whole project. Also, eliminating saves money. Makes NO sense. Most insane and unnecessary part of the plan. Best regards, Brian Andrews XXXXXXXXX
182	Brian Barrett	Please don't destroy the North Fields. They are the crown jewel of the valley. There are other options, including tunneling or option A. Don't make your legacy the destruction of one of the most scenic valleys in the US. Thank you for your consideration on this matter.
214	Brian Bartscher	Alternative B is clearly the best choice to optimize traffic flow, minimize disruption of existing structures, and protect wetlands over the long term. The information provided is thorough and meaningful. There will be dissenters regardless of option chosen. Thank you for the through study and logical solution choice!
287	Brianne Field	To Whom It May Concern: As a resident of Heber City XXXXXXXXXXXXX the planned 1300 South extension (XXXXXXXXXXX), I have major concerns about why it would be necessary to elevate the road. I mimic my fellow neighbors well thought out and researched comment: "I am a homeowner whose property directly borders 1300 South in Heber City, and I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor Project. I want to be clear at the outset that I am not opposed to improving traffic flow through Heber City. Congestion along Main Street and U.S. 40 is real, particularly during peak periods, and long-term transportation planning is necessary as the valley grows. I support transportation solutions that improve mobility for residents, visitors, and regional traffic while making responsible use of public funds and minimizing permanent

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		harm to existing neighborhoods and businesses. My concern is specific. I oppose the proposed grade-separated flyover and frontage road system along 1300 South. After reviewing the Draft EIS and supporting technical materials, it is not clear that this alignment and level of infrastructure are necessary to meet the project's stated purpose and need. It is also not clear, in plain terms, how the project moved from identifying mobility issues on U.S. 40 to selecting a new elevated facility immediately adjacent to homes and businesses along 1300 South. The Draft EIS describes the 1300 South segment as an elevated facility with one travel lane in each direction, combined with a one-way frontage road system intended to facilitate local traffic movements. It also states that the Industrial Parkway intersection would be removed and replaced with right-in, right-out access to frontage roads in order to consolidate access points and improve regional mobility. The intersection at 300 West would be grade-separated, and the Draft EIS explains that this is important because it would allow corridor traffic to move unimpeded. That explanation describes a design approach, but it does not clearly demonstrate why this approach is required rather than simply preferred. This design would place highway-scale elevated infrastructure immediately adjacent to existing homes and businesses. The Visual Resources Technical Report acknowledges that elevated structures in this area would be prominent and highly visible, creating adverse visual impacts where none exist today. These impacts are not temporary. They are permanent operational changes that would affect daily life along 1300 South for decades, including sustained noise exposure, visual intrusion, and continuous traffic activity. While mitigation measures are discussed, mitigation does not change the fundamental character of an elevated roadway or restore the existing neighborhood environment. The flyover and frontage road configuration would also affect existing businesses along 1300 South. While the Draft EIS characterizes frontage roads as preserving access, it also shows that direct intersections would be removed or limited to improve corridor mobility. In practice, this means fewer access points, longer travel paths, and reduced visibility from through traffic. Many businesses along this corridor rely on direct east-west access and pass-by visibility. Frontage roads may preserve technical access, but they do not necessarily preserve the same level of convenience, visibility, or customer awareness. These foreseeable operational effects are not fully evaluated in the Draft EIS, particularly for small and service-oriented businesses. A central issue in reviewing the Draft EIS is that the decision pathway leading to the 1300 South flyover is not clearly explained in plain language. The Draft EIS states that the needs assessment evaluation area is focused on U.S. 40 from SR-32 to U.S. 189 and also includes portions of U.S. 189 and U.S. 40 near the hub intersection to account for system operations and provide logical termini. The project purpose and need focuses on improving mobility on U.S. 40 and allowing Heber City to meet its vision for a historic town center, while also providing opportunities for non-motorized transportation. Given that U.S. 189 is expressly included in the evaluation area and recognized as part of the regional system influencing corridor operations, the Draft EIS should clearly explain why improving or optimizing existing state highway infrastructure was not advanced as a primary approach before selecting a new grade-separated facility through a residential and business corridor. The Draft EIS explains why grade separation and access consolidation are desirable for unimpeded traffic flow, but it does not clearly document what performance thresholds require a grade-separated solution at this location, why less intrusive at-grade or access management strategies would fail to meet the stated purpose and need, or when and how the permanent impacts to the 1300 South corridor were deemed acceptable. The Preferred Alternative technical materials include cost estimates for the action alternatives in the hundreds of millions of dollars, including engineering, right-of-way, construction, utilities, drainage, and mitigation. Elevated structures and grade-separated facilities also carry long-term inspection, maintenance, and future replacement obligations that extend for decades. At the same time, the Draft EIS evaluates congestion and operations primarily using weekday peak-hour metrics and recognizes seasonal variation in traffic volumes. Designing a permanent elevated facility with permanent neighborhood impacts to address peak-period conditions raises reasonable questions about proportionality and long-term cost responsibility. The Draft EIS also emphasizes the goal of allowing Heber City to achieve its vision for a historic town center, including reduced traffic volumes on Main Street and improved walkability. These are legitimate policy objectives. However, when a local vision objective is embedded directly into the project purpose and screening criteria, the Draft EIS should clearly explain how that priority was balanced against permanent impacts to adjacent neighborhoods, business access, and long-term public cost. At present, that balancing explanation is not clear in the record. For these reasons, I respectfully request that UDOT provide clearer responses to the following: • How the 1300 South flyover and frontage road configuration were determined to be necessary rather than simply beneficial?

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		• What specific criteria or performance thresholds required grade separation at this location? • Why less intrusive options were not sufficient to meet the project's stated goals? • How long-term public costs and maintenance obligations were weighed in selecting this design? • How permanent neighborhood and business impacts were balanced against benefits that primarily serve corridor through traffic. I also request a clear, side-by-side comparison between an approach that prioritizes improvements to existing state highways within the project evaluation area and the proposed grade-separated flyover and frontage road design along 1300 South. This comparison should address traffic performance, construction and long-term costs, right-of-way needs, and permanent impacts to nearby homes and businesses, including noise, visual effects, and access. Without this information, it is difficult for the public to fully understand both the tradeoffs involved and the decision process that led to the selected alignment. Brady Flygare Homeowner XXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah" After attending meetings and reviewing comments about the bypass from my fellow citizens of Heber City, maybe the bypass should just not happen altogether. The destruction of wetlands and other property as well as the effect the bypass has on homeowners is not worth the little time saved by adding a bypass. I respectfully request that UDOT listen to the citizens and do what is right by them. Brianne Field Homeowner XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah
453	Bridget Whiting	Dear Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project Team, Please accept the attached document as my formal public comment regarding the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input during this process. Sincerely, Bridget Nicole Whiting Heber Valley, Utah (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
455	Bridget Whiting	Dear Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project Team, Please find the attached proposal for your consideration as part of the ongoing review of the Heber Valley Corridor project. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the process. Sincerely, Bridget Nicole Whiting Heber Valley, Utah (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
653	Brook Flygare	To Whom it May Concern,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I am writing in opposition of the UDOT and Heber CIty bypass/corridor proposal to move Highway 189 to a new 1300 South in Heber through a massive round a bout. I have attended and listened to the many public open houses and meetings regarding the bypass for the past 5 years and continue to find the information very confusing and misleading. When asking questions to UDOT members each one had a different answer to the same questions. One rep said yes we are moving it for the airport, however later that was all taken back that person did not know what he was talking about. I also asked some questions to a city employee, which I later found out to be the City Manager, whom didn't know answers to some of the simple questions being asked. I also noticed at the meeting when the moving of 189 was first introduced to the public, the city and UDOT changed the narrative of this being a "bypass" to a "parkway." I'm sure this is to make it sound more appealing to the citizens of Wasatch County. However let's call it what it is, a HIGHWAY right next to 31 existing homes! I know the Mayor and CIty manager have a hope of turning Main street into a charming area tourist destination, like Midway and Park CIty. The only problem is that is not what Heber is, Main street was built on a highway plain and simple. This was evident at the open house where there were plenty of beautiful pictures of a charming downtown were presented while the bypass was shown with dotted and green lines and no renderings of what it will actually look like. I am a mother of 4 young children and live near the new proposed "bypass" route. I am concerned about many aspects of this project the first being the safety of the children. My children walk to school up our street to the corner of Industrial and 1250 South. This intersection would be less than 25 yards away from a road that will be 55 mph with large diesels and oil tankers speeding by. Oakwood homes subdivision is also located across from this intersection. They built a community park on this corner where many children ride their bikes to and families congregate during the warm spring and summer months. I am not sure how Udot plans to secure this section of the highway from the young children, since there were no mock-ups of what the "bypass" would look like when finished. The noise from this proposed route would also be great as many young families live in these homes. As soon as the diesels would be gaining speed to 55 mph they would essentially be slowing right back down to enter into the massive roundabout proposed to link 1300 south to the portion heading North. Another concern would be the large amounts of trash that come with rerouting the highway. I have driven down 189 and seen the trash that never seems to dwindle. What will be done to protect children, reduce the noise and excessive trash that comes along with a reroute of Highway 189. The second area of concern is the amount of money that this project will cost. When asked at the open house about a budget UDOT said they couldn't give one yet. However, I would guess its budget would easily be 2x the amount with the movement of an already established and recently, less than 10 yrs, widening and repaving of US 189.UDOT is also proposing building the largest roundabout to move traffic off 1300 S to a new road that parallels Southfield RD. During the summer this will be full of trucks pulling boats and RV's, motorhomes, horse trailers, and diesels, along with cars. In the winter those previously stated along with snow plows will navigate the complexity of the round a bout. This area accumulates many feet of snow and sometimes 10-24 inches at a time. How will the snow plows be able to keep the ice and snow cleared in this area? When a normal intersection would be able to meet the same needs without the show of being the biggest ever built in the West. Other concerns are what are the plans for retaining the railroad tracks and access to the Wasatch County Events Center. Southfield park is also within yards of the new "bypass" this park holds all the recreational activities for Wasatch county including fall and spring soccer, softball, baseball, and T-ball. Not to mention it crosses the main road that connects Midway to Heber. I would hate to see huge overpasses go up and block the beauty of the mountains which is a main reason most citizens moved to this valley. The next area of concern that certainly goes along with the cost is moving Highway 189. If this is done it gives the airport the opportunity to gain more acreage without much of a hassle. The expanding of the airport has been voted down by the citizens of Heber and they have let local government officials know that they do not want this. However, it seems the city does and by moving an entire highway this can be done! The city manager Matt Bowers stated in an interview that he fully supports enhancing the airport. We are currently involved in the process to update the master plan of the airport, which will then tell us if this needs to happen. With covid very little has been said or publicly announced about this project that should wrap up shortly leaving the citizens confused about the new plan. The area where 1300 South would be built goes through a sewer district and is home to many different wildlife. In the spring and the fall we get many flocks of geese migrating north or south. We also enjoy the white sand crane during this time. The birds spend a lot of time feeding and resting in these fields. How sad it would be for them to find another place to enjoy because of a loud and dirty bypass running through the middle of the fields. There are also many deer that fed in these fields throughout the year and I've heard a moose on occasion but never witnessed this. The last area of concern is the new traffic flow around 1300 south. I am not sure how i would be able to easily get out of my neighborhood unless i am headed to Provo or Park City. Getting onto main street or going to Daniels is practically impossible. Both of which i do multiple times a day going to the gym, shopping, and my childrens extra curriculars.. It seems all traffic from our area will be pushed to the light on 600 South and Main which is already a joke of an area on most days and most times. The reworking of the roads in and around Logan do not have these types of invasive overpasses nor the corridor in Lehi which is what we were told this would resemble! I know there are no easy solutions to the traffic issues that face the valley, however, I would like to know why other options besides just a bypass have not been explored. I would think that improving the timing of many of the lights on main street as well as adding green arrow turn lights at some of the busier intersections like 600 S and 100 N heading to Midway. Some have suggested updating 100 E and 100 W to one way streets to pull some of the local traffic off of main street. By doing these simple things traffic can become better now instead of in the 10+ years it could take to build the bypass. If the city doesn't have the funds to make some of these simple changes where will the money come to build a peaceful downtown center.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Please consider moving the route back to 189 and out of the backyards of families that have chosen to call this valley home! This valley does not need overpasses and underpasses. We are a small community and seeing what was proposed and now what is planned is honestly surprising and not at all what was promised by UDOT!! Thanks Brook Flygare
335	Bryanna Layer	To Whom It May Concern, I support the letter submitted by NFIC and strongly oppose Alternative B. In fact, I do not support either proposed bypass option, as both would be highly disruptive to the Heber Valley and would cause more harm than benefit. Before pursuing a billion-dollar infrastructure project of this magnitude, why has meaningful investment not been made to improve the existing US-40 corridor? Targeted improvements to the current alignment should be fully explored and implemented prior to introducing a new, environmentally destructive bypass. To date, those solutions have not been adequately prioritized. The traffic conditions cited as justification for this project do not warrant such an extreme response. Congestion in Heber Valley is limited and predictable — occurring briefly during peak commute times. This is not a region facing chronic, all-day gridlock. Many communities function successfully with moderate peak-hour traffic without resorting to large-scale bypass construction that permanently alters their landscape and economy. Most critically, the North Fields represent the last remaining source of surface water recharge and aquifer protection in our valley. Protecting our aquifers must be non-negotiable. Once compromised, these natural systems cannot be restored. Alternative B does not represent the “least harm” option — it represents the greatest environmental, agricultural, and fiscal impact at the highest cost. We expect fiscal responsibility from UDOT. A project exceeding a billion dollars demands clear, measurable benefits that outweigh its long-term environmental and community consequences. This proposal does not meet that standard. If the intent of this bypass is to serve regional traffic patterns beyond Heber Valley, then local impacts must not be sacrificed for external convenience. The residents of this community have voiced consistent concern and opposition. We ask that UDOT return to the drawing board and pursue solutions that address safety and traffic flow without causing irreversible harm to our land, water, agricultural heritage, and community character. Respectfully, Bryanna Layer Resident of Wasatch County
605	Candace Henderson	Please reconsider the issues with both options a and b. I know others have commented about moving the south portion a little to prevent the raised portion and I think that would be best as well as not going through the north fields! They truly need to be preserved!!!
559	Candie Bonner	I would prefer the bypass to not cut through the north fields, the last beautiful thing of our Valley as a resident of 47 years. is it possible to put a closer to the existing highway?With that being said, I’m also concerned about the south end by the Walmart intersection, are we able to move that a little intersection. south so we don’t have to have that mess with the walls by first America bank and those homes with a overpass? Thank you for listening Candie Bonner Heber, Utah
574	Carla Tibbitts	Thanks to UDOT for the work done on this issue and analysis of the alternatives developed. Thank you also for the ability to comment on the project. I have several concerns about the project and the proposals and believe a much better solution has not been considered. A key issue impacting the Heber City traffic is the double oil tanker-trucks traveling on US 40. When we travel from Midway to Salt Lake City (entering US 40 at River Road), we consistently count 20-25 double tanker trucks that we pass. This equates to 20-25 double tanker trucks passing through Heber per hour each way, 40-50 trucks total, a major impact on traffic and safety. Consider the solution of allowing the oil companies to construct a pipeline to move the oil and gasoline! This would have many benefits and address issues with traffic and safety not only for Heber City but also

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		beyond it: · Funding would come from the oil companies instead of spending over $700 million of taxpayer funds · Emissions from all these trucks would be ELIMINATED, not just reduced slightly because they can travel faster with a bypass · Environmental impacts from construction activities would be MUCH lower · Business and residential impacts would be minimal · Impacts to farmland would be reduced dramatically, with much less land required and just required monitoring/cut-offs above-ground after construction. · A pipeline would generate a positive economic return to the oil companies by eliminating trucking cost, easily justifying the investment for them · A bypass would still leave the double tankers on US 40 and I-80, potentially more of them with higher bypass speeds. These trucks make the US 40 pass at Jordanelle incredibly dangerous, even in dry conditions. I have witnessed several near-misses, particularly when these trucks pass one another while going uphill at low speeds. Cars cutting over to the left lane in heavy traffic to pass these trucks also cause sudden stops and near-misses (and I'm sure some accidents). The scope of the study should have included addressing safety in this area in addition to Heber City traffic. I know UDOT is in the business of building roads, but please consider a pipeline as a more economic and better solution. Regards, Carla Carla M. Tibbitts XXXXXXXXXXXXX
588	Carol Davis	The Heber Valley fields provide one of the best birding habitats in Utah. In addition, Heber has always been know for its exceptional beauty and serenity. Please leave this amazing area alone. Haven't we done enough to ruin the environment once again for the convenience of a small group of people?
547	Casey Stevens	I am confirming that my comment was received. Below is a copy of my comment submitted on the UDOT website. UDOT Administrators: I would like to submit my comment for the Heber Valley Corridor Project. I have been following the project for some time as a full-time resident of Heber. If I had to choose between the two options currently being proposed by UDOT I would choose Alternative A. Alternative A provides a lower impact to the rural Heber Valley. Everyone I have talked to about the project fears that placing a full-scale freeway project through the North Fields section of the valley is going to be the end of the rural feel of the valley. Myself just like many others, chose this place to live for the rural mountain living. If I wanted to live somewhere with massive freeways and track home sprawl, I would have chosen to live in the Salt Lake Area. If alternative B is chosen, this will be the beginning of the end for the rural feel of Heber. I also attended the meeting at Wasatch High School. Talking with many people in the crowd and listening to the many speakers showed that the alternative B option was strongly disliked. I am also a public employee and it is my job to listen to the public as I work for them just like you. If I heard the opposition from the public like I heard that night of the meeting, there is no way that I could go through with Alternative B. The number of people against it was overwhelming. Unfortunately, I was not able to stay late enough for my turn to speak that is why I am writing the comment. There are several concerns I have over the two options that are presented. The amount of impact on water quality, flow, and groundwater retention in the North Fields if Alternative B is chosen. Alternative B will also destroy the rural feel as you drive into the valley. Instead of beautiful valley views, you will be treated to ugly interstate views. This will also encourage more urban sprawl between the old Hwy 40 and the new bypass if option B is chosen. For both options, I would have liked to see a combination of roundabouts and overcrossing incorporated in the project. One of the previous alternatives included roundabouts exclusively. There was no combination

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		of overcrossing and roundabout options. I think roundabouts in some of the locations, but not all would help keep the rural feel and still provide smooth traffic flow. Neither option provides a max weight for through traffic flow through Main Street. With either option, there needs to be a max weight so heavy long-haul trucks can not drive on Main Street. 20,000 lb max possibly. Choosing Alternative A also provides for future freeway expansion if needed. If it is determined in the future that the section from 900 N to College Way is actually needed, then it can be built. But once that section is built like Option B, it can never be taken back, and the valley will be tarnished for good. Choosing Alternative A provides for this flexibility. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. Please take them seriously, as I feel strongly against Option B. Casey Stevens
369	Catharine Williamson	Hello, Please confirm receipt of this email. Thank You. I am attaching my comment letter regarding the potential US 40 By Pass in Wasatch County, UT near Heber City, UT. It is my hope you will read and give thought to my comments. I am opposed to By Pass B. Kind Regards, Catharine Williamson XXXXXXXX Cell/Text XXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT XXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
445	Catherine Scott	**Subject** Deficiencies in DEIS Related to Aquifer Protection, Design Speed, Alternatives Analysis, and Growth Inducement Dear UDOT Project Team, I am a local resident submitting this comment to identify specific deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement [DEIS) for the proposed bypass project. These concerns relate directly to compliance with **NEPA**, the **Clean Water Act**, and implementing regulations. ### **Aquifer and Groundwater Protection** The DEIS does not demonstrate that impacts to aquifer recharge areas and hydrologically connected wetlands have been adequately avoided or minimized, as required under the **Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C § 1251 et seq.)** and **NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332)**. The analysis lacks sufficient site-specific hydrogeologic data addressing long-term risks from roadway runoff, spills, and maintenance activities. Given the reliance of this community on groundwater, this omission is significant and must be corrected. ### **Design Speed and Wildlife Impacts** The proposed **65 mph design speed** exceeds that of all connecting and nearby roadways and is the highest speed in the surrounding region. The DEIS does not adequately analyze the relationship between design speed and wildlife mortality, nor does it evaluate lower-speed alternatives consistent with the rural and environmental context. Failure to consider reduced design speeds violates NEPA's requirement to rigorously explore reasonable alternatives (**40 CFR § 1502.14**).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		### **Failure to Analyze Existing Infrastructure Alternatives** The DEIS does not provide a meaningful evaluation of alternatives that improve or optimize existing transportation infrastructure, such as targeted roadway improvements, intersection upgrades, or traffic management strategies. NEPA requires consideration of reasonable alternatives, Including those that utilize existing facilities (**40 CFR § 1S02.14(c)**). The cursory treatment of these options is insufficient. ### **Growth-Inducing Impacts and Roadway Classification** The project is proposed as a **Class III facility**, which allows for future access points at approximately half-mile intervals. This classification is inherently growth-inducing. Despite this, the DEIS asserts that the project will not induce growth, without providing analysis to .support that conclusion. NEPA requires disclosure and analysis of indirect and induced growth impacts. Designing a roadway with freeway-level access potential while disclaiming growth effects is internally inconsistent and fails to meet NEPA standards. This inconsistency may also render the DEIS arbitrary and capricious under the **Administrative Procedure Act (S U.S.C. § 706)*** ### **Requested Action** Before advancing the project, the DEIS must: 1. Provide a rigorous analysis of aquifer and groundwater impacts and demonstrate avoidance and minimization 2. Evaluate reduced design speeds consistent with surrounding roadways 3. Fully analyze alternatives utilizing existing infrastructure 4. Disclose and analyze growth-inducing impacts consistent with roadway classification 5. Reconsider roadway classification to align with the stated non-growth purpose of the project Thank you for considering these comments. I request that these deficiencies be addressed in a revised or supplemental EIS. Respectfully, Catherine Scott Midway, UT We also support the letter sent by Wasatch County. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
475	Catherine Scott	To Whom It May Concern: I am a concerned citizen of Midway, Utah. I have attended city council meetings addressing the Heber Valley Corridor going through the North Fields and not addressing the current concern of local traffic. I support the comments sent by the leaders in this community. Please consider them. Thank you, Catherine Scott
70	Cathleen White	I support Alternative A. We have a responsibility to provide an environment for future generations that preserves wetlands as much as possible and minimizes impact on the Heber aquifer. Alternative B does not meet this commitment.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
586	Cathleen White	Dear UDOT: As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It will cause irreparable damage to the water, farmland, and quality of life in Heber Valley. Please consider the following two alternatives: 1: If a bypass must be built, align it next to US 40, not straight through our precious farmlands. 2. Since the purpose of the bypass seems to be primarily for through traffic and not local traffic, please consider building a tunnel under Heber City to carry the through traffic. Many cities and countries have used traffic tunnels with great success. Sincerely, Cathleen White Pear Tree Llamas Midway UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX www.peartreellamas.com
231	Celeste Johnson	To: Craig Hancock, UDOT project manager From: Celeste Johnson, previous Midway Mayor Date: February 12, 2026 RE: Heber Valley Corridor EIS Dear Craig, For nearly my entire 8 years as Mayor of Midway, the bypass has been discussed. Back and forth the discussions went. Over and over we were all told that community input mattered, that studies had to be done and that the best alternative would be presented once all factors were considered. For those of us who understood how important an additional transportation corridor was, and that it had been delayed for too long, we watched with anticipation as the process played out. We encouraged our citizens to be patient and participate at every opportunity. We trusted that the participation would be heard and respected. I was very surprised then when I saw that Option B was selected. The overriding concern for protecting the North Fields and all the water associated with that area, as expressed by the vast majority of those who have been participating from the beginning seems to have been relegated to a minor concern. The concern for wetlands, groundwater, aquifers and farmlands, have been shared by many others and they have sited Utah Code, as well as Federal Policy, so I won't go into all of that here because I know it has already been relayed to you. I just want to say how disappointed I am that Alternative B was chosen. It's more expensive and it dramatically impacts the very things our community was most concerned about. Please read with serious consideration all the letters being sent to you and hopefully we will be pleasantly surprised with an alternative that respects our water and our farmland. Sincerely,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Celeste Johnson (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
473	Charles Ratcliffe	Forever, those of us living on the North Fields have enjoyed utter darkness every night after witnessing the glorious sunset and twilight over the Wasatch. By night, the only sounds have been those of the cattle stirring. That, alone, is why we live where we do. I find it astounding, if not disgusting, that UDOT, Wasatch County and Heber City are now intent on completely spoiling that quality of life in order to "preserve" a few blocks of Main Street in downtown Heber on which no one lives. No one. The idea that this destruction of the last remaining open space in the Valley in some way paves the way for someone's grandiose concept of a pedestrian downtown is laughable. Heber City sold out quaint many decades ago and there is simply no buying that back. The only pedestrian opportunities now are those to walk between one Karl Malone dealership to the next. And, now, there is already a new very large commercial hotel development in the works right on Main Street. Again, not so quaint. Given all of that, I guess I do also have a few pertinent questions. What are your plans for sound and light abatement along this bypass. The tractor-trailer noise alone is going to be window rattling 24 hours a day, but I see 65 mph plans coming into 45 mph intersections right now. I know all too well how the engine brakes are going to sound coming into those. And don't even try to convince me that that will be policed. Through the intersections, lights will be sweeping past every residential property in the Fields all night long. I know that you say that property along the bypass will be preserved. Much of the property along the bypass path has already been deemed preserved via conservation easements and protected open space, so I guess we see how much water that holds with you coming through regardless of that designation. How can you possibly ensure that the North Fields will not soon just become more residential or commercial sprawl? Also, Spring Creek runs right through my back yard. What is the impact going to be on that, specifically, and to the entire wetland upon which this entire route runs? Most of the North Fields are under water in the spring. I am pretty certain that we'll no longer see our ducks, herons, muskrats and sand hill cranes in the very near future. And what is going to be your solution to eventually poisoning the primary recharge are for Heber Valley's aquifer. Once that is gone, it, too, is irrecoverable. Are you not simply discarding generations of ranching in Heber Valley? You should be ashamed. What becomes of the retail businesses in town who completely depend on traffic volume? How do you justify spending what will certainly be at least $1 billion of taxpayer money when all is said and done? Is all of that just to be added to the vast collateral damage of this so-called improvement? And for what? A few minutes of travel time savings. Leave the highway where it is and just fix the traffic flow through town. Hands off the North Fields.
500	Cherie Reed	I am writing you to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative B and choose Route/Alternative A or some other route. I have looked at the impact to our precious North Fields it would cause and think it is a foolish and short sited idea to disturb this land. I would rather see all the traffic go down Main Street than to put a highway through our North Fields. Surely something else could be done. I think many of the big truckers would still use Main Street to stop in for fast food or use the rest room or even make deliveries to the businesses on Main Street. Lets put our heads together and rethink this. Sincerely, Cherie Reed XXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX
550	Cherie Reed	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Sincerely, Cherie Reed Name Cherie Reed Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
211	Cheryl Hardy	I, too, would like to preserve the North Fields, but I think Alternative B is the best long-term solution to the traffic congestion on Main Street.
230	Chris Bender	I am writing to express my concerns about the Proposed Bypass utilizing 1300 South as the preferred route! I am strongly opposed to this plan and stand behind Heber City's recommended Preferred Route detailed in their response attached: Issue 1: 1300 South Elevated Roadway Concern: Heber City would have preferred to see the South Highway 40 leg—planned to run along 1300 South—located further south through the undeveloped area to reduce impacts on residential and commercial properties along 1300 South. Resolution Request: Consider alternate routes to the south of 1300 South running more through the open land used for the HVSSD Sewer Fields. Evaluate whether these routes could reduce impacts to property owners and if they could reduce the cost and expense associated with the long length of raised roadway and underpasses along 1300 South. If an acceptable alternate route can be identified, it may eliminate some of the additional Having read through all of Heber City's recommended changes to the Bypass Plan, I stand behind all of their suggestions! As a homeowner whose property is located in close proximity to the proposed utilization of 1300 S, I am very concerned that my quality of life and value of my home will be severely impacted! I am urging UDOT to re-evaluate what this would mean for those of us living in this area and to move forward with a new plan that mirrors the recommendations spelled out in the letter from Heber City dated 2/3/26: Subject: Heber City Comments on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft EIS Regards, Chris Bender
149	Chris Bodily (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Please reconsider going with option A. These are my reasons: -Route A minimizes the impact to the North Fields, which is very important to those that live in the valley. -Route B affects both North and South Fields which is very bad for the residents. You will get better support from locals if you go with Route A. -Developers along Coyote Lane don't speak for the people. They will encourage UDOT to make decisions that benefit their developments. Don't be swayed by those with deep pockets. -Putting the bypass thru the North Fields benefits people who don't live here. Don't take away something of value to the locals to appease theose outside our county. -A lot of the through traffic from Provo to Park City is construction vehicles. Once we hit a recession, this traffic will drop significantly. We saw this in 2012 and it will happen again. Thank you for your consideration. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
516	Chris Bodily	Dear UDOT Committee, Please accept my comments on the Heber Bypass Project. I recognize that on paper, the numbers suggest that Alternative Route B appears to be the better route to avoid downtown Heber City. However, I think we all know by now that the efficiency of Route B does not reflect the will of the people in the Heber Valley. As one of those that helped gather signatures so that the people of this valley could vote on protecting the North Fields just a few years ago, I don't understand why UDOT would go against the people of this valley who overwhelming voted to keep the North Fields as they are. Alternative Route B does the most destruction to this valley and does not meet the criteria for least destructive. My friend in Park City recently heard a member of the Park City Board of Realtors publicly admit that they (the board) is doing everything they can to keep the traffic challenges and low income housing in Wasatch county so it doesn't destroy the pristine mountain vibe of Park City. Why does Wasatch county have to take the brunt of

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		the labor and growth problems of Park City? I kindly have 3 requests of UDOT in this decision: 1. Please honor the vote of the people here to keep the North Fields as they are and not move forward with Alternative Route B. 2. Please recognize that Alternative Route B is the most destructive path for a bypass route in this valley and does not prioritize the needs of local residents. The EIS does not demonstrate how Alternative B meets the LEPDA requirement. 3. Please consider an alternative bypass route that is a 2-lane surface road that starts at the intersection of 800 North & US-40 and follows a similar route as Alternative Route A heading west but then goes south and follows the powerlines that currently run north/south till you hit 100 South (Midway lane). Align the intersection with existing South Field Road (1140 west). Vehicles traveling between Provo Canyon and Park City would be able to bypass Heber City using some existing surface roads and a new road and only have the one traffic light at the intersection of 100 South and South Field road until they reach the intersection with US-40. This version of the bypass would eliminate traffic from Provo to Park City from Heber City main street and offer significant time savings but because it is a surface road, the impact will be minimal to the value and because is uses existing South Field road, the cost will be a small fraction of what Alternative Routes A or B would cost. Based on these concerns, I urge UDOT to revise the EIS and prioritize alternative routes so that we can protect our farmlands, water reservoirs and character of the Heber Valley.
645	Chris Crittenden	I'm am strongly opposed to a bypass through the North Fields. The North Fields are a key part of what makes this valley so special and why we live here. If the only option is to put something through the North Fields then please do option A. Saving a minute or two of travel time isn't worth the cost to the North Fields. Thank you.
673	Christi Judd	Dear Mr. Hancock and Heber Valley Corridor Project Team, Attached find our Heber DEIS comments. Christi Judd Executive Director Friends of Heber Valley XXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
315	Christen Thompson	Please post this as a public comment: UDOT's proposal to build a four-lane freeway through the North Field is short-sighted, environmentally destructive, and will have lasting negative consequences for Heber Valley and the communities that depend on it. Utah's population is projected to grow from 3.5 million today to 5.6 million by 2065. That growth will require 800,000 new homes and the infrastructure to support them. But simply paving over Utah is not a plan — it is a surrender of imagination at precisely the moment we need bold thinking most. The science is clear: building roads doesn't solve traffic. Study after study confirms that adding highway capacity induces demand. New lanes fill up. Congestion returns. We spend billions and end up exactly where we started — except we've permanently sacrificed farmland, community character, and environmental quality to get there. I have add five peer-reviewed studies documenting this effect at the end of this comment. There is a better way. A single quality rail line can move the equivalent of twelve lanes of freeway traffic. Investment in mass transit — trains, buses, and connected bike infrastructure — produces lasting transportation benefits without the irreversible land costs of freeway expansion. Specifically, I urge UDOT to seriously consider a trench-and-cap alternative. The above-grade freeway proposal carries an estimated price tag of over $800 million. For a comparable investment, we could trench Highway 40 beneath Main Street, cap it, and transform Heber City's downtown in the process. This is not a radical idea — cut-and-cover tunneling has been used successfully in cities around the world, and it works. Here is what that alternative could look like: Using Claude AI with full reasoning mode and sourced cost breakdowns (see attachment), trenching Highway 40 is estimated at $850 million to $1 billion — in the same range as the surface proposal. According to Google Maps, Main Street is approximately 85 feet wide. Reducing it to two lanes frees up roughly 40 feet of width across the full two-mile corridor — nearly 10 acres of prime downtown real estate. That land, made available for two- to three-story mixed-use development, could generate the tax base and land-sale revenue needed to close the funding gap between the surface and trench options. The result would not just be a highway. It would be: A walkable, connected downtown with shops, housing, and gathering spaces

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Desperately needed housing supply in a community facing serious affordability pressure A corridor ready for future rail — the trainbox can be sized now to accommodate a commuter or intercity rail line, avoiding the far greater cost of retrofitting later A lasting asset for Heber City rather than a scar through its heart For further inspiration on what transformative regional transportation can look like, I encourage UDOT and decision-makers to review the Rio Grande Plan (riograndeplansaltlakecity.org) created by concerned citizens and the Wasatch Back Train proposal (wasatchbacktrain.org) created by me. As a rule we should work to stop urban sprawl, concentrate growth in downtown areas and use tax revenue to buy and preserve land with public access for all of us to enjoy and to protect and create clean air and water. Heber Valley deserves a transportation solution that serves the next hundred years — not one that trades its future for a few minutes of commute time today. I urge UDOT to pause, think bigger, and choose the path that builds a better Utah. Studies: The Fundamental Law of Road Congestion (Duranton & Turner, 2011): This comprehensive study found that vehicle kilometers traveled (VKT) increase in direct proportion to the expansion of highways (a 1-to-1 relationship). UC Davis National Center for Sustainable Transportation (2015): Confirmed that for every 1% increase in highway capacity, traffic increases by 0.29% to 1.1% in the long term, driven by more trips, longer trips, and shifts to car travel. Katy Freeway (Houston, TX): Despite being widened to up to 26 lanes at a cost of $2.8 billion, the commute time actually increased by 30-55% within four years, as reported in studies on induced demand. SHIFT (Systemic Hitting of Induced Demand for Transportation) Calculator: A tool frequently used by researchers to show that expanding lane capacity, such as in the Portland I-5 project, increases, rather than decreases, total traffic. Texas A&M Transportation Institute Studies: Data indicates that new lanes are often 40% full of new, induced traffic almost immediately, and 100% full within four years. Claude Cost Estimate Cost Estimate: Trench-and-Cap (Cut-and-Cover Tunnel) US-40 Through Heber City, Utah — 1200 South to 900 North (~2 Miles) What "Trainboxing" Means Here A cut-and-cover (trench-and-cap) operation involves: Excavating a trench along the existing freeway alignment Constructing a reinforced concrete box structure (walls, floor slab, roof slab) Backfilling over the roof and restoring the surface (roads, parks, etc.) Maintaining traffic during construction (phased) This is distinct from a bored tunnel and is the same technique used on Boston's Big Dig surface streets and many urban highway lids. Key Site Conditions (Heber City Specific) These meaningfully affect cost:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Factor Assessment Cost Impact Heber Valley water table High — near Provo River floodplain 🔴 High — major dewatering needed Soil type Alluvial silts/gravels, some clay 🟡 Moderate complexity Seismicity Active Wasatch Fault zone nearby 🔴 Seismic structural premium Elevation (~5,600 ft) Short construction season, frost depth 🟡 Moderate Remoteness No major urban contractor base nearby 🟡 Mobilization premium Existing ROW US-40 already exists — limits but helps 🟢 Saves some land cost Utilities Moderate urban utility conflicts 🟡 Manageable Project Scope Assumptions Length: 2.0 miles (10,560 linear feet)

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Roadway: 4 lanes + shoulders = ~70 ft inside clear width Box cross-section: ~90 ft wide × 22 ft tall (exterior), reinforced concrete Depth of cover: ~5–8 ft of fill over roof slab Interchanges: 2–3 modified at-grade or half-diamond ramps at portals and mid-point (not full buried interchanges) Surface restoration: Local streets + landscaping/trail on top Detailed Cost Breakdown 1. Excavation & Earthwork Cross-section cut: ~90 ft wide × 25 ft deep = 2,250 sq ft Total excavation volume: ~2,250 × 10,560 ft ÷ 27 = ~880,000 cubic yards Dewatering (Provo River proximity, high water table): adds significant cost Haul and disposal of ~880K CY of material Estimate: $55M – $80M 2. Concrete Box Structure (Main Tunnel) This is the single largest cost driver. A 90-ft-wide, double-barrel reinforced concrete box in seismic Zone D with waterproofing: Approximate unit cost: $18,000 – $28,000 per linear foot 10,560 LF × $23,000 avg = ~$243M Estimate: $190M – $295M 3. Portal Structures & Transitions Flared retaining walls, wing walls, drainage headworks at each end 2 portals × ~$8M–12M each Estimate: $16M – $24M 4. Interchange Modifications Entrance/exit ramps must reconnect at portals or via mid-tunnel openings Cut-and-cover interchanges are extremely expensive (requires openings in roof structure, grade separations) 2–3 simplified interchange connections Estimate: $40M – $80M 5. Drainage & Dewatering Systems Permanent sump systems inside tunnel (freeway tunnels need pump stations) Perimeter drainage, waterproofing membrane on roof/walls Construction dewatering given high water table

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Estimate: $20M – $35M 6. Mechanical, Electrical & Ventilation (MEP) Tunnel ventilation (jet fans or transverse), lighting, fire suppression, CCTV, emergency systems — all required by NFPA 502 Estimate: $30M – $50M 7. Utility Relocation Gas, water, sewer, telecom, power — all must be relocated or sleeved Heber City has moderate utility density Estimate: $15M – $25M 8. Surface Restoration on Top of Lid Local street reconstruction, sidewalks, landscaping, potential trail or park lid Estimate: $15M – $30M 9. Traffic Management During Construction Phased construction maintaining 2 lanes each direction at all times — requires temporary detours, signals, barriers over 4–6 year construction window Estimate: $10M – $20M Construction Cost Summary Component Low High Midpoint Excavation & Earthwork $55M $80M $67M Concrete Box Structure $190M $295M $242M Portal Structures $16M

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		$24M $20M Interchange Modifications $40M $80M $60M Drainage & Dewatering $20M $35M $27M MEP / Tunnel Systems $30M $50M $40M Utility Relocation $15M $25M $20M Surface Restoration $15M $30M $22M Traffic Management $10M $20M $15M

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Subtotal Construction $391M $639M $513M Soft Costs & Project Delivery Item Estimate Engineering & Design (12–15%) $47M – $96M Environmental Review (EIS/NEPA) $5M – $15M Geotechnical Investigation $3M – $6M ROW Acquisition (partial, some businesses) $15M – $40M Construction Management (8–10%) $31M – $64M Contingency (25–30% — appropriate for this complexity) $98M – $192M Total Project Cost Estimate Scenario Total Optimistic (simple geotechnics, few changes) ~$590M Most Likely ~$800M – $950M Conservative (high water table complications, seismic upgrades, scope growth) ~$1.1B – $1.3B

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Best single-point estimate: ~$850 million – $1 billion Calibration / Reality Checks Seattle SR-99 Bored Tunnel (1.7 miles, 4 lanes): ~$3.3B total — but bored tunneling is far more expensive than cut-and-cover Boston Big Dig surface-level cut-and-cover sections: ~$150–200M/mile in early 2000s dollars → ~$280–380M/mile in 2025 dollars, but narrower Utah DOT major projects: I-15 through Provo reconstruction was ~$1.8B for a broader scope; UDOT projects typically run 10–20% under coastal equivalents At $800M for 2 miles, that's $400M/mile — which is within the plausible range for a wide-box cut-and-cover in a geologically challenging mountain valley Important Caveats This estimate carries ±30–40% uncertainty at this level of definition. Key unknown risks that could swing the number significantly: Groundwater depth — if the water table is within 10 ft of surface (plausible near Provo River), dewatering and waterproofing costs could add $50–100M Seismic design requirements — a Wasatch Fault proximity study could trigger significant structural upgrades UDOT's interchange configuration requirements — if UDOT requires full grade-separated interchanges within the box, costs balloon dramatically Environmental mitigation — Heber Valley is a scenic corridor with active stakeholders; mitigation could add cost Schedule — a 5–7 year construction window risks significant inflation exposure A full feasibility study and geotechnical investigation would be needed to narrow the range meaningfully. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
139	Christian Heimburger (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hi, I'm Christian. I'm a historian. I've lived here nearly 50 years. Today I want to speak for the North Fields. Heber Valley's biggest asset is not outdoor recreation, tourism, or access to ski resorts, although these are very important parts of our economy. It is the North Fields. Here's how the State of Utah markets Heber Valley to visitors. Quote, "Verdant farmland and towering peaks may remind you of the Swiss Alps, but Heber Valley offers the same alpine beauty right here in the American West. Broad meadows, fresh water lakes, and meandering hillside trails greet travelers in search of more natural comforts. "Visitors, whether day trippers from Salt Lake or tourists from Asia, come here because its represents an ideal that no longer exists for them at home. A postcard place with wide open spaces, clean air, and lost charm." If these spaces are developed, we will most certainly lose that quaintness. For long-time residents, we risk losing something even greater than tourist dollars or aesthetics. We lose a sacred space that has long defined our character. After reading the EIS, I don't think that UDOT fully appreciates how important the North Fields are to the residents of this valley. They aren't just fields to us. They are our Yosemite Valley. They are our Notre Dame. If the bypass bisects the North Fields, it will break up a large swath of idyllic land that has served as a barrier to urban development for generations. Once that taboo is lifted, the flood gates will surely open. Businesses -- especially gas stations, fast food restaurants, and hotels -- will flock to the interchanges. Urban planners and transportation experts describe this phenomenon as axial growth or leapfrog development, which is generally defined as the tendency of a town to expand along primary transportation corridors. By building a bypass in a largely undeveloped area, the state is, unwittingly or not, building a powerful magnet for new development. In time, this will create additional ribbon developments that will fill in the space between the city and the bypass. UDOT stated that they will, quote, "limit any associated development pressures by capping the number of interchanges." Many people have interpreted this to mean that UDOT will proactively prohibit development along the highway, but I see no evidence of this in the EIS. There does not appear to be any legally binding mechanisms in place to ensure this. So such statements are somewhat misleading. I'm not opposed to a bypass. We certainly need thoughtful solutions to mitigate the Valley's congestion, and I applaud UDOT for offering some solutions to this end. But there are good, better, and best solutions, and Alternative B is neither better nor best. In the end, I question whether we are sacrificing expediency for something much, much greater.
693	Christie Moulton	We bought a home just off of 1300 South 8 years ago. We have absolutely loved being in a quieter part of town with a gorgeous view of the mountains and lots of great places to walk. One of the reasons we moved here from Bountiful 8 years ago was for my health. I was not doing well in the polluted air of Bountiful and dreamed of living in a place in Heber where I could walk and breath air away from all kinds of traffic. Right now the proposed plan will put an elevated bypass highway literally two houses down from where we live. It is proposed to go immediately next to our neighborhood playground. This will completely change the way we are able to live our lives. It will severely decrease our home value. It will destroy the peace and beauty that we came here for. Please throw your support behind the city's proposed plans to follow the road past the airport and then cut through the sewage fields. We understand the need for change and growth, but please don't do it at the expense of the many lovely neighborhoods in the area of 1300 S. Thanks for reading
266	Christopher Grange	I live in heber. Its is time we need a bypass. Im all for alternative b. Thank you guys (udot) for all of your hard work on this. I really hope we get to see this built
548	Christopher Homer	I don't think this bypass will actually solve real traffic issues and will cause more problems than it will solve. We're going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, just to get big trucks off main street. But this won't solve congestion as that will continue to grow as the valley population does. This will also ruin some of the natural beauty of the area and that can't be undone ever, once this is completed. It will also increase growth in the valley by creating a new busy street to build businesses and homes on, further progressing the increase in traffic in the valley. I just don't see how this bypass will provide a long term solution to any real issue

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		that we have here in the Heber valley. The only positive thing it will do, is move big trucks off main street. But now it will shift those loud trucks through existing residential neighborhoods and negatively affect people that would have never expected something like this near their homes.
447	Clayton Brown	Dear Heber Valley EIS, I am against this bypass as it will remove our important open lands and destroy the unique beauty of Heber Valley. I have driven through main street, and it is no busier than other roads in Park City or Salt Lake City. I'm concerned this bypass is being created just to help truck traffic and logistics away from Heber Valley rather than providing a benefit to the people who live here in Heber Valley. It destroys our land without providing a benefit to the people here. The benefits of this bypass do not outweigh the cons. I ask that a public referendum is conducted during an election cycle to determine if this bypass should be created. This ensures the voices of Heber Valley are represented, instead of merely heard. Sincerely, Clayton Brown Resident of Midway
426	Cliffe Johnson	Alternative B has my support. This diverts the bypass traffic away from all the new housing in north Heber and away from shopping traffic by the new Smiths. Cliffie Johnson XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
583	Clint Gertsch	Laren Gertsch Formal Comments (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
672	Clint Gertsch	To Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I submitted official comments earlier today via email to this email on behalf of Laren Gertsch. He also sent you an email submitting his comments, however I re-sent them because we added one more attachment to our comments. Will you please confirm that you received these comments and map attachment. I have re-attached the map and comments again for convenience. Thank you, Clint Gertsch (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
441	Colby Holmes	Please see attached. -- Colby Holmes (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
421	Colin Clark	In reviewing the two alternatives I strongly favor Alternative A. It will make the total time a little bit longer, but it prevents the proposed road from running through fragile wetlands and watershed areas north of the city. As a long-time resident of Utah and frequent traveler along that road (I backpakc multiple times a year in the Uinata mountains and travel up from Orem, as well as going to Park city via that same route) I strongly feel Alternative A better promotes the long-term growth and benefits the valley the most.
610	Conner Peterson	Attached are UDAF's comments regarding the Heber Valley Corridor EIS. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
213	Connie Kummer	I would encourage UDOT to seriously consider a railroad alternative for moving product and people. to use rail to transport oil in Uinta Basin to keep it out of the Wasatch Back. It would make the roads safer for the People on HWY 40.
637	Corey Baker	I support Option B for the Heber Valley bypass because it best improves safety, mobility, and long-term transportation planning for the region. Commute times from Heber City to Salt Lake City have increased from about 50 minutes to nearly 1 hour 30 minutes, and many commuters are diverting through Provo Canyon due to congestion. With 20,000–30,000 additional residents expected in Wasatch County, separating regional through-traffic from local traffic is critical. Option B improves regional mobility while preserving Main Street for local access and economic vitality.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
606	Courtney Hoover	Hello, Please see the attached memo from DOI transmitting our comments on the Heber Valley DEIS and Section 4(f). If you have any questions, please reach out. -Courtney Courtney Hoover Regional Environmental Officer, Denver Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance Department of the Interior Regions 5 (Missouri Basin) and 7 (Upper Colorado Basin) XXXXXXXXXX (Cell) XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P.O. Box XXXXX Denver, CO XXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
424	Crystal Wilson	To Whom It May Concern, As a Utah taxpayer, I urge you to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to comply with NEPA, the Clean Water Act (CWA), and the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) standards and is fiscally irresponsible, especially when more cost effective and less damaging alternatives exist. UDOT's preferred Alternative B threatens our water, farmland, clean air, and burdens taxpayers with long-term costs. The EIS omits safer, more affordable options and understates growth and environmental impacts. I demand accountability and true stewardship. While there are several impacts I find to be concerning, the items below resonate with me the most. Design Concerns: The 65 mph design speed requires wider lanes, larger footprint, more noise, and increases wildlife and livestock mortality. Elevated structures increase costs, maintenance, noise, and reduce property values. Air Quality and Climate Impacts Ignored: The EIS does not evaluate air quality or climate impacts, despite federal requirements to assess emissions and long-term environmental degradation. Again, I strongly encourage you to remove Alternative B as the damages caused can never be undone. Sincerely,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Crystal Wilson
678	Curt Clyde	Highway 40 bypass I am writing with some concerns with the bypass option b that is being proposed on highway 40. I have 4 concerns I would like to address. 1. How far west option B is being proposed. The current proposal has the bypass going through one of the only agricultural lands not being developed in Heber valley. The current proposal has no options for the ranchers to move livestock and equipment between fields. We have property that would be on both sides of the proposed road. Nothing has been discussed on how to move livestock and equipment between fields. 2. Water table. As everyone knows, the high-water table in the north fields. Building a major highway through the north fields would affect the water in many ways. As a 6-generation rancher in the north fields we have worked on the land for many years. If I dig a post hole 18” deep within minutes, it is full of water. I am no expert on water aquifers, but common sense says a major highway would affect the ground water drastically. 3. Wet land mitigation. The current proposal states that up to 15 acres to be mitigated to wetlands. The beauty of the north fields as you come into the valley is one of the most beautiful in the world. This will change dramatically if it turns into wet land. The farmers and ranchers keep the property green and beautiful in the summer. If turned into wetlands it becomes an overgrown eyesore. Currently a property owned by the state next to the Back 40 is a perfect example of what it would become. By mitigating up to 15 acres this become a land grab by the state. 4. Cost of construction on the current bypass b proposal. The current estimate has no access for the landowners. Aligning the road closer to highway 40 would save taxpayers money. I plead with UDOT, Heber City and Wasatch County to come up with a better solution. As a citizen of the valley I appreciate and understand the importance of finding a solution to a problem that has been created by so many people wanting to move to this beautiful valley. I do ask the question why the bypass could not be moved closer to highway 40? By moving the road closer to 40 and bypassing north or south of the Back 40, I believe the impact would be less invasive. I also believe the cost would be significantly less for the taxpayers. I understand it affects landowners dramatically no matter which option is chosen. Coming into this valley from the north is one of the most beautiful valleys in the state. Please reconsider the options and come up with a solution that leaves the beautiful scene as you drive into this amazing valley. By moving the road close to highway 40 I believe it becomes a win for everyone involved. Thanks for allowing input on this matter. Sincerely, Curt Clyde
59	Cynthia Donaher	I strongly oppose the development of Plan B and urge both the City and UDOT to halt this project. Plan B would cut across open fields and productive farmlands, damage watershed systems, destroy native vegetation, increase traffic through agricultural areas, and introduce constant noise from large commercial trucks into nearby farms and homes. These impacts are permanent and would fundamentally alter the rural character of our community. Open space is our most valuable asset. Our farmland, wildlife habitat, mountain views, and quiet, peaceful environment define what makes this community special. This land is not vacant or expendable—it supports agriculture, protects environmental health, and contributes directly to our quality of life. Once paved over, it cannot be restored. We question why the City and UDOT would pursue a project that sacrifices open space and farmland in favor of increased traffic and noise. This is not responsible or sustainable planning. True progress protects the resources that matter most and reflects the values of the community it serves. We call on the City and UDOT to stop Plan B, fully evaluate less damaging alternatives, and commit to preserving our open space, farmland, and rural character for current residents and future generations. Let’s keep our community healthy, beautiful, and defined by open land—not highways.
564	Cynthia Neibaur	Sent from my iPhone To the UDOT Review Team, I am submitting this comment to address significant procedural deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) analysis for the proposed bypass. The record does not demonstrate compliance with NEPA’s requirement to rigorously evaluate reasonable alternatives, nor with the Clean Water Act’s mandate to select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). NEPA’s Requirement to Evaluate Reasonable Alternatives Under 40 C.F.R. §1502.14, agencies must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, including those that avoid or minimize environmental harm. Courts consistently describe this section as the “heart of the EIS.” Additionally, 40 C.F.R. §1503.4requires agencies to respond to substantive comments by modifying alternatives, supplementing analyses, or providing a reasoned explanation for declining to do so. The Draft EIS does not meet these standards. Failure to Evaluate Feasible, Less-Damaging Alternatives Submitted by the North Fields Irrigation Company Approximately one year ago, the North Fields Irrigation Companymet with UDOT officials and presented multiple roadway alignments that were: More cost-effective Less damaging to wetlands, canals, and irrigation ditches Protective of all existing homes Operationally compatible with the valley’s irrigation infrastructure This was technical, system-level evidence from the entity responsible for managing the region’s water delivery network. Under NEPA, these alternatives qualify as reasonable and must be evaluated in detail. Yet the Draft EIS contains no acknowledgment, no screening, and no analysis of these alternatives. Eliminating a feasible, less-damaging alternative without explanation is a direct violation of NEPA’s alternatives requirement. Failure to Modify the Boundary to Allow Completion of the NRCS Conservation Easement UDOT was asked to modify the project boundary so that the NRCS could finalize a conservation easement that had been years in development and was ready to close. This easement would permanently protect

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		agricultural land consistent with county preservation plans and public intent. A minor boundary adjustment would have allowed federal funding to proceed. UDOT declined to make this adjustment, effectively blocking the easement. NEPA requires agencies to consider alternatives that avoid or minimize environmental harm, including boundary modifications or design adjustments. The Draft EIS does not analyze this option or explain its exclusion. Reliance on a Speculative Road Network Instead of Existing Conditions The Draft EIS repeatedly justifies Option B by citing “consistency with the North Village road network.” However: The North Village road network does not yet exist Its configuration is not fixed and can be altered at any time The annexation and developer agreement were advanced under terms that financially benefit developers if UDOT selects an alignment through their newly annexed land NEPA requires alternatives to be evaluated based on existing conditions, not speculative future development scenarios. Reliance on a hypothetical road network—while ignoring feasible, less-damaging alternatives already presented—is inconsistent with NEPA’s standards for objectivity and rigor. Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) LEDPA Violations Under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 230, the Corps and the applicant must select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). The LEDPA must: Have the least impact on wetlands and waters of the United States Be practicable in terms of cost, logistics, and technology Be selected even if it is not the applicant’s preferred alternative Option B cannot qualify as the LEDPA for the following reasons: It impacts the greatest acreage of wetlands among the options considered It disrupts the most irrigation infrastructure, including canals and ditches It conflicts with agricultural preservation plans and shallow aquifer recharge zones It performs worse on local traffic efficiency than other feasible alignments It ignores technically supported, less-damaging alternatives submitted by the irrigation company A practicable, less-damaging alternative was presented directly to UDOT—yet it was not evaluated. Under the 404(b)(1) Guidelines, failure to evaluate a feasible, less-damaging alternative is a per se violation of LEDPA requirements. Advancing the Most Damaging and Least Efficient Alignment Despite the availability of less-damaging alternatives, UDOT advanced the alignment that: Impacts the most wetlands Causes the greatest disruption to irrigation systems Blocks a federally funded conservation easement Relies on speculative development roads Provides the least efficient local traffic performance Selecting the most environmentally damaging alternative while failing to evaluate feasible, less-harmful options is incompatible with both NEPA and the Clean Water Act. Conclusion The Draft EIS does not satisfy NEPA’s requirement to rigorously evaluate reasonable alternatives, nor does it meet the Clean Water Act’s LEDPA standard. The omission of the irrigation company’s technically supported alignments, the failure to analyze boundary modifications needed for the NRCS conservation easement, and the reliance on speculative development roads collectively represent a procedural failure that must be corrected. A legally adequate EIS must include a full evaluation of all reasonable, less-damaging alternatives and must demonstrate compliance with the Clean Water Act’s LEDPA requirement. Sincerely,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		A concerned Wasatch County Resident
18	Dallin Quinn	Thank you for all of your hard work trying to determine the best route. I think that your decision to go with route B will be a wonderful thing for our valley. I'm sure you will get lots of negative comments, but I wanted to let you know there are also many and probably more people who are also in favor of your choice, route B going through the Northfields. Sincerely, Dallin Quinn Mountain Crest Property Group BHHS Utah Properties
150	Dan Kennedy (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I moved from overpass all over Calif. and it will not help anyone in Hever/Midway N Fields and the heart and lungs of the the valley. Protecting our air and water quality. Billions will not fix the problem. We need better internal roads. Response time for Hospital. 70% is local traffic. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
282	Dan Scribner	I'm writing in opposition to Alternative B plans that would cut through Heber's north fields. In addition to the community's protective sentiments towards this part of the valley, there are ecological impacts that are not worth the cost of having traffic move through this area to any extent. We must consider the wildlife that relies on these wetlands along with the community's finite resource of water. The north fields are a critical driver of this area's groundwater system (outlined here: https://pubs.usgs.gov/publication/70179036). We want to preserve the north fields at all cost so that they may continue to be a part of our valley for decades to come.
410	Dan Zimmerman	To whom it concerns, I am very much in favor of alternative B as it will provide a much more future proof solution to the Heber City traffic woes. Thank you for your time, Daniel Zimmerman XXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX
658	Dana Graham	I am very concerned about the heber bypass for the following reason. A few years back, there was a study on Heber Main Street and only 3 to 5% were oil tankers. The excuse for the bypass has long-standing been because of the reduction of these tankers on Main Street, but there aren't very many, there aren't that many campers and trailers either I looked at those statistics. I have not seen a current study, but I will say this, it is mostly vehicles such as personal cars. We believe by timing the lights differently that we can get the flow of traffic working better. There's no need to ruin a pristine aquifer over 3% oil tankers. Please do another study on Main Street. You will see that I am correct. While there is a future problem likely but many years down the road the true bypass should be on the east side. There is already one it's called Mill Road. If you take out the houses on each side of that road, you can make it into the four lanes that you so desire for the bypass that you are trying to shove down our throats now. Is it a lot of homes of course it is but the road is already there and that's where you should be putting the bypass where there is no pristine aquifer and open land. It would be cheaper in the long run and you know it. It might not be popular but what you're doing right now is even more unpopular. Just council the whole project until you can find out one that is not ugly with those stupid square concrete slabs. Don't you dare put those and obstruct our views in the fields west of Heber. Use your brain. Also there is a miniature northern owl that likely lives in the fields and it is federally protected. What you are doing is illegal. It needs to change. Someone in Udot needs to have the bravery and morality to fight for our Northfields. Now go do the right thing. Sincerely; Dana Graham
203	Dane Hill	Hello, I'm submitting this on behalf of Anita Hill & Duncan Biddle, who are the property owners of the property identified in this comment. We attended the Heber Valley Corridor open house last week and are submitting this email as a formal public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). According to the Draft EIS, Parcel ID XXXXXXXXXX (XXXXXXXXX, see attached map) is currently identified as a partial acquisition of approximately 0.03 acres. We respectfully ask UDOT to reconsider this

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		designation and evaluate the property for full acquisition. This property is two acres in size. We recently met with the Wasatch County Planning Department, who confirmed in writing that residential agricultural properties are limited to two horses per acre. Based on this guidance, any reduction in acreage below the current parcel size would further restrict the allowable number of horses and materially change the property's permitted use. In addition to the acreage reduction, the proposed roadway alignment places the expanded corridor in very close proximity to the property. Increased traffic volumes, ongoing roadway noise, lighting, and activity would significantly affect the remaining land's suitability for horses. Horses are sensitive to sustained noise and sudden disturbances, and the closer roadway would create ongoing safety and welfare concerns that further limit the practical use of the property. While the amount of land being taken may appear small on paper, the combined effect of reduced acreage and increased roadway impacts is substantial. Together, these changes would significantly diminish the primary use of the property and reduce the functionality and value of the remaining parcel. We also note that the project's impact to this parcel appears similar to, or greater than, other nearby properties currently designated as full acquisitions in the Draft EIS, including Parcel IDs XXXXXXX and XXXXXXXXX. We are concerned about the apparent inconsistency in how these impacts are being categorized and would appreciate clarification regarding the criteria being applied. We believe that a full acquisition more accurately reflects the real-world impact this project would have on this property and would avoid leaving a remainder parcel that can no longer reasonably serve its intended purpose. Thank you for your time and consideration. We are happy to provide the Planning Department's email confirmation or additional information regarding the property's current use if helpful. Sincerely, Dane Hill XXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
623	Dane Hill	Hello, Following the Heber Valley Corridor open house and our previous comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), I would like to ask whether a below-grade crossing (rail underpass) was evaluated as an alternative to an above-grade crossing at this location. If it was studied, could you please direct us to where that analysis appears in the Draft EIS or supporting documents? From a nearby property and community perspective, a below-grade crossing may offer several advantages that could reduce overall project impacts. First, a lowered roadway profile could substantially reduce the visual impact of the crossing. Elevated structures typically require large bridge structures, retaining walls, lighting, and extended approach ramps that can change the character of the surrounding rural landscape. Second, a below-grade design may help limit traffic noise reaching nearby properties. When roadways are elevated, sound tends to travel further across open areas, whereas a lowered roadway can help contain or buffer some of that noise. Third, a lower profile crossing could help preserve the scenic and rural character of the corridor, which is an important feature of the Heber Valley. Finally, from a safety standpoint, elevated roadway structures in mountain valleys can be more susceptible to winter icing and wind exposure. A below-grade crossing may reduce these conditions and improve winter driving reliability compared to an elevated structure. We recognize there are engineering, drainage, and cost considerations involved in evaluating alternatives. However, understanding whether this option was studied, and how it compared to the proposed design, would be helpful for the public as we review the Draft EIS. Thank you for your time and for considering this comment. Dane Hill XXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
40	Daniel and Caryl Moon	UDOT selection of Alternative B, (off US-40) is smart and well considered for your reasons and more. My wife and I both applaud the selection of Alternative B, (off US-40) for reasons beyond those cited by UDOT. 1 - The doubling of N-S traffic by 2050 suggests doubling of the acceleration-deceleration noise of diesel 18 wheelers (we hear it all night long). Tight turns of "A" would make noise unbearable - "B" minimizes it 2 - Tight turns of "A" is likened to the infamous "S" curve of Lake Shore Drive, Chicago in the last century. 31 deaths were at least partially blamed on this. Eventually they smoothed it out to a configuration more akin to "B". 3 - Wendy Fisher was disappointed at the selection of B, so can we consider noise cancelling berms, fences, landscaping or something adjacent NS roadway to placate her somewhat valid interests? 4 - Holy cow!! - what happens to Back 40 Restaurant?! "B" is the best for a calming entry point. Comment from Daniel Moon - XXXXXXXXXXX, Heber City, Utah
72	Daniel Cygrymus	Let me begin by outlining what I personally view as necessary projects that I feel would have much greater positive benefit to the perceived traffic issues in Heber Valley. I travel to and from Park City from our home in east Heber valley every day and often on weekends to both PC area as well as south to Provo. In no specific order: - Frontage/bypass road on the east side of 40, through the new North Village development area from Coyote Lane's light through to River Road, with overpasses onto rt 40 southbound (40 east). There is currently open land along suitable route along that entire length, though not closely to the existing highway in places (but neither would the highway added in option B), not a single business or residence would need to be removed. This is a project that could happen immediately and be vastly less costly. - Cloverleaf at River Road. River road's light has been a bottleneck and regardless of any bypass it is necessary and would alleviate a LOT of the traffic. - Climbing lane up the mountain north from River road. It is a sore subject what a mess udot created for multiple years as it repeatedly tore up the highway, rebuilt the existing bridges, and creating horribly unlevel humps north of Mayflower, while all the while not taking that opportunity to incorporate a climbing lane for the omnipresent semis that are a major source of traffic delays/slowdowns. I cannot express strongly enough the distrust I now have in the decision making done by udot due to the past work done in this valley, and trust even less the influence of the city clearly has over the decision (especially those seated in non elected positions such as the city manager and city planner), which did not plan for a frontage road through all of the developments they approved north of the city which dump directly onto the highway, and then now decry the situation those commuters are faced with. The fact that option A has a frontage road on the WEST side of 40 by NVOZ speaks volumes about the influence developers and their ilk have had in this process. Myself and many others feel like it was a foregone conclusion that the north fields would be paved, and that the only ones who's voices were being listened to were developers and those on the city council that were in league with them. Existing county/city residents like myself appear to have been utterly ignored, as were the campaigns to preserve the north fields and other open spaces in the valley. Formerly requesting that you do not move forward with option B, and if option A is chosen you take my points above in mind. Daniel Cygrymus Heber Valley Resident
253	Daniel Lyman	I've submitted my comments through the website and am confirming receipt with the comments reattached. Respectfully, Daniel Lyman
41	Daniel Moon	UDOT selection of Alternative B, (off US-40) is smart and well considered for your reasons and more. My wife and I both applaud the selection of Alternative B, (off US-40) for reasons beyond those cited by UDOT. 1 - The doubling of N-S traffic by 2050 suggests doubling of the acceleration-deceleration noise of diesel 18 wheelers (we hear it all night long). Tight turns of "A" would make noise unbearable - "B" minimizes it 2 - Tight turns of "A" is likened to the infamous "S" curve of Lake Shore Drive, Chicago in the last century. 31 deaths were at least partially blamed on this. Eventually they smoothed it out to a configuration more akin to "B". 3 - Wendy Fisher (enviro person) was disappointed at the selection of B, so can we consider noise cancelling berms, fences, landscaping or something adjacent NS roadway to placate her somewhat valid interests? 4 - Holy cow!! - What happens to Back 40 Restaurant?! "B" is the best for a calming entry point to the charming, authentic, and historically relevant Back 40. Thanks! Comment from Daniel Moon - XXXXXXXXXXX, Heber City, Utah
630	Daniel Wilkins	Dear UDOT Project Team, I just wanted to send a quick comment supporting Alternative B for the Heber Valley bypass. My family and I drive through Heber pretty often, and getting through Main Street can be really slow depending on the time of day. It feels like a lot of the traffic going through town isn’t actually stopping there, so having a bypass that lets that traffic go around the city makes a lot of sense. Alternative B seems like the best option to me. It would take pressure off Main Street while still keeping good connections through the valley. I also like that the route goes through an area where the views could be really beautiful. Heber Valley is such a scenic place, and a thoughtfully designed road there could actually make the drive through the area even more enjoyable. Mostly, though, it just seems like a good way to keep traffic moving while letting downtown Heber feel more like a town again instead of a highway.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thanks for taking public comments and for the work being done on this project. Sincerely, Daniel Wilkins
341	Danny Edwards	My comment is a question. Some of the land being used for the bypass route that is coming off of South Field rd. Specifically the Special service district farm is land that was condemned for Eminent Domain to be used for the disposal of waste water. In the condemnation laws, is there a requirement that if the land use changes would it revert back to the original owner? What is the plan for this?
31	Darryl Bosshardt	Hello - Thank you for your time and effort on the Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement. This email is just to log my support of Alternative B. Even though this route runs XXXXXXXXX of my home (XXXXXXXXXX), I feel it is the best option for the community. Hopefully when this project comes to fruition, in addition to a walking/biking path along the new section of 1300 South between the new road and my home (like currently runs along the Walmart Road), I would hope a sound wall would also be constructed to provide an additional level of safety and noise pollution abatement. Both of which can have a profound impact on safety, quality of life, and property values (which will all be negatively impacted by the re-route of Hwy 40 adjacent to my home. Thank you. Darryl
209	Dave Campbell	I am writing this email. in total favor of the proposed UDOT preferred plan for the Heber Bypass. This is the best alternative for the issues I see everyday in this area, and very excited to see that this is the plan you are leaning towards constructing. I am anticipating the great improvement this will bring to the valley. Thank you for all of your hard work. Sincerely a Heber Valley resident. David Campbell
45	Dave Curtis	I believe that Option B makes the most sense for the Heber Bypass. I like that no access would be given for the North Fields so it would retain its character and disturbed wetlands would be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio. While the time savings of Option B to A is just one minute, when that is multiplied by the number of vehicles and the number of drives, that is significant in lowering emissions for the valley as well. I REALLY like the idea of having a paved pedestrian bike path as well, that will be a huge addition for the valley. Thanks so much, Dave Curtis
277	Dave Lewis	Thank you for your presentation of information at Wasatch High School, the event was very helpful to view the 2 main options with UDOT representatives available to answer questions. I like Option B for the following reasons; -least impact on Heber -Preserves Heber Main Street -I like the access road at 900 north to Highway 40 -Quickest travel route and least impact on Heber City -I like Option B more than Option A because Option A creates a more heavy highway feel from 900 North northward on Highway 40 Thanks for your consideration!
65	Dave Nelson	To whom it may concern, My Name is David Nelson and I am a resident of Wasatch County. We are also owners of land in Heber City and Wasatch county that will be greatly impacted on both the North and the South of the proposed corridor. I have also been on the public steering committee from its inception I am in agreement with the proposed selection of Option B Even though this option greatly impacts 8 acres of land that we own on the southern end. I am in agreement because of the following reasons. This proposal has the longest lasting benefit to the entire county for the money being spent. Option A would be obsolete in under 10 years This proposal affects the least number of people. Option A would require the moving of 23 homes and businesses and would take out of the county over 20 million of taxable commercial properties. This proposal contrary to some public opinion does more to protect the future of the North Fields than option A. Option A would allow access to the north fields from the frontage roads. This proposal will be widely used by not only thru traffic but also the citizens of Wasatch County This proposal allows for the character of Main Street to once again become a small town gathering area. This proposal does not distract from the current entrance to Heber City where option A would require a huge fly over as you enter the city and also allows for the future commercial area of Heber City to be developed which will add Millions of dollars of tax dollars to the School District, Wasatch County and Heber City. This proposal will enhance and improve greatly the traffic on River Road as well as Midway Lane thus improving county wide access to Deer Creek High School and MTEC. While this will go through a section of the North Fields, because of UDOT's commitment to not allow additional access to this road it will help preserve the land and reduce the need of setting up conservation easements which come at a big cost to the public. For all of these reasons and more I believe that UDOT has prepared and chosen the best option for the corridor. Thank you David Nelson

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
280	Dave Nelson	To whom it may concern, My Name is David Nelson and I am a resident of Wasatch County. We are also owners of land in Heber City and Wasatch county that will be greatly impacted on both the North and the South of the proposed corridor. I have also been on the public steering committee from its inception I am in agreement with the proposed selection of Option B Even though this option greatly impacts 8 acres of land that we own on the southern end. I am in agreement because of the following reasons. 1. This proposal has the longest lasting benefit to the entire county for the money being spent. Option A would be obsolete in under 10 years 2. This proposal affects the least number of people. Option A would require the moving of 23 homes and businesses and would take out of the county over 20 million of taxable commercial properties. 3. This proposal contrary to some public opinion does more to protect the future of the North Fields than option A. Option A would allow access to the north fields from the frontage roads. 4. This proposal will be widely used by not only thru traffic but also the citizens of Wasatch County 5. This proposal allows for the character of Main Street to once again become a small town gathering area. 6. This proposal does not distract from the current entrance to Heber City where option A would require a huge fly over as you enter the city and also allows for the future commercial area of Heber City to be developed which will add Millions of dollars of tax dollars to the School District, Wasatch County and Heber City. 7. This proposal will enhance and improve greatly the traffic on River Road as well as Midway Lane thus improving county wide access to Deer Creek High School and MTEC. 8. While this will go through a section of the North Fields, because of UDOT's commitment to not allow additional access to this road it will help preserve the land and reduce the need of setting up conservation easements which come at a big cost to the public. For all of these reasons and more I believe that UDOT has prepared and chosen the best option for the corridor. I can also add because of my personal involvement on the New London Area of Heber along highway 40 and 900 North that Option A would have destroyed over 30,000 square feet of retail space, all of which is currently under contract and which will bring in annually several millions in tax revenue to the state, county, school district, and city. With the complete proposed project that number even potentially could grow by double. This area of the city is the entrance to the city and having a fly over bypass starting from this area would be financially destructive to future tax revenue to the city, state, and county. If it desired I could give a more complete breakdown of the numbers but previously those were shared with Craig and the UDOT team. Thank you David Nelson Managing Partner - Millstream Properties
551	David and Ann George	David and Ann George March 8, 2026 XXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT 84032 Dear UDOT, Comments on Deficiencies in the UDOT Draft EIS for the Heber Valley Bypass Road I have commented on the UDOT Heber Valley Bypass proposals for several years including on July 19, 2022, at the Public Meeting in Heber (3 min presentation and written copy of my comments) on January 28, 2026, and now as a formal reply to the Draft EIS. We live in Wasatch County at XXXXXXXXXXXXX, just outside of Heber City. The location of the bypass has changed significantly because of poor planning by both Heber City and Wasatch County and new UDOT freeway design criteria. If the UDOT Bypass Road system, either Alternative A or B, is built as proposed it will greatly impact on our property and many others in Heber Valley. Our small farm will be cut in half and likely be rendered uneconomic. UDOT failed to fully investigated all practical options to handle the forecast increased local and pass-through traffic on US-40, including Heber Cities Main Steet. The DEIS has numerous FATAL and MAJOR flaws. The appropriate remedy is for UDOT to withdraw the DEIS and redesign the freeway concept to comply with the many Federal, State and Local requirements and reduce the impact on Heber Valley. This would also allow UDOT to work with the City and County to identify ways to address traffic without resorting to an expensive project that destroys the valley. Attachment 1 is a summary of some of the deficiencies in the DEIS that I was able to

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		identify. There are likely many more. Many of the items are fatal flaws that necessitate redoing the DEIS to make it comply with the NEPA process and many other legal local, State and Federal requirements. I hope that UDOT will understand that the DEIS design has many flaws and oversights that should be remedied before a UDOT can render a final recommendation. Attachment 2 is a proposal for a process to identify an alternative, minimum change traffic design that has potential to address the traffic concerns of the ~70% who drive within Heber and the ~30% who travel through Heber City. This is the option that UDOT should have used as part of its NEPA evaluation. Failure to identify and evaluate this option constitutes a FATAL flaw in the DEIS process and violates NEPA and other legal requirements. I anticipate that the DEIS will face considerable legal challenges. Hopefully these will necessitate that UDOT address the deficiencies in the DEIS and come up with a more practical solution that won't blight the Heber Valley. Kind regards, [David George Signature] David and Ann George Attachments 1 & 2 Note: Transmitted to UDOT prior to the March 9th comment submission deadline by: Web Site link, e-mail and hard copy mail on Sunday, March 8th, 2026 Attachment 1 Deficiencies in the UDOT Draft EIS for the Heber Valley Bypass Summary: This index catalogs 18 specific deficiencies in UDOT's DEIS for the Heber Valley Corridor Project, 14 of these are FATAL (deficiencies of such severity that they invalidate the DEIS conclusions or are likely to be found in violation of federal law), and 3 are classified as MAJOR (omissions or flaws that misrepresent impacts or costs or that fail to support conclusions in the DEIS). In addition, the DEIS uses descriptive language that is incorrect or misleading, which can confuse the reader or promote false or ambiguous conclusions. # Category Deficiency Description Source Reference Severity 1 NEPA Basis UDOT's base design, as required by NEPA, includes the existing streets, roads and traffic controls. UDOT then concludes with no evidence that the existing system is optimized and looks no further. UDOT failed to consider logical improvements to traffic flow such as providing connectivity from the 9th North intersection on US-40 to the existing Southfield Road north terminus at SR-113. This logical improvement and many others have potential to eliminate the need for any freeway-like bypass roads. Remedy: Redo the analysis for a practical base case using current traffic data and updated future data. DEIS Chapter 2 page 2-5 FATAL See attachment 2. 2 NEPA Basis Good Engineering Practice Traffic Model UDOT relied on traffic data from a few Various FATAL days of traffic quantification period in July and August 2019. The technique used, Bluetooth MAC address monitoring, is now obsolete. More advanced techniques allow data collection using cellular phone locations to map the traffic flow over the entire study area and over long

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		time periods. Major changes in commuter habits, post-Covid 19 are well documented, but ignored in the UDOT analysis 3 NEPA Basis Good Engineering Practice UDOT's traffic time modeling did not include any sensitivity analysis to test alternative configurations for local traffic controls. The traffic at 5th North and at Main and Center Street and Main and Midway Lane, characterized as high level failures, should have been evaluated using other traffic light sequences or even prohibiting left turns at some time periods. Eliminating the traffic light on Midway Lane and diverting traffic to Center Various FATAL Street has potential to improve the failure determination. 4 Good Engineering Practice UDOT based traffic transit times on unrealistic and biased speed limits. The 65-mph speed limit on Alternative A and Bis high. This is inconstant with the lower 55 to 60 mph speed limits on the US-189 after the bypasses or on DEIS Ch. 2 2.2.4 FATAL US-40 east of Heber. This results in overstating the time savings for the bypass over the current system and biasing the results. It is not clear if the speed limits assume any impact from high traffic periods. 6 Good Engineering Practice UDOT failed to show or discuss the small transit time improvements that would be achieved during non-peak hours, the bulk of the time. The peak time percentages were not clearly Various MAJOR communicated, which misleads the reader. 7 NEPA Basis UDOT did not provide any engineering definition of critical infrastructure such as overpasses over local roads, irrigation system realignments, livestock corridors, impact of traffic on livestock, etc. This violates NEPA's requirement to study and evaluate the impacts before a decision on the infrastructure is made. (40 C.F.R § 152.16) DEIS Ch 4 FATAL Page 4 8 NEPA Route fails to maximize distance from many farms and homes and fails to provide any quantification if there are any additional costs or savings from an optimized route. This prevents affected landowners from evaluating DEIS Ch5, FATAL functional equivalency. Page 5 9 Traffic Model UDOT traffic modeling was not verified. The use of nested models, models inside of other models, is generally a poor practice for dynamic modeling. UDOT never validated that the model results accurately depicted the current traffic flows. Further, they never used DEIS Ch 2 FATAL equivalent other modeling techniques to confirm modeling validity. 10 Traffic Model UDOT improperly states that their model results 'measure' delays and traffic back-ups. Models do not measure anything. At best models give an indication of a potential result if all the underlying assumptions are valid, which is almost never the case. DEIS Misleading Chap 2 Statement 11 NEPA UDOT misinterprets the Heber City Vision by not referencing the main theme, preservation of the rural, agricultural and scenic valley. They Multiple references Fatal add to deliberate confusion by claiming, incorrectly, that they endeavor to meet the Heber City Vision of "a walkable main street", "promoting non-motorized commuting" and making Main Street safe for pedestrians and bicycles. At no point did UDOT analyze the cost of achieving these mistaken goals or offer a lower cost design that did not achieve their vision of what Heber wants. 12 Cost Estimate UDOT failed to provide anything than a summary level table of the costs for their two chosen options, A and B. UDOT notes that the costs when built may be higher but they fail to comment on the recent history of extreme cost overruns on many transportation projects in the US. UDOT should have provided their basis for project escalation with evidence that the inflation rate is reasonable and appropriate. DEIS CH. 4 Fatal DEIS App. 2E The cost estimate is a Class 5 or conceptual estimate which in normal engineering businesses is a -50% to +100% estimate. There is no evidence that UDOT has applied a suitable engineering contingency to the project costs that they provide. Given the lack of engineering a suitable contingency would be 30% to 50% at this stage. Escalation could increase the cost by another 50%. The total project cost could exceed $1.4 billion. 13 Cost Estimate UDOT has failed to identify the lowest cost option to deal with future traffic. My property is noted to be reduced by 1 /3 or more; there is no reliable design. Since my property is a small farm, it appears impossible to continue hay production to support my horses. This DEIS Ch 5 Fatal should trigger legally mandated 'remainder' damages. The UDOT DEIS provides no details on how the remainder damages were calculated for the cost estimate. The topic was only a place holder with no details. Similarly, since my property may no longer be a viable agricultural enterprise, it may trigger total economic buyouts for my property and others. 14 NEPA UDOT measured the background noise Fatal level near my property and then argued that sound mitigation was not appropriate based on their interpretation of the road noise. This analysis is likely incorrect because my property has unusually low background noise levels, particularly at night. It is almost certain that with a freeway immediately adjacent to my property and only 200 ft from my bedroom, that the noise will be continual and excessive. The application of typical assumptions used to minimize the need for noise mitigation appear to be in violation of the provisions in NEPA. If UDOT selects concrete as the road surface, which they often do, the noise level will be higher than with asphalt. Their use of noise along highway 40 at some unknown time and traffic use is not correct from an engineering point of view. 15 NEPA Environmental contamination. UDOT DEIS App. 3K FATAL proposes to use a median area to allow salt and contaminant water to percolate into a pristine aquifer. They fail to demonstrate that this high salt (chloride) water will not result in groundwater quality exceedance. In fact, exceedance is likely. The impact of chloride and other contaminants on domestic well water adjacent to the proposed route was not

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		discussed and no cost provisions were made for 'zero cost city water' replacement or secondary purification of well water in the event of well contamination. 16 NEPA Salt spray from the freeway will drift onto my property, cause corrosion and contamination of agricultural and residential buildings and potentially reduce crop production. DEIS Ch 3 etc. FATAL Salt spray will also fall onto the new Heber Light and Power and Rocky Mountain Power substation. This will trigger electrical faults from salt buildup and 'flash-over' events. This has already happened on Highway 40 north of Heber. This potential was noted in comments to the City and Power Companies prior to their decision to site the substation on what was formerly agriculture land. Cost to mitigate the salt spray were not included in the estimate. The bypass route is not optimal and needs to be moved further west to avoid the substation. Reduced speed limits will reduce salt spray generation, but this option was never discussed. There are alternatives to chloride based de-icers but UDOT only mentioned these with no binding commitment to use them or define the added cost. 17 Livestock No study of construction noise/vibration and dust impacts on livestock immediately adjacent to the proposed freeway. Loud noise and heavy equipment could make horse DEIS Ch 3 MAJOR riding on properties adjacent to the proposed freeway unsafe, resulting in economic and lifestyle costs. Mitigation of these risks could be expensive, including high barrier walls for isolation. 18 Wetland Data The perc tests to determine wetlands were not conducted during the normal wet season in the spring. Testing during the July-November 2021 and June-November 2022 will undercount wetlands. My property has seen water standing in fields during prolonged wet cycles. Not to mention this possibility or design DEIS App 3N FATAL around it is unacceptable. Attachment 1 A Practical Alternative to the UDOT Proposed Bypass Freeway Designs The topic of this attachment is to request that UDOT initiate a new process to identify an alternative to the two preferred UDOT Bypass option freeways. I believe that these options could be completed quickly and at much lower cost by making minor changes to the roads and streets in Heber City and Wasatch County. This is the base case that UDOT should have evaluated but ignored. The path forward includes the following: Problem Traffic in Heber Valley is projected to grow significantly by 2050 due to the underlying growth in the immediate Heber City area and dramatic growth of new housing and hotels in the north and east end of the valley and east along Highway 40. These growth projections are based on a variety of views from policy study organizations, developers, government associations, select local government entities and internal UDOT views. Many of the new habitations, up to 40% in some areas, are either second homes or short-term rentals with mainly seasonal use (skiing and summer). There is low confidence that the projected traffic volumes destined to go to or through Heber are correct. Traffic surveys used by UDOT to model future traffic patterns were based on a scant 4 days in July and August 2019, before Covid. This is a primitive data acquisition process and has been supplanted by much higher resolution techniques that track cell phone 'addresses' and use AI to analyze the data and produce a real quantification of traffic. Even the UDOT

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		traffic data collection showed that traffic congestion is only a problem in Heber on Main Street and north on US-40 for a short duration (1 hour) at evening rush hour. Basing the entire UDOT design on a short survey 7 years ago is simply not good engineering practice. UDOT, as part of the NEPA EIS process, is required to use as the base case the current traffic design and controls, such as stop lights, cross streets, etc. to mathematically model traffic flow and identify bottlenecks called failed intersections. UDOT has reviewed several alternatives to the bypass freeway but were quick to reject them as impractical or nonfunctional. They considered their evaluation to be comprehensive and sufficient justification to go directly into Freeway building mode. Nothing in the Federal NEPA EIS process prevents UDOT from considering a continuum of traffic improvements to optimize travel through the valley. A detailed review of the UDOT Draft EIS finds there are many fatal flaws and major deficiencies. There are many stakeholders reviewing the EIS and it is likely that this will lead to lengthy and costly legal challenges. Many of these flaws are in violation of Federal Laws governing the preparation of an EIS. Others are more qualified to address the many legal problems that the current DEIS fails to properly address. The UDOT Draft EIS process justified the freeway options by claiming a small commute time improvement and meeting the 'desires' of Heber City's Vision. They failed to understand that the Heber Vision guiding principle is the preservation of the rural setting so unique in the Heber Valley. They misinterpreted the Heber vision as placing huge value on providing a path for mainly oil tank trucks to bypass Main Street, allowing for undefined and likely insignificant non-motorized commuting and making Main Street 'walkable'. These goals, so readily accepted by UDOT, are apparently not fully supported by the local governments and are poorly defined. The cost for the UDOT preferred option, the North Fields Freeway, is $780 million in mid-2025 dollars. The estimate is apparently not yet publicly available (I wrote to UDOT but received no response), but it is likely the estimates are incorrect and low. The fundamental problem is the very limited engineering performed to define the costs. There was no geotechnical testing, roads, bridges and overpasses were factored from other projects, cost for land acquisition is undefined but likely low, and there is no time estimate for consruction. Transportation projects have among the highest potential for significant cost overruns. The Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering (AACE) defines estimates according to the degree of_engineering definition underlying the estimate. The lowest accuracy estimate is a Class 5 estimate, which is defined as having between <1 % to 5% of engineering completed. The accuracy of a Class 5 estimate is -50% to +100%. An appropriate contingency for a Class 5 estimate is between 30% to 50%. Cost escalation for major road projects has been dramatic since 2018, with peaks of 20% in some years. The average escalation over the last 7 years has been reported to be much greater than 5%. Assuming time for legal challenges, project approval and construction suggest a minimum 7-year time frame during which the cost will increase to over$ 1.1 billion. It is entirely possible that the time frame could extend to 10 to 15 years. Applying a 30% contingency for just 7 years raises the cost to over $1.4 billion. The benefit after this huge expenditure is a few minute reduction in the travel time from SR-32 at the far end of Heber Valley to the SR-113 and US-189 intersection near Deer Creek Reservoir but only during the highest traffic periods at rush hour. Most drivers, up to 70%, will be local and not benefit from this minor time savings. UDOT also applied a very highspeed limit, 65 mph, to the freeway. This likely overstates the potential commuter time

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		savings and does nothing for local traffic. The probability of approval for such an expensive project with so few benefits seems unlikely. Alternative - No Freeway Option Given the defects in the UDOT freeway design and evaluation it is recommended that two studies be performed to support a revision of the DEIS. The first deals with characterizing the current traffic flow and patterns, including the anticipated population growth in the NE area of the valley. The second is to re-envision traffic flow within the city by modifying and augmenting local streets so that traffic can move through and within Heber without necessarily having to travel down Main Street. Some specific action items include: 1. Obtain real data on traffic movement. Heber and Wasatch County, in cooperation with UDOT, should engage an independent traffic consulting company to use more modern technology to quantify, not estimate, the actual traffic through Heber over the full seasonal cycle of recreational and commuter use. This can be done easily by analyzing cellular phone locations and movement, without any privacy concerns. If performed properly this can also quantify the traffic from new growth areas and correlate this with the growth in housing and hotels. 2. Determine how traffic flow can be improved. The consulting firm would review non-bypass options to improve traffic. This may require changes in the existing intersections, traffic lights, use of "smart" traffic lights, curtailment of some turning at peak times, etc. 3. Check the UDOT model results. Modeling is an attempt to mathematically understand a system, in this case traffic flow, using many imprecise assumptions. UDOT used two different traffic models that were combined to provide the final assessment. It is entirely possible that UDOT's modeling is delivering erroneous results. An independent model check using more current traffic data would validate or invalidate UDOT results, identify opportunities for improvements and inform local government of the underlying uncertainty in modeling. 4. Improve underutilized surface streets. This is the case that UDOT did not study. Simply stated the goal is to provide pathways for traffic to avoid central Main Street during high congestion periods. It is not to provide an alternative heavy truck route through Heber City. Extend Southfield Road north past SR-113 and connect to the 9th North (Smiths) traffic light. To avoid excessive impact on the residents along Southfield Road, me included, the road would be patterned after the successful River Road design. The road extension would be typical of a surface street, with two lanes and right and left turning lanes as justified. Major intersections would be 'calmed' by using roundabouts. These would be installed at 12th South, 650 South, the Wasatch County Fair Ground, SR-113, Northfield Road (N600 W) and perhaps at another location on the extension north of SR-113. The speed limit would be reduced to 25 mph in residential areas. Roundabouts would discourage heavy truck traffic, and the city could prohibit truck traffic if it became a problem. Access to the new High School and Technical College would be improved. The UDOT plan to effectively cul-de-sac Southfield Road at 12th South and restrict left turns at SR-113 would be eliminated.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		This option can divert a significant amount of automobile traffic off Main Street and directly to US-189 during high traffic periods. Residents may object but they should look at River Road where traffic has been effectively calmed. It may be necessary to install a traffic light-controlled intersection at the intersection of Southfield Road and Highway 189. There would little impact on farms and rural residents living in the small area north and east of Midway Lane to 9th North. Midway Lane, SR-113, is already used as a bypass around Heber's Main Street. UDOT did little to quantify the traffic along that route or project how it could play a role in the future. Traffic tracking needs to be performed at several points along SR-113. This can support modeling of traffic to and through Midway. I do note that UDOT claimed in the Draft EIS that SR-113 was 'approved' to be expanded to 5 lanes ... is this true? I can understand 5 lanes for the short section near the new High School but all the way to Midway seems unwarranted. What problem is that highway expansion seeking to remedy? The mismatch between Center Street and Midway Lane (SR-113), a one block offset, is unfortunate. It might be possible to redesign this area to eliminate one stop light on Main Street. UDOT found that closely spaced stop lights were problematic in their high traffic flow models, but they never offered any remedies. I've seen similar off set intersections in many other cities and they can work fine. There may be other surface street improvements that could provide residents with better options than Main Street travel. I'm less familiar with the streets east of Main Street but this area can probably take some of the traffic load. Remember, about 70% of the traffic in Heber and along US-40 is local traffic. The overall objective is to eliminate the need for a UDOT freeway system to bypass Heber. It will require that all of us accept some additional traffic, but if done correctly, the impact can be minimized. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
344	David E Rabiger	i have been a property owner in Heber and Midway since 2005 and have witnessed the increased traffic congestion in US 40 Main Steet through Heber. However the North Fields are what make Heber area a special place. I could support nearly any variation of Alternative A, but not Alternative B that will cross through the North Fields. In the future, perhaps a narrow service road could be constructed parallel to north side US 40 to accommodate local traffic. The people who reside in Wasatch Country should have a stronger voice in the alternatives since they will endure the traffic congestion.
137	David George (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Thank you very much. I'm David George. I have a small farm on the south fields. Thanks for the time. I want to address just two of the issues that I have identified reviewing the EIS. Let's remember the Main Street is normally not a problem. The focus on UDOT's study over short periods of time when traffic growth combined with no improvements on US-40, Main Street corridors are projecting to cause traffic. First, the bad news. People have talked about the cost -- 760 million for the preferred option. The bad news is it's going to be much more than that. I don't know what UDOT uses for contingencies. I come from a background of major projects. Probably at this stage of development, at least 20 percent. If we apply that on top of that, that's 910 million. But, wait, there's more. We also got escalation, interest, inflation. A major project like this, we've seen year-to-year inflation 20 percent a year in some parts of the U.S. Averages over the last five years have been around 10 percent. UDOT in their project documents have spoken about a seven-year typical cycle to go ahead and seek funding to construction. Legal challenges and delays in funding could extend that time by several years. We could be talking a decade. If we assume the base cost of 912 million, apply 7 percent inflation for seven years, guess what the number is? It's one and a half billion dollars. It's untenable. It means that the funding will be in jeopardy. It will be very difficult to get. Second issue, base case was poorly structured, and alternatives were dismissed too early. UDOT did evaluate many alternatives, but they didn't consider many that should have been obvious. They placed too much value on satisfying the many external demands like the Heber vision, making this walkable. They made bold statements that Main Street was already optimized. This I doubt. I recommend UDOT to spend further work on this project until the city and county can evaluate how to improve traffic flow through Heber at a much lower cost and sooner and without the destruction to the environment and to the citizens. We need an independent traffic engineering firm, preferably from outside the state, to explore alternatives to the current bypass design. We need outside traffic expertise because I don't think our planners have the requisite skill. It isn't all about Main Street either. Other surface roots need to be evaluated that lead traffic off of Main Street. I've already prepared a list of some of these for this purpose. To promote transparency, I recommend we should form a citizens advisory group to work with the government and the consultants. I'd be happy to participate. UDOT would, of course, be resourced to bridge any findings this group may identify with the current bypass design. We need to preserve the character of the valley while adapting to increase traffic. To make this successful as a community, we may have to make changes in some of our longstanding goals.
515	David George	See Attached letter with comments. Please confirm receipt of comments. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
340	David Hallock	To whom it may concern, The following are my specific concerns with the current Heber Valley EIS preferred route. 1. The choice to move the southern end of the Bypass to 1300 South is extremely harmful and completely unnecessary. The following are the issues with that decision. A. It requires building an entirely new route of extreme complexity while ignoring a current roadway that is completely up to standards. This is extremely wasteful. B. It will move the Bypass directly against several neighborhoods causing significant loss of quality of life and loss of value. Over 200 homes will be negatively impacted, not the 30 which has been wrongly stated. C. It will capture traffic within a raised two way roadway at 45 mph surrounded by walls. This will create a closing speed of 90 mph with no escape. This is an extremely dangerous situation. This choice is being made due to the lack of easement along 1300S. This entire situation can be avoided by keeping the roadway on its current path. D. Due to the Bypass being limited access, the southern portion will create a choke point for east-west traffic in the valley. This will impede emergency services from being able to reach the western side of the valley. As the hospital is south central in the valley, ambulances from the West will not be able to quickly reach the hospital when traffic is backed up on the bypass. E. The presence of the Bypass on 1300 south will greatly impact local traffic in the area. This will reduce accessibility to local businesses such as Walmart and will create dangerous situations. F. The drainage ditch along 1300 S. is vital to flood control in the area. To remove or cover that ditch will greatly increase the likelihood of flooding. 2. The intention to reduce lanes of travel and speed on main street will be extremely harmful to residents in the center and on the east side of the valley. This goal is core to the design process. It has been confirmed as the impetus for this process by both UDOT and Heber City. This will increase travel times for the majority of the population of Heber Valley 3. Forcing the majority of the traffic through a single route is extremely harmful. This route will be impacted by accidents. When that happens, there will not be an easily usable alternative. Given the amount of traffic to be pushed on to the Bypass, this will be the norm, not the exception. It makes far more sense to increase the flow on multiple local routes. With that approach, A. Residents are able to move more directly to their homes. B. More local utilization will spread increased traffic across multiple routes and therefore limit any single impact. B. When an accident does happen, traffic will have multiple alternatives. This will lessen the overall impact to traffic. 4. Routing the Bypass through the north fields is harmful and unnecessary. The same movement goals can be achieved by using more efficient intersections on the current path. As a taxpayer, I would like to make the following comments about this entire process. 1. In general, the entire EIS is focused on the wrong goals. It is designed to move trucks off of main street, not improve traffic flow within the valley. This was a goal that was requested of UDOT by the Heber City Council while under heavily unethical influence of a special interest group, a special interest group which will profit from slowing down and removing traffic from main street. As such, UDOT has failed in its obligation to the taxpayer to provide the alternative which is best for the community in general. Any continuing pursuit of this process will be directly against the best interest of the citizens of Heber Valley and therefore will make UDOT subject to litigation. This is a waste of taxpayer's money. 2. The only design feedback being used in this process is predictive computer modeling. This modeling is a third order prediction at best, and could easily be considered a fourth order prediction. Given basic math, the prediction is more likely to be wrong than it is to be correct. Any computer modeling will have a confidence quotient, a measurement of the accuracy of the predition's result. UDOT is refusing to release any of the metrics used in this modeling process including the confidence quotient. This is a massive lack of transparency and again makes UDOT subject to litigation. 3. While this process purports to have a design goal of 2050, it is being extremely short sighted. The primary pain points the EIS is trying to address, the movement of large tanker trucks on main street, will go away due to sheer economics. The oil fields in Duchesne will either move to rail transport, or will shut down. With the movement towards EV's and the discovery of larger, more accessible oilfields elsewhere, it is not fiscally viable for the current operational format to continue. Due to this combination of factors, UDOT has no ethical choice but to abandon the current EIS and start over. We do need a common sense, forward thinking plan to address future traffic flow in the valley, but this is not it.
124	David Monte Nelson (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	My name is David Nelson. I represent myself as well as our company, and we do have property that will be impacted dramatically, no matter what is done but -- adversely. But at the same time -- and because of that, I've been on -- somebody said they've been looking at this for 10 years. I've been on the committee for over 20 years just because our property was going to be affected no matter what happened. I want to thank the people from UDOT for the professional manner in which they have conducted themselves and even when so many roadblocks were put in the way and actually having to do and start the -- the environmental impact study over twice. They have analyzed, I believe, every possible solution to the inevitable. When people talk about a 90-second change, it's not a 90-second change during rush hour. Okay? Right now it takes me 12 to 15 minutes during rush hour with no change, and if you think that a trucker is not going to take a different route simply because of two minutes or three minutes, you're wrong. They're going to take the quicker route because they don't want to have to stop and go, and that will greatly improve our air quality because those truckers starting and stopping create more issues. As I mentioned, we got substantial acreage that is going to be impacted and will be totally consumed in the process. But even besides that, I still believe as -- I've only lived here for 33 years, and by a lot of people, that's still a newcomer to the valley, but I believe what I've seen over time is -- and what the growth -- we're not going to stop the growth. The growth is going to be here. And I believe that over time, this will greatly enhance, especially the traffic that's coming from Denver all the way down to Provo. They will not even go through Main Street. Main Street won't be there again. People talk about that only 70 percent of the traffic -- that 70 percent is local. Well, that's true, but the other 30 percent are four times the size. When a trucker goes through, that's the equivalent of four cars. When a truck and a trailer goes through, that's the equivalent of five cars. So the impact is great. I -- I love the North Fields myself. It is private land. Those guys get to do what they want with it. And we can't stop what they want to do in the future, and I wouldn't want to because, overarching all of this, I believe in the right of personal property. Most of our freedoms that we enjoy in this country reside under personal property rights. Without them, none of the other rights would we have. I believe that UDOT has done a tremendous job, and I believe, long term, the best solution for us is Option B. I would hate to see a flyover bypass or whatever you want to call it -- I'm sorry. My time is up -- right as you enter the city with a wonderful viaduct. That doesn't make sense to me. Thanks.
151	David Robling	Do nothing. Not Cost effective. The disruption is not worth the benefits. Let it Be!!! Do Nothing. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
	(Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	
62	David Sorensen	I am against Option B. It would be very harmful for the wet lands and is not solving the problem. Please do not do this! David Sorensen Sent from my iPhone
326	Deb Stenger	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name Deb Stenger Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX. Heber City, UT XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
549	Deborah Stenger	To whom it may concern and hopefully impact. Please do not pave over the Northfields of Heber Valley. Option B is destruction of one of the most beautiful and environmentally delicate areas of the Heber Valley. Traffic is not unbearable. It is not even a real issue. UDOT needs to understand that the traffic issues could be alleviated If 40 north to park city had a climbing lane - or a more rapid flow rather than stop light at River road. Same thing coming into Heber. 40 as it comes down from Mayflower area would benefit from a more rapid flow for cars / trucks etc going to 32 or Midway area. This is where the bottlenecks occur. Please listen to the HEBER residents / tax paying locals who live here and don’t want the valley floor destroyed all for tankers / tourists. Please consider a change in time tankers can travel through Heber main st. Limit travel for those tankers 10pm - 5am. No engine breaks.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		If New York City paved over Central Park - they could change the traffic congestion. But they don't!!! Because they don't want to pave over the last jewel that they have. We shouldn't either. Please think outside the box. Deborah Stenger XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Sent from my mini secretary, iPhone XXXXXXXXXXXXX
546	Deborah Van Leeuwen	I support the proposal of roundabouts presented by Lythgoe Design Group. I recommend that no bypass adversely impacts the north fields.
629	Debra Lynn Whiting	Please slow traffic on Main Street to 25 MPH and add lights. The bypass at this point is foolish to cost what it does to cut a few minutes off of a drive and will destroy the reason people come to Heber. We will be like every other city at that point. Please do not destroy the North Fields with a bypass! This is toxic to the groundwater, aquifers, etc. At a minimum, route a is better than b.
504	Debra Magdalene	Hello, Please seriously consider Lythgoe Design Group's proposal for a more beautiful transition to plan A for the Heber City ByPass. https://www.lythgoedesign.com/post/roundabouts-in-the-heber-valley-corridor-bypass-project Thank you! Debra Magdalene 13 year resident of Heber City
135	Dennis Van Leeuwen (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Good evening. I'm Dennis Van Leeuwen. I can't tell you how many of these meetings I've been in over years and years and years. There are others in this room here that have been in these types of meetings for decades, and in all of those meetings, what I hear is the same thing that we're hearing tonight -- that this community understands that there are issues, but you don't solve them by destroying the very fabric of the community. UDOT, I understand you have a job to do. Your burden of proof and the background to where -- the reason that you've gotten to this decision -- you haven't met that. There are other people that speak far more eloquently to the individual items that have not been addressed -- the ag protection zones, the water table. We can go on and on. The Olympics? I'm sorry. That's not an excuse. We had the Olympics. They're going to bus people in anyway. They're not going to drive them up to the front door in their individual cars. Personally, what has upset me about all of this after sitting in this meeting is UDOT seems to think since they work for the state, they can do whatever they want. This is our community. We've built this town. The ranchers have built it. We go back to Ulysses Grant. This is our community. We are the people, and what upsets me is it doesn't matter what any of you say. If you think the comments tonight are going to change UDOT's mind, you're mistaken. They're going to do whatever the -- they want. That's just the way it is because they know better. And what I am asking is -- this is our community. Find a different way. Every time these pictures come out, they get worse and worse and worse. I notice that there's not a picture going from Potter Lane to 12th tonight, but it's -- it's over there somewhere; right? It's over there somewhere. You can draw that picture and show everybody where that is. And then putting up 25-foot walls? This isn't Layton. This isn't Centerville. This isn't the spaghetti bowl up at Lagoon, but that's what they want to turn this into, and it cannot happen. There are other ways to do it. I think going from Potter Lane to 12th North was straight up lazy. That could have been shifted up onto the bench like Laren was saying instead of cutting the thing 25 percent into the east-west alignment of the North Fields. It's lazy. I know you have a job to do. You haven't done it in my opinion. Try harder.
530	Dennis Van Leeuwen	My name is Dennis Van Leeuwen. I am a landowner in the North Fields and Share Holder in the North Fields Irrigation Company. I am against Alternative B. I believe UDOT's EIS is an incredibly flawed, inaccurate, and biased analysis of the different options for the bi-pass road. UDOT's report and conclusions are clearly an attempt to override years of Heber City planning, Wasatch Counties Resolutions, the North Fields Irrigation Company, Conservation Easement, Agriculture Protection Areas and the Communities overwhelming voice against Alternative B. The EIS is a case study in governmental overreach, arrogance, and the deliberate advancement of a pre-determined decision which ignores the criteria which governs UDOT's selection. I refer you to, and fully support, the written comments as provided by Laren Guertch, Wasatch County, Then North Fields Irrigation Company, Friends of Heber Valley and Dan Simmons. These documents are replete with detailed analysis of the deeply flawed process and conclusions of UDOT. A simple reading these arguments against Alternative B brings one to the conclusion that UDOT has not demonstrated in any way, that the requirements to make such a determination, have been met or can honestly be defended. One is hard pressed to have any confidence in the competency of UDOT given the lack of compliance and disregard of their own data. As enumerated and demonstrated, the EIS significantly fails in both it's due diligence, practical application of Local, State and Federal requirements, directly ignores the Heber City's Open Lands vision statements, and ignores critical issues such as elimination of generational ranching and farming, land values, irrigation water, damage to our pristine aquifer, and the quality of life that we'll be irreparable lost in the Heber Valley. At best, UDOT has done a poor job in presenting a fully compliant EIS that addresses critical elements which will have permanent impacts to the Heber Valley. At worst, I believe the EIS demonstrates a dishonest

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		assessment of the impacts of Alternative B and aligns UDOT with those who would annex and develop the North Fields. I would ask that UDOT go back the drawing board and recognize that there are several other much more viable options available that have significantly less impact on the North Field that the community can and will support. Initial alternative options have now been presented in which the alignment of the bi-pass road would shift to the east, more closely paralleling US-40 thus solving and mitigating many of the critical issues and concerns that are inherent in Alternative B. Dennis Van Leeuwen
375	Dian Monson	I believe that Alternative A is a better choice for Heber and for the environment.
491	Diane C.	Alternative A is the only responsible option. The impact on fragile wetlands, groundwater, etc. cannot be repaired. Please listen to the community and discard Alternative B.
607	Diego Vazquez	To whom it may concern: While I am concerned of the development, traffic, and environmental repercussions of a major highway cutting down the middle of the north fields, I'm most concerned what this mean for my family and I. My Father in Law runs and lives at XXXXXXXXXXX, while my wife and I are the owners and operators of XXXXXXXXXXXX. Together we employee around 10 people and service between 20-50 people any given day. The installation of the traffic light in front of the new smiths, the turning lane and the narrowing of the west shoulder has incredibly hindered the accessibility of our farm for our customers, employees and for my in-laws who live on property. With either option, I'm very concerned what it will mean for XXXXXXXXXXXX. This farm has been here since the 80's, and it has felt as though there has not been any consideration for us with any of the recent decisions or suggestions made. Please ask that you consider us, life long Heber Valley residents and business owners. Our lively hoods depend on it. -Diego Vazquez Avila
51	Don (No Last Name)	The state has done a great Job, lets go with option B
366	Don Taylor	Alt A makes much more sense from an active transportation perspective. If you are looking to reduce automobile traffic by getting people to walk or ride bikes the people are in the north village and they will want to travel along Highway 40 into Heber in the most direct route.
152	Donna Kuzmiski (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Heber has always been a beautiful, quiet Wasatch back community. Although I understand progress, it reaches a point when you have destroyed the reason people wanted to live here. Freeways DO NOT belong in this beautiful valley. It would destroy our wetlands, wildlife, air and quality of ourdoor activities currently the love of beautiful Heber Valley. Progress should be well through out without losing site of the people that made this community the beautiful place it is. Overdevelopment has destroyed many communities, please don't put Heber on that list. All we here about is water conservation, yet development after development continues to get approved. We need a moratorium on building and development in this valley now. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
61	Doug	My wife and I own a home at XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Heber, Utah, and we strongly support Alternative B. Doug
407	Douglas Thompson	B is better
193	Dr. William L Marble	I support the Heber Valley Bypass Preferred Option B. No solution can be perfect. It appears to me to be the only viable option, and further delay makes the many transportation issues worse. Main Street in Heber cannot continue to bear the traffic load. The analysis of the potential impacts and proposed mitigation seem reasonable to me.
462	Dustin Grabau - Wasatch	Please find attached an official public comment for Wasatch County Dustin Grabau County Manager XXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		www.wasatch.utah.gov (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
368	Dwight Hansen	To Whom It May Concern, I feel strongly about NOT adopting "Alternative B" for the bypass road in Heber Valley. It destroys the beauty and functionality of the North Fields, which are a beautiful and highly valued part of the culture and history of Heber Valley. Alternate A would take up much less of the North Fields and not be near as destructive of this treasured part of our valley. In addition, Alternative B destroys 53.9 acres of wetlands vs. 22.5 acres under Alternative A. Also, the price tag of over $1 billion dollars for Alternative B is CRAZY, when Alternative A is not only a better choice for the above reasons, but its cost is at least $48.6 million less than Alternative B. The potential damage to the water system is super important to consider as well---All of this to save minutes in travel time? The consequences are irreversible once this is done. I strongly oppose Alternate B. Dwight Hansen Heber City Resident
196	Eddie Garcia	PLEASE, just start AS SOON AS POSSIBLE!!! 😊 Whichever route UDOT feels is in our best interest, we support you! Eddie & Tracie Eddie & Tracie Garcia XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX
508	Edward Piepmeyer	I support option B
692	Edwin Figueroa	Why spend tens of millions of dollars of taxpayer money to build an elevated highway in the backyards of residential neighborhoods when UDOT can save us money by using the existing highway that is already there, US-189, and has the capacity to do the job? If runway expansion of a REGIONAL airport that most of the residents of the Valley don't use is not in the plans, as it was stated to me personally by multiple UDOT representatives- unless they lied to my face, THERE IS NOTHING STOPPING UDOT FROM USING US-189 AS THE CONNECTION POINT OVER A MONSTROSITY OF AN ELEVATED HIGHWAY WHICH IS A LACK OF FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY OF TAX PAYER MONEY by UDOT & ELECTED OFFICIALS THAT ARE LETTING THIS HAPPEN! The Heber Valley Airport has local roads relatively near the runway but outside the protected FAA zones, i.e. US-189. The FAA does not set a specific parallel highway distance, so using US-189 would be the logical choice to create this hated by-pass and: 1. Save taxpayers money 2. Stop the disruption of the quality of life for the homes that will have that elevated monstrosity in their backyards. 3. Keep our Valley as one versus the proposed splitting in half. UDOT should care more about the Valley residents that will have to live with these abysmal plans vs saving the oil tankers a couple of minutes to cross Heber City- this was also stated to me by UDOT representatives as being one of the reasons to build the by-pass. Yet we the residents are losing our quality of life, our beautiful North Fields- I dare you to find a prettier or even more grandeur of an entrance into a Valley than the one we currently have. DONT MESS WITH THE FIELDS! (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
397	Eileen Hilton	While I don't live in Heber Valley, I live in Orem and have driven the impacted stretch of Hwy 40 many, many times. I support Alternative A. The northern valley is beautiful and leaving it alone for that reason, the aesthetic enjoyment of all, is reason enough. But beyond that the degradation to the environment and the watershed are additional critical reasons to avoid a highway through the area. So much development has happened; it's important we fight to maintain whatever green spaces we can. There are far more important things impacting quality of life than shaving minutes off a commute.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Eileen Hilton XXXXXXXXXX
236	Eleanor Hancock	Hello! I just posted a comment on the draft EIS. Could you confirm my receipt? This is what it was. Dear Ms. Kisten, I recently reviewed the draft EIS for the proposed Heber Valley Corridor project. I am grateful that you all are actively seeking to alleviate Utah's traffic problem, as well as incorporating greater non-motorized and walkable routes. All in all, I agree with option B being the most appropriate choice when faced with both alternatives and the no-action plan. There was one portion of the EIS that I have a few concerns about. In section 3.14.3.3.1, on page 321 of the PDF, it only briefly discusses the issue of wildlife-car impacts. With the fact included in the table that 166 carcasses (mostly mule deer) were picked up on that highway over the last seven years, it seems that this is an established issue. I am concerned that with the new highway development in a more rural area (one that probably has an even greater animal population) that number will only grow. I do not see any mitigation recommendations for such a problem included --- perhaps you may consider adjusting the plans to include an animal over or underpass? As you are seeking to have a minimal effect on the environment, although these animals may not be endangered I believe it is still important to consider their lives (not to mention potential damage to the cars that collide with them.) As you said, no migration lines go through it, but animals may still exist there, especially in such a rural area. Thank you for your consideration! Eleanor Hancock
38	Elizabeth Charles	Dear Mayor and City Council Members, I am writing to express my support for Option B for the Heber City bypass. I regularly travel from Heber Valley to Salt Lake City for work at the VA Hospital, and I have growing concerns about increasing congestion along this route as new development continues. Without a bypass that meaningfully diverts through-traffic, much of that additional volume will continue to funnel through existing roads, worsening delays and safety issues for residents and commuters alike. Option B appears to best balance the need to improve traffic flow and safety while minimizing long-term impacts to our community. It helps relieve pressure on current corridors, preserves the character of Heber Valley, and avoids unnecessary disruption to established neighborhoods and agricultural land. As our city grows, proactive infrastructure decisions are essential. Option B represents a thoughtful, forward-looking solution that addresses congestion now while protecting Heber’s quality of life for the future. Thank you for your time, careful consideration, and commitment to incorporating public input. Respectfully, Liz Charles XXXXXXXXX Heber
615	Elizabeth Crittenden	To Whom It May Concern, I am very uncomfortable with the proposed freeway as a taxpayer and as a resident of Wasatch County. My primary concerns are these: 1. The proposed plan will not solve the traffic problem in the long run. I've observed that during spring and fall break when many residents are out of town, the traffic on main street is dramatically lighter. This indicates that perhaps the bigger concern is improving the street design within the city, as of now there are few collector roads to move across town. 2. High Cost of the project If removing the oil trucks from Main Street is the primary concern, (one I support), then perhaps exploring other truck-route options would be more cost effective for taxpayers, even if they take a bit longer for the truck drivers. I think as a state we should push that cost and burden to the oil companies. I would support a rail option to transport oil from the basin area to refineries. 3. It is an overbuilt proposal that violates our community values and what sets this valley apart from the Wasatch Front. This could cause long term harm to our tourism economy and property values. Prioritizes time over beauty, convenience over preserving the pristin, unspoiled serenity of the north fields and Provo River Corridor Our local economy relies heavily on tourism. I've met people from across the world who come to fly fish along the middle Provo River, or from across the country who spend part of their ski vacation at our shops and restaurants. I often hear visitors and residents describe the calm they feel as they descend into the valley from above Jordanelle. Option B will horribly disrupt that peaceful feeling, and option A is not much better.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Residents who live here are more distant from airports, retails, and other services because we prioritize pastoral beauty over convenience. Our rising property values indicate that this is highly valued by many more. Please Consider the Following Alternatives: If an uninterrupted bypass is deemed indispensable (which I do not think it is), then consider using a simple two lane highway, similar to roads through national parks. PLEASE - do not permit overpasses that interrupt panoramic views. Rather, take intersecting roads underneath so as to minimize the visual impact of the road. Thank you for your consideration. Elizabeth Crittenden
552	Emily Armstrong	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Emily Armstrong Name Emily Armstrong Address XXXXXXXXXX Orem, Ut XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
405	Emily Rodriguez	Sent from my iPhone (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
487	Emily Rodriguez	Sent from my iPhone (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
402	Emma McAdam	Please go with alternative A, it has a much more environmental approach, thank you.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
662	Eric Bachmann	Cancel this project... cancel Plan A, Plan B and every other plan... abort this highway bypass project! As a resident of the Heber Valley and specifically, Midway, I do not want any changes to the current road system and configuration. The time for a thoughtful solution to Heber City downtown vibe has passed. The lack of vision 20 years ago and the inept of city planners, UDOT and politicians has exponentially exacerbated the minor density of Main Street Herber City. No one cares about a nice Heber city downtown... instead we all just want to live in a modestly rural area without a ridiculous major highway infrastructure that is going to be an eyesore, noise pollution and an absolute embarrassment. Closed minded and corrupt politicians, government agencies like UDOT, local landowners and businesspeople have caused this issue... just let it be... cancel all plans for a highway bypass.
293	Eric Bunker	Greetings, I support the option B because of the potential to fix, to the best possible outcome of the choices presented. I think the data shown is complete and shows the option as the best case scenario. The population increase has preceded the need for the road, as the current roadways are in failure mode with conditions not previously seen or even conceived of in this valley. As Heber City continues to allow high density housing the need compounds. It is now just as fast to go to Orem, as to go to Smiths from Daniel. The export of taxes and sales is affecting the funding base in the valley and will impact repair capabilities for municipalities in Wasatch County.(crisis) We hear taxes are very burdensome from the residents and I think it will get more impactful without the bypass/ alternative route, to rectify export of local revenues. Do not forget, the County has implemented a corridor transportation fee residents have been paying into for years, to accommodate this endeavor. Please proceed with all speed, to secure funding and construction activities. Thank you and Still talking about it thirty five years later, Eric Bunker Daniel
176	Eric George Gingras	Hi UDOT Project Team Great job last night! Your multiple year research, rationale for Alternative B and your presentation to why were all spot on. I am sorry that a very vocal minority does not happen to understand your vision. I believe that they are focusing on a single issue (North Fields) and were going to use any information they could create to discredit your work. Listed below are the primary facts as I know them to support Alternative B 1. The flow of traffic and reduced back up will be far superior to Alternative A. This will reduce time and reduce the amount of automobile idling related to a back up. Everyone seems to discuss their concern for water quality but what about air quality? The Heber Valley could easily be turned into an "Inversion Bowl" just like SLC 2. Alternative B will support the development of Heber Downtown in a far superior manner 3. The Alternative B Bypass is going through a very small corner of the North Fields. The large majority of this region will stay intact 4. The Heber Valley will be a bridge or "pinch point" between Park City/Deer Valley/Jordanelle expansion on one side and Provo/Orem/Sundance on the other side. Improving flow through is critical to this Valley's Future 5. The Alternative A proponents say the mitigation will not work. Is their any real facts to back up this claim? 6. Alternative B saves more homes and businesses - this human concern needs to be taken into consideration 7. Alternative B creates a much more vibrant Heber Main Street - this is in everyones interest In closing - Alternative B allows us to honor our past while building a functional future. Please stick to your original recommendation of Alternative B - and don't allow a small, very vocal, one dimensional minority sway your team from doing what is correct. Thanks - Eric Gingras / 15 Year Citizen - XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX
153	Eric Gingras	UDOT Comment: Support for Alternative B Eric Gringas | 15-Year Resident | Real Estate Professional THE FACTS -Regional Growth: We are the bridge between Park City, Jordanelle, Deer Valley and Sundance, Provo/Orem. That growth is real, and we need to manage it responsibly. -Saving Neighbors: Alternative A forces us to remove local homes and businesses. Alternative B preserves our community's core. -Traffic Reality: Industrial trucks and weekend travelers are increasing. They need a dedicated route around us, not through our neghborhoods. -The Data: Alternative B is simply the beyyer long-term solution for traffic flow and reduced congestion. THE FUTURE -Engineering Confidence: Concderns about water mitigation are valid, but they are solveable engineering challenges, not deal-breakers. -Our Identity: We are evolving from strictly agricultural to a premier Resort Community. Our infrastructure needs to match that new reality. -Vibrant Main Street: To have the walkable, thriving downtown we all want, we must move the heavy traffic to the bypass (Alt B). Closing: "Alternative B allows us to honor our past while building a functional future. Thank you." (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
33	Eric Johnson	I submitted the attached comment on-line. Thank you, Eric Johnson Amphibian Refuge (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
621	Eric Sorenson	See attached Comment Letter from the Provo River Watershed Council (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
689	Erik Rowland	Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments regarding the Heber Valley Draft EIS. On behalf of the Wasatch County Council, the Midway City Council, members of the Heber City Council, Charleston Mayor, Utah State Representatives Mike Kohler and Utah State Senator Ronald Winterton, we submit these comments in the attached PDF in a spirit of collaboration and and constructive dialogue. Sincerely, Erik Rowland - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Karl McMillan - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Mark Nelson - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Colleen Bonner - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Spencer Park - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Luke Searle - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Kendall Crittenden - Wasatch County Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Craig Simons - Midway City Mayor (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Kevin Payne - Midway City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Lisa Orme - Midway City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Andy Garland - Midway City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) JC Simonsen - Midway City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Andrew Osborne - Midway City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Heidi Franco - Heber City Mayor (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Aaron Cheatwood - Heber City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Morgan Murdock - Heber City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Yvonne Barney - Heber City Council (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Ronald Winterton - Utah State Senator (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Mike Kohler - Utah State Representative (XXXXXXXXXXXX) Doug Clements - Charleston Mayor (XXXXXXXXXXXX) (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
367	Erin (No Last Name)	Please stop building. Preserve the land. That's what makes Heber so beautiful is the land. Not the buildings. Don't be a part of the problem. Keep the country country
553	Eugene Cook	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Eugene Cook Name Eugene Cook Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, Utah XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
57	Fatima Doman	Please confirm you received my submitted comment on the proposed bypass thru the UDOT Heber Valley Environmental Impact Study: I am opposed to any bypass that goes though Midway. We need to protect the fragile ecosystems in Midway, and the unique history that Midway holds. Countless people enjoy visiting Midway for the scenic beauty, open space, quiet and peace. We cannot allow beautiful Midway to be overtaken by loud freeways and urban sprawl. We must protect Midway for future generations of visitors.
364	Fontaine McFadden	I am very concerned about the possibility of developing the Alternative B design for the bypass and how it will impact available farm and ranch lands as well as water supply. I support Alternative A whole heartedly and stand behind the North Field Irrigation Company and the 99 deficiencies they cited about the project.
272	G Baird	we're just wondering if it really matters that the majority of the people in heber valley don't want this big new road/highway/development/air pollution? is it going to get done anyway? against what the great majority wants? signed, the baird family of heber valley
218	G Cook	My preferred Bypass route is no bypass at all. The cost and and negative environmental impact on the North Fields is not worth reducing traffic for a few downtown city blocks. The downtown Heber City traffic congestion is only a few blocks long. It does not go on for miles. Driving on the bypass will only save a few minutes driving time. Constructing the bypass will be the beginning of the end for the North Fields. It will just be a matter of time until more construction and development clutter the North Fields no matter what the present agreement is guaranteeing limited development. My opinion is no bypass is better and way more cost effective than any constructed Heber Bypass. G Cook
121	Gary Kofinas	First, I'm writing to inform you that the Hebrews the EIS system is not allowing us to submit our comments. When pushing the submit button, nothing happens. I understand that others are also having this problem. Below are my brief, but important comments on the EIS: I'm writing to express my serious concern for alternatives A& B. My study of this issue leads me to conclude that these alternatives will have serious, environmental, social, and economic impacts. I strongly recommend that you consider other alternatives. Please let me know if you need additional comments for me. Gary Kofinas
415	Gayle Lockwood	I am emailing to confirm receipt of the following comment online. Hello. My comment is that research has been done that shows that Alternative A could have a potentially harmful and disruptive impact on many acres of Heber Valley's North Fields and wetlands as well as affecting the water supply to both Heber Valley and Utah Valley. It appears that Alternative B would be less likely to cause environmental disruption. I cast a vote for ALTERNATIVE B. Thanks, Gayle Lockwood
327	Gaylyn Latimer	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name Gaylyn Latimer Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX. Heber City, UT XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
420	Gaylyn Latimer	To EIS March 4, 2026 I am a resident of Heber Valley. I understand the importance of reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor Project. After reviewing the DEIS, here are my questions, comments and input. In reference to Alternative B in the North Fields, have UDOT and DEIS calculated... 1. The cost of replacing soil quality, water quality and water rights? 2. All the disruptions to the existing agricultural operations? 3. The cost of replacing the farmland with similar quality soils, water quality and water rights? 4. How will Alternative B create irreparable harm to the Agricultural Protection Area? 5. How groundwater movement with pollutants will reach the Provo River, private wells and city wells? 6. The sites that UDOT looked at as a model, do they have the same unique soil depth, prime soil types as well as the same amount of cobble rock above an unconfined aquifer as the North Fields? 7. How to protect unconfined aquifers, wetlands, soil, and groundwater from petroleum products, road salts and other road-based chemicals? 8. The possibility of creating a hydrogeologic dam because of the amount of road base and compaction needed on top of the acres of wetlands and streams that Alternative B will cross over in the North Field? 9. How is groundwater recharge affected due to Alternative B? Or a study on groundwater recharge on known road construction similar to Alternative B? 10. What negative cumulative effects will have on unconfined aquifers or wetlands? There will be 500+ acres between Highway 40 and Alternative B. This area will be under tremendous pressure for growth. Does UDOT plan to include any funding to preserve this land? How much money is budgeted for wetlands mitigation? I want to include the definition of unconfined aquifer, which is not the same as a wetland, although they are often directly connected and depend on each other. An unconfined aquifer is an underground layer of water-bearing, permeable rock, sand, or gravel that is not restricted by an impermeable layer above it, allowing it to be recharged directly from the surface. A wetland is an ecosystem where the land is covered or saturated with water (either permanently or seasonally) at or near the surface. The North Fields is a living breathing balanced system that we need to protect and preserve. I have one last question, comment and input. If this is an Environmental Impact agency, how can this agency not understand how much negative impact to the environment Alternative B will have on the North

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Fields? To the owners within North Fields? To the farmers? To the wildlife? To the wetlands? To the pure beauty of the North Fields? Common sense should be your guideline to not choose Alternative B. Gaylyn Latimer
314	Gene and Mardell Stucky	My husband and I both oppose building the Heber alternate route through the North Fields. The North Fields are crucial in keeping the rural nature of the Heber Valley intact.
39	George Hansen	Hello Mr. Perkins My name is George Hansen. I am a citizen of Wasatch County (Midway) and I am reviewing the Draft EIS for the Heber Valley bypass. I know wetlands a bit, as my backyard is a federally protected wetland with beautiful wildflowers and the ocassional visitor. I have been studying your report in the EIS, It is quite comprehensive . I do have a couple of initial questions: As the field study appears to have started on or about July 8, 2021 and ended on or about Nov 15, 2021, how do you account for in season vs out of season hydrological flows on irrigated vs non irrigated land? Same question concerning “seasonal wetlands”? I am hopefully sure that this has been shared with USACE. Could you please confirm that either way. I woyuld like to know the status of their involvement. Have these UDOT deliniations been submitted for formal review yet? Any information concerning the USACE involvement and status so far would be appreciated. Thank you so much George Hansen XXXXXXXXXX
81	George Hansen	George Hansen XXXXXXXXXXXX (See Attatchments) (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
132	George Holmes (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hello. I'm -- my family's relatively new to the valley compared to many families here. I'm third generation on the Holmes side. My mother's side is probably seventh generation. One thing that I would like to remind people, this does not solve the problem of traffic on Main Street. The other thing is the water in North Fields is very important, and the underground water is hugely important, for not only our valley, but other valleys and for wells and things. I was on the Wasatch County Planning Commission from about '95 to 2007. In the late '90s, or sometime in the '90s, we identified a bypass route. Chairman of the County Commission and Mayor Adams and somebody from UDOT, this area, signed in blood that that was going to be it. Now, things happened, a subdivision was planned right where the bypass was to be. During my time on the Planning Commission, we identified three different bypass areas. Subdivisions clogged two of them. The third one is the one that's still available. Thank you. Which is A and getting around the city. Yes. Yes.
488	George Holmes	Sent from my iPad (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
668	George Holmes	Sent from my iPad (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
431	Georgia Campbell (Comment translated from voicemail)	yes my name is Georgia Campbell Im at XXXXXXXXXX I live in the Heber Valley Im here in Utah and Im calling about the bypass for Route B I am so in favor of it I do hope that you dot is able to move forward even if there are negative thoughts and comments for this we have been promised a bypass for as long as I can remember being in the valley well over 30 years and with just a few people fighting it all the time we are now in a point where our street our main street is dangerous to be on crossover even while driving it is just not safe we are in so need of this bypass please please go ahead and put this bypass in this is surely the time to not turn back you may call me if you have any questions thank you
440	Ginny Smith	Option A appears to support agriculture and environmental uses and concerns while still allowing diversification of traffic flow
705	Glenda Cotter	I cannot imagine being more dismayed than when I heard of UDOT's possible plans for redirecting U.S. 40 through the North Fields of Heber Valley. I am a resident of Salt Lake City who places a high value on this area, and I urge you to listen to residents of Heber and Midway--even the mayor of Heber--and cease your plans for this desecration. Citizens of Utah need these farm fields, this precious open space, and the bird and animal habitat found there much more than we need another road. Sandhill cranes nest and raise their young in these fields. Wilson's snipes do the same. Ospreys, red-tailed hawks, and turkey vultures soar above the fields. Numbers of warblers and sparrows and orioles and tanagers, robins and blackbirds and meadowlarks, inhabit these fields in summer. There is no better habitat in Utah for bobolinks, whose beautiful songs fall upon these fields. Foxes and marmots gambol in the fields, spring peepers welcome the season. More roads for more cars for more development are poor recompense for spoiling this place. Once gone, it can never be regained. I urge you to forego either Plan A or Plan B and find a less expensive, less intrusive, and less harmful means of dealing with Heber Valley traffic. Leave Heber's North Fields alone! Glenda Cotter Salt Lake City, Utah
154	Glenda Gray	I listened to the reasoning behind the necessity of 1300 S. I just don't think the projected benefits are worth the cost of building a whole new road instead of utilizing the existing Hwy 189. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
	(Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	
118	Glenn Anderson (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hello, friends and neighbors. I am not Diann Anderson, as you can tell. I am her lovely husband, and so she asked me to do live comments. With Alternative B seemingly moving forward as the option of choice for UDOT, we'd like to make a few comments related to the loss of North Fields lands under this alternative. The North Fields is one of the last remaining large tracts of open space nestled in the valley floor. For those of us who reside here, it is a refreshing drive into the valley with the expanse of North Fields greeting us after spending a day in the urbanized grass of Salt Lake and Utah Valley. If Alternative B or any alternative proceeds, we suggest the long-term preservation of as much of the remaining North Fields as possible -- more than UDOT may now be considering. Please consider two ways to preserve more of the North Fields and prevent development in the vicinity of the new highway. First, we read the EIS material that wetlands mitigation might be at a ratio of two to one. One local municipal planner talked to us about a ratio of four to one. We ask for -- for the use of at least four to one or higher under Alternative B or any alternative. Second, we would ask that $25 million in the project budget be allocated to the establishment of conservation easements with landowners in the areas adjacent to the proposed highway. Based upon past successes of the Wasatch Open Lands Board, they've averaged conserving 63 acres for every $1 million allocated. We are asking that only 3 percent of the budget for this project be allocated to preserve open space. These are not only our suggestions, these are our hopes. Thank you.
58	Grant Jamieson	You are too slow to address this crazy problem. You need to focus on the part of 40 going up the hills towards Mayflower and Park city as that's where the Oil Trucks kill the flow of traffic and when PEOPLE DIE from the crashes that will continue to happen due to the lack of planning and that fact that the cities of Heber and Park City both want to develop to make money. Well they have done that and now the Roads are a moving DEATH zone. Thank's you dumb city leaders!!!
581	Greg Stephens	My property is right near the projected southern bypass. The large structure will greatly impact the very view I build my house for. From the noise and pollution alone this will greatly impact my families way of life. I am not saying it shouldn't be built if it is truly necessary, I just don't think it needs to be built where it is proposed. Why can't highway 189 near the airport be used as the route? I have heard rumors that it is't being used because the airport will get a much larger runway once this bypass is underway. If this isn't the case then down 189 makes more sense. I would personally love for the bypass to move closer towards the airport and 189 at the very least. In all honesty I don't feel it is necessary on this side of town. More people live on the east side of highway 40 and a bypass over there would make more sense but I know the reality of that happening doesn't exist. In a perfect world the bypass wouldn't be built at all. Or you can buy my house for $1,300,000 and I'll be an advocate for the bypass! ;)
265	Greta Andreini	To All Concerned, As a concerned citizen of the Heber Valley, I want to say that I oppose Alternative A & B for various reasons. I understand the growing area and traffic concerns,but this bypass is detrimental to the Heber Valley. Firstly, the chosen Alt B is a horrific option towards the whole ecosystem of the Provo River water system. You have mentioned mitigation at 2:1, but that could be chosen anywhere. You would be permanently impacting the delicate balance of the water that sustains Wasatch county residents, forever impacting groundwater, aquifers, wildlife and the pristine rural-ness of the valley. Secondly, neither Alternatives consider the residential impact and displacement of farmers and their generational land. As a resident living (which would appear to be just a stones throw from this tanker highway) its a frightening idea. People live here. Kids play here. I specifically moved here for the rural-ness not to mention the folks that bought land with the idea that they would be farmers not afraid of a super tanker highway. The noise, the danger of accidents, threats to safety of residents would be daunting. I also do not see that noise walls would be a consideration making the noise a constant for all living here. It would also go against the Dark Skies initiative that the county has. Both Alternatives would still impact the Provo river ecosystem, which is our water that we recreate, hold dearly and protect and live off of. Additionally, the Heber Valley Heber Creeper which I enjoy partaking in and watching from my house. The overpass or underpass would impact this great source of Heber's charm and economy. We need these aspects of tourism- not fancy restaurants, big brand stores and expensive boutique shops. You wanted "solution oriented" comments. The solution is to create a semi only overpass on already expanded Main St.so they can just blast through.Or a designated lane for trucks only with strict law enforced for them only to be able to drive through without so many light stops. Personally, I believe it is a good thing for them to slow their roll, but ultimately they end up on the same highway a couple miles down the road. Please do not build this Super Tanker bypass on behalf of: the Provo River ecosystem, farmers, and residents who have lived here a long time and want to keep Heber's quality of life simple and rural.
385	Gwyn Purvis	> Dear UDOT: > > As an Utah taxpayer, I strongly urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. I know you are intelligent and qualified people but from what I understand, it fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. > It seems that less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and I urge you all to continue to pursue these options. I understand that some feel this proposal is not in Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. > > There are lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company I hope will be seriously considered. I also believe there were Understated Growth and Traffic Impacts - Induced growth is under-modeled. Highways generate development, and development generates traffic. Main Street congestion is largely local and will not be meaningfully solved by a bypass that simultaneously accelerates growth and doesn't account for the mass East-side developments. > There will also be irreversible Agricultural Loss and I deeply feel that there is a misaligned Public Purpose - The alignment prioritizes regional through-traffic and resort access over local mobility, contrary to adopted city and county preservation goals. > Alternative B maximizes environmental harm, fiscal exposure, and long-term development pressure while offering limited traffic relief. UDOT, please select the least damaging, fiscally responsible alternative — one

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		that protects water, farmland, air quality, and the rural character that defines the Heber Valley. Sincerely, > Gwyn Purvis
439	Haily Hadfield	To Team UDOT : Choosing to sacrifice a recharge zone and prime farmland in one of the driest states in the country is shortsighted. We will regret every acre lost and every gallon of clean water put at risk because UDOT refused to acknowledge alternatives it is legally obligated to consider. As someone who lives downstream, I know exactly what's at stake. The North Fields aren't empty space where you draw in a line for a high-speed freeway — they're a functioning groundwater recharge system. Disturbing wetlands and hydric soils has long term consequences. Pollutants move through the aquifer, through the Provo River, and into every home and farm that relies on clean water, both in the Wasatch Front and Back. Once that system is damaged, it cannot be restored. That's why the Clean Water Act requires the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. Option B is the most damaging option on the table, so why was it preferred? The EIS avoids the most basic question: why hasn't UDOT evaluated the simple, low-cost traffic improvements that fit inside the existing roadway and avoid permanent environmental damage? Your own engineering standards support these operational fixes, yet they're missing from the analysis. That omission shapes the outcome and makes it impossible to trust the process. Choosing to sacrifice a recharge zone and prime farmland in one of the driest states in the country is shortsighted. We will regret every acre lost and every gallon of clean water put at risk because UDOT intentionally ignored the alternatives it is legally obligated to consider. Taxpayers fund UDOT. We have the right to demand fiscal responsibility and transparency. Instead, UDOT is pushing the most expensive, most harmful alignment while ignoring cheaper, safer, and more practical solutions. We are the ones that will foot the bill and live with the consequences. And because your own data shows Option B will not meaningfully improve Main Street traffic in the long-term for the people who actually live here, the public deserves an honest answer: If this road doesn't help locals, harms our water, and violates LEDPA, why is it still in the EIS? Option B must be removed from consideration. Sincerely, Haily Walter
238	Hannah Larson	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Heber Valley Cooridor EIS. My name is Hannah Larson and I am from Millcreek, Utah. This project is of particular interest to me as I have experienced major delays due to traffic in the Heber Valley area. Heber City is quaint and historic and serves as an important junction to many locations throughout Utah and to our neighborning states. The proposed alternative travel routes would help decrease traffic in Heber. This would decrease travel time and preserve Heber's historic nature. While I support Heber City and Wasatch County's project of adding an alternative route, I agree with past commenters in my concern for the effects this project will have on the Provo River and adjacent wetlands. As mentioned in section 2.3.2.3 Impact to Water Quality and Water Resources, wetland deliniation was necessary in order to fully evalutate the effects of this project on water quality and resources. This section also states that further deliniation will inform the final EIS. Both alternative route A and B cut through streams and run near the Provo river, having potential to pollute those ecosystems. As a concerned citizen, who values wetland health, lives downstream of the Provo river and also would like less traffic in Heber, I ecourage this delination to be a major deciding factor in the final EIS and permit granting process. This project has the potentail to reduce traffic in Heber City, and I ask that wetlands and watershed be taken into extra consideration in the final EIS, as both are crucial to human health.
457	Hannah Schindler	I am strongly against this bypass through the north fields and haven't heard a single person who lives here say they think it's a good idea. Those fields are what made me fall in love with Heber along with the backdrop of Timpanogas when I was a little girl. My grandparents lived here and we would come down 40 and I loved seeing the old school sprinklers in those fields with the big wheels and the animals and greenery and in the winter all the untouched blanket of snow. There were bison where UVU and the hideous and destructive development on the east side is. It was wild. That is what welcomes everyone to the valley. The open space. The beauty. The calmness to the west. What everyone says about Heber that it's so beautiful. The bypass will change that feeling as has so much of the development already has. I don't think a bypass will even make a big enough difference to main street traffic. I think there are other greedy motives behind it and if this goes through I won't be surprised to see more development come in and continue to destroy the land I love alone that bypass. I am so sad about all the development. I have cried about it because I'm losing the safety I once felt here. I thought the north fields would be safe. I want Heber to preserve the native plants and animals and every time a new development comes in our plants and animals suffer. We want to protect our ecosystem. Just because it's not a loud ecosystem, it's there and life abounds. This will kill it. I know it will. Those fields as I'm sure you know sustain life here. This bypass should not be done. Period. I know this email will fall on deaf ears but I'm sending it anyway. I'm angry that the land I fell in love with is being destroyed. The smell of Heber was so strong of sagebrush when I moved here when I was a little girl (no we didn't build a home and develop land). That smell is gone. The wildness of Heber is gone. Please stop. Don't build this bypass. You guys don't know what you're doing. You're so focused on what you want. But the people who live here don't want it and you should listen to us. Hannah Schindler
461	Hannah Williams	We do not want the bypass!! It will ruin Heber. End of story. Shame on anyone who continues to destroy Heber. So much damage has been done but this bypass will only make it worse and we don't want it. We didn't want the development that's happening and we don't want anymore. Do not do it.
206	Heber City	Comment has been attached below and emailed to hebervalleyeis@utah.gov (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
496	Heber Valley Aquifer Alliance	Please consider Route A as your final selection. While I undertand the priority of UDOT is to optimize traffic, the priority of Heber Valley residents is to protect the North Fields. The extra cost for Route A along with the impact to existing properties and businesses will be nebligible in 10 years and will be worth every dollar spent if it keeps the North Fields from commercial development and reduces the environmental impacts that would come from Route B. I know Route A will add 1-2 minutes to the transit time through the valley, but the overall time savings from just having a Bypass far outweighs the extra 60-120 seconds from Route A. The residents of Heber Valley are literally begging UDOT to implement Route A.
113	Heidi Franco (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hello, neighbors. These are some of my comments to UDOT. There's so many reasons and questions and issues that I have with Route B. There is no perfect route. We understand that, and there's not going to be a perfect route because of the high density that -- for the last six years that the Heber City Council has approved. So we are stuck with traffic. But let me talk about some of the premises that UDOT is saying in their EIS and I want to give other insights on. I do not believe Route B is going to help Heber City's Main Street with traffic. It is not going to take diesels off of Main Street. UDOT admits that themselves in Chapter 3 of the EIS. Diesels will still be able to take Main Street. It still will be the shorter route, even with the lights. And, to me, that's the main reason that we want the bypass -- is to get the diesels off of Main Street. So that's a huge issue. Next issue -- water quality. I want clean water for Heber citizens and for the valley for generations and generations to come. UDOT has not shown in the EIS to me about the groundwater study in the North Fields and the water flows that will go down to the Provo River and what will be the chloride, the nutrients, the petroleum effects into that groundwater with the wetlands because that is our drinking water source for this entire valley. So I need to know what is happening with cumulative groundwater effects in sensitive lands, and that is, to me, the pivotal thing that has happened in our valley, everyone. We're now down to sensitive lands being developed. And quick side note, where developers are trying to come into sensitive lands with high water tables, they're bringing in fill. All right? Feet of fill so they can even get their utilities in the ground, and then they will build higher on top of that. Okay. Another reason that supposedly Route B was chosen was for the cue up that's going to happen when traffic coming southbound is going to 500 North, and Route A is going to be over 2,000 cars, and Route B is supposed to be 700 cars. Everyone, without Route A and having three lanes on each side going north from 900 North, that is the cue up that we're going to be facing with our city from College Way, the new light there, and then at the common, and then down to -- sorry -- Coyote and so forth. So we're going to have nothing but gridlock in Heber City from 1500 South on Highway 40 all the way up to the top of that bypass. And then Route B is proposing bottlenecks for Heber City traffic on 1200 South, on 100 South, and on the 900 North. And that is the cue up that Heber City is going to be facing all the way up existing Highway 40 with bottlenecks to get over to the bypass. There's many more things I can say, but I thought that those were important to address. Thank you.
620	Heidi Franco	Thank you for adding my attached comments to the Heber Valley Corridor DEIS public comments. I look forward to the Project Team's answers and collaboration on the issues mentioned. Heidi Franco Transparency & Accountability to Citizens (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
681	Heidi Franco	Hello, Please accept the attached comments from the Wasatch Open Lands Board for the Heber Valley Corridor DEIS public comment period. Thank you, Heidi Franco Transparency & Accountability to Citizens
682	Heidi Franco	Mayor Heidi Franco, Heber City XXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
609	Heidi Harmon	UDOT, I support the written letter Wasatch County, Midway City, & 3 members of the HC council sent in recently. Please explain "WHY" you won't just widen HWY 40 & then have it branch off to a bypass that runs all the way to HWY 189? It's absolutely unnecessay to have it turn up 1300 S bc of SO MANY Reasons....Homeowners/Neighborhood bordering 1300 S should not have to be subjected to blaring Extremely loud traffic right behind their homes, property devalued, & Toxic Exhaust Fumes from the big trucks, & everything else! We moved here for Peace & quiet... Please care about people who will be adversely affected. The aquifer in the North Fields SHOULD NOT BE DISTURBED!!! It affects our precious Resource... OUR PRISTINE DRINKING WATER!!! Please don't just listen to Mike Johnston & Sid Osterguard!! They don't care about what we hold dear. Listen to the Citizens who have taken the time to let you know the North Field's is a NO GO!!!!! *Attached Picture is showing how limited the space that's left for the 1300 S bypass. There's NOT ENOUGH SPACE!!!! When this became a thing, there was supposed to be a Berm. There's NOT enough space for that now... Also, an elevated Road is ludicrous. My home backs up to the sewer field/1300 S. Please don't put the bypass there! In my opinion, NOT enough thought went into Option B. The head of UDOT is on record saying that the bypass won't save any time. 20%-30% of out of town traffic is NOT worth ruining OUR beautiful fields & spending upwards of a billion $$$$$ of taxpayers money. Most of the traffic is local.The North & South Fields Need to Be Left ALONE!! There are also a bunch of laws being broken (Lawsuits will be filed!!) The North fields are not just vacant lands, they are working agricultural lands that perform an important hydrological function through flood irrigation, allowing the water to filtrate soils & recharge the valley aquifer that supports existing wells throughout the Heber area. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
411	Hilary Richards	Please see attached letter concerning the Heber Valley Corridor Project and my concerns with the proposed selection. Hilary Holmes Richards

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
382	Hillary Dummar	I am writing to state my position on the UDOT Route B proposal. I reject alternative B. The North Fields hold a lot of water for the valley and our water aquifers will be destroyed. I suggest you move the road east closer to US 40 so it minimizes the impact on the water aquifer. Additionally, I endorse the concerns raised by the North Fields Irrigation Co. I do not believe that a bypass will solve the traffic problem in Heber. The traffic is from the locals and unfortunately our city councils did not plan well when approving all of the development. I believe many truck drivers would still choose to use main street even if a bypass road existed. Thank you, Hillary Dummar
112	Holly Bodily (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Okay. I'm not a public speaker either. My primary concern, to piggyback on to Lori's, is the impact that this Alternative B has on our water supply. It -- it is a highly valued resource here in our desert state, and under the Clean Water Act, Section 404(b)(1), UDOT is legally required to select the least environmentally damaging practical alternative, which Lori just referred to as the LEDPA. This is not discretionary. It is the controlling federal criteria for any project that impacts wetlands or waters of the United States. Yet UDOT's own EIS states, and I quote, "The primary disadvantages of Alternative B are greater impacts to wetlands and farmlands." So this contradictory statement advancing Option B, despite acknowledging these impacts, is inconsistent with federal law and the Army Corps of Engineers requirements. Utah Law Code -- it's called Code Title 17, Chapter 41 requires the protection of groundwater and aquifers, particularly where they influence drinking water quality, flood risk, and long-term community health. These fields recharge Class 1 aquifers, which are designated as pristine and must be protected, and the code reads "to the maximum extent feasible." A highway constructed across wetlands and recharge zones introduces contamination pathways for oil, fuel, road salt, and storm water runoff. These impacts directly conflict with Utah's groundwater protection standards. Hindsight is going to be 20/20 if we destroy these irreplaceable aquifers. We will all look back, and I don't think anybody is going to say, "I wish we would have destroyed more wetlands." I think we're going to say, "I wish we did something to protect them while we had the chance." This is our only chance. Once they are developed, they are gone, and Option B does also put those at risk. Really quickly, the EIS focus is on the impacts of the wetlands, but not on the aquifer, and that needs a lot more attention and study. Also, our current trends are showing already significant upward trends in contaminate levels, which this will only accelerate. Boy, time goes fast. The EIS -- couple of quick questions. The EIS maps are only showing Option A and B and then no action scenario, but there's no comparison of lower impact alternatives, such as maybe winding the highway or optimizing the traffic timing, adding turn lanes, creating one-way streets or a climbing lane, anything that would help currently with today's congestion, not in ten years which is this is going to take to build out. We need solutions now. And, also, like we mentioned, the APA was not acknowledged, and that is a huge overlook, and we need to make sure that the mitigation process is a lot more streamlined and way more identifiable because it's just way too vague, and that's why we have all these questions.
618	Holly Bodily	Draft Environmental Impact Statement Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Project Re: Bypass Alternative B Submitted by: Preserve Midway Affiliation : Nonprofit Address or Connection to Area: Date: 2/18/26 I. PURPOSE OF COMMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD NOTICE We submit this comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Project to identify specific deficiencies in the analysis of Bypass Alternative B under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This comment is intended to ensure that the agencies take the required “hard look” at environmental consequences, indirect and cumulative impacts, and reasonable alternatives, and to preserve these issues for the administrative record. II. FAILURE TO ADEQUATELY ANALYZE INDIRECT AND GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS NEPA requires agencies to analyze reasonably foreseeable indirect effects, including growth-inducing impacts and changes in land-use patterns. The DEIS evaluates Alternative B primarily as a transportation facility and does not adequately analyze how new roadway capacity in a rural valley will foreseeably induce development, alter land values, and change land-use patterns over time. This omission is particularly significant because the proposed alignment crosses land formally designated as an Agricultural Protection Area (APA) under Utah Code § 17-41-101 et seq. APAs exist specifically to preserve agricultural land and prevent premature conversion. Any action that undermines an APA’s purpose requires heightened scrutiny, yet the DEIS does not analyze how a high-capacity bypass would accelerate: Conversion of agricultural and open lands Secondary infrastructure demands and public service costs Increased land speculation and rezoning pressure Loss of conservation funding opportunities tied to APA preservation

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Without this analysis, the DEIS understates the foreseeable environmental consequences of Alternative B. This omission also conflicts with Wasatch County's and Heber City's adopted General Plans and long-standing community visions, including Envision Heber 2050, whose top priority is the preservation of rural character. The DEIS does not reconcile these conflicts or acknowledge that Alternative B would undermine the very planning objectives the communities have formally established. III. FAILURE TO ADEQUATELY ANALYZE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS The DEIS does not adequately evaluate cumulative impacts as required by NEPA. Rather than analyzing the incremental impacts of Alternative B in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, the DEIS treats impacts in isolation. This approach fails to address cumulative effects such as: Fragmentation of agricultural systems protected under APA designation Long-term loss of rural character Combined effects with ongoing development and transportation projects Increased pressure for annexation and rezoning Because APAs are created through a public process and protected under Utah Code § 17-41-301, the cumulative weakening of these protections must be analyzed. The DEIS does not do so. IV. INADEQUATE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND QUALITY-OF-LIFE EFFECTS NEPA requires consideration of impacts to the human environment, including community character and quality of life. The DEIS does not adequately analyze how a high-capacity, high-speed bypass corridor would affect: Noise and light levels near residential areas Valued viewsheds and open space Neighborhood connectivity and cohesion Recreational, aesthetic, and cultural resources These impacts are particularly relevant in a valley where agricultural landscapes, wetlands, and open space define community identity and where residents have repeatedly expressed preservation priorities. V. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS RELIES ON UNREALISTIC LAND-USE ASSUMPTIONS The traffic analysis appears to assume static land-use conditions, ignoring the well-documented phenomenon of induced growth. This assumption is inconsistent with foreseeable development responses to new roadway capacity. Available information indicates that between 8,000 and 16,000 residential units are already approved or in the development queue on the east side of the valley, though the DEIS does not disclose or verify these figures. Traffic generated by these units would access Main Street directly from the east and would not be captured by the proposed bypass, thereby exacerbating congestion on the very corridor the project purports to relieve. A legally adequate analysis must therefore evaluate these foreseeable land-use changes and assess operational improvements to Main Street as an immediate and practicable alternative. Because the proposed alignment would directly affect APA-designated land and surrounding agricultural parcels, the DEIS must integrate induced-growth scenarios into traffic forecasting. Without this, the DEIS does not adequately disclose whether congestion relief would be temporary or illusory. Studies were only done at peak hours, not consistent and needs to be fully evaluated. The DEIS also does not accurately characterize freight movement in the region. Appendix 2E (p. 17/38) notes that while oil tankers predominantly use South US-40 due to its connection to resource-extraction areas, existing traffic data show that US-189 carries a higher total volume of trucks than South US-40. This discrepancy is material because it undermines assumptions about which corridor freight traffic would realistically use and whether the bypass would meaningfully alter truck routing patterns. Further, the DEIS limits its travel-time comparisons to PM peak hours. Trucks operate throughout the full 24-hour cycle, and congestion diminishes substantially outside peak periods. As a result, freight operators may have little incentive to divert to a longer bypass route during off-peak hours. A legally adequate analysis must therefore evaluate truck behavior across all time periods—not only during PM peaks—to determine whether the bypass would meaningfully reduce congestion on existing corridors. VI. PURPOSE AND NEED MAY IMPROPERLY CONSTRAIN ALTERNATIVES The framing of the project's purpose and need emphasizes long-term vehicular capacity expansion in a manner that appears to presuppose a bypass-scale solution. NEPA prohibits defining purpose and need so narrowly that it forecloses reasonable alternatives. The DEIS does not adequately evaluate whether project objectives could be met through:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Smaller-scale or context-sensitive improvements Hybrid alternatives combining limited bypass elements with existing corridor upgrades Transportation demand management or transit strategies Phased implementation tied to demonstrated need Because the proposed alignment affects wetlands and aquifer recharge areas, federal law — including the Clean Water Act Section 404 LEDPA requirement — obligates UDOT to evaluate alternatives that avoid these impacts. The DEIS does not demonstrate that this has occurred. VII. FAILURE TO EVALUATE A REASONABLE MODIFIED OR HYBRID ALTERNATIVE NEPA requires analysis of reasonable alternatives that would reduce environmental harm while meeting project objectives. The DEIS does not adequately evaluate a Modified or Hybrid Alternative that could include: Alignment refinements to avoid APA lands Limited access to reduce growth-inducing effects Context-sensitive roadway design Phased construction tied to actual need Given the presence of wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and APA-designated land, such alternatives are not only reasonable — they are legally required under both federal and state environmental protections. VIII. DEFERRAL AND VAGUENESS OF MITIGATION MEASURES The DEIS relies on generalized or deferred mitigation measures, indicating that impacts will be addressed through future studies or later decisions. NEPA requires mitigation to be discussed in sufficient detail to demonstrate that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated. This is especially problematic because: Wetlands and aquifer recharge areas are functionally irreplaceable Utah groundwater protection rules (Utah Admin. Code R317-6) require prevention of irreversible contamination or hydrologic alteration The DEIS proposes mitigation ratios (e.g., 2:1) that do not reflect the permanent loss of wetland function Once wetlands are disturbed, hydrologic changes can cause flooding, reduced recharge, and long-term water-quality impacts. These consequences cannot be undone, and the DEIS does not meaningfully address them. The proposed mitigation ratios also fail to demonstrate whether replacement acreage would be preserved in perpetuity or merely maintained as cleared, non-functional land. As noted in the 1/27/26 public Zoom meeting, “mitigation” may consist only of weed-free maintenance rather than true ecological replacement, which does not satisfy NEPA’s requirement for meaningful mitigation or the Clean Water Act’s standards for functional wetland preservation. IX. SEGMENTATION AND CONNECTED ACTIONS To the extent the proposed bypass corridor is functionally linked to other transportation improvements, development actions, or future expansions, the DEIS must analyze these actions together. Failure to do so risks improper segmentation and understates cumulative impacts. This is particularly relevant because the bypass would open new areas to development, requiring additional infrastructure that is not analyzed in the DEIS. X. LOCALIZED IMPACTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE (PRESERVE MIDWAY) As a nonprofit organization, Preserve Midway is dedicated to thoughtful growth and to providing landowners with meaningful options to preserve the rural character, open space, and agricultural heritage of Midway, Utah. Our mission is to protect the historic rural identity and safeguard the agricultural and open lands that define this valley. The North Fields — including the wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and agricultural parcels affected by Alternative B — are central to that mission. Preserve Midway represents a community of more than 1,400 residents, landowners, and supporters who have consistently expressed a clear preference for preservation-minded planning and context-sensitive transportation solutions. Our members have asked us to convey, unequivocally, that Alternative B is not an acceptable solution. It is incompatible with the rural landscape, the agricultural protections already in place, and the long-standing community vision for the Wasatch Back. We are not the Wasatch Front, and we do not seek Wasatch Front–style infrastructure imposed on a valley whose identity, economy, and ecological health depend on open space, agriculture, and groundwater integrity. Our concerns are grounded not only in mission, but in lived experience. We have observed firsthand how disturbing wetlands — even at the edges of a project area — can alter hydrology in ways that are not always foreseeable. When nearby wetlands were disturbed in our community, water began flowing differently, creating flooding in areas that had never flooded before. These changes happened quickly and could not be reversed. This is precisely why wetlands and aquifer recharge areas are protected under both federal and Utah law: once disrupted, the consequences extend far beyond the project footprint.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The wildlife that depends on the North Fields — migratory birds, raptors, amphibians, and mammals — relies on the shallow groundwater and wet meadow systems that define this landscape. Many wells in the valley depend on the same groundwater. Displacing or degrading these wetlands could have serious, long-term consequences for water quality, aquifer recharge, and ecological stability. These risks are not adequately addressed in the DEIS. Our community has also already suffered a measurable financial loss tied directly to the preservation of this land. The proposed bypass alignment signaled that the land might not remain protected and immediately a conservation easement, years in the making, lost federal funding, which stopped the conservation. These funds were intended to safeguard the very resources now threatened by Alternative B. Now lost, they cannot be recovered. Proceeding with an alignment that undermines an Agricultural Protection Area disregards both the statutory purpose of that designation and the clearly expressed desires of taxpayers who voted to preserve these lands. For all these reasons, Preserve Midway urges UDOT to pursue alternatives that align with the scale, values, and environmental realities of the Wasatch Back — alternatives that respect the community's long-standing commitment to preservation, protect irreplaceable water resources, and avoid irreversible harm to the North Fields. XI. CONCLUSION AND REQUEST FOR REVISION For the reasons stated above, the DEIS does not yet satisfy NEPA's requirements or applicable state and federal environmental protections. We respectfully request that the agencies revise the DEIS to: Fully analyze induced growth and indirect land-use impacts Evaluate cumulative impacts Reassess traffic outcomes using realistic land-use assumptions Reevaluate purpose and need to ensure reasonable alternatives are not foreclosed Analyze a Modified or Hybrid Alternative that avoids APA lands and wetland resources Demonstrate compliance with the Clean Water Act LEDPA requirement Provide enforceable and clearly defined mitigation measures consistent with Utah groundwater and wetland protection laws Thank you for the opportunity to submit this comment for inclusion in the administrative record. Respectfully submitted, Preserve Midway 2/18/26
659	Holly Bodily	Attached please find my formal comment regarding **Alternative B** of the Heber Valley bypass project. I respectfully request that it be included in the official project administrative record and that a written response be provided in accordance with federal environmental review procedures. Thank you for your attention to this submission. Sincerely, Holly Bodily XXXXXXXXX Midway, Utah (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
472	Hunter Lombardi	NO to Alternative B - Heber Bypass
466	Ian Peisner	As someone who commutes daily through Heber City I feel I am quite familiar with the traffic in the area. There has been great improvement since the timing of the traffic lights on Main St was changed recently. I wonder if it's possible to make further improvements by addressing more of this "low-hanging fruit," rather than spending $750 million-$1 billion on more and bigger roads? I know that big projects and vast reshaping of the landscape is more exciting, but I wonder if it's entirely necessary or the best possible option. That said, I firmly believe that of the two options presented, Alternative A is far less destructive and makes a great deal more sense for the area. It is simply not worth it to further degrade the agricultural and rural character of the area to shave ~1 min (or less) off people's travel time. Your preferred alternative is a poor choice and a mistake.
200	J Craddock	The analysis of the potential impacts 1. The analysis neglected to include light pollution generated by either proposal and the resulting impact of residents, agriculture, and wildlife.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		2. Vehicular accidents are not included as a potential impact from speeding vehicles and the resulting debris, petroleum-based contamination of wetlands, natural habitats and agricultural lands. 3. The analysis did not include any impact on Spring Creek and changes necessary to create the roadway. 4. The analyses did not include any mitigation of road run off, including road applications for melting ice, oil, other debris because the runoff overflows do not prevent the effect of these chemicals on agricultural, habitat or wetlands. 5. The proposals claim that they might mitigate the traffic on 40 through town enabling the town to create an “historic downtown”. 6. Future development along the proposed highway was not addressed nor were the restriction of that, leaving the north fields open to development. The proposed mitigation of potential impacts 1. I did not see any effective mitigation of noise and/ or light pollution proposed for either of the corridors. Concerns are that there is both noise and light pollution caused by vehicles traveling at 65 MPH and over, as people do here. 2. Additionally, with the number of vehicle crashes that occur at the intersection of 40 and River Road, how many would occur within the proposed highway. 3. Spring Creek and other waterways should be protected from runoff and chemical that are applied to roadways that change the saline and/ or Ph of the waterways. 4. Mitigation did not include the requirement of nonuse of any applications for ice on roadways, only plowing and minimally a monthly testing to ensure that the wetlands, agricultural and natural habitat ecosystems are not impacted by the roadway runoff. 5. The impact of the loss of business along main street in Heber with the loss of traffic was not addressed, nor was the notion that the proposed bypass would be underutilized. The preferred alternative 1. While the table used to delineate the preferred alternative, the missing data as outlined above, renders both proposed alternatives unusable. Interestingly, in more populated portional of the US that have heavier traffic impacts, the trend is to reduce the size of roadways. For example, a 4 lane road becomes a 2 lane road through a city or town, with wider sidewalks, bicycle lanes, parking, and planting corridors. These are cities which are at least 10 times the size of Heber City. Traffic calming design is making these cities more pedestrian friendly.
307	Jacee Andersen	Dear Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, My name is Jacee Andersen. I grew up in Midway and have returned after 10 years to farm, grow fresh produce and nutritious food for the community that raised me. I’ve committed my life to create thriving water, air, soil and other ecological systems through small scale regenerative agriculture. After attending the Preserve Midway March today and speaking personally with our generational farmers and stewards of the land, i can officially state my side as a citizen of Midway and as a local who grew up here and has seen all of the development happen over the past 10-15 years. I am writing to urge UDOT to reject route-alternative B and choose route/alternitive alternative A. Is UDOT following in accordance with: -The Farmland Protections Act -Safe Drinking Water Act -Utah Code 19-5 Water Quakity Act

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		-Utah Code 17-41 Act Agricultural Protection Areas Act As an individual who aims to grow food for her community in this valley for generations to come, I would urge to create an equal space for us who want to take the hard job of farming and leave us some land so we can support the vitality of the land, water, and people of the Heber Valley. Thank you for your time. Jacee Andersen FarmHer J Farm Manager of Velvet Acre Farms Midway, UT
361	Jacob Brown	I am a resident of Heber Valley since 1982 and am pretty shocked by the decision UDOT made to pursue alternative B for the bypass road. It seems to be the most detrimental option for the rural character of Heber Valley, the families whose farms and way of life will be permanently erased and for the quality of our water supply. Please rethink this decision. It's just bad. Choose alterative A if you must have a bypass, though I am very doubtful of any real or lasting benefits to the valley with any bypass. Sincerely, Jacob Brown XXXXXXXXXXX Midway, UT XXXXX
572	Jacob Loveland	Jacob Loveland XXXXXXXXXXXXX A raised bypass road would bring significant visual, noise, and environmental impacts to nearby homes. Elevated roads tend to carry sound farther, create large visual barriers, and change the character of surrounding neighborhoods. Many of us chose to live in Heber City because of its scenic views, quiet neighborhoods, and small-town feel. A raised bypass through our residential neighborhood would permanently alter that character and affect the quality of life for many families. There appears to be a reasonable alternative: placing the bypass farther to the south. From what has been discussed publicly, a southern alignment could achieve the goal of improving traffic flow while avoiding many of the impacts on existing homes and neighborhoods. If a solution exists that accomplishes transportation goals while minimizing harm to residents, it deserves serious consideration.
699	James Goodley	To Whom it May Concern, Attached please find a letter that includes Heber Valley Special Service District's comments on the Heber Valley Corridor EIS. HVSSD looks forward to your response. Sincerely, Jim Goodley (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
47	James L Benson	Very strongly in favor of alternative B in our household. Traffic on us40 is already a problem, and starting the bypass at 900 North in alternative A just keeps it crowded all the way into town. Alternative B allows everyone in the valley to enjoy the North Fields by putting biking and pedestrian access, keeps traffic flowing, and actually bypasses traffic away from town as intended. As the north side of the valley continues to develop, moving traffic away from US40 is critical, so please proceed with Alternative B!
643	James Russel	Thank you for your time. I appreciate your work on this important issue. UDOT claims Alternative B causes the "least overall harm" to historic properties by impacting only 1 historic building (vs. 4 for Alternative A) and protecting downtown Heber's historic town center by diverting traffic. However, Route B would directly affect or destroy over 15,000 feet of NRHP-eligible historic canals (1860s irrigation systems integral to Heber's agricultural heritage) and alter the historic rural setting of the North Fields. Provide: (a) the specific historic buildings or structures that Route B "saves" compared to Alternative A; (b) how UDOT evaluated the North Fields' historic agricultural landscape (including canals, field patterns, and cultural integrity under Section 106/4(f)) as a contributing resource; and (c) why preserving downtown buildings outweighs the irreversible loss of historic irrigation heritage and rural setting in North Fields. What specific properties will be saved with Route B rather than Route A? What specific properties are you hoping to save with all bypass options? What exact benefit will there be with more roads to downtown? Provide the studies proving this theory. 1. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the US Army Corps of Engineers requires a "least environmentally damaging practicable alternative" (LEDPA) analysis. Why was Alternative B selected as preferred when it impacts 54 acres of wetlands (vs. 23 for Alternative A), and how does UDOT justify that it meets LEDPA when east-shifted or US-40 optimization options appear to avoid more wetlands? Provide the full LEDPA evaluation and any preliminary agency feedback on permit approvability.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		2. Alternative B threatens over 15,000 feet of NRHP-eligible historic canals (from 1860s) and forces NFIC to switch from gravity-fed to mechanical delivery, potentially violating 165-year-old Utah water rights. Provide: (a) full Section 106 assessment and consultation records with NFIC/landowners; (b) engineering plans/costs for canal siphons, overpasses, and reconstruction; (c) how UDOT will ensure gravity-flow continuity during/after construction; and (d) contingency if NFIC rejects mechanical changes or water rights are impaired. Which historic properties specifically will be saved by using route B. How does the compare with what is lost historically by using route B? 3. The DEIS base cost is ~$760M for Alternative B but excludes land access disputes, full canal/aquifer/wetlands mitigation, long-term maintenance, induced growth controls, and flooding liability. Provide a comprehensive, itemized cost estimate exceeding (including all deferred items) and a risk/reward analysis justifying ~$138M per mile (vs. standard rural freeway ~$22M/mile). Why is this "easier to build" premium acceptable 4. Wetlands in North Fields act as natural flood buffers for Heber City. If the project reduces this capacity (e.g., via fill/embankments), who bears liability for increased flooding risks/damages? Provide flood modeling post-project, responsibility allocation, and any compensation framework for affected properties. 5. Mayflower and Jordanelle Ridge are known bottle necks, not downtown Heber. With Deer Valley turning their parking lots into hotels and pushing traffic to the Mayflower entrance what are your traffic mitigation plans there? How does more traffic getting there quicker affect the bottle neck? 6. Critical elements (siphons, overpasses, stormwater collectors, final mitigation) are deferred to post-approval permitting/final design. How does this comply with NEPA's "hard look" requirement for meaningful analysis of impacts/mitigation before selection? How are we suppose to give meaningful feedback without meaningful information? 7. Why were eastward-shifted alignments or one-way couplets (which reduce farmland/wetland/canal impacts) dismissed without full detailed analysis and cost/impact comparison to Alternative B? Provide the complete screening data and rationale. 8. The DEIS provides a base construction cost of approximately $760.5 million for Alternative B but explicitly excludes several categories that would add to the total taxpayer burden over the project's lifecycle (e.g., full land acquisition disputes, complete canal/irrigation reconstruction, wetlands/aquifer mitigation and long-term monitoring, stormwater/deicing pollution controls, induced growth infrastructure, flooding liability, and local upkeep of any ancillary features like frontage roads or trails). Provide a comprehensive, itemized lifecycle cost estimate for Alternative B covering at least 50 years, including annual/state/local maintenance projections, inflation adjustments, and any deferred mitigation expenses. Specifically, clarify what portion of long-term costs (maintenance, monitoring, repairs, liability) will fall on Heber City, Wasatch County, NFIC, or other local entities/taxpayers versus UDOT/state/federal funds, and how UDOT justifies these exclusions in the DEIS given NEPA requirements for a full 'hard look' at reasonably foreseeable impacts and costs. 9. Developers in Heber City and Daniel have funneled large communities onto US-40, contributing to deadly congestion. What enforceable mechanisms—beyond relying on future local zoning—will UDOT implement to prevent the bypass from enabling similar funneling of traffic from new developments? Provide: (a) modeling of induced traffic/growth impacts; (b) specific language in the Record of Decision or permits prohibiting new interchanges/access points; and (c) how this aligns with the local 1-house-per-20-acres vote and City/County preservation agreements. 10. Are you going to make public any private conversations or agreements between UDOT and Scott Phillips, Sid Ostergaard, Matt Brower, Mike Johnston, Rachel Kahler, and Ivory Homes? Are you aware of Matt Brower's potential conflict of interest due to property affiliations in downtown Heber and his group's advocacy for the bypass? 11. North Fields gets limited access/frontage roads with barriers for local exits. Will Coyote/Sorenson areas receive identical restrictions? If not, explain unequal treatment and how it avoids disparate impacts. 12. Are you going to make your affiliation with google public? 13. How do you justify an extra $100 million+ per mile simply because it is "easier to build because of traffic mitigation"? 14. What are your plans with the back 40 restaurant. 15. With little apparent community support for Route B, who exactly is the "community" you believe will benefit? 16. Why are yet-to-be-built businesses considered more important than water quality for 1.5 million people served by the North Fields aquifer? 17. The DEIS $760.5 million construction cost for Alternative B excludes land acquisition disputes, full canal reconstruction, wetlands/aquifer mitigation, stormwater/deicing controls, induced growth infrastructure, flooding liability, and local upkeep of frontage roads/trails. Provide a detailed 50-year lifecycle cost estimate for Alternative B that includes all these excluded/deferred items, with a clear breakdown of what portion will be paid by Heber City, Wasatch County, NFIC, or other local taxpayers versus UDOT/state/federal funds. 18. UDOT claims Alternative B causes the 'least overall harm' to historic properties by impacting only 1 historic building (vs. 4 for Alternative A) and protecting downtown Heber's historic town center by diverting

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		traffic. However, Route B would directly affect or destroy over 15,000 feet of NRHP-eligible historic canals (1860s irrigation systems integral to Heber's agricultural heritage) and alter the historic rural setting of the North Fields. Provide: (a) the specific historic buildings or structures that Route B 'saves' compared to Alternative A; (b) how UDOT evaluated the North Fields' historic agricultural landscape (including canals, field patterns, and cultural integrity under Section 106/4(f)) as a contributing resource; and (c) why preserving downtown buildings outweighs the irreversible loss of historic irrigation heritage and rural setting in North Fields. 19. What specific properties' will be saved with route B rather than route A? What specific properties are you hoping to save with all Bypass options? What exact benefit will there be with more roads to downtown. Show the studies you have taken to prove this theory.
644	James Russel Peterson	Dear UDOT team, Thank you for your time and for the opportunity to submit public comments on the Heber Valley Corridor EIS. I appreciate the work UDOT and the project team have put into studying this important transportation issue and for providing a process that allows residents to participate. As someone who lives in Utah and cares deeply about the future of Heber Valley, the North Fields farmland, historic irrigation systems, water quality, flood protection, and the overall character of our community, I am concerned that the Draft EIS does not fully address several critical environmental, cultural, economic, and local impacts of Alternative B. I respectfully submit the following specific questions for the record and request that they be addressed in detail in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. 1. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the US Army Corps of Engineers requires a "least environmentally damaging practicable alternative" (LEDPA) analysis. Why was Alternative B selected as preferred when it impacts 54 acres of wetlands (vs. 23 for Alternative A), and how does UDOT justify that it meets LEDPA when east-shifted or US-40 optimization options appear to avoid more wetlands? Provide the full LEDPA evaluation and any preliminary agency feedback on permit approvability. 2. Alternative B threatens over 15,000 feet of NRHP-eligible historic canals (from 1860s) and forces NFIC to switch from gravity-fed to mechanical delivery, potentially violating 165-year-old Utah water rights. Provide: (a) full Section 106 assessment and consultation records with NFIC/landowners; (b) engineering plans/costs for canal siphons, overpasses, and reconstruction; (c) how UDOT will ensure gravity-flow continuity during/after construction; and (d) contingency if NFIC rejects mechanical changes or water rights are impaired. Which historic properties specifically will be saved by using route B. How does the compare with what is lost historically by using route B? 3. The DEIS base cost is ~$760M for Alternative B but excludes land access disputes, full canal/aquifer/wetlands mitigation, long-term maintenance, induced growth controls, and flooding liability. Provide a comprehensive, itemized cost estimate exceeding (including all deferred items) and a risk/reward analysis justifying ~$138M per mile (vs. standard rural freeway ~$22M/mile). Why is this "easier to build" premium acceptable 4. Wetlands in North Fields act as natural flood buffers for Heber City. If the project reduces this capacity (e.g., via fill/embankments), who bears liability for increased flooding risks/damages? Provide flood modeling post-project, responsibility allocation, and any compensation framework for affected properties. 5. Mayflower and Jordanelle Ridge are known bottle necks, not downtown Heber. With Deer Valley turning their parking lots into hotels and pushing traffic to the Mayflower entrance what are your traffic mitigation plans there? How does more traffic getting there quicker affect the bottle neck? 6. Critical elements (siphons, overpasses, stormwater collectors, final mitigation) are deferred to post-approval permitting/final design. How does this comply with NEPA's "hard look" requirement for meaningful analysis of impacts/mitigation before selection? How are we suppose to give meaningful feedback without meaningful information? 7. Why were eastward-shifted alignments or one-way couplets (which reduce farmland/wetland/canal impacts) dismissed without full detailed analysis and cost/impact comparison to Alternative B? Provide the complete screening data and rationale. 8. The DEIS provides a base construction cost of approximately $760.5 million for Alternative B but explicitly excludes several categories that would add to the total taxpayer burden over the project's lifecycle (e.g., full land acquisition disputes, complete canal/irrigation reconstruction, wetlands/aquifer mitigation and long-term monitoring, stormwater/deicing pollution controls, induced growth infrastructure, flooding liability, and local upkeep of any ancillary features like frontage roads or trails). Provide a comprehensive, itemized lifecycle cost estimate for Alternative B covering at least 50 years, including annual/state/local maintenance projections, inflation adjustments, and any deferred mitigation expenses. Specifically, clarify what portion of long-term costs (maintenance, monitoring, repairs, liability) will fall on Heber City, Wasatch County, NFIC, or other local entities/taxpayers versus UDOT/state/federal funds, and how UDOT justifies these exclusions in the DEIS given NEPA requirements for a full 'hard look' at reasonably foreseeable impacts and costs 9. Developers in Heber City and Daniel have funneled large communities onto US-40, contributing to deadly congestion. What enforceable mechanisms—beyond relying on future local zoning—will UDOT implement to prevent the bypass from enabling similar funneling of traffic from new developments? Provide: (a) modeling of induced traffic/growth impacts; (b) specific language in the Record of Decision or permits prohibiting new interchanges/access points; and (c) how this aligns with the local 1-house-per-20-acres vote and City/County preservation agreements. 10. Are you going to make public any private conversations or agreements between UDOT and Scott Phillips, Sid Ostergaard, Matt Brower, Mike Johnston, Rachel Kahler, and Ivory Homes? Are you aware of Matt Brower's potential conflict of interest due to property affiliations in downtown Heber and his group's advocacy for the bypass?

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		11. North Fields gets limited access/frontage roads with barriers for local exits. Will Coyote/Sorenson areas receive identical restrictions? If not, explain unequal treatment and how it avoids disparate impacts. 12. Are you going to make your affiliation with google public? 13. How do you justify an extra $100 million+ per mile simply because it is "easier to build because of traffic mitigation"? 14. What are your plans with the back 40 restaurant? 15. With little apparent community support for Route B, who exactly is the "community" you believe will benefit? 16. Why are yet-to-be-built businesses considered more important than water quality for 1.5 million people served by the North Fields aquifer? 17. The DEIS $760.5 million construction cost for Alternative B excludes land acquisition disputes, full canal reconstruction, wetlands/aquifer mitigation, stormwater/deicing controls, induced growth infrastructure, flooding liability, and local upkeep of frontage roads/trails. Provide a detailed 50-year lifecycle cost estimate for Alternative B that includes all these excluded/deferred items, with a clear breakdown of what portion will be paid by Heber City, Wasatch County, NFIC, or other local taxpayers versus UDOT/state/federal funds. 18. UDOT claims Alternative B causes the 'least overall harm' to historic properties by impacting only 1 historic building (vs. 4 for Alternative A) and protecting downtown Heber's historic town center by diverting traffic. However, Route B would directly affect or destroy over 15,000 feet of NRHP-eligible historic canals (1860s irrigation systems integral to Heber's agricultural heritage) and alter the historic rural setting of the North Fields. Provide: (a) the specific historic buildings or structures that Route B 'saves' compared to Alternative A; (b) how UDOT evaluated the North Fields' historic agricultural landscape (including canals, field patterns, and cultural integrity under Section 106/4(f)) as a contributing resource; and (c) why preserving downtown buildings outweighs the irreversible loss of historic irrigation heritage and rural setting in North Fields. 19. What specific properties' will be saved with route B rather than route A? What specific properties are you hoping to save with all bypass options? What exact benefit will there be with more roads to downtown. Show the studies you have taken to prove this theory. Thank you again for considering these questions. Protecting the North Fields, the aquifer, historic canals, and the long-term well-being of Heber City and Wasatch County is essential for current and future generations. Sincerely, James R Peterson
356	Jami Hewlett	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Sincerely, Jami Hewlett XXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
155	Jan Phillips (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	My preference is no action. The bypass options chosen do not solve the stated problem of less traffic on Main Street through town, and destroy acres of wetlands and open space. If a bypass is build, I prefer Option A. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
383	Jan Reinhart	Hello, I'm writing to express my concern about UDOT's preference for Alternative B. The North Fields of Heber Valley are an invaluable resource, not only for this valley, but for the Provo River watershed. With Utah being a desert environment, we should be prioritizing and protecting our water resources and wetlands more than anything. Mitigation practices never replace the benefits of leaving a natural system intact, and once you disrupt those natural processes, they can never fully be recovered. I don't think that either Alternative A or B will decrease the amount of traffic on Main Street through Heber City. Early in this EIS process, UDOT mentioned in a meeting that one of their studies found that the large majority of the traffic was local traffic. The city was designed with all of its major businesses, gas stations, and restaurants along Main Street, so that's where everyone goes. Even people who are just driving through stop to fill up their gas tanks and get something to eat. I think it's unrealistic to think that building a bypass will make US-40 a "quieter, local road," especially with all of the recent development. I'm not sure how Heber City could create a "historic" or "walkable" downtown. Main Street is lined with fast food restaurants, car dealerships, and gas stations. These aren't places that people want to walk to. I think that the time and effort of this project would be better spent trying to find ways to use existing infrastructure to improve traffic flows around downtown, such as improvements to side streets, additions of roundabouts, etc. We should keep US-40 as the highway and preserve the dwindling natural and agricultural resources in this valley as much as possible. Thanks for your time, Jan Reinhart
201	Jana Lindberg	Thank you for all the research and work that has gone into evaluating options for US 40 through Heber. I agree that option B is our best alternative. Can't wait to get the truck traffic off of Main Street. Can you start tomorrow? Best regards, Jana Lindberg Heber Resident
395	Janell Palmer	Absolutely no bypass in north fields Heber valley! Bypass the semis. Wait for the train. What are you thinking. This is not a solution. Janell Palmer Janell
378	Janelle J Jarvis	Please select the most sustainable plan: Alternative A (on US 40), in order to do the least amount of disruption to the landscape and preserve the current water supplies.
614	Janet Athay	I support the letter submitted by NFIC and oppose alternative B!Protect our aquifers at all costs- the North Fields is the ONLY source of surface water left. We demand fiscal responsibility from UDOT- they have intentionally refused cheaper alternatives presented by several entities and refused to realign the bypass to allow funding of a conservation easement. This will greatly affect our taxes without solving the problem. Sincerely, Janet Athay
235	Janet Trunnell	Sir/Madam, I'm a Heber resident and am writing about the proposed bypass option B. I'm against this option on so many levels, but here are a few for your consideration: No options were provided of what would happen if current highway 40 was improved e.g. light timing, right turn and climbing lanes. Future east side development numbers do not appear to be factored in.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The APA of the north fields was not included Alt. B violates LEDPA and is not the least impactful route. Aquifers can never be replaced, but businesses and driveways can! Alt. B violates the Federal Clean Water Act. Mitigation ratios and utilizations need clarification, please. Changes needed to overall design to be at grade, not overpasses. I'm not opposing traffic solutions, but hope that said can safeguard the living heart of Heber Valley. The north and south fields protect our water, our air, our farms, our wildlife and the identity that makes our valley home. Option B asks us to sacrifice all of that while failing to fix the true traffic problems. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Sincerely, Janet M. Trunnell
8	Janice Homer	What will be done to reduce noise in the neighborhood along 1200S . It appears there are many homes that will be directly on the highway. I live on Industrial Parkway and Im concerned about noise. Also why is the new road so close to these homes? Can the road be more south away from these homes? On the map it looks like the road could be more south and Impact a few businesses not homes.
67	Janice Homer	Plan b states.It's not going to affect many houses which is actually untrue.Because there is approximately twenty three houses on1300 which is right where the bypass is going to go in their backyard. This is going to ruin people's lives in homes and peace.I'll be on the zoom tonight and plan to get to the meeting on 28th at the High school. Bottom line, I feel like this bypass it's not going to improve anybody's life in heber, it's turning us into salt lake city, suburb with lots of traffic and lots of big highway's . This plan to revitalize main street is not going to work. Because there's still going to be traffic. And a lot of traffic down main street is because of local traffic. I think we should put a toll on the roads for all construction, trucks and oil tankers. This will slow them down as they enter the city. Put some pedestrian bridges over main street to make it safer.For people to cross. Green light straight down main street. So the traffic can get through with longer waits at side streets, especially in the morning or when there is high traffic. Let the traffic go straight down main street with green lights for 11 min ... the time this bypass is supposed to save. Allow people on the streets behind main street to have businesses commercial businesses and restaurants ... leave main street alone the way it is.
264	Janice Homer	Lutting the raised bypass on 1300 South will ruin 2 neighborhoods. The highway is directly in the backyard of more than 20 homes. UDOT states plan B and A impacts few homes. You are lying as both Aand B impact more than 20 homes. The vibrations and noise from this proposed highway in backyards will ruin these people's lives. The only solution is to stop the bypass....tell the truth about how the bypass will ruin all these homes.
289	Janine Morton	I am a resident (XXXXXXXXXXX, Heber), and am writing in opposition of both Alternative A & B and in favor of No-Action Alternative. Please accept and consider the following comments: -250' wide in our rural, peaceful, desirabley natural habitat is an absolute eye sore for visitors. It in direct oppostion to the draw to the area for both prospective new homeowners & visitors. There is not one picture promoting Heber Valley that has a gigantic 250' wide concrete road structure. -"Historic town" is not the draw. It is not what we residents are proud of. It is the natural beauty, and thereby that is not the "vision". Also, non-motorized transportation is a delusion and absolutely not a widely held goal. Please ask locals if there is any doubt. A 9% decrease in through traffic, according to your published response, based on undisclosed future growth in 30 years (purpose & need scope is already 5 years old). All of this for 9%, while local traffic will increase and regional traffic also, compared to the No-Action Alternative. -$1 BILLION (NO PROJECT EVER CLOSES @ BUDGET). That is a massive expenditure for non critical, non family, non education, non environmental, non safety project. -Getting from one end to the other without stopping or saving ONE MINUTE is a misappropriation of the communities priorities. Keep us serene, peaceful., safe & beautiful!! -Is it correct that funding is 5-6 years away, as I was told by a representative at the public hearing last month. -Comments said it would foster a pleasant street atmosphere. I am not seeing it and I am certain that I am in the majority. -250,000 hours save isa an erroneous number. Speaking with several other residents, that math simply can not get there. If that is in fact accurate, please show us how you got there. Respectfully, it seems contrived. - Progress is a part of life, however this is not a good project.
290	Janine Morton	This project also has a significantly negative impact on the value of some very nice, extremely high dollar homes in the area.
541	Jarad Skaley	Regarding the Heber valley bypass. I am not in favor of filling in any part of the north fields open space, especially if it's for the purposes of redirecting traffic from highway 40. The disruption to the wetlands will create a larger and unforeseen problem that will become a cost and environmental burden long after the project is finished. I would like to know if what type of restrictions are placed of the use of the land along the bypass, the possibility of fuel stations placed along the new road significantly expands the footprint and opens the door for unchecked development. If no other amenities are allowed to be built along the new road, what would the incentive for traffic to use the road? The bulk of the vehicles traveling highway 40 stop in Heber to fuel vehicles, buy food and get last minute supplies. The minority of vehicles using Heber's main street for regular commuting may use a bypass with nominal effect to the usual congestion times. The main road through town is used as a food/fuel/rest stop and creating a bypass deprives the businesses of sales if it is used as you suggest. From what I've seen of the traffic passing through our valley this new road with be burdened with construction delays, cost overruns and become a barely used eyesore disrupting the unbroken beauty of nature that comes with being a mountain valley
349	Jason Hurst	please listen to the voice of the public and give serious consideration to the use of roundabouts. having spent considerable time in the UK and Ireland i have experienced their use of roundabouts in heavy traffic areas as well as not so heavy of traffic. Roundabouts are so much more efficient and attractive. The Heber Valley doesn't deserve to have fly overs and overpasses ruin the charm and beauty of this amazing place.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
523	Jason Seegert	Dear UDOT Project Team and Decision-Makers: I submit this comment in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Heber Valley Corridor Project, published in January 2026. After careful review of the Draft EIS and associated materials, I urge UDOT to reject Alternative B as the preferred alternative. If an action alternative must be selected, Alternative A has substantially fewer impacts on irreplaceable wetland resources and better complies with the Clean Water Act. My comment is organized around three principal arguments: I. Alternative B Cannot Legally Be the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) II. The Alternatives Analysis Has Significant Gaps III. Water Quality Risks to the Provo River Watershed and Deer Creek Reservoir Are Significant I. Alternative B Cannot Legally Be the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) The central legal problem in this Draft EIS is UDOT's designation of Alternative B as the LEDPA under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 CFR Part 230). This designation is not supported by the record and should not survive review by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. A. The Scale of Aquatic Resource Destruction Alternative B would destroy 53.92 acres of aquatic resources, including 50.34 acres of palustrine emergent wetland, 2.12 acres of perennial stream, and 1.46 acres of canals and ditches (Draft EIS, Table 3.14-5, p. 3-191). Alternative A would destroy 22.52 acres — less than half. Alternative B destroys 2.4 times more aquatic resources than Alternative A. This is not a marginal difference. These are not degraded, isolated wetlands. The Draft EIS describes them as part of a "large wetland complex that continues to the north and west beyond the evaluation area adjacent to the Middle Provo River" (p. 3-187). They perform critical functions including storage of surface and subsurface water, particulate retention, nutrient cycling, and organic carbon export (p. 3-188). They support wetland vegetation and animal communities, including potentially suitable habitat for the federally threatened Ute ladies'-tresses orchid (Spiranthes diluvialis) (p. 3-180). A total of 162.06 acres of wetlands were mapped in the 870-acre evaluation area (p. 3-187). Alternative B would permanently destroy nearly one-third of the mapped wetlands in the study area. B. The 404(b)(1) Guidelines Establish a Clear Legal Standard That Alternative B Fails The Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines prohibit the discharge of dredged or fill material where a practicable alternative exists with less adverse impact on the aquatic ecosystem, "so long as the alternative does not have other significant adverse environmental consequences" (40 CFR § 230.10(a)). For non-water-dependent projects, there is a rebuttable presumption — meaning UDOT bears the burden of proving otherwise — that practicable alternatives exist that do not involve special aquatic sites (40 CFR § 230.10(a)(3)). Highway construction is not water-dependent. This presumption has not been rebutted. By contrast, Alternative A demonstrates that a practicable alternative exists with significantly lower aquatic impacts. The question is whether Alternative A has "other significant adverse environmental consequences" that would disqualify it as the LEDPA. UDOT's answer, set forth in Appendix 2F, rests on two arguments: relocations and Section 4(f) compliance. Neither holds up. C. Relocations Are Not "Significant Adverse Environmental Consequences" UDOT argues that Alternative A would require relocating 15 businesses and 12 residences (estimated cost of $57 million), compared to 2 businesses and 6 residences for Alternative B ($12 million) (Appendix 2F, Table 2). The difference between 27 and 8 relocations is meaningful, and I do not dismiss it. But relocations are temporary, compensable under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, and routinely managed in highway projects. The destruction of 53.92 acres of functioning wetlands within a connected complex is permanent, and the ecological functions of mature wetland systems cannot be replicated through compensatory mitigation at any ratio. Those aren't the same kind of harm. The 404(b)(1) Guidelines exist precisely to prevent agencies from trading permanent, irreversible environmental damage against temporary, compensable costs. The $45 million difference in relocation costs represents roughly 6% of the project budget ($711–$760 million, Draft EIS Table S-4). That marginal cost variation does not justify destroying an additional 31.4 acres of wetlands. Moreover, the Draft EIS acknowledges that 13 of the 15 business relocations under Alternative A are businesses "in various stages of approval or construction" at the 900 North/US-40 intersection (Appendix 2F, Table 2). Several of these businesses have not yet been built, meaning the relocation "impact" is hypothetical and should carry correspondingly less weight in an LEDPA analysis. Courts have recognized that economic considerations alone do not override wetland protection under the CWA framework. See, e.g., Bersani v. Robichaud, 850 F.2d 36 (2d Cir. 1988). D. The Section 4(f) Argument Does Not Overcome the Wetland Impact Differential UDOT argues that "compliance with Section 4(f) limits UDOT's ability to select Alternative A" because Alternative A would impact 4 historic properties versus 1 for Alternative B (Appendix 2F, p. 13).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Section 4(f) requires selecting the alternative that causes the "least overall harm." The least overall harm analysis must consider all environmental impacts, not just the count of Section 4(f) properties used. Both alternatives would use Section 4(f) properties — neither is a total avoidance alternative (Appendix 2F, p. 13). The difference is 4 properties versus 1. Mitigation for historic structure impacts (documentation, relocation, or redesign) is well-established and routinely accomplished in highway projects. Compensatory mitigation for 53.92 acres of functioning wetlands within a connected complex is unlikely to succeed at any ratio. At UDOT's estimated mitigation ratios of 2:1 to 15:1, Alternative B would require between 108 and 809 acres of compensatory mitigation (p. 3-195). The feasibility and ecological success of creating or restoring wetlands at this scale — in a valley already under intense development pressure — is highly uncertain. The difference between 4 and 1 historic property uses cannot outweigh the 31.4 additional acres of permanent wetland destruction in the least-harm analysis. E. The Jurisdictional Determination Must Be Completed Before an LEDPA Is Designated UDOT requested an Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD) from USACE in April 2024. As of December 2025 — 20 months later — no AJD has been issued (Draft EIS, p. 3-189). The Draft EIS candidly acknowledges that jurisdictional wetland impacts used to compare alternatives "might change if an AJD differs from the wetlands UDOT identified as likely jurisdictional" (p. 3-189). It is premature for UDOT to designate any alternative as the LEDPA when the jurisdictional status of the very wetlands at issue has not been determined. The 404(b)(1) analysis in Appendix 2F is built on assumptions that may be materially altered by the AJD. USACE should not accept an LEDPA determination based on the applicant's self-assessment when USACE's own jurisdictional determination is pending. The evolving definition of "waters of the United States" following the Supreme Court's decision in Sackett v. EPA, 598 U.S. 651 (2023), adds further uncertainty. Under Sackett, jurisdiction extends only to wetlands with a "continuous surface connection" to jurisdictional waters. Some wetlands in the north fields may not meet this standard — the Draft EIS notes they are inundated primarily by "seasonally high groundwater and/or flood irrigation" rather than surface connections (p. 3-188), and that no traditional navigable waterbody is present in the immediate area (Appendix 3N). If post-Sackett jurisdictional review reduces the number of regulated wetlands in the evaluation area, the remaining jurisdictional wetlands become even more ecologically significant and their protection more critical. Fewer jurisdictional wetlands means each one matters more, not less. The case for avoidance gets stronger as the protected resource gets scarcer. This is precisely why the AJD must be completed before any LEDPA designation is finalized. F. Requested Action on LEDPA I request that the Record of Decision: Acknowledge that Alternative A is the LEDPA under 40 CFR § 230.10(a), as it has less than half the aquatic resource impact of Alternative B. If UDOT disagrees, provide a detailed analysis explaining why temporary, compensable business relocations — covered by federal relocation law — constitute "significant adverse environmental consequences" sufficient to override the permanent destruction of 31.4 additional acres of functioning wetlands — with specificity beyond the 14-page memo in Appendix 2F, which states conclusions without supporting analysis. Complete the Approved Jurisdictional Determination before finalizing the LEDPA designation. II. The Alternatives Analysis Has Significant Gaps NEPA requires agencies to "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 CFR § 1502.14). The Draft EIS's alternatives analysis has two significant deficiencies. A. No Multimodal or Reduced-Build Alternative Was Studied The Draft EIS eliminated transit from preliminary screening and never studied a reduced-build alternative that combines modest US-40 improvements with demand management strategies. NEPA requires consideration of reasonable alternatives, including those outside the lead agency's jurisdiction (40 CFR § 1502.14(c)). The alternatives analysis is "the heart of the environmental impact statement" (40 CFR § 1502.14), and the absence of any multimodal or hybrid alternative is a significant omission. This gap is compounded by the fact that the transit alternative was eliminated during the 2022–2023 screening, before the updated travel demand model (version 2.1, finalized spring 2024) projected 30% more traffic on north US-40. A dramatic change in projected demand should trigger reconsideration of all alternatives, not just highway capacity options. B. Induced Growth Is Acknowledged but Not Addressed UDOT's own induced growth analysis (Appendix 3A) demonstrates that Alternative B would accelerate development pressure in the north fields — the same area whose wetlands Alternative B would destroy. This isn't speculation — it's from UDOT's own project record: Wasatch County's planning director stated during the November 2, 2022 induced growth meeting that under Alternatives WB3 and WB4 (predecessors to Alternative B), "it is likely the north fields would be subdivided at a quicker rate" and that these alternatives "would have the biggest impact on the transition of land use compared to other alternatives" (Appendix 3A, p. 4). The induced growth meeting notes also reveal that "if there is access in the north fields, there will be pressure from developers" (p. 3); that Heber City acknowledged likely "pressure to put driveways every 350 feet from landowners" (p. 3); and that landowners between the bypass and US-40 "would be surrounded by roads on two sides" creating "pressure to provide access" (p. 4).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The economics literature broadly confirms that highway capacity expansion induces additional vehicle travel. Duranton and Turner (2011), in their study published in the American Economic Review (101(6): 2616–2652), found that vehicle-kilometers traveled increase in rough proportion to highway capacity on urban interstates. While the precise elasticity may differ in a rural valley context, the basic pattern tracks with what UDOT's own stakeholders described: building a bypass through the north fields will accelerate the development that threatens the remaining wetlands and agricultural land. The Draft EIS doesn't wrestle with this contradiction. UDOT's promise of "no additional access" is a design constraint, not a land use control. Development pressure from being "surrounded by roads on two sides" works through local zoning and annexation, which UDOT has no authority over. The mayor of Heber City has publicly confirmed that "the developer pressure is exceedingly real." UDOT's track record on design constraints gives little comfort here. The Legacy Parkway settlement near Salt Lake City restricted the road to four lanes with no trucks and a 55 mph speed limit. Less than 20 years later, UDOT is expanding it to six lanes. Promises made during permitting do not survive the next traffic model update. The travel demand model assumptions — particularly regarding secondary (vacation) homes, growth distribution, and the 30% traffic increase from version 1.0 to version 2.1 — should be disclosed and validated so the public can meaningfully evaluate whether the projected demand is reasonable or reflects assumptions consistent with the project's own existence. III. Water Quality Risks to the Provo River Watershed and Deer Creek Reservoir Are Significant The project is located in the Middle Provo River watershed between Jordanelle Reservoir and Deer Creek Reservoir — two critical components of the Central Utah Project that supply drinking water to much of the Wasatch Front. Alternative B would destroy 53.92 acres of wetlands that currently perform nutrient cycling, particulate retention, and water storage functions that protect downstream water quality. Destroying these wetlands while simultaneously more than doubling the impervious surface area contributing highway pollutant runoff to the watershed (from 83.9 acres under no-action to 179.8 acres under Alternative B, per Appendix 3K, Table 2-5) is a compounding impact that the Draft EIS does not sufficiently address. The Water Quality Technical Report (Appendix 3K) documents that both action alternatives would increase pollutant concentrations in stormwater runoff reaching the Provo River, including total phosphorus exceedances, dissolved cadmium and lead at levels above drinking water and aquatic life standards, and de-icing runoff producing total dissolved solids concentrations averaging approximately 1,380–1,410 mg/L — exceeding the 1,200 mg/L surface water standard for agricultural use and far exceeding the 500 mg/L groundwater quality standard. Given the high groundwater table in the north fields (seasonal fluctuations of up to 30 feet, Draft EIS p. 3-177), the potential for highway pollutants to reach groundwater is substantial. The Draft EIS should analyze the cumulative effects of removing natural wetland filtration while increasing pollutant loading in a watershed that serves as a drinking water source for much of the Wasatch Front. IV. Additional Supporting Concerns Agricultural Protection Areas. Alternative B would impact 38.4 acres of designated Agricultural Protection Areas (APAs), compared to 11.8 acres for Alternative A (Appendix 2F, Table 2). These APAs were established under Utah law (Utah Code § 17-41-101 et seq.) specifically to protect agricultural land from conversion. Building a freeway-type facility through 38.4 acres of protected farmland is inconsistent with the purpose of the APA designation. Incomplete Endangered Species Surveys. The Draft EIS acknowledges that Ute ladies'-tresses habitat surveys are incomplete and that 84 acres of the evaluation area are "new to the project in 2025" and have not been formally delineated for aquatic resources (p. 3-175). It is inappropriate to select a preferred alternative before these surveys are complete, particularly given records of individuals within a 2-mile radius of the evaluation area (p. 3-183). Community Character. The north fields are an iconic landscape feature of the Heber Valley. The Wasatch County General Plan's Central Planning Area emphasizes continuation of "historical land use patterns" in the north fields due to "meadows, riparian areas, a high groundwater table, and unsuitable soils for building and infrastructure development" (Draft EIS, p. 3-9). Alternative B is fundamentally inconsistent with these community values. V. Requested Actions For the reasons stated above, I request that the Final EIS and Record of Decision: Reject Alternative B as the preferred alternative. If an action alternative must be selected, designate Alternative A as both the preferred alternative and the LEDPA. Complete the USACE Approved Jurisdictional Determination before finalizing any LEDPA analysis. The 404(b)(1) compliance memo in Appendix 2F is premature without it. Analyze cumulative impacts of wetland destruction combined with increased impervious surface and pollutant loading on the Provo River watershed and Deer Creek Reservoir drinking water supply. The north fields cannot be rebuilt or replicated. They are an ecological, agricultural, and community resource that the Clean Water Act exists to protect — precisely to prevent the unnecessary destruction of aquatic resources when practicable alternatives exist. Alternative A is the practicable alternative. I urge UDOT to follow the law and protect these resources. Respectfully submitted, Jason Seegert

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		PO Box XXXXX Park City, UT XXXXX
514	Jaxon Tate	To whom it may concern, These plans and migration of the highway will impact local wildlife migration and travel. This is just another plan to cut off access and make Heber Valley a 15 minute city just like the 2030 agenda. No where in the document do these plans or other public plans include future or current flock safety and traffic cameras. These will be included and used to incriminate Americans and others alike while being illegally installed with the tax payers money. I will refuse to contribute to this conspiracy and have our roads be our enslavement. We have a right to travel freely I as well as several other Americans demand that these traffic cameras and Palantir software immediately removed as it has been abused by the system that be already. Supreme Court has protected the right to travel through the Article IV Privileges and Immunities Clause, the Fourteenth Amendment's Privileges or Immunities Clause, and due process. True justice has not been seeked for crimes against humanity against higher powers that be and run our country and I will not stand by the technocrats or big businesses that run our country. If the privitized cameras must exist on the roads, they shall be encrypted but yet able to be accessed by any citizens via the Freedom of Information Act. I request to see the current contracts and legislation that put these cameras in place as this is an infringement and blatant overstep of power. This is not a joke. This is the people's livelyhood and freedom that will be controlled if these systems go into place. Have some humanity and focus on the ecosystem instead of your profits for once.
675	Jean Tabin	Could not make comment on UDOT site. As currently planned, I think the UDOT plan for US40 is too harmful for open space and wetlands. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
654	Jeff Nicholas	I'm writing to express my thoughts on the route selected for the Heber Bypass. I believe Alternative A would be a much better option than Alternative B for the following reasons: It would preserve most of the North Fields, which offer an iconic view and preserve the character of the Heber Valley; It would preserve farmlands and protect the shallow aquifer in the North Fields; Generations to come would benefit from preserving the North Fields, and Alternative B seems to have been selected because it would cost less to acquire/relocate homes and businesses. That is a very short-sighted reason for making a decision with such far reaching consequences and which would lead to an unsightly highway that would scar the beauty of the North Fields. Respectively, Jeff Nicholas
114	Jeff Parker (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hello, everybody. I am here today standing to express my firm support for the recommendation of Alternative B for the Heber Valley bypass. And, look, I recognize that this is an incredibly complex decision. I believe that I represent a portion of the community that views this infrastructure as the only viable path preserving Heber's long-term character. I know a lot of the opposition towards Alternative B centers around the North Fields, and, look, they are beautiful. Don't get me wrong. They're incredible vistas, and undeniably so. However, it's important to clarify the role that these North Fields play in our valley. First of all, they're privately owned parcels. They're not public access parks, and there's also a misconception that these fields serve as the lungs of the valley or an aquifer. They're agricultural lands. They're irrigated. They're using water, and they're also using fertilizer. There is modern infrastructure planned directly through Alternative B that can help manage the runoff and the environmental impact more predictably than these agricultural practices. But that's not the reason I support Alternative B. The reason I support Alternative B is to help bring back the small town feel that we have here in Heber. Yeah. Exactly. Right. Like, Heber's growing quickly. Our valley is growing quickly, and we need to plan for that. Right? We can either stick our heads in the sand and lock us into heavy traffic all on Main Street, or we can consider an alternative that boots some of the heavy traffic off and perhaps bring back, like, some walking storefronts and a more pedestrian friendly destination. We cannot simply wish away the population increase. We must plan for it. Heber is on the trajectory now to mirror the congestion of Kimball Junction. I don't know if any of you have been to Kimball Junction, but, boy, that's rough; right? Stoplight after stoplight of unsynchronized red lights and miles and miles of backup. In conclusion, this bypass is an investment in our daily quality of life, and it allows for a functional downtown and a sustainable future for the valley. I urge UDOT to move forward with Alternative B. Thank you.
237	Jeff Parker	Dear UDOT Project Team, I am writing to formally submit my support for Alternative B regarding the Heber Valley Corridor. As a resident invested in the long-term health and character of our community, I believe Alternative B is the only viable path forward for the following reasons: 1. Preserving the "Small Town" Heart The consensus in Heber is nearly universal: we want to maintain our rural feel. To me, that is impossible if Main Street remains a congested thoroughfare for heavy transit. Alternative B provides the necessary relief to return Main Street, River Road, and other streets to the residents, creating a free-flowing environment that preserves our town’s identity. 2. Environmental and Historical Responsibility While the travel time savings are cited at roughly 1.5 minutes, the cumulative impact is significant. When multiplied by the thousands of vehicles traversing the valley weekly, this efficiency leads to a meaningful reduction in idling and overall emissions. Furthermore, Alternative B is the more responsible choice as it: Minimizes impacts on our irreplaceable historical buildings. Preserves more critical wetland space compared to other proposed routes.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		3. A Pragmatic View of the North Fields I acknowledge the beauty of the North Fields; however, sentiment must be balanced with reality. These fields are privately owned with no public access and primarily serve as hobby farms rather than high-output agricultural land. We cannot prioritize scenic vistas on private land over the safety and mobility needs of the entire public. 4. Planning for Growth vs. "Bandaid" Solutions Alternative A is a temporary fix—a "bandaid" for a wound that requires a long-term cure. Heber Valley is growing, and we cannot afford to "stick our heads in the sand." Alternative B is the only option that looks at our valley's inevitable growth with clear eyes, providing the infrastructure necessary to handle future traffic rather than leaving us with the same problems five years down the road. I urge UDOT to move forward with Alternative B to ensure a functional, sustainable future for Heber Valley. Sincerely,
2	Jeff Thatcher	My name is Jeff Thatcher. I live in Midway. I like Alternative B much more than Alternative A. Thanks, Jeff Thatcher
55	Jeffrey Anderson	I have lived here now over 10 years and have actually written multiple times of my concern that the Corridor impact on the South End of the valley has just been ignored. It still continues. I have personally never heard much concern or response to its impact on businesses and homes along 1300 South. It's been like you established this plan 20 years ago and you are not changing regardless, even if the area has changed as it has. Here's a common sense idea that you guys apparently still haven't figured out or want to consider. It will actually save you money too, Utilize the existing 189 highway corridor instead. That way you don't affect homes and business and the safety of the people who live in this area. I have once again reached out and hope somebody is listening and has the willingness to look into a common sense alternative.
521	Jeffrey Pierce	Dear UDOT: As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. 1. Non-Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. Lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company, were not properly advanced as required under LEDPA standards. 2. Foregone Conservation Opportunity - UDOT refused to adjust the project boundary to accommodate a federally funded NRCS conservation easement, disrupting plans to permanently protect nearly 300 acres of prime farmland. 3. Incomplete Cost Disclosure - The EIS omits substantial costs, including utility relocation, irrigation reconstruction, agricultural crossings, stormwater infrastructure, and long-term maintenance — obscuring the project's true fiscal impact. 4. Understated Growth and Traffic Impacts - Induced growth is under-modeled. Highways generate development, and development generates traffic. Main Street congestion is largely local and will not be meaningfully solved by a bypass that simultaneously accelerates growth and doesnt account for the mass East-side developments. 5. Irreversible Agricultural Loss - Alternative B converts prime farmland to pavement at the highest rate among options, fragments working farms, and relies on vague mitigation measures inconsistent with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and state land-use policies. 6. Water and Air Risk - The route cuts through aquifer recharge zones and wetlands that naturally filter runoff. A 65-mph design increases pavement width, noise, dangerous wildlife accidents, and the pollutant load running into groundwater and the Provo River. 7. Misaligned Public Purpose - The alignment prioritizes regional through-traffic and resort access over local mobility, contrary to adopted city and county preservation goals.Alternative B maximizes environmental harm, fiscal exposure, and long-term development pressure while offering limited traffic relief. UDOT must select the least damaging, fiscally responsible alternative — one that protects water, farmland, air quality, and the rural character that defines the Heber Valley. Sincerely,
536	Jeffrey Pierce	Please do not ruin our historic north fields forever. Our community doesn't want it, and please listen to us. For too long we've been ignored, and help us save what we have left our rural community.
195	Jeffrey Weidell	This highway will cut through the most scenic corridor of this beautiful valley, and the aesthetics of the scenery are a positive to us residents and all who drive through. There are basic on grade straight-line highways and those with some contour and variation in design. The best designs blend in with the environment like well designed homes do. Simple comparison is communist block construction versus high quality 21st century American design. I prefer the latter and hope we can build a beautiful highway for a beautiful valley. Thank you.
696	Jenni Horner	Here it is in case you didn't receive it Dear Utah Department of Transportation, First of all I would like to thank you for trying to come up with solutions to traffic issues in our valley. I know it is not easy to propose plans to a community that is reluctant to growth and striving to keep charm and

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		small town feel. I realize that many traffic solutions must be solved before the 2034 olympics and I hope everyone can come to an agreement on this ongoing debate. I have fought for the north fields as a young teen when it was threatened with development and will fight for it again. So much of our valley has been uprooted and destroyed due to careless planning and I would hate for the same thing to happen here. I would encourage you to look at other cost efficient solutions that have been offered up by the community such as Lythgoe design group and the Clydes. I think they have some valuable insight as to ideas that would be less damaging environmentally but also cut down on sound pollution and safety concerns for our water sources and also our new high school and technical college. I also would encourage the idea of expanding our public transit much like park city has. I couldn't even get parking at the hospital this last winter because that is where all the skiers park as it is the only bus stop in Heber that offers rides to the lifts. I think it has potential for growth and that alone would cut down on local traffic. Thanks for taking time to listen to the community this will affect. https://www.lythgoedesign.com/post/roundabouts-in-the-heber-valley-corridor-bypass-project
694	Jenni Young	Dear Utah Department of Transportation, First of all I would like to thank you for trying to come up with solutions to traffic issues in our valley. I know it is not easy to propose plans to a community that is reluctant to growth and striving to keep charm and small town feel. I realize that many traffic solutions must be solved before the 2034 olympics and I hope everyone can come to an agreement on this ongoing debate. I have fought for the north fields as a young teen when it was threatened with development and will fight for it again. So much of our valley has been uprooted and destroyed due to careless planning and I would hate for the same thing to happen here. I would encourage you to look at other cost efficient solutions that have been offered up by the community such as Lythgoe design group and the Clydes. I think they have some valuable insight as to ideas that would be less damaging environmentally but also cut down on sound pollution and safety concerns for our water sources and also our new high school and technical college. I also would encourage the idea of expanding our public transit much like park city has. I couldn't even get parking at the hospital this last winter because that is where all the skiers park as it is the only bus stop in Heber that offers rides to the lifts. I think it has potential for growth and that alone would cut down on local traffic. Thanks for taking time to listen to the community this will affect. https://www.lythgoedesign.com/post/roundabouts-in-the-heber-valley-corridor-bypass-project
351	Jennifer Barnes	I live in the Heber Valley and I want to share my thoughts about the proposed bypass going through the North Fields. I strongly oppose putting a highway through the North Fields. That land isn’t just “empty space.” It’s part of what makes Heber beautiful. When you drive past those open fields and see the mountains behind them, that’s the heart of this valley. Once it’s paved over, it’s gone forever. I’m also very concerned about our aquifer. The North Fields sit on top of shallow groundwater that supplies drinking water and supports irrigation in this valley. Adding a major roadway means road salt, oil, runoff, and long-term contamination risks. Clean water is something we cannot replace. Saving a few minutes of drive time is not worth risking our water supply. I like these ideas by this architectural firm https://www.lythgoedesign.com/post/roundabouts-in-the-heber-valley-corridor-bypass-project The rural character of Heber is why so many of us live here. If we continue to solve growth by paving farmland, we will slowly erase the very thing people came here for. There have to be better options that improve traffic without destroying productive farmland and sensitive water areas. Please reconsider routing the bypass through the North Fields. Protect our water. Protect our farmland. Protect the beauty of this valley for the next generation. Thank you for listening. Jennifer Barnes XXXXXXXXXXXXX Midway Ut XXXX XXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
624	Jennifer Bosshardt	I would ask you to reconsider the raised road. I feel like it will just raise up the road so we have to see the traffic instead of Timp. Maybe there is some benefit that I'm not aware and if it is significantly going to make something better, then I get it but to have it higher so we see it and the cars on the road will be looking into those homes, or you'll have to build a higher wall, that doesn't seem beneficial to me.
481	Jennifer LeMaster	My husband and I own a home in Heber at XXXXXXXXXXX. We oppose Route B for the proposed bypass in Heber. Jen LeMaster LeMaster Law Firm www.lemasterlawfirm.com

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
495	Jennifer McCarthy	UDOT Bypass Study team, I have lived in the Heber Valley for the past 20 years. As everyone else I have watched the development grow exponentially without regard to the infrastructure. Yes my commute takes longer than it did to get through Main Street since I live on the south side and commute to Park city. However, it is only certain times of the day that are impacted. 40 is no different than 248, 248, I-80, 215 or all other major roadway during commute times. Heber City is not a destination town center. Our downtown has car washes, car dealerships, fast food etc. I believe all this bypass will do is seriously impact our precious water supply and create another avenue to develop ad destroy the North fields. We don't need a Bypass. We can slow down for those very limited times of day that are impacted with traffic. The majority of the traffic will still choose to go through town bypassing the destructive bypass. The impact off our water and the heber valley citizens that reside off of Southfield road and the other areas it will negatively impact are far greater than the benefit. Please don't contaminate our water and destroy our natural habitat. Stop paving paradise and calling it progress. Just stop already. With kindness, Jennifer McCarthy XXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah XXXXXXX
419	Jennifer Ostergard	I am in strong favor of option b. I do have concerns on the southern portion of the bypass. I listened to and agree with what Heber city has pointed out in their letter to UDOT regarding their concerns on the southern portion of the bypass. Please consider their suggestions. Please build the bypass with option b as the preferred route. Jennifer Ostergaard
108	Jennifer Thorn	Please consider option B for the bypass option. Thanks Jenn
374	Jennifer Wolff	Please consider regarding the proposed corridor. Alternative A offers a more sustainable option that protects the landscape, while facilitating growth in the valley. Thank you. Jennifer Wolff
651	Jenny Strangis	To whom it may concern - I'd like to voice my concern about the options proposed for the bypass around Heber. I personally think both A and B are not great options. I would like to see the least disruption to our community. If I had to choose, I would support option A as this proposal has the lowest impact on the community in general. Option B will disrupt the wetlands in the north fields that could have a HUGE impact on the future of our community. Thank you, Jenny Strangis cell: XXXXXXXXXXX email: XXXXXXXXXXXXX
192	Jeremiah Jones	UDOT, I am not sure if you received my online comment, I submitted it through the website. I will leave it here as well. Although I wholeheartedly disagree with the bypass highway, I added a few suggestions for the project if it is to be built. My wife and I are building a home XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, close to XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. Over the last year of being in the area and building our home we have spent many days and nights enjoying the absolute beauty and quiet of the open lands in Heber City. This is what makes the Heber Valley so special, is the lack of major highways. This allows for the entire area to remain one of the last undisturbed valleys in all of Utah. Many of the open lands provide a beautiful view of Mount Timp, and allow you to enjoy the area without the noise and eye sore that will be a massive 4 lane highway. I'm not entirely sure why this project is even necessary, as the traffic on Main Street is not even remotely as busy as other areas around Utah (ie roads leading to daybreak, 2100 North,etc.) and as a result you are disturbing 100's of acres of beautiful open fields. As far as our personal impact, the highway will be a close earshot away from our home. Right now we have wonderful Mountain views and peace and quiet, and your proposed project curves to the east right by our property. It also includes THE LARGEST interchange proposal of the entire project right by our property connecting to Southfield road. I have no idea why you feel it was necessary to add an interchange larger than ones I've seen near downtown Salt Lake in Heber Valley. It feels completely over the top and a direct attack at what the Heber Valley has enjoyed for many years, peace and quiet.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		We fear this highway will dramatically hurt our personal property value and its long term impact on the community as a whole will be negative. Obviously I wholeheartedly disagree with the project and don't understand why this was passed in the first place, and yes I've read your reasons on the website, and still disagree. However, if the project is to move forward I would like to propose the following. 1. A smaller interchange near the south of the route connecting to Southfield road, or even better continue the highway south and connect it to the existing highway 189 at that point. 2. Rather than building an overpass across the train tracks and 1200 S, build a tunnel underneath that area to help minimize noise and reduce the eyesore that a 4 lane highway is. 3. Alternative A has a much less impact on the north fields and I highly recommend leaving the north fields alone and allowing any development that happens there to utilize smaller roads with less impact on the overall landscape. I hope you will truly consider the opinions of one's who will actually have to live next to your massively over engineered, expensive, and unnecessary highway. Jeremiah
544	Jessica Jones	Jessica Jones XXXXXXXXXXXX I believe the alternative that Wasatch County Council proposed is the best option for the bypass road. It leaves the existing hwy 40 north of Heber as a collector road for the homes and businesses along it to all access the new hwy at one intersection. It will leave the North Fields in one contiguous area which makes a lot of residents happier than alternative B. It's a great compromise. I feel strongly that you should eliminate the interchange at Midway Lane hwy 113. Local traffic already has plenty of options to access hwy 189 and hwy 40, this new road should send highway traffic away from our town centers, that's what a bypass should do. The fewer access points the better the traffic can flow and the less green space gets paved over with on / off ramps. We need a bypass , what options A and B give us is just another big road. Sent from my iPad
537	Jessica Reschke	I grew up in a city that prioritized growth, convenience, and development over nearly everything. Spending 18 years of my life in Las Vegas, NV showed me exactly the opposite of what I wanted for my future family's home. I moved to Midway in the pursuit of a slower, more intentional life. I wanted to live in a place that valued its history, where people appreciated and protected the beauty of their natural surroundings. I know it seems hyperbolic to compare the two cities, but I have now spent the same amount of years living in Utah and have seen other rural communities overdeveloped and changed forever. That is not the future I want for Midway and Heber. I am not a lawyer or a politician, and I don't have the perfect words to convince you, but I am a citizen of this beautiful valley who would choose nearly any inconvenience to live here and not near a freeway overpass. I hope that those with the power to make this decision will consider the voices of the people who live here, run businesses here, and have chosen to raise their families here. I am not in favor of either proposed option, but Alternative B is especially horrific to me for its destruction of irreplaceable natural resources. The only option that sounds somewhat tolerable is to redraw the map to stick as closely as possible to the existing footprint of highway 189. Carving away more of what makes this valley so special would be a tragedy in my eyes.
584	Jill Lawson	Do what's best for the community and people that live in Heber. Move the 1300 south road more south to eliminate the need to have a raised area and be further from the homes. There is space to move it south to create a better environment for all of us that live here. Please think about the people! Thank you, Jill Lawson
283	Jill Merrifield	I support route B. I think the sooner you divert traffic from town the better. 1: The traffic being diverted sooner means there will be fewer cars past that point. 2: The noise from a bypass will not affect town quality of life as much if it's furthest away. J. Merrifield. Heber City resident. XXXXXXXXXXXX
593	Jill Van Leeuwen	To the UDOT Project Team, I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the selection of Alternative B, which proposes a four-lane highway bypass through the North Fields of Heber City. As a concerned citizen, and owner in the North Fields, I believe this route is detrimental to the environmental, agricultural, and economic health of our valley. Preserving Green Space and Protecting Water The North Fields are not just open space; they are a critical agricultural ecosystem and the green lung of the Heber Valley. The proposed route (Alternative B) threatens to destroy over 50 acres of wetlands and farmlands. Furthermore, this area sits atop a shallow aquifer that provides essential water for local irrigation and drinking water for residents. Introducing a major highway, with its associated pollution and runoff, directly above this, risks contaminating a vital water source. Detriment to Ranchers and Agriculture The proposed bypass would be devastating to local agriculture and ranching operations. It acts as a physical wall, splitting farms into non-viable fragments and disrupting generational, flood-irrigated land that has been in families for generations. The disruption to water systems, which includes the potential to ruin the ability to flood-irrigate, would put many farmers out of business.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Alternative Solution: A Smarter Approach If the primary goal of this project is to move traffic from US-40 to the airport road/US-189, we do not need the excessive, high-impact "loopy" on and off-ramps associated with the current Alternative B, which threaten to disrupt agricultural business logistics. Instead, a more sensible solution is to utilize a simpler, lower-impact route. A turn at or before 900 North that follows the existing power lines—or keeping improvements close to the current US-40 alignment—has been proven to be far less impactful to the environment and the local residents who live there. I urge UDOT to go back to the drawing board and to reconsider the, heavily criticized Alternative B and focus on a plan that protects the agricultural heritage and water quality of the North Fields. Sincerely, Jill Van Leeuwen XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX
191	Jill Watson	I am not sure the submission worked for Udot site. So I'm voicing my opinion here ; After the meeting on Jan 28th, I learned quite a bit more. I am not at all in favor of B and or A, A is better but it still oreeents huge problems for our valley. Neither help the traffic as mist us local. I would like to see traffic lights timed better. Create right hand turn lanes even though we would loose some parking on main. I propose we have the city purchase what they can behind those building and create a few parking garages to make up for the Main Street parking to accommodate the Right hand turn lanes. This will improve the traffic flow. Also requesting 18 wheelers time their pass through during after rush hour traffic . Lastly, if that doesn't solve a better situation, we should revisit the Boring company idea. Most had no idea and we need more facts and open discussion on this option. For truckers wanting Fuel & Coffee or food , all this mess combinations will be significantly less expensive & Offer less noise, pollution and visual eyesores. Finally our valley needs to come together and stop the growth of homes which creates the bulk of the problem. Jill M. Watson Sent from my iPhone
450	Jillyn Klein	UDOT, To you, the North Fields represents the most efficient way to travel from A to B. On paper, it does seem the most reasonable choice. There would be less disruption and fewer homes to disturb. What you are missing in this equation is the human element. The North Fields represents much more to the citizens of Heber Valley. It is what greets us as we enter the valley from the north. It is the view of Timpanogos across the fields that tells us we are home. It is intrinsic and irreplaceable. Once this is gone, the essence of Heber Valley is gone. It becomes just another community that is paved over in the name of progress. It reminds me of the Jimmy Buffet song "they paved paradise and put up a parking lot". If you are not from here, I don't think that you could possibly understand what keeping these fields as pristine as possible means to us. My one grandmothers land, where my mom would help her dad milk cows, has became Soldier Hollow. My other grandmothers house is now the site of Jordenelle Dam. There was little choice in either 'sale', as eminent domain was exercised by the state for both properties. It was for the sake of progress. Even though one was necessary for the water infrastructure and the other was for recreation and has somewhat been preserved, it still represents a loss to us, a slow chipping away of the extraordinary. Right now, Heber Valley is still extraordinarily. One of the crucial elements that makes it extraordinary is the open space of the North Fields. There are few vistas in this state that create such a sense of piece as the view across the north fields. There are other choices for this bypass. Your primary choice isn't the only alternative. Please, please, please listen to the people of Heber Valley. We have poured our heart and soul into this valley and are wanting it to remain extraordinary. Please reconsider your choice. Best Regards, Jillyn Klein
156	Jim Gagan (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	10 years and 3 quarters of a Billion Dollars to save 90 seconds? It make No Sense. I suggest hiring a traffic Light Company to do a Study on traffic light timing and turn lane signals. Fix the traffic light timimng and 40% of the clogs go away! Use AI and traffic cams to run the lights. I have lived in Chicago and California the traffic lights are better and the tech is availavle today. I vote for NO Bypass. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
677	Jim Gagan	I am opposed to option B! Not only does this option destroy the natural beauty of our valley, but endangers the watershed!

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I also think that spending a billion dollars to save an estimated 90 seconds is ridiculous! Option A is a better route if there has to be a bypass.
216	Jim Kaiserman	All, I am a licensed professional engineer and a licensed land surveyor. I moved to Heber City in 1992 when the county had 7500 people and Heber City had near 4500. One (1) stop light in the valley. Today 40,000 +/- and thirteen (13) stop lights. When you/we talk about people, remember Heber, Wasatch County and Midway have +/- 30 % second home where we get the traffic and do not count the people. Wetlands, if you look at the pre 1990 USDA aerials and use their infra-red version, you will see the North Fields very wet. Keep that photo and add todays photo. Very wet to not so wet and dryer every year. The +/- 1995 Central Utah Efficiency project came next. This effort lined the canals and put farm land under pressure irrigation. (Reduced run off.)Then look at the State of Utah Department of Water Resources Publication "Canal water Seepage". (+/- 1980). This booklet detailed water loss in canals. Using The Wasatch and Timpanogos canals as the poster child(s) it measured how much water a canal losses as the water seeps out. These are the same two canal and their seepage that used to feed the North Fields. Ater you partially concrete line them, the water is no longer available to show up in the North Fields. If you could figure out how to put the North Fields under pressure irrigation, most of your wetlands would go away. My vote and hopefully yours will be Alternate B or C where you take the traffic all the way to River Road with a 1-80 – Hwy 40 type interchange. Best Regards, James C. Kaiserman PE / PLS XXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX
513	Jim Marsh	As someone who lives in the Heber Valley and sees our traffic challenges every day, I believe Option B is the most responsible and forward-thinking bypass solution. It actually pulls the heavy regional traffic—especially the trucks and through-travelers—out of our historic Main Street, which would finally give our community some breathing room. Option B improves safety, reduces congestion, and supports the kind of walkable, family-friendly downtown so many of us want for our kids and grandkids. It also strikes a better balance between mobility and preserving neighborhoods compared to the other alternatives. For those of us who call this valley home, Option B feels like the option that protects our quality of life while still preparing for the growth we all know is comin Option A feels like a band aid and not a real solution.
299	Jodi Call	Hello, I would like to state my voice on opposing the option B plan for the Heber Valley bypass through the north fields. I support the letter sent by NFIC. We need to save our only surface water and protect the aquifers in this land. There have been several other suggestions and options that need to be addressed and evaluated as a serious contender. It is important to save these resources. UDOT kmows better than to do this option B. Jodi Call
542	Jodi Flickinger	Regarding the Heber valley bypass. I am not in favor of filling in any part of the north fields open space, I regularly travel main street. I do not find it necessary to build a bypass in our North Field to avoid traffic through main town. There is not going to be enough tourist traffic to build up main street to support a bypass. This would destroy the community between Heber and Midway and add traffic to an area. Traffic is not that bad! So what if it takes 12 minutes to get through town. I would rather sit in that, than lose my north fields and view of Timp. Along with the highway once it is built there will be gas stations, fast food, bathroom stops built with the possibility of residential property. I do not want that, all so someone does not have to sit in 4 minutes of extra traffic on a Friday afternoon with their camper trailer. I use main street currently, I walk to and from businesses regularly. Heber is not set up as a downtown tourist attraction and building a road through our outdoor area would impede the appeal for more people to come and visit the area. Please do not take away from the value our town has with the current open space just for an extra 5 minutes of traffic through town. Because once a road is built out there, no matter the research and concern put into the project, the area will be lost forever as open space.
531	Joe Bateman	As a SLC resident, I oppose the alternative Plan B that will pave over farms and an aquifer. There has to be a better option.
194	Joe Willa Motley	Udot, thanks for choosing a great route. This is the best option and is desperately needed. You might as build it right the first time. The people complaining about the route have no real facts with real merit. Thanks Joe Motley

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
579	Joe Willa Motley	UDOT One thing I have not heard anybody address is all the traffic that gets off highway 40 at Potters lane when traffic is backed up on 40 and the dust cloud that is formed. This is more of an environmental impact than that of the roadway. Also the north fields have been drying up since the canal above coyote was concrete lined. These are all facts. The small impact of the foot print of the bypass option 2 will only be a minor impact. It will actually make alot of thing better. Thanks Joe Motley Sent from my Galaxy
284	John Anderson M.D.	I propose a mile-for-mile bike path equal to the length of the eventual Heber Valley Bypass for cyclists, pedestrians and perhaps class I ‘e-bike,’ Also- there should be express bus service High Valley Transit all the way from Heber to downtown Salt Lake transit hub Thanks, John Anderson (Midway)
524	John Blickenstaff	Please reconsider your selected alternative B. Respect the longstanding use of the North Fields and don’t threaten the agricultural nature of the area and purity of its underlying aquifer. John Blickenstaff Sent from my iPhone
64	John Conradt	Dear UDOT Project Team, I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed Heber Valley bypass project, and in particular to Option B. I do not believe a bypass is the right solution for Heber Valley. The project would permanently alter the character of the valley, encourage sprawl, and induce additional traffic rather than meaningfully solving congestion. Similar projects elsewhere have shown that new highway capacity quickly fills up, leaving communities with more traffic, more noise, and more environmental damage—but without long-term relief. Option B is especially concerning. Its alignment would have significant impacts on existing neighborhoods, open space, and agricultural land that define Heber Valley. It would divide the community, reduce quality of life for residents, and irreversibly change the landscape that draws people here in the first place. These impacts far outweigh any speculative travel-time savings. Rather than building a bypass, I urge UDOT to prioritize alternatives that preserve the valley while addressing mobility needs more sustainably—such as improved transit options, targeted safety improvements, demand management, and better land-use planning that reduces the need for long cross-valley trips. Heber Valley is not just a traffic corridor; it is a community. Once this kind of infrastructure is built, there is no undoing the damage. I respectfully ask UDOT to remove Option B from consideration and to seriously reconsider whether a bypass is appropriate at all. Thank you for considering public input and for taking the long-term well-being of Heber Valley into account. Sincerely, John Condrat Heber Valley Resident
543	John L. Paul	Heber Valley Bypass Comments By John L. Paul I have been a resident of Heber Valley since 1988. It is amazing the misdirection and subterfuge being passed as concerns. I am for your alternative B proposal, with one exception. I have attended almost all the meetings over the years. One Item that has continued to come up is the moving of US189 away from the airport. Every meeting I attended the people of the valley wanted the road to stay a straight line along the airport, the only people that wanted it moved was Heber City council so they could increase the airport runway. The people did not want it. To address the claim that going through the north fields would destroy the look and feel of the valley. As you drop in to the valley the open fields aren’t the only sights that are what make up the Valley, it was also the sage brush and grass hills on the east of the road. They both made the small-town ambiance. Keeping just one set of fields won’t complete the look. They lost the feel of the valley when they approved the massive buildup on the east side of the road. If they were truly serious about the north fields, they would not have approved the large development on the north field corner of the intersection at river road. So, as you come

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		down the hill the first look of the valley is a large commercial development. Where were the North Field warriors, I think it is a developer tool to keep the fringe people occupied and keep them from slowing the east side developments. The second part of their new argument is water quality of the aquifer. If the quality of the water in the north fields was a concern, why are they doubling the size of the Twin Creeks Sewer system that handles the sewage from all the development up on Jordanelle and the east bench. The strained and light treated sewage water is discharged into the irrigation system. All the chemicals and microplastics are then added to the recharge of our aquifer. They have been putting treated sewage water on the south fields by the airport for years, when they care enough to clean those contamination sources up then I would worry about the road runoff. I wonder if this is a distraction from the fact that we are making massive developments while all the water in the valley has been overallocated for years, in wet years we are good but in dry years we will have problems. We are still adding new developments. With some developers buying water in the weber river basin and moving through the canal system to the Provo River. As a last thought when you go to New York and drive by central Park that one acreage of grass surrounded by massive high-density developments, it does not make you feel like you are in a farmland. Maybe you should tell the city that if they take away the north fields you will take away the airport bypass. Regards, John L. Paul
460	John Powell	I am supportive of the preferred alignment (Alignment B), especially if access points are limited. I travel through Heber to the Uintah Basin on a regular basis. The congestion continues to become worse along Heber Main Street, especially with the large amount of truck traffic. Heber Main Street will significantly benefit from rerouting traffic. The truck fuel economy will greatly benefit from the bypass, and in turn, the air quality should improve. Travel times for those passing by Heber will be a massive improvement. Thanks for considering improvements to this area. Without the improvements, Main Street traffic will just become a greater mess in the future.
125	John Scheid (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	My name is John Scheid. I -- when I first heard about this bypass option, I brought up the scenario of using a tunnel under Main or some place else in the valley, and I keep getting pushback saying that it's too expensive, the water table is too high. Well, it's not too high. You can build tunnels under the Chesapeake Bay. You can build tunnels between France and England. So a tunnel and water table issue is not an issue. The other scenario -- I asked a few weeks ago if they talked to a boring company, and I was told when I was out in the hall that you have talked to the boring company, but that was a while ago. And the boring company is evolving, and the cost to build a tunnel by the boring company initially was about $10 million for a mile. Now, we're talking about $750 million for this project, and I don't know how many miles of tunnel you can build for -- for that, but, you know, even if it's $50 million for a mile -- I know that the city of Nashville, for instance, is looking at doing 5 miles of tunnel, going from the center of their city to their airport to relieve the traffic congestion there. The city of Houston is looking to put in 100 and some odd miles of tunnels to -- and these are not for traffic. These are for flood, but that 100 and some odd miles of tunnels there is $750 million. So I don't think that looking at the boring company is as not an option. It is the way to go. And I'm being told also that you can't put trucks through these tunnels. Well, okay. You can't put trucks through the tunnel. You can relieve a lot of the other traffic, and you don't have all of the environmental impact that you're going to have with the bypass the way it currently is set up. So I think, you know, realistically looking -- the boring company just got started in 2017, and they're constantly evolving. And we don't know when this bypass is going to actually be built, when it's going to be funded, but to take that tunnel option totally off the table at this point, in my mind, is very, very poor planning and very, very poor management. Thank you.
697	John Young	Dear Utah Department of Transportation, I’m writing as a Heber Valley resident to express my strong opposition to the proposed bypass through the North Fields near Deer Creek High School. Building a raised highway right next to a brand-new high school serving nearly 1,500 students simply doesn’t make sense. It raises obvious concerns about safety, traffic, air quality, and noise around a school where hundreds of students arrive and leave every day. Placing major highway infrastructure directly next to a school feels like poor planning and something our community will regret long-term. The North Fields are also one of the last remaining open spaces in the valley. The open views of the mountains are a huge part of what makes this place special and why so many people are drawn here. Putting a raised bypass through the middle of that landscape would permanently change the character of the valley. Heber has already lost much of its historic character over the years. While people often talk about preserving “historic” Heber Main Street, the reality is that many of the original historic buildings and sites have already been replaced. Because of that, the remaining open landscape of the valley is one of the most important things we still have to protect. What’s especially frustrating is that this doesn’t appear to be the only option. Several community members, including Kody Clyde and Lane Lythgoe, have proposed creative alternatives that may be more cost-efficient and would avoid the impacts this plan would have on the North Fields. Utah also already has much of the infrastructure from the 2002 Winter Olympics, and with the 2034 Winter Olympics coming, there will likely be significant investment in infrastructure again. It seems reasonable to ask whether some of that funding could support transportation solutions that reduce congestion without running a highway through the last open green space in the valley. I strongly encourage UDOT to reconsider this alignment and avoid placing the bypass through the North Fields. Please work with the community to seriously evaluate alternatives that solve traffic issues without sacrificing one of the defining landscapes of Heber Valley.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Sincerely, Johnny Young Heber City, Utah Resident
442	Joline Esposito	As a Heber Valley resident and Main Street commercial property owner, I'd like to express my support for the Heber Valley bypass. I would have been supportive of either option A or B as they would both allow us to finally have a safe, walkable and pleasant downtown in Heber, and a more sane overall traffic situation throughout town. And let's not forget the upcoming 2034 Olympics -- the bypass will be essential to keep traffic under control. However, I'm happy that option B was chosen over A. It will divert traffic for a longer distance on SR 40. The intersection point proposed in option A is already very busy and too close to our downtown area. I also appreciate that option B will affect fewer established homes and businesses. The Heber City council sent a letter to UDOT in January with their recommendations to improve option B. I agree with their suggestions concerning pedestrian/cyclist safety, adjustments to the Midway Lane interchange and moving the southern connection.
278	Jon Fudge	Feb 24, 2026 Hello, I have been following the Heber bypass development for years now. From my experience nothing will change for the better until the high-speed traffic moving through the valley is separated from the local everyday traffic. Plan B will fix this problem, Plan A will not. If traffic is left combined on the old highway everything will just get worse. Heber City is growing so fast the city has approved thousands of new homes that are being proposed by developers. The roads need to keep ahead of it all. I have followed along and studied the EIS. It looks very complete and I agree with your findings. Plan B is the best choice. Thank you Jon Fudge (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
401	Jon Woodard	Please find attached, a letter commenting on the draft EIS. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
464	Jonelle Fitzgerald	Hello, I'm emailing to remind you of the attached letter submitted by the Wasatch County Board of Health back in January of 2023 and resubmit as comment as you are considering Heber Valley bypass options at this time. Thank you, Jonelle Fitzgerald Director/Health Officer Wasatch County Health Department XXXXXXXXXXXXX, UT XXXXXX O: XXXXXXXXXX | C: XXXXXXXXXXX Visit us at www.wasatchcountyhd.org (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
99	Joni Wirts	UDOT, I am a Summit County, Utah resident, and I urge you not to go with Option B for the Heber Valley bypass highway. I drive to Heber or Midway often to access Snake Creek and to patronize their restaurants, and I appreciate the landscape that Option B would decimate. I value the aesthetics of the North Fields. This provides important habitat for wildlife; deer in particular, as their populations in Utah are suffering from overdevelopment. These wetlands provide us important environmental services including carbon sequestration, and reducing the effects of pollution through filtration and detoxification. Please choose Option A, not Option B for the Heber Valley bypass highway. Thank you.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Best Regards, Joni Wirts XXXXXXXXXX
652	Josalyn Irving	Josalyn Irving XXXXXXXXX Midway, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX 3/9/26 Utah Department of Transportation Environmental Impact Statement Concerns and Request to Relocate Proposed Overpass – Heber Valley Project To Whom It May Concern, I am writing as a concerned resident to request that the proposed overpass and west-side bypass alignment in the Heber Valley project be reconsidered and relocated in order to preserve the North Fields wetlands, agricultural lands, and critical water resources. I respectfully ask that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by the Utah Department of Transportation be revised to address significant deficiencies in its scope, analysis, and conclusions. Failure of the Purpose-and-Need Analysis The EIS appears to fail two of the three required Purpose-and-Need elements. The scope of the project is overly narrow, and the Purpose-and-Need statement does not accurately reflect current and projected traffic patterns within the valley. Most new growth is occurring on the east side of the valley, yet the proposed west-side bypass does not meaningfully serve those trips. It is unclear how the Purpose-and-Need can be considered valid when the majority of new traffic originates east of Main Street and still funnels into that corridor. West-Side Bypass Does Not Address Local Traffic As a resident who regularly travels these roads, the assumptions presented in the EIS do not align with real-world traffic patterns. East-side development continues to accelerate, and those trips still rely on Main Street. A west bypass would do little to alleviate congestion caused by this growth. The public should be provided with transparent data demonstrating how the proposed alignment would meaningfully improve local traffic conditions. Reliance on an Unworkable Planning Framework The EIS relies heavily on the Heber Vision plan as a planning framework. However, many residents and stakeholders understand that this plan is not feasible in its current form. Even its consultant, Terry Brooks, acknowledged significant limitations. Major transportation decisions should not be based on a plan widely viewed as unrealistic. Regional Benefit vs. Local Harm While Alternative B may provide minor benefits to regional commuters traveling to destinations such as Park City, those benefits come at a substantial cost to local residents. The proposed alignment would threaten farmland, agricultural production, wildlife habitat, wetlands, and valuable water resources. Local communities should not be asked to sacrifice these irreplaceable assets so regional commuters can save a marginal amount of travel time. Eminent Domain and Property Impacts The EIS does not adequately address the scale of property acquisition required to construct the project. Residents deserve clarity regarding how many homes, farms, irrigation systems, and water rights may be affected. Information regarding compensation plans, property impacts, and compliance with Utah's constitutional requirement for just compensation should be clearly disclosed. Failure to Demonstrate the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative Federal environmental law requires that agencies select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). The EIS does not demonstrate that Alternative B meets this requirement. Less damaging alternatives appear to have been dismissed prematurely without sufficient analysis, particularly options that would avoid impacts to the North Fields wetlands and agricultural lands. Main Street Improvements Should Be Implemented First

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Before constructing a high-impact bypass, lower-cost improvements to the existing corridor should be fully evaluated and implemented. Adjustments such as improved signal timing, additional turn pockets, and maintaining three-lane continuity could provide meaningful congestion relief with far fewer environmental impacts. Lack of Transparency in Mitigation Plans The mitigation strategy presented in the EIS is vague and raises concerns about transparency. Wetlands and farmland cannot simply be replaced elsewhere without long-term ecological consequences. Residents deserve clear information about what land would be used for mitigation, who would own or manage it, and whether mitigation credits might be sourced outside the valley. Potential Impacts to Aquifers and the Provo River The valley's shallow aquifer system and the nearby Provo River are critical natural resources. Scientific studies demonstrate that highway pollutants can travel significant distances through shallow groundwater. The EIS does not sufficiently address how runoff, road salts, and other contaminants would be prevented from impacting the valley's drinking-water recharge areas. Traffic Study Limitations The traffic studies referenced in the EIS appear to emphasize peak congestion periods, such as rush hour or holiday travel. Residents experience congestion during normal daily conditions as well. The full traffic dataset should be made available for public review so the community can understand how projections were developed. Incomplete Cost Analysis Several major cost considerations appear to be missing from the EIS, including the cost of agricultural underpasses, induced development pressures, noise mitigation, and long-term maintenance. Without a complete financial analysis, the public cannot accurately evaluate the true cost of Alternative B. At-Grade Options Should Remain Under Consideration At-grade improvements should remain viable alternatives. Many residents would prefer tolerating moderate traffic over the construction of large overpasses and highway infrastructure that permanently alter the valley's viewshed and rural character. Conclusion Based on these concerns, I respectfully urge the Utah Department of Transportation to revise the EIS, correct the deficiencies in its analysis, and prioritize alternatives that protect farmland, wetlands, water resources, and the character of the Heber Valley. Relocating or reconsidering the proposed overpass alignment would help preserve the North Fields wetlands while still allowing transportation solutions that better serve local needs. The current EIS does not appear to meet the legal, procedural, or community standards expected for a project of this magnitude. I ask that UDOT reconsider the proposed alignment and work collaboratively with local residents to develop a transportation solution that protects the long-term environmental and agricultural health of the valley. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Josalyn Irving
587, 587 Revised	Josee Seamons	Good morning, Please see attached comment letter on behalf of the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Thank you. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
478	Josh Reinhart	Hello there, I truly believe that the preservation of the North Fields is way more important than a bypass. Destroying that ecosystem and disrupting the wetlands isn't worth the minimal time saved for people to drive through

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		town. I also don’t see how Heber will ever change Main Street into a quaint little road. It is way more important to use existing surface streets to move people around town. I’d prefer to see the money spent on making an additional climbing lane for semis heading up over Mayflower to save time instead. Please reconsider this current plan. Thanks, Josh Reinhart Concerned Heber Resident Sent from my iPhone
483	Josh Wafford	This will be a disaster in terms of killing the character of this town. Once traffic is maxed out there will be constant noise pollution. This is only a bandaid fix to the problem. What's the plan for when traffic inevitability increases? Add another lane? Tear up more land? How will this construction affect water run off? Will there be an increase in contaminates? How will the project affect riparian habitats since this is very close to the Provo River? Wouldn't it be in the interest of the public to use public transit, particularly light rail? Incorporate UTA? Studies are showing that cities with excellent public transit are more desirable. A walkable Heber City where you can ride to park city to salt lake or straight to Provo. If the state would expand UTA it can pull even more people here than we already do plus it reduces emissions and noise pollution. This byway is just another step towards Utah being more like California just adding freeways where ever and when ever. Traffic on the 405 is well known to be horrendous maybe another lane would solve it for a month or 2. Houston, TX is another example of traffic being horrendous and adding lanes not helping. Also does oil interest play a role in this project being pushing? There is an awful lot of oil coming through from the Uintah Basin makes one think that there are hidden individuals pushing and funding this.
640	Joshua Cieslewicz	Please reconsider the bypass for Heber Main Street. The current plan is destructive to our fields and is unnecessary in its drastic suggestions for raised roadways. This does not belong in our community. No bypass would be preferable to the lower section that is too close to existing homes and requires and elevated roadway that is not needed. Please listen to our community. There is more work that needs to be done. This should not be the final solution.
286	Joshua Hogge	Dear UDOT Project Team and HDR Study Team, As a Heber City resident and a neighbor Utahn, please find attached my public comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement, submitted within the comment period ending March 9, 2026. The attached comment raises substantive issues requiring individual response under 40 CFR §1503.4(a), including: Noise methodology — the 10 dBA substantial-increase threshold is inadequate for the valley's ambient environment, and FHWA's 23 CFR Part 772 permits a more protective standard Sensitive receptor omission — Deer Creek High School (<600 ft from corridor) does not appear to be included in the Draft EIS noise analysis, nor does it address the impacts of environmental noise on education and working memory. Alternatives analysis — the Draft EIS does not evaluate a depressed-profile or mixed-profile vertical alignment at the western interchange complex, which constitutes a reasonable alternative given UDOT's successful precedent on Bangerter Highway and US-89 Elevated structure design — noise barriers at the source on flyover structures were not evaluated I respectfully request that each of these issues receive a substantive response in the Final EIS. Thank you for your consideration. Joshua Hogge XXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
394	Juli Schultz	Please do not ruin our wonderful town and beautiful fields!!!!! Option B is a big NO!!!! We love our town. Please do not destroy it!! (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
129	Julia Marco	To Whom it May Concern, I am writing to provide formal comments regarding the proposed EIS Alternatives, specifically Alternative B, which is identified as the preferred option. I appreciate the opportunity to comment and would like to share concerns related to environmental impacts, land use, and compatibility with planned development.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		My primary concern is that Alternative B results in disproportionately higher impacts to sensitive resources and existing land uses compared to other alternatives, particularly wetlands, agricultural lands, and the North Fields area. Alternative B would result in more extensive wetland disturbance and fragmentation than the other alternatives. Wetlands in this area provide important ecological functions, including flood mitigation, water filtration, and wildlife habitat. Increasing direct and indirect impacts to these wetlands may also require more mitigation, with uncertain long-term success. Alternative B cuts directly through the North Fields, an area that has both ecological value and future planning significance. This alignment appears to limit future flexibility for land use and conservation efforts in this area. Alternative B also has greater impacts on existing agricultural lands. Fragmentation of farmland can reduce its long-term viability, interfere with farm operations, and accelerate conversion away from agricultural use. From both an economic and land-use planning perspective, minimizing impacts to productive agricultural land should be a priority. Alternative B would generate higher noise levels adjacent to areas identified for planned development. This raises concerns about long-term compatibility with residential or mixed-use development and may necessitate costly mitigation measures that could potentially be avoided under other alternatives. I respectfully suggest the following: Further evaluate whether other alternatives could better avoid wetlands and agricultural lands while still meeting transportation goals. Clarify whether long-term costs associated with mitigation (wetlands replacement, noise barriers, land acquisition) have been fully considered when selecting Alternative B as the preferred option. Consider whether adjusting the alignment or design of Alternative B could reduce impacts to the North Fields and nearby planned development. Thank you for considering my comments, Julia
53	Julie Button	Hi, I have clicked submit many times and reloaded the page and ensured I've included all information and I'm unsure my comment has been submitted as it doesn't do anything. Here is my comment. I do not understand why UDOT would choose Alternative B when the public has repeatedly expressed stronger support for Alternative A. Alternative A impacts fewer wetlands and better discourages sprawl through the surrounding fields. Alternative B offers only a minimal reduction in travel time through the valley, which makes that justification particularly weak. This decision feels influenced by a small number of development-friendly Heber City council members and developers, rather than by meaningful consideration of public input. The claim that wetlands will be preserved in the north fields as compensation is also unconvincing—especially without clearly stating the number of acres affected under each alternative. That omission raises concern that the mitigation does not truly offset the damage to those fields.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Please listen to the community and reconsider this decision by selecting Alternative A.
362	Julie Button	To the UDOT Project Team, I am writing to provide formal feedback regarding the current proposals for the Heber Valley Corridor. While I appreciate the opportunity to offer suggestions for improvement, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Alternative B. This proposal is fundamentally flawed for the following reasons: * Legal and Environmental Violations: Alternative B violates the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) and the Clean Water Act. * Impact on Agriculture: Farming was not adequately protected under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). This oversight undermines our existing county bonds and will ultimately force local residents to pay more in taxes to mitigate the fallout. Alternative A has less issues with this. In addition to opposing Alternative B, I request that UDOT incorporate the following design change to better serve the Heber community: * Maintain At-Grade Design: Elevated freeways were not part of the original designs and are inconsistent with the character of our valley. Keeping the roadway at grade is essential to managing noise, light pollution, and traffic speeds. We aim to preserve our rural aesthetic and avoid the over-engineered look of the Wasatch Front. I expect these concerns to be included in the official project record. Our community is committed to a solution that respects the environment, our agricultural heritage, and the long-term fiscal health of our county. Sincerely, Julie Button Resident of Midway
204	Julie Cirillo	Hello, I am a new resident to Heber in 2024, and while I know there are many in the community that disprove of the selected plan. I am one in favor of it. Although I personally do not think it goes far enough. I wish it extended all the way to River road or beyond. But if the options are A or B, B is the better option. Option A will not have the intended effect of alleviating traffic or decreasing travel time as it is just as easy to go through town than go further to the bypass and come around back to main Street. The growth here is exploding and while I wish this was already completed prior to the jordanelle ridge development and the slopes development, it is an absolute necessity at this point for our future. Julie Cirillo
430	Julie Kendall	After reviewing all the materials, I would like to say that I agree with Alternative B being the preferred route. I live in Heber City and am excited to see this come to fruition. Thank you to all involved for all the work in bringing this forward!
77	Julie Monahan (Comment translated from voicemail)	hi this is Julie Monahan my phone number I guess Ill give you is XXXXXXXXXX Im calling regarding the public hearings for sorry for Plan B for the Heber Valley bypass road I strongly oppose it I think youre going to hear this from all of us cuz youve already heard it from us a million times we need to protect the north fields even really we want to we need to okay its a very important ecosystem of the valley and you ruin it and we dont ever get to restore it it doesnt were not going to go back from this when its not even clear that your solution is going to do any better than the other solution so whats wrong with it altered alternative a looks just dandy to me I mean we got a thing to the future the future is not Cars anyway so why are we why are we ruining a pristine important area for cars Im sorry Im just not on board with this at all I will write you as well and I hope I be there in public but at the public hearing but Im not sure if Ill make it bye
66	Kailey Parker	Hello - I want to share my SUPPORT for option B of the bypass. I know there are many naysayers, but watching the growth and ongoing traffic in the valley I am fully in support of something being done. Thank you for your hard work in researching this and making it happen. I know a consensus can be reached - especially if working with the county to add further building protections to the North fields. I recognize the north fields are beautiful but are essentially useless to everyone else in the valley except for the select few who are privileged enough to live there. It’s time for us to address our infrastructure needs and move forward.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you, Kailey Parker
46	Kam Kohler	As a property owner in the North Fields, I am in total support of your choice of option B. We are in gridlock now. What option will divert the most traffic off of Main Street? I agree with UDOT. Option B is the best choice for a long term solution. Build it and build it now.
107	Kameron Kohler	As a lifelong Heber Valley Resident I am not happy with the choices we have for the bypass-road. It is too late to change any of that history. Today we need Option B. Even better would be a bypass that goes to River Road. Option A is a bandaid. As an owner in the North Fields that has placed a conservation easement on my property to preserve into perpetuity, I think we should focus our efforts on picking the best option today and preserving the ground around the bypass road so we do not have truck stops(or any other development) lining the bypass road and massive development over the north and south fields. Kam Kohler
554	Karen Bassett	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Karen Bassett Name Karen Bassett Address XXXXXXXXX HEBER CITY, UT, XXXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
312	Karen Curtis	We need more beauty and nature and less chaos and traffic. Now is the time to preserve serenity. Karen Curtis XXXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Sent from my iPhone
26	Karen Halverson Zorsy	I am in favor of this, however, I live in Park City, not Heber. Karen Zorzy XXXXXXXXXXX, PC, UT XXXXX
60	Karen Smith	I am writing in favor of option B even though I mourn the loss of the peace in the North Fields. I see the reality of what has to happen. I do have a question and concern. I have listened to your presentation and read over the literature. From my understanding the land along the bypass will not be privately owned and there will not be access off the bypass except at noted interchange roads to ensure development will not happen along this roadway. However, there are those that are saying development will happen along the bypass. Could you clarify this for me?
233	Karin Jentzsch	Karin Jentzsch XXXXXXXXXXXX UDOT LETTER Please confirm that you have received this email. Karin Jentzsch XXXXXXXXXXX I will also mail this letter/commet to: Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Thank you for your time. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
94	Kasey Gabel	To whom it may concern. I have been a resident of Heber Valley since 2013. Many reasons brought me to this valley, not only the beauty but also the feel of a small town. 2017 I moved to the NW section of Heber. Absolutely love everything about this area of town. This is also a time I started truly learning about the bypass for Heber alone. I walk every single day out in the North Fields. I talk to locals, visitors, and people who just embrace what this valley currently has. Do people not understand the destruction that is about to happen? Is it about the money? Who is paying UDOT to DESTROY Wasatch County? This bypass makes absolutely no sense. While it is proposed, destroying the North Fields, taking business in the South End of Town, Uprooting residents from their homes, making this valley look like downtown Salt Lake.....why? The design makes no sense! 20 years ago is when this bypass should have happened. It truthfully takes 6-10 minutes to get through town on Main Street. Seriously revamp the stop lights and have the traffic move smoothly. I have lived in 2 other towns where there is pretty much one way in and one way out. The traffic is much worse than in Heber. People will always complain, but it is UDOT that can make this change. No matter what happens people are always going to complain. I would rather have complainers than destruction of this community! -- Kasey Gabel Office Manager O - XXXXXXXXXXXXX
177	Kasey Gabel	Thank you, So I overheard a conversation today. I also feel there is a different option on how things could be looked at. Such as running the by pass along highway where highway 40 would be a frontage road. This would help cut through the north fields.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I also work on main street. It was stated in last nights meeting that 600 tanker trucks go through heber on a daily basis. I disagree with this statement. I face the road and I literally have been watching all day long. It is not true. Also the way the meeting was held, there was no open forum for the people to speak unless you went into a different room. It was very unprofessionally done. The bypass will not make any difference with the temple being built in the location it is in. Everyone will still come through main street. We are still a small enough town. Get the lights in sync. Studies also show that majority of the traffic is local traffic. Get a transportation system. It would take down who drives where. There are much better solutions. than destroying this little town. Save something in our state and on this side of the Wasatch. Don't destroy it! Be better than everyone else. Listen to the people for once!
208	Kasey Gabel	Please have someone reach out to me. Especially if they are in the area. I would truly love to take them through as a resident/visitor in the Heber Valley. Get out of the work minded headed for all the money to be made. Show the vision in such a different way. I am sure they have taken in to perspective a lot of this. However truly it is not as bad as it may seem. Especially when I sit at my desk at a very busy intersection facing main street. I would love to sit and count tankers with an employee of UDOT. Most of that traffic is coming off 80 and going to the basin anyways. So why route the bypass through heber? Oh yes there are areas in Wyoming to connect a road from 80 to the basin. Would actually probably resolve much faster travel times. There are WAY better options. SAVE Heber Valley
281	Kate Scribner	My family has been in the Heber valley for over 4 generations. Both sides of my family are from Heber along with both sides of my husband's family. The North Fields are the crown jewel of the valley. It is what makes the tone and reverence of the area what it is. Once we make a footprint on these lands, the loss will be irreparable. I'm opposed to Alternative B and am writing to ask UDOT NOT to build through the North Fields to any capacity. In addition to the preservation of the beauty and history of this area, I'd also like to note that building through the North Fields will be damaging to ecosystem and wildlife in spite of the protective acreages outlined in Alternative B. Thank you in advance for your consideration in finding another route and option. Best- Kate Scribner
295	Katherine Pierce	Like most residents of Heber City, I hate that we have a multilane highway that runs through the center of our town that is merely a passthrough for those coming up Provo canyon or Strawberry to get to I-80 or Park City. I suspect the bulk of our traffic is not local, but rather those traveling to and from locations that are not Heber City. Due to this, Heber City's main street isn't a desirable place to visit, nor is it easy to navigate if you have to get around town. The times when I need to cross the four lanes of highway to get to the other side of town without a light during rush hour is an impossible task. However, I am not in favor of either of the proposed bypass resolutions. Neither are adequate and nor do they meet the needs of our community. Both bypass options destroy the beautiful fields area and instead move the 4 lane highway into our most sensitive ecological environment, and closer to the Provo river. Clearly, this is not a solution. Additionally, this will not "remove" large truck traffic as claimed. Heber City thrives off the fast food stops of these long distance truckers and other bypass-ing vehicles. These vehicles will not be saving the 1 minute to make it to the other side of town, they'll be driving still through our Main Street. So why are we wasting money and ruining our fields to actually find ourselves with two highways now traveling through Heber City? I urge UDOT to do nothing over giving Heber City numerous multi-lane highways that cross our town. I'd rather see nothing done than ruin what we have further. It's disappointing that no better alternatives were presented and promoted by UDOT. I encourage UDOT to go back to the drawing board and truly understand the needs of this community, not the needs of those who just want to drive by Heber City and who add pollution to our valley. We don't want to face the same fate as Salt Lake City with terrible air and water quality.
352	Kathleen Howell	I am a Utah taxpayer, and I am angry that UDOT is even considering building a major roadway through wetlands and over aquifers while our state is in a severe, ongoing drought. Utah is one of the driest states in the country. Water is our most limited and most valuable resource. Yet this proposal would threaten wetlands that store water, filter pollution, and recharge aquifers—systems we depend on to survive droughts that are only getting worse. This is one of the few remaining aquifers like this in the entire state and you would consider risking drinking water for millions of Utahns???? This isn’t just environmentally reckless. It’s fiscally reckless. It’s irresponsible and short-sighted. Especially when there are other alternatives, or simply improve Highway 40 all the way through Heber. UDOT is asking taxpayers to fund a project that: - Risks violating the Clean Water Act - Raises serious concerns under NEPA - Does not comply with LEDPA - Permanently damages water resources we cannot replace - Saves drivers only a few minutes of travel time Are we really at the point where we are willing to sacrifice farmland, wetlands and groundwater aquifers because we’ve all become too impatient to sit in traffic? There is also growing concern that this bypass exists primarily to move traffic to new developments along Highway 40. If that is true, then this project is not about public need—it’s about subsidizing private

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		development with public money. That is not an appropriate role for UDOT. If new developments need transportation capacity, then those developers should be required to provide solutions like: - Dedicated buses for workers - Transit incentives - Transportation demand management Buses are cheaper, faster to deploy, better for the environment, and easier on employees than long commutes on newly paved highways. Utah should be investing in conservation, resilience, and smart growth—not destroying wetlands during a drought (or ever) to shave minutes off commute times. Don't all areas of Utah have traffic issues? Why spend so much more on this project that isn't the most fiscally responsible and risks so much when it could be allocated to other pressing infrastructure? You should be truly ashamed and embarrassed to even propose alternative B. I would expect UDOT to uphold the laws and codes, just as you ask the citizens to do so. This bypass should be rejected outright. Sincerely, Kathleen Howell A Very Concerned Utah Taxpayer
23	Kathy Grieve	I wish you had not chosen to cut through the Heber Valley's North Fields.
414	Kathy Grieve	PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE DO NOT BUILD A FREEWAY THROUGH OUR BEAUTIFUL NORTH FIELDS!!!!!
612	Katie Wilkins	Dear UDOT Project Team, I am writing to express my strong support for Alternative B in the Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Study. My family and I travel through Heber Valley frequently, and anyone who drives through the area regularly knows how congested Main Street has become. During peak travel times it can take an unexpectedly long time just to get through town. A bypass that moves through-traffic around downtown would make a tremendous difference for both residents and visitors. Alternative B seems like the most forward-thinking solution. From what I understand, it would create a new limited-access route west of Heber City that removes a significant amount of traffic from Main Street while maintaining good connections to U.S. 40 and U.S. 189. This would improve travel times and allow Heber's historic downtown to function more as a local main street rather than a regional highway. That feels like a win for both transportation and the character of the city. Beyond the practical benefits, I believe Alternative B also has the potential to become a beautiful scenic drive. The Heber Valley is one of the most stunning areas in Utah, and a thoughtfully designed corridor across the valley could give travelers incredible views of the surrounding mountains and open landscapes. In many ways it could become similar to other memorable scenic drives, where the road itself becomes part of the experience while still serving an important transportation function. Reducing congestion on Main Street would also improve the overall experience in Heber City. It could make the downtown area safer and more enjoyable for pedestrians, local businesses, and community events. Overall, Alternative B seems to provide the strongest long-term transportation benefit while also helping preserve the character of Heber City and the beauty of the valley. For these reasons, I strongly support moving forward with Alternative B. Thank you for your time and for the work being done to plan thoughtfully for the future of the Heber Valley. Sincerely, Katie W.
308	Kaye Nelson	Hi - I love Heber Valley and I think the powers who decide should listen to the many voices who are asking UDOT to choose Plan A over Plan B. There would be negative impacts from a new bypass constructed through many acres of wetlands in the Heber Valley. Besides the obvious habitat loss and fragmentation, negative impacts to water quality and viewsheds, the new bypass would dramatically increase the level of noise pollution. Both alternatives have impacts, but their preferred Alternative B affects more than twice as many acres of wetlands and is closer to the PRRP corridor. Please do the right thing and choose option A!

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you - Kaye Nelson -- Kaye Nelson "There's no place like home."
600	Kayley Cassity	Dear UDOT, I am concerned about the Alternative B Route through Heber Valley's Northfields. I believe the best way to mitigate impacts from this project (visual and noise pollution, sprawl, permanent loss of the peaceful, bucolic nature of the Heber Valley) is an option you have not proposed: All through-traffic HWY 40 through Heber City to be directed through a tunnel UNDER Main Street. This preserves all of your stated goals of: 1.Reducing Main Street congestion because it is the faster and more direct route, heavy trucks and through-traffic pass below downtown, preventing gridlock at major intersections. 2. Protects Historic Downtown with fewer impacts to historic buildings and helps turn North US-40 into a quieter local road, making the town center safer and more accessible for residents. 3. It provides reliable emergency and school access by creating a second way out of the valley during emergencies and offers a more efficient commute for students traveling to the new high school, because local traffic could use the surface streets without heavy truck traffic or through-traffic congestion. The tunnel could begin around College Way, then continue South under Main Street and emerge on the South end of Heber with an exit on US 40 and another along US 189 near the airport. Thanks for your consideration, Kayley Cassity XXXXXXXXXXXX
157	Keira Wilson (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I am born and raised in heber Utah, I live directly next to the north fields right next to the proposed bypass. Asking thee question what is the preffered alternative is a rhetorical question because the answer is absolutely neither. Both options will deteriorate the wild life, wet lands, historical properties, and agricultural land. Traffic is a normal aspect of having automobiles, and we need to learn to deal with it. Adding the bypass will make it so semis are unable to stop for gas and food so some will choose to ignore the bypass making it uselesss to a protion of those it supposedly caters to. This bypass is by far the stupidest idea to be brought forth, if you don't want traffic walk or bike, if you want to drive over a bypass so badly go through parleys or provo avoiding heber all together. Do not destroy Hever because you lack patience!!! PS. This was written by a 19 yr old girl if I can understand and see how negatively this affects our community you at your grown age should be able to comprehend this!! (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
313	Kelley Eileen Ingols	Dear Heber City Government and to all who help make the final decissins, It is within my heart that we do whatever we can to make a proclamation that will proteact and preserve the North and South Fields. These places hold not only great beauty but are truly part of the heart of this valley. They are wetlands that many creatures make their homes. They are a place to contemplate to find ease and peace in the hectic life that we humans make for ourselves. They hold vegetation that feeds the wildlife. Stop and walk into these areas and listen. Listen to the songs of the birds, crickets, frogs and the song in your heart that says, YES. YES! We need to stop over developing so that our souls can be in peace and that future generations will know that these lands are for them to enjoy if even for the pure sake of beauty and nature heals. We know this and you also know all the other reasons of devloping these areas and creating a bypass through that will devastate the land. The land that one can never get back when altered to an extreme and changed. The land, the

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		animals, the vegetation and that which benefits us is extremely important. Be part of a legacy that is not about the money and development but that which has saved, preserved and protected great beauty for the future. Thank you for your time and please do whatever you can from your heart to save these lands and open spaces that make this valley what we all love. Beauty~ Sincerely, Kelley Ingols
701	Kelli Gomez	To: UDOT- Re: Public Comment - Heber Valley Corridor I am writing in opposition to the proposed bypass route B. A few years ago Heber Valley residents voted for a 10 million dollar bond to put toward conserving open space (specifically the North Fields). Bonds don't pass easily here so this shows how much the majority of residents care about our open space. When we have had public meetings regarding our master plan and envision 2050 the residents overwhelmingly choose preserving open space and land conservation over a walkable Main Street. If route b moves forward it will not only impact the area environmentally but it affects the ability to leverage bond and open space funds. A bypass straight through open space makes it undesirable to preserve and opens it up for rezoning and development. If there has to be a bypass I would like to see the least destructive and most economical one move forward. -Alternative B fails to meet NEPA, Clean water act and LEDPA requirements. It impacts more wetlands and aquifer recharge zones, and irrigation infrastructure. Please consider the lower impact alternatives proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company as required by LEDPA. - I support and agree with the letter submitted by County Council member Eric Rowland and joined by other Heber City, Midway City and County Council members opposing Route B in favor of a route running further east and parallel to the existing Highway 40, for all the reasons he stated in that letter. Thank you for your time and consideration. Kelli Gomez - Heber City Resident
210	Ken McConnell	The majority of Heber residents have expressed their displeasure of UDOT trying to force the bypass through the North Fields. At a meeting here in Heber a representative from UDOT said it didn't matter what the residents wanted; it is going to go through the North Fields. This appears to be your government at work. What the citizens want doesn't matter. Big Government says, "you'll get it thought the North Fields and you'll like it." It's been rumored that when it goes through, all the land on either side will be zoned commercial open to development for hotels, gas stations, etc., simply to garner more tax dollars. I expect the city and county elected officials to oppose plan B and approve plan A. Which, by the way, will cost 50 million dollars less. Ken McConnell
328	Ken McConnell	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name Ken McConnell Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX. Heber City, Ut XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		(For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
527	Kendra	Please protect and preserve the North fields, as they are the crown jewel to our Beautiful Heber Valley!! In 1954 there were concerns about a bypass road and although it may not have been a good solution at the time , UDOT and Heber city council and planning commission should have put ground aside for when the time came for further development for a bypass road there would be a place for the bypass, but as it stand today Heber city and UDOT have fail to make any plans! Heber City is about uncontrolled development, worried about the Historic Heber main street, the North village and has no concern about the destruction on the North fields, you want to use Alternate route B, but as you know from the EIS it would be devasting to the land owners, cattle producers whom help feed America!!
345	Kent J Sam	It appears that both bypass option A and B will have a serious and detrimental impact on the fields currently owned and used by the Heber Valley Special Services District to irrigate alfalfa fields using type II effluent water. How many acres will HVSSD lose if the bypass is built? Looks like at least 60 direct acres and possibly 100-150 additional acres could be lost or compromised as they will no longer be suitable for center pivot irrigation and access by tractors and equipment to harvest crops will be lost. For a system already struggling to keep up with growth in the Heber Valley this is a very serious issues. These fields cannot be replaced. Does Heber Valley face a choice between saving a few minutes on the roadways or paying 3-4 times more for sewage treatment services?
685	Kent Jones	Dear UDOT, Currently there is significant oil tanker traffic flowing through Heber, 600-700 tankers per day. If the proposed railway spur is built in Eastern Utah much of the waxy oil produced in the basin will be headed to California. Current capacity at the 5 refineries near Salt Lake is about 85,000 barrels, the basin could produce 350,000 barrels. If producers can get more money by shipping to California that's where the oil will flow. Refinery operations in Salt Lake could become marginalized reducing the number of trucks traversing the mountain passes and through Heber City. The need for more roads in Heber is obvious. A "bypass" is likely not the best way to spend the money. Most of the growth has and will continue East of Main Street. Few of these people will use a west side bypass. Simply widening some of the roads in the valley would give people better alternatives for their daily trips. Elevated roads do not fit the needs of Heber Valley and will more quickly urbanize what is well known as a rural community. Thoughtful roundabouts, wider roads especially throughout East Heber would get more people off of Main Street. The very worst solution is trying to build a road through the wetlands in the north fields. The required base and width of the proposed route B would forever change the Heber Valley. Either route A or B as proposed will dramatically impact the operations of the Heber Valley Special Services District. The direct "taking" will be 60 acres but the roads will likely reduce the useable acreage for effluent spray and farming by an additional 100-150 acres. These fields cannot be replaced at any reasonable cost. The new bypass will likely force the HVSSD to build a new mechanical sewage treatment plant that will cost $100-150 million. The cost to consumers will go up 3-4 times in order to pay for this new infrastructure. Heber Valley doesn't need to be "bypassed" it needs to be enjoyed. Tanker traffic might decrease over time. Residents would be better served by investing in alternative surface routes. Residents shouldn't be required to pay 4 times more for sewage treatment services to accomodate 15-20% of the vehicle traffic that is just passing through. Thanks, Kent Jones
494	Kent Spitler	Unfortunately, due to development allowances along Mill Road decades ago, the best bypass option is no longer available so we are now left with "the best bad idea we can come up with" to quote a movie line. Of the two options, B serves the greatest percentage of benefit traffic wise but does have drawbacks with it being routed through the North Fields. A is less impactful to the North Fields but almost defeats the purpose of the bypass altogether because if trucks are going to travel on Hwy 40 all the way to 900 N, many will probably just continue on 40 through town anyway. As I stated previously, neither of these are "best case" scenarios but all things considered, I feel B is the better bad choice.
74	Kenyon Cotton	We want option A to preserve our water aquifer and option A actually solves the real problem of reducing traffic on Main Street.
215	Kerin Bartsher	 I agree with Alternative B. It is the clear choice to mitigate the traffic challenges Heber is experiencing over the long term. Thanks
229	Kevin Allan	As residents of Midway, my wife Lisa and I are very concerned about the probability of induced growth (sprawl) due to the currently proposed Class 3 designation of Alternative B. PLEASE REDUCE the number of potential interchanges on the bypass to the lowest number possible. The purpose of the bypass is to reduce congestion on Rte. 40, NOT encourage the proliferation of future interchanges up to every half-mile to access additional business and/or residential development! Please! Kevin Allan Sent from my iPhone
404	Kevin O'Connor	Dear Utah Department of Transportation Representatives, I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposed Northfield bypass project currently under consideration by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I have lived in Park City for almost 30 years and while I understand the importance of planning for future growth and addressing transportation needs, I am deeply concerned that the Northfield bypass would create significant negative impacts for our community. Specifically, I am worried about increased environmental degradation, loss of open space and agricultural land, higher noise and air pollution levels, and the potential decline in quality of life for residents living and recreating near the proposed corridor. In addition, large roadway expansion projects often encourage further sprawl rather than solving long-term congestion challenges. I believe there are more sustainable and cost-effective alternatives that deserve greater consideration, including improving existing road infrastructure, enhancing traffic management strategies, and investing in public transportation options. The Northfield area has a unique character and community identity that would be permanently altered by the construction of a bypass. I urge UDOT to carefully evaluate the long-term social, environmental, and economic consequences of this proposal and to meaningfully incorporate public feedback into the decision-making process. Thank you for your time and for considering the concerns of residents like myself. I respectfully request that UDOT reconsider the proposed Northfield bypass and prioritize transportation solutions that preserve our community's character and natural resources. Sincerely, Kevin T. O'Connor XXXXXXXXXXXX Park City, Utah XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX
144	Kevin Payne (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Real quickly, by way of background and experience, my degree is in architecture. I've been developing housing, primarily affordable housing. Helped create what became the largest and oversaw the entire development operations of the largest affordable housing venture in the western half of the United States. The bypass will never be a real solution for traffic on Main Street Heber. Why? Because over 75, if not 80 percent, of all the traffic is local traffic, and this percentage will only increase as Heber Valley, and, more importantly, as Heber City grows. So, in reality, neither Option A or B will ever solve the traffic issue on Main Street. Building a bypass will waste billion dollars to save 90 seconds, if even that, on Main Street. Option A is the lesser of two evils. While Option B is a developer's dream, it will only result in full development of the land long term from Highway 40 to the bypass in the North Fields. Contrary to others' claims, no one can guarantee that development will never happen unless an open space easement in perpetuity is recorded against such properties and held by a land trust. Some have asked then what is the solution? It's next to impossible, in my opinion, to really come up with a good viable solution at this stage due to the lack of planning and foresight for this over several decades and the massive unchecked development that Heber City has approved. This wasn't UDOT's problem to solve, in my opinion, but Heber City's problem to solve and plan for it in its master plan for roads. Again, over 75 to 80 percent of all the traffic on Main Street is local and will continue to increase over time as Heber City grows. And where does the by far majority of local residents live in Heber Valley? That would be east of Main Street/Highway 40. And where's all of the new residential growth going to occur? That would be east of Main Street/Highway 40. Does UDOT's Option A or B adequately address this problem? Absolutely not. Why? Well, for example, how would a local resident who is coming down East Center Street or six -- East 600 Street or East 1200 Street drive to, say, Walmart or the baseball fields, O'Reilly Auto Parts store, or to Park City or Provo? They'll be using Main Street. Where will all the new development east of Highway 40 and north of the new Smith's go to shop for their groceries? They will shop at Smith's, Lee's, Natural Grocers, and will they take the bypass to get there? No, of course, not. They'll use Main Street. These are but a couple simple examples that demonstrate that the proposed bypass will never solve this local traffic problem. As I mentioned my degree in architecture, I learned a quote that goes "A camel is a horse designed by committee." Well, Option A and B are both way, way worse than a camel. Thank you.
501	Kevin Payne	To whom it may concern: I am strongly opposed to Option B or any solution for that matter that would go thru the North Fields. I am also strongly opposed to the heavy handed / heavy infrastructure solutions with overpasses and raised bypass sections etc. as those would be in complete opposition to what everyone wants Heber Valley to remain and keep its more rural aspect. Such would also inhibit good pedestrian and bicycle traffic corridors. Let's not be so quick to "Oremize" Heber Valley. Finally, with 75-80% of all traffic on Main Street Heber City (and rising as Heber City grows uncontrollably) and the by far majority of the local population of Heber Valley all living on the East side of Main Street Heber City and with all of the planned and entitled future growth which will all occur on the East side of Main Street Heber City, the Bypass will virtually do nothing to reduce the impact of local traffic on Main Street. All one has to do is look on Google Maps and pick current and future home location and ask yourself how are they going to patronize businesses on Main Street and almost all of them will NEVER use the bypass to visit a business on Main Street. Why on earth are we considering spending up to almost a billion dollars to solve currently 20% of the traffic today (non-local traffic) which will be 15% if not lower by the time a Bypass is ever built (in 10 years)??? From my architectural / planning university days the saying goes "A camel is a horse designed by committee".

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The Bypass Option A and even worse Option B are both worse than a camel IMO. Sincerely, Kevin P. Payne, President P a y n e D e v e l o p m e n t , L L C P.O. Box XXX, Midway UT, XXXXXXXXXXX Phone: XXXXXXXXXXX Email XXXXXXXXXXXXX
502	Kevin Payne	To whom it may concern: I am strongly opposed to Option B or any solution for that matter that would go thru the North Fields. I am also strongly opposed to the heavy handed / heavy infrastructure solutions with overpasses and raised bypass sections etc. as those would be in complete opposition to what everyone wants Heber Valley to remain and keep its more rural aspect. Such would also inhibit good pedestrian and bicycle traffic corridors. Let's not be so quick to "Oremize" Heber Valley. Finally, with 75-80% of all traffic on Main Street Heber City (and rising as Heber City grows uncontrollably) and the by far majority of the local population of Heber Valley all living on the East side of Main Street Heber City and with all of the planned and entitled future growth which will all occur on the East side of Main Street Heber City, the Bypass will virtually do nothing to reduce the impact of local traffic on Main Street. All one has to do is look on Google Maps and pick current and future home location and ask yourself how are they going to patronize businesses on Main Street and almost all of them will NEVER use the bypass to visit a business on Main Street. Why on earth are we considering spending up to almost a billion dollars to solve currently 20% of the traffic today (non-local traffic) which will be 15% if not lower by the time a Bypass is ever built (in 10 years)??? From my architectural / planning university days the saying goes "A camel is a horse designed by committee". The Bypass Option A and even worse Option B are both worse than a camel IMO. Sincerely, Kevin Payne Midway City Council XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Phone: XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX P.O. Box XXX Midway, Utah XXXXXXXXX
492	Kevin Schultz	Subject: Feedback on the Proposed Heber Valley Bypass UDOT, First, I want to acknowledge the work your department does to keep Utah's transportation system functioning safely. In particular, I'm grateful for the effort that goes into winter road maintenance. Having lived in other states where snow management is far less effective, I truly believe Utah stands out for the quality of its winter road operations, and that is appreciated. At the same time, I have serious concerns about the proposed bypass in Heber Valley, especially since the current concepts place it essentially in my backyard. Based on the information presented so far, this project would require a very large financial investment while only reducing traffic on Main Street by roughly a quarter. Given the scale of the cost, that level of improvement does not appear to justify the long-

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		term impacts the project would create. The effects on nearby residents and the environment would be substantial. A new highway through this area would introduce ongoing noise, additional light at night, and increased air and water pollution. For those of us who live here, these changes would fundamentally alter the quiet and rural setting that defines the valley. Many families choose to live in Heber Valley specifically because it offers open land, working farms, and ranches. If we wanted the density and traffic of larger cities, we would have chosen to live in places like Salt Lake City or Provo. Preserving the agricultural land and open character of both the North Fields and the South Fields is important to many of us who call this valley home. Another concern is the potential for a bypass to accelerate development that is inconsistent with the area's agricultural roots. Heber has made an effort to remain dark-sky friendly, yet a new highway would inevitably require roadway lighting. Over time, that could easily lead to additional illuminated infrastructure such as signage or commercial advertising, gradually eroding the dark skies that make this place special. It also seems that many of the strongest voices supporting the bypass are not year-round residents and often live on the opposite side of Main Street from the areas that would be directly affected. Those of us whose homes and land sit near the proposed routes would bear the majority of the long-term impacts. While traffic on Main Street can certainly become busy at times, it is still manageable. There appear to be several smaller, more targeted improvements that could meaningfully improve flow without permanently altering the valley landscape. Examples might include: Better synchronization of traffic signals along Main Street Installing dedicated left-turn signals instead of yield arrows at high-volume intersections Temporarily converting on-street parking to travel lanes during peak commute hours (such as morning and evening rush periods) while providing alternative parking nearby Adjusting or staggering school start times to reduce concentrated traffic during the busiest morning window Measures like these could help address congestion while preserving the character of the community. The land being considered for the bypass includes long-standing ranches and farmland that have been part of this valley for generations. Once that land is converted to roadway, it is gone forever. For many of us, these fields are not just scenery—they represent our homes, livelihoods, and hopes for passing this way of life on to our children. Because of that, the idea of a bypass running through these areas is deeply troubling. It would permanently reshape both the landscape and the lives of the families who live here. From the perspective of those of us in the valley, it is difficult not to wonder who ultimately benefits the most from this project. It can feel as though the primary advantages would go to future development rather than the residents who already live here. I strongly encourage UDOT to reconsider this proposal and focus on transportation solutions that improve traffic flow while protecting the rural character and agricultural heritage that make Heber Valley such a unique place to live. Thank you for your time and consideration.
393	Kim Svoboda	Hello, I am a concerned citizen of Wasatch County. Based on the NFIC study, I say "No" to UDOT option B. It'll pollute our water source and create irreversible damage to our wet lands, farms, and beautiful entry corridor to the valley. $1 billion is not worth 70 seconds saved and the damage that will be done to this valley. Development needs to be managed and higher tankers need to be rerouted. You're will be ruining some of the most beautiful land in northern Utah. Sincerely, Kim Svoboda Sent from my iPhone
599	Kimberly Momtoya	I strongly oppose the proposed bypass route through the North Fields of Heber Valley. This area is not just open land it plays a critical role in protecting the valley's groundwater and aquifer recharge. Disturbing this landscape with major roadway construction threatens the very water resources our community depends on. The North Fields function as an important natural recharge zone for the valley's aquifer. Large-scale excavation, paving, and the addition of roadway pollutants increase the risk of contaminating and disrupting groundwater systems that supply drinking water to residents of Heber City and surrounding communities. Once an aquifer is compromised, the damage is often irreversible and extremely costlyif not impossible to repair. This valley already faces increasing pressure from rapid development and population growth. Protecting our water sources should be a top priority for long-term sustainability. A bypass that jeopardizes the aquifer puts future generations at risk and contradicts responsible planning. I urge UDOT to reconsider the alignment and pursue alternatives that avoid the North Fields entirely. Infrastructure solutions should protect critical environmental resources, not endanger them. The long-term health of our valley's water supply must take precedence over short-term transportation convenience. Sent from my iPhone
589	Kimberly Payne	I am writing to express my strong opinion against the Heber bypass both option B because of the environmental damage it will cause and option A because it does not solve the problem. Both are unnecessary and a waste of money. Will disrupt the valley here in profound ways Kimberly Payne Midway City Resident Sent from my iPhone
485	Kody Clyde	I am an agriculture teacher in Wasatch County and a life long resident of this beautiful valley. We have seen tremendous growth over the past 50 years in Heber and have had to accept the fact that this is our new normal. With this growth comes challenges. One of which is traffic. I understand the need for a bypass, but putting in through the middle of the only thing we have left, our north fields, is unacceptable. My father, who is a landowner, has offered to negotiate with some of his own land, a bypass that starts further south of proposal B. His land is by the Back 40 Restaurant. This would allow the bypass to stay closer to current developments and preserve our valley. Please consider changing this highway to satisfy both the needs of UDOT and the people who will live with this decision forever. Please reach out for further comments. XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
75	Kolsum Ginney	Leave our precious aquifers and north fields alone. Marcia Ginney Sent from my iPhone
353	Krista Winterton	I grew up on a farm in the Heber Valley. Most of my family still lives on the farm that my ancestors sacrificed and worked hard to homestead. By building a bypass through this beautiful valley, you are spitting in the face of all of those who came before us and left a legacy for their families. Do NOT "pave over paradise to put up a parking lot". The Heber Valley has already changed so much and not for the better, don't add to the destruction of such a beautiful mountain Valley.
594	Kristin Anderson	There are fireflies in the north fields. Right by Potter Lane. It will be sad if they get destroyed. Kristin Anderson Sent from my iPhone
158	Kristin Case (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Please do not direct more traffic down 1300 South. My back yard faces 1300 South. Having a major road and elevated road "in" my back yard will reduce the value of my home and will cause more noise, pollution, etc. Please connect the bypass to US-189 -> use industrual land to expand the highway. Please, please please keep the bypass away from existing homes and neighborhoods -> USE highway 189! Beautiful swallows come to our neighborhood because there is a water source near by the canal. The canal will be partially coveredbased on teh current plan. This will not be good for these birds. We also love seeing the sandhill cranes - an endangered species - come to our valley each summer. The bypass will go through areas where they enhabit each summer. The bypass will be bad for these majestic birds. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
434	Lamont Harris	To whom this may concern, I am a landlord owner in the North field to Hebrew and adamantly against route B the truck bypass highway going right to the middle of the North fields. This was disrupt, the water supply for all the farmers whom families have owned this land since 1850. There has to be a better alternative than to put a highway down the middle of the North Fields. Thank you. Best Lamont Harris XXXXXXXXXX Heber City. Sent from my iPhone
347	Lana P Hillstead	I really like the Lythgoe suggestion of making the interchanges for this bypass ROUNDABOUTS and make them beautiful like the current roundabouts in Heber City. It would move traffic effectively, slow people down and be accessible to all sizes of vehicles.
22	Lannas Barfield	I don't like the South 1300 route to connect to 40. S 1300 is already a busy street in an area of major commercial (WalMart) etc. I believe that connection should be at intersection of 189 with overhead ramps connecting bypass to 189 east to 40 S Please don't route Oil Tankers down 1300 S. !!!
126	Laren Gertsch (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	We met with -- I'm going to address my comments first related to the road going north from 900 North. Irrigation company met with UDOT several months ago. And in that meeting, they promised us an overpass at 1200 North, 1600 North, and 2400 North to accommodate cattle moving across there or traffic moving across there and cattle moving underneath the equipment and the traffic. To my knowledge, these are not necessarily in the budget today, but each of those overpasses cost roughly $100 million to -- to build. In the spirit of what was asked in last night's Zoom meeting, they asked for any suggestions on how this could be improved. One of the things that we suggested was the irrigation board -- was that they moved the road -- any option, any road -- from the west side of 6th West to the east side of 6th West. And because of the water problem, they said that they need to go up on the property as close to Highway 40 as they can. Now, if they don't want to move the homes, and I can appreciate that, they can build it on the west side of those homes and still be on the block. But by moving the road east slightly, they can eliminate two of those overpasses and eliminate significant costs. Now, the most important thing to focus on is the water in the North Fields. First of all, once CP was installed, everybody went to pressurized irrigation except the North Fields. In the North Fields, they flood irrigated in order to regenerate the wells. So in a recent discussion, we said how are you going to keep the 12- to 18-inch water table equal on both sides of the road without them making a dam, and how are you going to make sure you don't dry up the wells in the Heber City and other places? I asked that question to Mr. Hancock, and he said we don't have -- you know, I asked, "What is your plan B?" And he said, "We don't have a plan B. We need to think about it." But if they dry up the wells, that's a significant problem. The other thing is we asked for a hydrolysis study to demonstrate that they can keep the water table the same in both -- you know, once they build the road. We asked how far down they were going to dig the road, and we were told that they weren't going to dig down. They were going to put the road on top of the current ground. And, again, how do you keep the pressure from not draining down on one side and the water coming through equal on both sides. We need to make sure that there are adequate studies that can demonstrate that the water is not being affected. Again, the irrigation board has asked that they move to the east side of 6th West and close to the highway as they can. I had more comments, but that's all.
578	Laren Gertsch	Formal Gertsch Comments (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
232	Larra Murdock	TO THE UDOT PROJECT TEAM: WE DEMAND TO BE HEARD. Please include this email as an official public comment for the Heber Valley Corridor EIS submitted before the March 9 deadline.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I am writing to formally reject Alternative B and demand that UDOT select the No Build alternative. Your "Preferred Alternative" is a failure of fiscal responsibility and community planning for the following reasons: FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY: The projected cost has ballooned to over $760 million. Spending nearly a billion dollars of taxpayer money to destroy a historic valley while ignoring cheaper, innovative traffic management solutions is unacceptable. FLAWED TRAFFIC LOGIC: Your study relies on "Induced Demand." Building a high-speed bypass through the North Fields will only attract more regional traffic, eventually returning Heber to the same gridlock while permanently destroying our agricultural heritage. ENVIRONMENTAL DISREGARD: Your report minimizes the catastrophic impact on 54+ acres of wetlands and our shallow aquifers. This project prioritizes asphalt over the critical ecosystem that sustains our valley's water and wildlife. VIOLATION OF COMMUNITY CHARACTER: The aggressive use of eminent domain to fragment working farms is a violation of property rights. You are choosing the "easiest" path for engineering rather than the "right" path for the people who live here. UDOT, you have consistently pushed aside the "No Build" option despite overwhelming public opposition. We do not accept your projections. This is our valley, not your corridor. Select the NO BUILD alternative. Sincerely, Larra Murdock XXXXXXXXXX Heber UT XXXXX Sent from my iPhone
567	Larry Wine (Comment translated from voicemail)	hi this is Larry wine my number is XXXXXXXXXX I am just calling to leave a message about this whole bypass in Heber I sincerely oppose it we do not need it we need something left that Ive lived here for 23 years I love Heber I love living here but the growth is a little nuts and I think this bypass isnt going to do any good it really isnt I commute everyday I can handle a little bit of traffic thanks bye
224	Latifa Rainbow, Reint Smit, Kelton Smit	We vote yes for Plan B Heber bypass Latifa Rainbow Reint Smit Kelton Smit
159	Laura Wardle (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I feel that this project will do the exact opposite of what you state it will do. It will attract more traffic and trucks into the Heber Valley not fewer. Traffic on Main Street in Heber is only congested at peak commuter hours. A highway bypass will encourage additional trucks and great damage to the beauty of the Hever Valley Main Street is not a walkable thoroughfare in its current form so the bypasss will not preserve it. I would prefer that you don't do any sort of a bypass but since public opinion doesn't seem to have an impact on your decision making process I would implore you to go with Option A since it is a little less destructive. Thank you!! (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
174	Lauren Jackson	Hello, As a resident of Wasatch County for the past 22 years, I truly believe that Alternative B is the best option for the Heber Valley Bypass. While it hurts to see the north fields be ruined by a highway, I think that Alternative B provides the least amount of damage and upholds the integrity of the city. Thank you for the consideration, Lauren Jackson
143	Laurie Gagan	Hello, everyone. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I'm going to first talk about legal does not necessarily equal safe. But for the people who are left in this room, can I have a show of hands who have children or grandchildren that live in our valley? Okay. So I'm the founder of stopspraying glyphosate.com. Glyphosate is the active ingredient in Roundup that is known as a class 1 carcinogen, meaning it can cause cancer. The last guilty verdict by Roundup was a $2 billion guilty verdict that was awarded to a farming couple in central California. So I am passionate about heavy metals and chemicals, but if you go to EWG.org, the

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
	(Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Environmental Working Group, the passion is on the aquifers, which a lot of people in this room tonight have talked about the safety of the water, which I don't believe Utah, UDOT, have actually provided us with a mitigation -- how they're going to mitigate it or even what's going to happen with the contaminates. So let me just read you what currently is in Heber's water report. And I have personally tested city water in many of the towns, and I can say that there is minimum amount of glyphosate -- again, a carcinogen, cancer causing -- in our water systems that our children and our grandchildren are drinking. So here's a couple of the contaminates: Arsenic. What's the legal limit? There is no legal limit. And what's the potential hazard -- potential effect? Cancer. Chloroform. Potential effect, cancer. No legal limit. Dibromoethane. No legal limit. And what's the potential effect? Cancer. We get into nitrate. Possible effect, cancer. There's a whole slew of this in what is already in the Heber Valley water system. Dichloroacetic acid. Potential effect, cancer. Haloacetic acid. Potential effect, cancer. Now, think about the children and our grandchildren that are drinking the water, and where is the research that UDOT has provided us? With the bypass that's going to go over, think about all the chemicals in the gasoline. Think about how sick our children and grandchildren is, and there's not enough doctors talking about root cause -- environmental chemicals, environmental toxins. I don't support the Option B, and I think there's a better solution. I don't even know if we've honestly have checked the -- you know, the traffic lights to see if we can time them better, but I can tell you sending trucks and cars over where people live -- and I have not had the honor to meet Laren and all or any of the ranchers, but I think that we need to stand for each other, not only to protect the farmers and the ranchers, but also to protect our children and grandchildren from the chemical poisoning that is what to come.
619	Laurie Gagan	As a citizen of Heber Valley Utah, I am against UDOT Option B. This option harms our pristine aquifer with the chemical off-gassing from rubber tires, fuel, oil spills, etc into our wetlands Ther is no 100% mitigation plan in place that we are aware of. A play as you go will not be acceptable for the people who pay taxes. Near $1 billion being shoved down our throats is unacceptable There are other options and even option A is better Start with the stop lights!! Time the trucks that can go through Main Street during work hours of 8-9 am and 4-6 pm. This is your job to do best for what is best for taxpayers who pay salaries This is disgusting as it sits with a possible decision with so many residents, farmers, ranchers against what you are trying to do!!
617	Laurie Neal	To the UDOT Project Team, As a resident of Wasatch County, I am writing to express my firm opposition to the preferred Alternative B bypass route through the North Fields. While I recognize the need to address Main Street congestion, this "Billion Dollar Bypass" imposes an unacceptable environmental and financial burden on our community for a marginal gain in travel time. My concerns are based on the following deficiencies in the current Draft EIS: Irreparable Impact on Wetlands and Aquifers: Alternative B is estimated to destroy approximately 53.9 acres of wetlands, a 140% increase over Alternative A. These wetlands are the "lungs" of our valley, and the proposed route sits directly atop a pristine, shallow aquifer that provides culinary water for 1.5 million people from Heber City to the Wasatch Front. Any contamination from highway runoff or deicing salts poses a permanent risk to our drinking water that mitigation cannot fully resolve. Destruction of the North Fields and Agricultural Heritage: The North Fields are a critical part of our community identity and agricultural economy. Alternative B bisects generational family farms and threatens the gravity-fed irrigation systems that have operated since 1860. Once this land is converted to a highway corridor, its value as open space and its ability to support agriculture are gone forever. Massive Cost vs. Minimal Benefit: The projected cost of this project has surged to over $760 million, with local experts estimating it will exceed $1 billion once full mitigation and infrastructure costs are included. Spending a billion dollars in taxpayer funds to save approximately 70 seconds of drive time is fiscally irresponsible and does not justify the destruction of the valley's "crown jewel." Incompatibility with Local Planning: Wasatch County residents have consistently voted to prioritize the preservation of the North Fields, with 74-75% of voters supporting the protection of current zoning and open space in this specific area. UDOT's preference for Alternative B ignores years of warnings from local landowners and elected officials who have requested a more responsible route that parallels existing infrastructure rather than cutting through undeveloped land. I respectfully urge UDOT to scrap the preferred Alternative B and work with the County Council to develop a lower-impact solution that preserves our water, our farmland, and our rural character. Sincerely, Laurie Neal XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
656	Laurie Nicholas	To Whom It May Concern,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I'm writing to reconsider the route selected for the Heber Bypass. I believe Alternative A would be a much better option than Alternative B for the following reasons: It would preserve most of the North Fields, which offer an iconic view and preserve the character of the Heber Valley; It would preserve farmlands and protect the shallow aquifer in the North Fields; Generations to come would benefit from preserving the North Fields, and Alternative B seems to have been selected because it would cost less to acquire/relocate homes and businesses. That is a very short-sighted reason for making a decision with such far reaching consequences and which would lead to an unsightly highway that would scar the beauty of the North Fields. Respectively, Laurie Nicholas
571	Laurie Thomson	Route A please!!
311	Lee Ann Worth	I feel Heber Valley should not put a by pass in thru the Northern Fields. This Valley is so beautiful and this bypass will ruin the rural small town feel. Let the traffic continue as is and we the people will deal with it. Lee Ann Worth
337	Leslie Miller	The following comments were submitted to UDOT today. Please confirm receipt. Thank you, Leslie Miller Dear UDOT: Please understand why as a longtime MIdway, Utah resident (and voter) I am appalled by and OPPOSE Northfields Bypass Alternative B as your preferred route. To begin with, it is the most expensive plan for taxpayers and importantly, an ecologically damaging alternative for addressing the traffic impacts in Heber Valley. Massive residential and resort developments in Wasatch and Summit County are creating an increase in highway traffic, speed and related deaths to drivers and wildlife. Utah state legislators and UDOT have violated our trust in sound governance because 'leadership' does not address this reality or offer sustainable solutions to impacts from their over-development policies. Instead taxpayers and the environment will be left with an ugly bag of consequences if Alternative B is implemented —– threatened water quality, devalued properties, destroyed historic and cultural legacies and wildlife habitat —–. Threatening the Valley's air quality, especially during winter month inversions, by increasing the quantity of vehicles disrupting our pristine Northfields, is unacceptable. UDOT decisions, clearly influenced by Utah legislative agendas intending to monetize our natural landscapes, at all and any cost and for their benefit rather than the community's, is a misrepresentation of your constituents interests, health, safety and welfare. Plan B disrespects the rare beauty and agricultural uses existing in the Northfields. Why in God's name anyone would choose to destroy the quality of this landscape in order to decrease by only minutes the amount of time it may take to move from one end of the valley to the other, is mind-boggling. Especially when alternatives exist that would be less destructive and cheaper! Finally, when the Bureau of Reclamation reclaimed the natural course of the Provo River, also using tax payer dollars, a set of criteria, terms and conditions were established to protect the very qualities UDOT and legislators are attempting to destroy. I am aware that the Bureau has advised UDOT of the ecological threats to the valley and river way we paid to conserve by UDOT's choice of Plan B. Your organization needs to go back to the drawing board. Please present us with additional alternatives to the Plan B proposal you and legislators expect us to endorse. We will not. We should not. Plan B is sacrilege to the intrinsic values of the Northfields. Thank you for your consideration.
509	Leslie Nielsen	I am adamantly opposed to the North Fields bypass route plan. Although the UDOT study has wetlands mitigation, it does not contain a sufficient watershed mitigation. Wetlands can be restored. Aquifers can not. Utah is running out of water as it is, and to contaminate a pure water source is unconscionable.
317	Levi Bodily	To the Utah Department of Transportation, I grew up in the Heber Valley. I learned to fish in these waters and watched the farms and open space define what it meant to live here. Though I now live downstream, my family still depends on the same watershed and aquifer your proposed bypass would cross. And I still depend on that same water supply, as well as millions of people along the Wasatch Front. What happens in that valley flows to all of us. Yet the EIS did not account for long-term impacts nor impacts on those down-stream. As someone from the next generation who will live with the consequences of this decision, I am deeply troubled by the direction UDOT has taken. The western bypass alternatives do not resolve the core issue on Main Street. Anyone who has lived here understands that Main Street is not simply a through-corridor — it is the access point for local businesses, schools, churches, and daily life. Even if a bypass diverts some regional traffic, it does nothing to eliminate the local trips that begin and end in town. At the same time, significant residential and commercial development is occurring on the east side of the valley. Increased density there will generate new local traffic that must still rely on Main Street and connecting roads. Growth patterns suggest that any diverted traffic may be offset — or exceeded — by new local demand. This raises a serious question: how does this proposal meaningfully resolve long-term congestion rather than simply shift it? Equally concerning is the absence of meaningful alternatives in the Environmental Impact Statement that prioritize improvements to existing infrastructure. Transportation best practices across the country emphasize optimizing current corridors — intersection redesign, access management, signal coordination, and phased improvements — before constructing entirely new highways. Yet the EIS does not present a fully developed version of this approach.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Under NEPA requirements, agencies must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives. The failure to develop or analyze a full suite of existing-infrastructure improvements is a clear deficiency. Approximately a year ago, the North Fields Irrigation Company met with UDOT officials and presented multiple feasible roadway alignments that were more cost-effective, less damaging to wetlands, canals, and irrigation ditches, did not affect existing homes, & compatible with the valley's irrigation and agricultural systems This was not casual feedback. It was technical, system-level evidence from the entity responsible for managing the region's water delivery network. Under NEPA and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), agencies must consider relevant technical information and cannot ignore viable alternatives without explanation. Yet the Draft EIS contains no acknowledgment, no screening, and no analysis of these alternatives. That omission is not just disappointing — it is procedurally unlawful. UDOT was asked to modify the project boundary so the NRCS could finalize a conservation easement that had been years in development and ready to close. A minor boundary adjustment would have allowed federal funding to proceed and permanently protected agricultural land consistent with county preservation plans. UDOT blatantly declined to make that adjustment. As a result, the conservation easement collapsed. Under NEPA, agencies must consider alternatives that avoid or minimize environmental harm. Under the APA, agencies cannot disregard obvious, less-harmful options without a rational explanation. The EIS provides none. Reliance on a speculative road network — not existing conditions The Draft EIS repeatedly justifies Alternative B by citing "consistency with the North Village road network." But the North Village road network is not built out and can be altered at any time. Under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, the Corps and the applicant MUSTselect the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). The LEDPA must be chosen even if it is not the applicant's preferred alternative. Alternative B cannot qualify as the LEDPA because it: Impacts the greatest acreage of wetlands Disrupts the most irrigation infrastructure Conflicts with agricultural preservation plans and shallow aquifer recharge zones Won't lighten the Main Street traffic efficiency better than other feasible alignments Ignores technically supported, less-damaging alternatives submitted by the irrigation company A practicable, less-damaging alternative was presented directly to UDOT. The failure to evaluate it is a per se violation of LEDPA requirements. Building over a pristine aquifer that supplies drinking water to the Wasatch Back and Front communities is not a minor design choice. It is a generational decision. Once water quality is compromised, restoration is extraordinarily costly — and sometimes impossible. Once farmland is fragmented, livelihoods are destroyed, preservation becomes far more difficult. The EIS does not account for those losses. We have already seen preservation opportunities disappear. Those losses cannot simply be reversed later. As a younger Utahn, I will shoulder the tax burden of this project and its long-term maintenance costs. My generation will also inherit the environmental and financial liabilities if projections fall short or impacts are greater than anticipated. Many of us want to trust our institutions. But trust is built on transparency, restraint, and a demonstrated commitment to minimizing harm. Advancing one of the most expensive and most environmentally impactful alternatives — while rejecting or under-developing less harmful options — raises legitimate concerns about whether that commitment has been upheld. PRIOR TO ADVANCING ALTERNATIVE B (which is already illegal) AN UPDATED EIS NEEDS TO BE MADE INCLUDING: Provide a clear, detailed explanation for rejecting alternatives with fewer impacts to the aquifer and farmland. Demonstrate how the chosen alternative meaningfully addresses long-term Main Street congestion given projected east-side growth. Clarify why comprehensive existing-infrastructure improvement options were not fully developed in the EIS. Explain why technically feasible alternatives from the irrigation company were excluded from analysis. Address the failure to adjust the boundary to allow the NRCS conservation easement to proceed while at the same time appeasing to developers using future roads that don't exist yet. Demonstrate compliance with NEPA, the Clean Water Act, LEDPA standard, and the APA's requirement for reasoned, non-arbitrary decision-making.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Commit to enforceable, long-term protections for water quality and agricultural preservation. This valley shaped me. The water that begins there continues to sustain myself & my family today. The decisions made now will define whether future generations inherit stewardship — or consequences. Accountability matters. Long-term thinking matters. Protecting water and land that cannot be replaced matters. Sincerely, Levi Bodily American Fork, UT
116	Levi Henrie (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Good evening, everyone. Levi Henrie, as mentioned. We heard a lot of good stuff today about environmental concerns, historic concerns, and I'd like to voice my full support. I'd also like to add a element of this of loss of enjoyment to your property, loss of property value, noise intrusion, and visibility in your property, and I'd like to do it by telling my story. I'm an entrepreneur. I built my business. I'm not from the Heber Valley. I'm from nearby American Fork. Now, you know, with a little bit of success and immense personal cost achieved a little bit of success and was able to put together enough money to build my family's dream home. Now, as mentioned, I'm not from out of state, but I am from American Fork. I've done business in Heber City this whole time, but if you're a person with a job and a family and you're not part of the local rumor mill, you might not have known that such a thing as the Heber Valley Corridor was being talked about. Now, I bought my lot apparently just right before when it would have had to be a disclosure. So, anyhow, we begin construction of, like I said, our dream home, invest the large portion of our life savings into the house just to have the displeasure about four days ago of learning that such a thing as the Heber Valley Corridor exists, and we'll have a bridge over the railroad and a road and a canal about XXX yards from my house. Now, these people, of course, will have downward visibility into, you know, house, lot, and pool, other things that don't give me a lot of comfort as a father of four children. So at this point, I don't know if UDOT has done their due diligence in mitigating effects to property owners. When I look at the right-of-way, I do notice that it's 250 feet wide, including, of course, grass area, huge shoulders, two lanes, enormous median, two more lanes, shoulder, grass area. Now, this is where the quiet part that we don't say is that we're leaving room for expansion. I think that a lot of the time it's played off as a safety concern. Again -- and I'm going to close early here -- I don't think we've done our due diligence to mitigate effects on property owners. I think the least we can do is push them together, use sound walls, reduce visibility, potentially reduce speed limits, and that goes, not just for me, but for lots of other people in the valley.
183	Lezli (No Last Name Provided)	Alternate B makes the most sense. If the southbound traffic isn't diverted at Potter Ln, the cars will likely just continue to use Main Street to go through Heber. Also, if the bypass road goes through the north fields, the North Field area can actually be preserved against housing development. Alternative B does the most to protect Heber from increasing traffic congestion.
425	Lillian Laszlo	I urge UDOT to consider the roundabout proposal submitted by Luther Design Group. It is a great solution and far more appropriate for the rural area of Heber. Lillian Laszlo Sent from my iPhone
274	Linda Middleton (Comment translated from voicemail)	This is Linda Middleton, my email address is XXXXXXXXXXX. My comment, which I tried to post to the website, I do not think it posted, is the question I have about the Heber Valley corridor is I feel like they are not able to already safely maintain what property UDOT is supposed to maintain near my house on South Field Road. So, why can't UDOT control weeds, mow and safely maintain the roadside areas around Deer Creek and around Jordanelle and around the Provo River? Because corridors that they already own are not maintained up to a safety standard, because there are high weeds and that's a fire hazard, so then they have to spray herbicides. Does the state of Utah have unlimited time and money to encourage higher speeds in Heber Valley when semi-trucks cannot go any faster up the hill on Highway-40 as they leave Heber to access Highway-40 onto Interstate-80? Why not in a better infra- in a better place that doesn't have the kind of grades that require lower speeds and require tanker trucks to go slow through our community? Why are we paying so much to increase speeds when they hit uh- slower speeds going into Park City from Heber valley? Because they can't go any faster around Jordanelle and they can't go any faster around Deer Creek because we've already had three tanker trucks roll into our reservoirs where our drinking water is. Why not invest in a better graded route away from drinking water sources? Why is the state of Utah paving over the last remaining basin of productive agricultural land in the Wasatch back? Who is getting paid not to consider any other corridor for trucking and speeders that would require less wetland management and less road-based infrastructure? This area should be designated as a scenic byway and protected wildlife migration habitat. You have not proven that you can maintain the fence line along Highway-189 and Highway-40 where herbicides are allowed to be sprayed. Who pays for the corridor lifetime herbicide application?
292	Linda Middleton	Heber Valley, Rare, Flat Fertile Farmland is Fine Resident Plead Rescue Resillient River from Roadwork Less Speed = safer school zones No Route B is able to defend the North Fields without Herbicides Sprays to slow Envasive weeds. HWY 189 is Proof. Bisecting the North Fields… No Beauty B Nothing gained No Better Safety Plan B disrupts native species. The State of UTAH and UDOT cannot defend this ecosystem No Plan B!! No Amount of Money-State or Federal can repair this Ecosystem once it is disturbed! Heavy traffic and Higher speeds require stable Roadbase no Bs. No Plan achieves desired objectives of Scenic Byway Standards No Bisecting THe Wetlands No Plan B… Too Costly… Unsafe @ any speed

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		P.S. Every day we are given stones. But what do we build? Is it a bridge or is it a wall? I love you, Mom Dear UDOT, Linda Middle and NATURE, ask that you consider aligning Southfield Road with the acess Rd to the M campus installing a traffic light there and leaving Northfields undisturbed. P.S. I love this quote by Albert Schweitzer: "Happiness is nothing more than health and a poor memory." I love you, Mom (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
357	Linda Middleton	Dear UDOT, How much has it cost to lift 3 semi trucks out of Deer Creek Reservoir? Higher speeds are not needed here. **Subject** Deficiencies in DEIS Related to Aquifer Protection, Design Speed, Alternatives Analysis, and Growth Inducement Dear UDOT Project Team, I am a local resident submitting this comment to identify specific deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement [DEIS] for the proposed bypass project. These concerns relate directly to compliance with **NEPA**, the **Clean Water Act**, and implementing regulations. ### **Aquifer and Groundwater Protection** The DEIS does not demonstrate that impacts to aquifer recharge areas and hydrologically connected wetlands have been adequately avoided or minimized, as required under the **Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C § 1251 et seq.)** and **NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332)**. The analysis lacks sufficient site-specific hydrogeologic data addressing long-term risks from roadway runoff, spills, and maintenance activities. Given the reliance of this community on groundwater, this omission is significant and must be corrected. ### **Design Speed and Wildlife Impacts** The proposed **65 mph design speed** exceeds that of all connecting and nearby roadways and is the highest speed in the surrounding region. The DEIS does not adequately analyze the relationship between design speed and wildlife mortality, nor does it evaluate lower-speed alternatives consistent with the rural and environmental context. Failure to consider reduced design speeds violates NEPA's requirement to rigorously explore reasonable alternatives (**40 CFR § 1502.14**). ### **Failure to Analyze Existing Infrastructure Alternatives** The DEIS does not provide a meaningful evaluation of alternatives that improve or optimize

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		existing transportation infrastructure, such as targeted roadway improvements, intersection upgrades, or traffic management strategies. NEPA requires consideration of reasonable alternatives, Including those that utilize existing facilities (**40 CFR § 1S02.14(c)**). The cursory treatment of these options is insufficient. ### **Growth-Inducing Impacts and Roadway Classification** The project is proposed as a **Class III facility**, which allows for future access points at approximately half-mile intervals. This classification is inherently growth-inducing. Despite this, the DEIS asserts that the project will not induce growth, without providing analysis to .support that conclusion. NEPA requires disclosure and analysis of indirect and induced growth impacts. Designing a roadway with freeway-level access potential while disclaiming growth effects is internally inconsistent and fails to meet NEPA standards. This inconsistency may also render the DEIS arbitrary and capricious under the **Administrative Procedure Act (S U.S.C. § 706)*** ### **Requested Action** Before advancing the project, the DEIS must: 1. Provide a rigorous analysis of aquifer and groundwater impacts and demonstrate avoidance and minimization 2. Evaluate reduced design speeds consistent with surrounding roadways 3. Fully analyze alternatives utilizing existing infrastructure 4. Disclose and analyze growth-inducing impacts consistent with roadway classification 5. Reconsider roadway classification to align with the stated non-growth purpose of the project Thank you for considering these comments. I request that these deficiencies be addressed in a revised or supplemental EIS. Respectfully, Dear UDOT, How will semi trucks deliver cars and new vehicles to existing businesses on Main St Heber unless option (Route A) grants them access from existing roads crossing Main St. Plan (Route B) bisects Provo River Valley but doesn't explain how transportation to local economy and ecology will be protected from years of road construction and disruption Please consider designating HWY 40 and 189 as scenic byways, lowering speeds around residential neighborhoods and school zones when you choose Route A. Sincerely, Linda (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
446	Linda Middleton	**Subject** Deficiencies in DEIS Related to Aquifer Protection, Design Speed, Alternatives Analysis, and Growth Inducement Dear UDOT Project Team, I am a local resident submitting this comment to identify specific deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement [DEIS) for the proposed bypass project. These concerns relate directly to compliance with **NEPA**, the **Clean Water Act**, and implementing regulations. ### **Aquifer and Groundwater Protection**

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The DEIS does not demonstrate that impacts to aquifer recharge areas and hydrologically connected wetlands have been adequately avoided or minimized, as required under the **Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C § 1251 et seq.)** and **NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332)**. The analysis lacks sufficient site-specific hydrogeologic data addressing long-term risks from roadway runoff, spills, and maintenance activities. Given the reliance of this community on groundwater, this omission is significant and must be corrected. ### **Design Speed and Wildlife Impacts** The proposed **65 mph design speed** exceeds that of all connecting and nearby roadways and is the highest speed in the surrounding region. The DEIS does not adequately analyze the relationship between design speed and wildlife mortality, nor does it evaluate lower-speed alternatives consistent with the rural and environmental context. Failure to consider reduced design speeds violates NEPA's requirement to rigorously explore reasonable alternatives (**40 CFR § 1502.14**). ### **Failure to Analyze Existing Infrastructure Alternatives** The DEIS does not provide a meaningful evaluation of alternatives that improve or optimize existing transportation infrastructure, such as targeted roadway improvements, intersection upgrades, or traffic management strategies. NEPA requires consideration of reasonable alternatives, Including those that utilize existing facilities (**40 CFR § 1S02.14(c)**). The cursory treatment of these options is insufficient. ### **Growth-Inducing Impacts and Roadway Classification** The project is proposed as a **Class III facility**, which allows for future access points at approximately half-mile intervals. This classification is inherently growth-inducing. Despite this, the DEIS asserts that the project will not induce growth, without providing analysis to .support that conclusion. NEPA requires disclosure and analysis of indirect and induced growth impacts. Designing a roadway with freeway-level access potential while disclaiming growth effects is internally inconsistent and fails to meet NEPA standards. This inconsistency may also render the DEIS arbitrary and capricious under the **Administrative Procedure Act (S U.S.C. § 706)*** ### **Requested Action** Before advancing the project, the DEIS must: 1. Provide a rigorous analysis of aquifer and groundwater impacts and demonstrate avoidance and minimization 2. Evaluate reduced design speeds consistent with surrounding roadways 3. Fully analyze alternatives utilizing existing infrastructure 4. Disclose and analyze growth-inducing impacts consistent with roadway classification 5. Reconsider roadway classification to align with the stated non-growth purpose of the project Thank you for considering these comments. I request that these deficiencies be addressed in a revised or supplemental EIS. Respectfully, Linda L Middleton XXXXXXXXXXXXX, UT XXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		You may also text your reply to XXXXXXXXXX Small Pasture Management guide for Utah published by Utah State University extension can provide current data and guidance. Protective agricultural and management wildlife, clear streams, native plants, healthy livestock. Why did UDOT disregard the value that citizens of Heber Valley repeatedly stressed about preserving scenic North Fields iconic agriculture and aquifer? UDOT: When you open the Wasatch County GIS Portal and tum on the layers that matter for environmental review, a very clear picture emerges: Option B sits directly on top of the highest-value, highest-sensitivity, and most heavily regulated land in the entire Heber Valley. This isn't a matter of interpretation - it's what the maps show. 1. Groundwater Depth: The Map Turns Dark Blue Under Option B When the Groundwater Depth layer is activated, the North Fields immediately light up in 0-5 ft and 5-10 ft polygons. Option B runs straight through these shallow-water zones. This means: • There is almost no soil buffer • Contaminants from a highway would reach groundwater quickly • Stormwater infiltration basins are not feasible From a visual standpoint, the alignment sits on the shallowest groundwater in the county. 2. Aquifer Recharge: The Corridor Overlaps the Primary Recharge Zone Turning on the Recharge Zones layer shows the North Fields as a continuous block of: • Primary Recharge Area • High Recharge Potential • High-conductivity alluvium Option B overlays these polygons almost perfectly. On the map, it looks like the alignment was drawn directly on top of the recharge zone - because it was. 3. Wetlands & Hydric Soils: The Map Fills With Blue and Green When you activate: Wetlands (NWI) & Hydric Soils the corridor becomes a patchwork of: • PEM wetlands • PSS shrub wetlands • PUB ponded areas • Hydric soil complexes These layers visually confirm: • The ground is seasonally saturated • Wetland indicates are widespread • A Clean Water Act §404 permit would be unavoidable

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The map shows wetland clusters exactly where Option B is proposed. 4, Irrigation Ditches & Drainage: The Alignment Cuts Through Every Conveyance Turning on Streams & Ditches reveals a dense network of: • Irrigation laterals • Private ditches • Historic conveyance routes • Seasonal drainage paths Option B crosses these features repeatedly. On the map, the alignment looks like a blade slicing through the valley's irrigation circulatory system. 5. Agricultural Preservation: The Corridor Bisects Protected Areas The Land Use ➔ Preservation Areas layer shows: • Agricultural Preservation Areas • Open Space Priority Zones • Rural Preservation Corridors Option B cuts directly through these mapped preservation polygons. Visually, the alignment contradicts every adopted land-use map. 6. Prime Farmland: The Entire Corridor Sits on High-Value Soils When you turn on Prime Farmland (NRCS SSURGO): • Nearly the entire corridor is shaded as Prime Farmland • Remaining areas are Farmland of Statewide Importance The map shows no low-value soils along Option B. 7. Floodplain & Local Hazard: The Alignment Occupies Flood-Prone Ground Activating: • FEMA Flood Zones • Local Flood Hazard reveals: • Zone A floodplains • Seasonal inundation areas • Shallow flooding polygons Option B crosses these hazard zones multiple times. On the map, the corridor sits in the lowest, wettest, most flood-prone part of the valley! What is the true motive behind all of this? It's obviously not to build a bypass, unless you are trying to build the most expensive, damaging option there is. I demand you remove alternative B from the running as it violates every code and protection at

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		both state and federal levels. Sincerely, The Middleton Family XXXXXXXXX The many development on the East Side of Heber have changed local traffic patterns. A scenic byway above. Red ledges should route traffic to Frances Ramas and connect HWY 40 to route trucking EAST to our landfills (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
555	Linda Middleton	**Subject** Deficiencies in DEIS Related to Aquifer Protection, Design Speed, Alternatives Analysis, and Growth Inducement Dear UDOT Project Team, I am a local resident submitting this comment to identify specific deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement [DEIS] for the proposed bypass project. These concerns relate directly to compliance with **NEPA**, the **Clean Water Act**, and implementing regulations. ### **Aquifer and Groundwater Protection** The DEIS does not demonstrate that impacts to aquifer recharge areas and hydrologically connected wetlands have been adequately avoided or minimized, as required under the **Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C § 1251 et seq.)** and **NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332)**. The analysis lacks sufficient site-specific hydrogeologic data addressing long-term risks from roadway runoff, spills, and maintenance activities. Given the reliance of this community on groundwater, this omission is significant and must be corrected. ### **Design Speed and Wildlife Impacts** The proposed **65 mph design speed** exceeds that of all connecting and nearby roadways and is the highest speed in the surrounding region. The DEIS does not adequately analyze the relationship between design speed and wildlife mortality, nor does it evaluate lower-speed alternatives consistent with the rural and environmental context. Failure to consider reduced design speeds violates NEPA's requirement to rigorously explore reasonable alternatives (**40 CFR § 1502.14**). ### **Failure to Analyze Existing Infrastructure Alternatives** The DEIS does not provide a meaningful evaluation of alternatives that improve or optimize existing transportation infrastructure, such as targeted roadway improvements, intersection upgrades, or traffic management strategies. NEPA requires consideration of reasonable alternatives, Including those that utilize existing facilities (**40 CFR § 1S02.14(c)**). The cursory treatment of these options is insufficient. ### **Growth-Inducing Impacts and Roadway Classification** The project is proposed as a **Class III facility**, which allows for future access points at approximately half-mile intervals. This classification is inherently growth-inducing. Despite this, the DEIS asserts that the project will not induce growth, without providing analysis to .support that conclusion. NEPA requires disclosure and analysis of indirect and induced growth impacts. Designing a

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		roadway with freeway-level access potential while disclaiming growth effects is internally inconsistent and fails to meet NEPA standards. This inconsistency may also render the DEIS arbitrary and capricious under the **Administrative Procedure Act (S U.S.C. § 706)*** ### **Requested Action** Before advancing the project, the DEIS must: 1. Provide a rigorous analysis of aquifer and groundwater impacts and demonstrate avoidance and minimization 2. Evaluate reduced design speeds consistent with surrounding roadways 3. Fully analyze alternatives utilizing existing infrastructure 4. Disclose and analyze growth-inducing impacts consistent with roadway classification 5. Reconsider roadway classification to align with the stated non-growth purpose of the project Thank you for considering these comments. I request that these deficiencies be addressed in a revised or supplemental EIS. Respectfully, Linda and Mark Middleton XXXXXXXXXXXXX, UTAH XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX [Art exhibit included] Option B, as outlined in the DEIS, does not improve East-West traffic flow or reduce truck traffic deliveries to existing businesses in Heber Valley on HWY 40. Zones requiring compliance with lower speed are overlooked. Protection against noise & light pollution and ground water contamination are inadequate or unsustainable without high costs ongoing into the future. The DEIS does not allow for these costs. Substantial efforts are being made to clean areas around the Jordan River today because environmental damage was not considered in the Salt Lake Valley before. Over looked design flaws were passed onto future generations. Scenic byways in Utah traditionally are built above cities, have fewer exits, lower speeds and allow wild life access to water and forage. DEIS doesn't achieve HV goals. It is not a fiscally responsible choice - most expensive and least effective option. MANY cost analyses were NOT included in the EIS, nor long term impact studies, Including High ROW acquisition costs, Complex hydrology mitigation, Irrigation system reconstruction, Wetland permitting and mitigation (UDOT has already had several failed attempts w/mitigation), long-term stormwater treatment infrastructure. These costs are disproportionate to the limited traffic benefits. Taxpayers pay twice - for the road itself & then infrastructure, services, etc. that follow development Pressure to get workers to Mayflower developments were not analyzed to include shuttle routes, etc. Failure to Analyze Downstream Impacts (40 C.F.R § 1502.16) The DEIS does not evaluate how construction, fill, dewatering, or contamination risks in Heber Valley could affect: Jordanelle Reservoir operations, Deer Creek Reservoir water quality, Lower Provo River flows and

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		flood risk, Utah Lake nutrient loading, Jordan River water quality standards, Salt Lake County drinking-water reliability, Great Salt Lake inflows This omission is a clear violation of NEPA's requirement to analyze reasonably foreseeable effects, including those occurring outside the immediate project area. • Heber Valley's aquifer and river system are part of the Wasatch Front's critical drinking-water infrastructure • Any contamination, diversion, or hydrologic disruption affects hundreds of thousands of downstream residents • The Great Salt Lake crisis makes upstream water protection even more urgent The following are some of the codes and Acts that UDOT should be following in their EIS. {Many discrepencies and ommissions have been identified by community members.) Please look them over in comparison to the EIS and comment accordingly. Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) • "Federal programs shall, to the extent practicable, be carried out in a manner that will minimize the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses.,, Safe Drinking Water Act (SOWA) "The Administrator shall publish maximum contaminant level goals which ... are protective of the health of persons." NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) • "To the fullest extent possible ... the policies, regulations, and laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act." • "Agencies sha/1 ... insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in environmental impact statements." • "Agencies shall rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." Utah Code §19-5 - Water Quality Act • "It is the public policy of this state to conserve the waters of the state and to protect, maintain, and improve the quality thereof." Utah Code §17-41 -Agricultural Protection Areas Act • "It is the policy of this state to conserve, protect, and encourage the development and improvement of its agricultural land." • "Agricultural protection areas are established to protect l and preserve agricultural lands and operations from incompatible land uses." Utah Constitution

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		• "All waters in this State are hereby declared to be the property of the State." Utah Constitution, Article XVIII Leave Heber Valley better than Utah found it… A thing of Be(Utah)ful. (of life) (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
556	Linda Middleton	Why Heber Valley Must Say NO to Bypass Option B Traffic is a real problem - but Bypass Option Bis the wrong solution. It sacrifices our drinking water aquifers, farmland, and community identity without fixing Main Street traffic & with a billion-dollar price tag. 1. It Doesn't Fix Main Street Traffic • UDOT's data shows only a 25% reduction on Main St. • 75% of traffic is local, doing business & carpools in Heber, and won't use the bypass. • Time savings are only 90 seconds during peak travel times. But that's at 65MPH ! ! ! ! Reckless speed for this area, on a built-up dike, with wildlife. {only way they can justify time savings is to increase the speed) • Trucks can't be forced to use the bypass • EIS did NOT account for indirect & growth-inducing impacts nor traffic forecasting. • EIS did not analyze impact of taking measures to improve existing Main/40 with 2. It Threatens Critical Drinking-Water Aquifers • The North Fields replenish Class 1 pristine aquifers serving Heber. They are our ONLY drinking water source & should be protected at all costs! www.say-no-to-option-b.com has details. • Building a highway over wetlands risks contamination from oil, gas, salt, PFAS, and runoff. Ditches are proposed which will drain into the Provo River. • The EIS does not comply with Utah state code requiring protection of aquifers & the Clean Water Act 404 (b){l) requiring the least environmentally damaging option be chosen. Emails from UDOT indicate they are above the law. 3. It Destroys the North & South Fields • These fields filter our air quality, support tourism, agriculture, wildlife, blue ribbon fishing, and our rural identity. They are the heart & lungs of our valley. • Both Heber City's and Wasatch County's Visions are being violated - "honoring and protecting rural character... " • No long-term environmental footprint analysis and cost • Mitigation is VERY vague in the EIS and defers decisions to the Army Corps of Engineering, which can lead to a land grab to fulfill their mitigation debts. The North Fields are the ONLY source of surface water rights left in the State of Utah that meets the criteria they need. This would lead i:o

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Heber losing our water and recharge that supports our aquifers. No water = no livestock, to farming, no life! This is critical to force UDOT to acknowledge and be transparent on how this process will take place BEFORE advancing this route. It is imperative to understand how severe this loss can be. 4. UDOT's EIS Contains Inaccuracies & Lacks Transparency • In October 2024, UDOT's director attended Wasatch County Council & admitted they had failed the EIS process & could not satisfy their purpose & need and had to start over. Option B (then D) was one of those failed routes. Heber paid a consultant who concluded Main St. is never going to be walkable, contradicting UDOTs plan to allow Heber's vision. • Missing compliance with aquifer and wetland protections in Utah code. • Renderings omit true overpass heights of 30' & don't include detailed visual and environmental impacts. (See Mayor Franco's suggested route changes at www.vote4mayorfranco.com) Original plans were at grade. We don't need Wasatch Front solutions in the Wasatch Back. Park City said NO to UDOT to widen 224, and won. Set the precedent. • The EIS ignored the Agricultural Protection Area (APA) Utah Code §17-41 - Agricultural Protection Areas Act "It is the policy of this state to conserve, protect, and encourage the development and improvement of its Agricultural land." • "Agricultural protection areas are established to protect and preserve agricultural lands and operations from incompatible land uses." 5. It Harms Farmers & Generational landowners • Generational families face losing everything from government eminent domain. Fragmented land will ultimately lead to loss of livelihoods, which are not analyzed in the EIS. • Farmers & Wasatch Co taxpayers already lost over $25 million in preservation grants because this route was proposed. UDOT knowingly undermined voter-approved 2018 open space efforts & bond funds and the community's intent to protect the agricultural use of the North Fields. UDOT REFUSED to modify the proposed route when asked to by the NRCS so they could fund a conservation easement!! • The EIS does not adequately analyze the cumulative impacts 6. It Accelerates High-Density Development & Raises Taxes • Despite UDOT's claim that development won't happen, they do not have the power to determine that -there are no guarantees- and any preservation has not been clarified. • Historically, bypasses invite development along their entire corridor and sprawl will raise OUR taxes. • EIS refers to using North Village Road Network, which does NOT EVEN EXIST and can easily be modified (Heber's recent

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		annexation at River Road & 40) TAKE The Highground, Please consider a scenic byway to the east of Heber Valley away from school zones and East-West existing corridors and proposed residential developments. Thank you for widening and making safety improvements to existing highways in Utah. A scenic byway protects water, Farmland, tourism, local schools and residential infrastructure without disrupting water and air quality, existing traffic patterns, railroad crossing, future redesigns to repair ecosystems and endless legal challenges over land and water rights. Sincerely Scenic, Linda L Middleton needs a Scenic Heber Valley XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Utah XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX P.S. A legacy of Beauty, Design, and Harmony with Nature and sustainable Safety & Production Depends on UDOT Design Make it Legendary (in a Scenic way) Now, instead of wild beasts and unpredictable elements we have a predictable patterns of twelve tanker trucks, and speeding traffic rushing through our residential hometown every hour. I attended the Wasatch Council meeting and read the Wave report summery of that public meeting where the Executive Director of UDOT spoke about his role in torpedoing grant funds for North Fields' agriculture so that a bisecting speedway, (that UDOT doesn't have the money to build) must PAINFULLY be routed between the new high school complex and the environmentally sensitive Provo River. Heber City has endured years of road construction and paid for infrastructure upgrades to route massive development onto HWY 40. Now UDOT's only option to save Main Street from commuter traffic delays are "painful" not only for Heber City residents and North Field agricultural futures, but un-addressed environmental concerns as well. The environment, and its ability to cope with UDOT's unfunded plan has no input in human plans and no voice in our councils. Historically, the environment does have its own way to inflict painful consequences. There are other small valley communities that are forever scarred by fires, floods, storms and toxins released by earthquakes. No wonder UDOT's route (requesting federal funds) include years of of decimation in the North Fields, robbes funds from Valley residents and muddies the Provo River Waters. Having another constant construction speed zone define" human patterns of disturbance of tranquil landscap13s. That is the spirit of competition of industries that continues to harden Heber Citizens' pain tolerance. There is no forecast for when and where Natural Elements (or Federal Budgets) will exact payment from Heber citizens of the future. "PAINFUL" is in our current news so much that it hardly registers until our month lasts longer than our money. Current Heber humans just pay the inflated interest rate till the burden crushes our ability to endure. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
100	Lindsay Ashby Devonas	Please see attached (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
101	Lindsay Ashby Devonas	This change.org petition was created on Jan. 17, 2026 and in 11 days has received 477 signatures as of Jan. 28, 2026 at 4:16 p.m., $580 was raised promoting the petition, and recent analysis has shown that 70% of the petition signers live in Heber Valley, with nearly all petition signers living in UT in adjoining counties. Including the comments posted here for official submission/ comment. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
102	Lindsay Ashby Devonas	Including the change.org text here: The Issue We recognize the need for a highway bypass in Heber Valley. What we strongly oppose is UDOT’s decision to route that bypass through the North Fields (Option B), one of the valley’s most scenic, productive, and irreplaceable landscapes. Option B would permanently cut through open farmland, wildlife habitat, and wetlands in the North Fields to save one minute in travel time, according to UDOT’s own analysis. This tradeoff is unacceptable. Once this land is paved, it is gone forever. The North Fields are central to what makes Heber Valley special: wide open views, working farms, clean air, and a landscape that defines our community’s identity. Preserving this land protects wildlife, supports agriculture, and ensures future generations inherit a valley that still looks and feels like Heber, not just another highway corridor. Here are the facts: Land preservation is a one-time decision. Option A preserves future choices; Option B permanently removes them. Option B costs approximately $48 million more than Option A. Option B saves ~one minute compared to Option A.. Option B cuts directly through the North Fields; Option A stays closer to existing US-40 infrastructure. Building through the North Fields puts a highway through the LAST large, beautiful contiguous agricultural area left in the Valley. Portions of Option B would be elevated, permanently altering the valley viewshed. If long-term growth requires additional mitigation, that can be addressed through access management, frontage roads, and operational changes without routing a new highway through the North Fields. The North Fields also have a high water table and watershed sensitivity, which is the entire reason they have not been developed yet. Utah faces statewide water supply and water quality constraints; building major highway infrastructure in this location increases long-term risk.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		We are not saying “no bypass.” We are saying build it smarter. Option A keeps the road closer to existing highways, preserves far more open space than UDOT acknowledges, and aligns with decades of farmer and community input calling for protection of the North Fields. We urge UDOT and state leaders to reject Option B and pursue a bypass alignment that respects the land, the people who live here, and the long-term heritage of the Heber Valley. Sign this petition to stop Option B and protect the North Fields for today and for our children for generations to come. Take Action UDOT’s public comment period is open until March 9, 2026. This decision will not change without significant, visible public input. Written comments, calls, and attendance at public meetings all matter and become part of the official record. Your efforts matter. Here's how you can help: Sign this petition. Submit a written comment to UDOT at hebervalleyeis@utah.gov or 801-210-0498. Attend the hearings (Jan 27 virtual, Jan 28 in-person) and put your input on the record. Virtual meeting + Q&A: Jan 27, 2026, 6:00–7:30 pm (instructions to join are found here or hebervalleyeis.udot.utah.gov) Open house + public hearing: Jan 28, 2026, 5:30–8:30 pm, Wasatch High School Library (930 S 500 E, Heber City, UT) Get updates (text + email) so we coordinate comments, turnout, and outreach. Contact our local decision makers and leaders to make your opinion heard. UDOT Project Manager for Orem, Provo Canyon, and Wasatch County, Craig Hancock, XXXXXXXXXXXX / XXXXXXXXXXXXX Transportation Commission Commissioner (Region 3), Jim Evans – XXXXXXXXXXXX / XXXXXXXXXXXXX Utah State Senator (Senate District 20), Ronald (Ron) M. Winterton, rwinterton@le.utah.gov / 435-299-8531 Utah State Representative (House District 59), Mike L. Kohler, mkohler@le.utah.gov / 801-420-6158 Midway City Mayor, Celeste Johnson, cjohnson@midwaycityut.gov Heber City Mayor, Heidi Franco, hfranco@heberut.gov Wasatch County Manager, Dustin Grabau – dgrabau@wasatch.utah.gov / 435-657-3180 (County Admin Office) Heber City Council, Yvonne Barney, ybarney@heberut.gov Heber City Council, Aaron Cheatwood, acheatwood@heberut.gov Heber City Council, Mike Johnston, mjohnston@heberut.gov Heber City Council, Sid Ostergaard, sostergaard@heberut.gov Heber City Council, Morgan Murdock, citycouncil@heberut.gov Heber City Council Office, (general), 435-654-0757 Wasatch County Council Chair, Karl McMillan, kmcmillan@wasatch.utah.gov Wasatch County Council (general), (general), council@wasatch.utah.gov Wasatch County Council Office, (general), 435-657-3180 (Please note that I found these listed on various government websites. Do alert me to any error in the contact information and I will update promptly)
259	Lindsey M.	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I am a resident of Heber who lives close to US-40 / Main Street, and my comments are based on daily experience observing traffic conditions in this area. Issue of Concern From what I observe living near Main Street, much of the congestion appears to be generated by local traffic rather than regional through-traffic. In recent years, growth in Heber has accelerated significantly, particularly with new residential development and ongoing construction activity on the east side of town. There are now thousands of homes either under construction or planned in that area, and a large portion of daily traffic—including construction vehicles and residents—travels along US-40 to access those developments. Because of this pattern, it is difficult to see how a bypass located on the west side of town would substantially reduce the traffic that residents experience on Main Street. Most local trips will still need to travel through the existing corridor. Analysis Referenced in the Draft EIS In reviewing the transportation analysis in the Draft EIS, I understand that traffic modeling was used to evaluate future conditions and diversion to the bypass alternatives. However, I have read that some of the modeling inputs may be based on data collected several years ago. Given the very rapid growth in Heber over the past few years, it would be helpful to understand whether the traffic model reflects: - recent residential growth and approved developments, - current construction activity and associated traffic, - and the concentration of new housing on the east side of the community.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		If these factors are not fully incorporated, the projected effectiveness of the bypass could be overstated. Project Cost and Effectiveness The Draft EIS indicates the project could cost close to one billion dollars. With an investment of this scale, it is important that the proposed solution clearly addresses the actual sources of congestion. If local traffic is the primary contributor to delays on Main Street, a west-side bypass may not provide the level of benefit expected. Potential Impacts Both alternatives would introduce a new roadway corridor through open land adjacent to existing residential areas on the west side of Heber, permanently altering views, increasing noise and lighting, and changing the character of these areas. Question Does the traffic modeling in the Draft EIS include the most recent development approvals, current construction activity, and updated population projections reflecting the rapid growth that has occurred in Heber in the past few years? Suggested Direction / Potential Solution If the primary issue is local traffic related to recent growth, it may be more effective to prioritize improvements within the existing corridor, including: - intersection and signal improvements along US-40 / Main Street, - safer pedestrian crossings or grade-separated crossings, - operational improvements to improve traffic flow, - and planning that better reflects where new housing and trips are actually occurring. Given the scale of growth currently underway in Heber, ensuring the analysis reflects current conditions will be critical to selecting the most effective solution. Thank you for considering these comments.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		- Lindsey Sent from my iPhone
320	Lindsy Cieslewicz	The bypass road through the Northfields has always been a bad idea. I have submitted comment previous to this draft. I live on the other side of Heber. These fields are the gem of Heber Valley. No bypass is worth destroying them and all the homes that would be affected. The aquifer in this area also needs to be protected. The time to build the bypass has passed. UDOT and Wasatch County should have dealt with this a decade ago when there were more options. Now that Northfields are the only option, that time has passed. No more bypass road in Heber Valley. Thank you.
538	Lindy Reioux	I Lindy Reioux, resident of Heber City, respectfully disagree with the preferred Route B First, the citizens of Wasatch County voted and passed a 10-million-dollar Open Space Bond to protect and preserve our agricultural lands, primarily to North Fields. Route B is in direct conflict of what the residents of Heber Valley have voted on as a community. Route A, while not great, aligns much closer with what the voters have already agreed upon. Second, Route B is directly over our drinking water that is protected by the Federal Clean Water Act and Utah Admn. Code R317-6-5. This Class 1A Aquifer should be protected at all costs. Saying the runoff and pollutants would be minimal, it is not acceptable, one accident and a tanker truck leak into the fields the damage could be catastrophic. Fresh Water in Utah is a critical issue. Allowing the possibility for this prime aquifer to be comprised is unacceptable. Lastly, the projected cost difference is a big factor. Spending millions of dollars more of taxpayers' money is not prudent. Based on the current growth projections on Utah, there are 100's of more projects that will need funding. Spending so much more on plan B does not make sense. There are many things that I personally don't like about Route A. But, based on the above, it's a far better option over Route B. Lindy Reioux XXXXXXXXX, Heber City UT XXXXXXXXXXXX
602	Lindy Reioux	Please re-look at the southern access area along 1300 and see if there is any possible way to move the connection. Moving to majority of the traffic from a rural/industrial area into residential does not make sense to me. I have attached a map showing where I believe it would fit. It's slightly closer to the Airport but not any closer than we currently travel. Thank you Edward Reioux XXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
690	Linsey Loveland	Dear UDOT, I ask that you look at the south end again of the Heber Valley Corridor. I know orginally there were different options but the two alternatives left have no change on the south end. Bringing in an elevated road right in the midst of homes and businesses is not ideal for the look of our community nor the homes in this area. Please look at other options to use the existing highway 189 to eliminate the elevated road and bringing a highway right next to homes and businesses on 1300 South. I am under the impression that the bypass road is to help Heber to achieve the goal of less traffic on Main Street and to have a historic town center. I realize that the current plan probably has the best and fastest flow for traffic. Currently traffic has to stop at a stop light at 1200 S to continue down Main Street or turn down 189. Wouldn't it still be feasible to look at options to run traffic down the existing 189 fartherw west and then cut across the sewer fields and tie into the new alternative? If traveling south on the new alternative the road could cut through the sewer fields at any angle to 189 to avoid taking the highway down 1300 S. Regardless, the highway has to go through the sewer fields so the land used would for the highway would generally be about the same and if it continued south to 189 this could elimate having an elevated highway through businesses and homes. It may add on time to travel but it keeps the small town feel for Heber and better quality of living for residents and business owners in this area. My other concern with this alternative is the fact that there is no access for residents who live west of Industrial Road to access the highway to go south on the new highway. This means they will have to travel through two school zones and several parks to Industrial road to go south. Increased traffic in school zones seems like it is something that should be avoided. By making this the only access point on the south end travel time also increases for residents. Please relook at the south end planning for the corridor. Heber Valley residents to me should take priority over adding minutes to travel time of those traveling through Heber via the bypass. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
180	Lisa Meiner	I oppose Option B. We need to do everything we can to preserve the ecosystem and beauty of the North Fields. Our crown jewel that makes our valley so beautiful. Option A is ok but perhaps the best solution is to keep the traffic where it is and move main street. Please do not kill the beauty of our valley and our water shed for 60 seconds improved travel time.
355	Liz Jones	Hi, I live in Midway, and Heber is getting uglier and uglier by the week. Way too much growth, to much concrete. Save the North Fields. I'm a pilot for American Airlines so I see from above all the destruction of our open spaces. How about a tunnel under Heber, like in Vegas using the Boring Company. Regenerative Farming is my passion, and we need to save our open fields, farms and have beauty all around us. NOT strip malls, Tract homes and ZERO green open spaces. Who the hell wants to live that way! Elizabeth Jones XXXXXXXXX Sent from my iPad
331	Liz Patnode	I am opposed to alternative B due to the impacts on wetland, agriculture, aesthetics and wildlife. I believe it negatively affects our beautiful valley. Losing the North Fields will impact the valley in ways that cannot be repaired. I think Alternative A is better, with less damage to our valley.
443	Lon Wardrop	To the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project Team: My name is Lon Wardrop. I am a longtime investor and property owner in the Wasatch Back. I am submitting this formal public comment in opposition to Preferred Alternative B and to urge UDOT to reconsider whether any bypass is the right solution for Heber Valley. I have spent decades building things in Utah — businesses, relationships, communities. I understand better than most that the decisions you make today determine what you leave behind for the next generation. That long view is exactly what is missing from this DEIS. As a Midway property owner, the North Fields aquifer is not an abstraction to me. It is the water system that sustains the character, the agriculture, and frankly the property values of the entire Heber Valley. The DEIS admits a direct hydrological connection between the North Fields shallow aquifer and the culinary wells serving Heber City, Midway, and Charleston — yet UDOT conducted no pump-test modeling and has no contingency plan if construction compromises that aquifer. That is not an acceptable level of due diligence for a $760+ million public project. THE COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS DOES NOT ADD UP I have built businesses and evaluated investments my entire career. When UDOT's own spokesperson says publicly that "the study isn't really looking at price," that is a red flag no serious investor or public steward should ignore. Alternative B costs at least $48.6 million more than Alternative A — and that figure omits enormous unbudgeted liabilities including groundwater infrastructure, farm access overpasses, severance damages, water rights acquisition, and potential municipal water replacement costs. The true cost likely exceeds $1 billion. All of this to save approximately 70 seconds of drive time. THE BYPASS WILL ATTRACT THE TRAFFIC IT CLAIMS TO SOLVE A new freeway-style corridor through the North Fields will do what new highway capacity always does: generate new traffic. Beyond induced demand, there is a strategic risk the DEIS has not studied at all — a faster US-40 corridor through Heber Valley could divert westbound traffic currently using I-80 through Salt Lake City onto this route instead. Salt Lake City's infrastructure was built to handle that volume. Heber Valley's was not. The DEIS traffic model is labeled "Not Calibrated" for summer — the highest-traffic season — and contains no regional rerouting analysis whatsoever.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		THE RIGHT ANSWER IS TO RECONSIDER THE QUESTION I do not believe either Alternative A or Alternative B is the right answer. UDOT failed to rigorously study the no-bypass alternative, including intersection improvements, demand management, and the one-way couplet that Heber City itself formally supported. Before spending three-quarters of a billion dollars of public money on an irreversible decision that will permanently transform this valley, those alternatives deserve a fair analysis. If a bypass must be built, I support rejection of Alternative B and demand that any route be moved as far east of 600 West as possible to protect the North Fields, the aquifer, and the 160-year-old senior water rights infrastructure that sustains this community. I urge UDOT to: 1. Decline to issue a Record of Decision on the current DEIS, which fails to meet NEPA's "hard look" standard. 2. Commission an independent regional traffic study examining induced demand and I-80 rerouting risk. 3. Prepare a Supplemental DEIS that fully accounts for all project costs and environmental impacts before any final decision is made. The Heber Valley is worth protecting. I have invested in this community because of what it is — not what a bypass might make it become. Respectfully, Lon Wardrop XXXXXXXXXXXXX Midway Ut, XXXXX
372	Lori Forsyth	I'm writing to encourage adoption of Option A for accommodating growth and easing congestion in Heber Valley. I'm concerned about the impact that the other option, B, would have on the surrounding area, wetlands, the aquifer, and on the population, both human and wildlife, of the area
111	Lori Stone (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	The route of Option B does not meet the purpose and need to remove the traffic from Heber Main. When you look at Chapter 1 of the EIS, Purpose and Need, it says, "Traffic on Main Street has grown to a point where a UDOT-sponsored western bypass alternatives study is underway. When a western bypass route is finalized and constructed, Main Street will see a significant reduction in large trucks and a reduction in vehicle traffic." In August of 2025, the executive director, Carlos Braceras, of UDOT spoke at Wasatch County Council meeting, and he was asked about will these bypasses, A and B at the time, lift the traffic that has been promised to the public. His answer -- I will read it -- was -- "Will the bypass off Heber City Main Street traffic problem [sic]?" He said, "Probably not." He said, "75 percent of traffic is caused by local congestion." Keep in mind, this traffic report that they are working on on this EIS is from 2019. It could be up to 2021, but it is not current, and we've had almost a 30 percent growth in more people moving to this valley. Option B bypass will induce growth impacts if it's built and will be built on sensitive lands that have APA protections, which is agricultural protection areas that our county council had forethought to put in place a few years ago to protect these aquifers and all the things that are sensitive on the North Fields. When we look at the January 7th release of the EIS report, it seems negligent because it did not include any of the APAs, the agricultural protection areas, on their -- in their EIS. Why is that? The EIS fails to properly analyze the negative impacts to the wetlands that Alternative B and even A that this route will destroy. One thing that they need is called the LEDPA, which is the least environmentally damaging and practical alternative. It's mandatory, and it's a legally binding standard under the Clean Water Act, which is Section 404(b)(1) guidelines. It actually even prohibits the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from issuing a permit for discharging different things of material on these lands. This adds more concern to support this EIS that was put out

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		because it did not truly abide by LEDPA and follow the guidelines for study under impact for the wetlands. They are wetlands, and the wetlands in the EIS study was done out of season when it was dry. That's when they gathered their data for this EIS. That appears to be another form of being not transparent, and also it feels negligent. A clear contradiction is the EIS heavily weighs its decision to pick Route B over A on protecting three historic structures, houses, driveways, that Option A would then perhaps have to go around. So they said we cannot pick Option A. Well, finish it off real fast with the big thing -- how they picked and they weighed heavily -- the EIS stating that these protective structures with SHPO, which is the state agency of historic preservation office, that they said that we have to pick B because these three historic structures have protection and we have them registered with the state historic preservation office. And here's the catch -- is that the -- UDOT -- they are not registered with the historic society.
392	Lori Stone	Dear UDOT: As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. 1. Non-Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. Lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company, were not properly advanced as required under 2. Incomplete Cost Disclosure - The EIS omits substantial costs, including utility relocation, irrigation reconstruction, agricultural crossings, stormwater infrastructure, and long-term maintenance — obscuring the project's true fiscal impact. 3. Understated Growth and Traffic Impacts - Induced growth is under-modeled. Highways generate development, and development generates traffic. Main Street congestion is largely local and will not be meaningfully solved by a bypass that simultaneously accelerates growth and doesnt account for the mass East-side developments. 4. Irreversible Agricultural Loss - Alternative B converts prime farmland to pavement at the highest rate among options, fragments working farms, and relies on vague mitigation measures inconsistent with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and state land-use policies. 5. Water and Air Risk - The route cuts through aquifer recharge zones and wetlands that naturally filter runoff. A 65-mph design increases pavement width, noise, dangerous wildlife accidents, and the pollutant load running into groundwater and the Provo River. 6. Misaligned Public Purpose - The alignment prioritizes regional through-traffic and resort access over local mobility, contrary to adopted city and county preservation goals.Alternative B maximizes environmental harm, fiscal exposure, and long-term development pressure while offering limited traffic relief. UDOT must select the least damaging, fiscally responsible alternative — one that protects water, farmland, air quality, and the rural character that defines the Heber Valley. Lori Stone
438	Lori Tolton	There is very few beautiful space left, Heber Valley is one of few left, Ee must push back and save our beautiful Heber Valley
518	Lorrie Hansen	I am writing to show my support of UDOT's choice for Alternative B (off US 40). I live on the north end of Heber and the highway traffic and danger is unbearable. I am happy to see something finally being done to ease the flow of traffic on this road and make it safer. Thank you, Lorrie Hansen
181	Louise O'Reilly	I fully support the current proposal. Projected growth in the area is incontrovertable and cannot be wished away. Plan and act now or live with a major mess later.
136	Luisa Mead Frankenburg	I am NOT in favor of either A nor B
279	Lynn Adams	I desire that Alternative B be selected as it is the best long-term solution to traffic that is available. Thanks for your patience with the people that continue to oppose the bypass and/or desire alternative A, which will cause more problems later on as the county continues to grow. Please continue with Alternative B, which is the best long-term solution for the vast majority of Wasatch County residents and those who travel through our valley on our roads. Thanks so much! Dr. Lynn L. Adams
576	Lynn Simoneau	This is being built in the backyards of many homes. You already have a road to use, you do not need ot go through peoples LITERAL backyard on the south side.
343	Lythgoe Design Group	To Whom it May Concern at the Utah Department of Transportation, We at Lythgoe Design Group are an architecture firm based in Heber City. We have deep roots here and want to make sure that we do our part to ensure that the Heber Valley Corridor bypass project is done in a way that helps the community grow in a responsible manner.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		As an architecture firm, we take our role in shaping the community seriously. Though the bypass is not an architectural project, it is something that will dramatically impact our community, and we feel it is important to look at all possible solutions. For that reason, we have taken it upon ourselves to look at options that are more contextually appropriate for our community. As part of the Heber Valley Corridor, UDOT has proposed the use of overpasses, flyover ramps, and elevated roadways as a method for providing mobility to regional traffic. These elements of infrastructure may be a straightforward approach to the traffic problems that the community will face as traffic increases, but we must ask ourselves if that is what fits in the context of our community. An area of particular concern is at the south end of Heber City, where an elevated roadway and overpasses would run past residential areas, cutting off access to commercial businesses and local roads. We are proposing that UDOT incorporate roundabouts in the bypass plan in place of the proposed interchanges. Roundabouts are a safer, cheaper, more beautiful and more environmentally responsible way to provide connection through and around the community than overpasses, flyover ramps, elevated roadways, and signalized intersections. Roundabouts are a proven traffic-calming measure that reduce the number and severity of crashes, allow for the smooth flow of traffic, reduce emissions due to stopping and acceleration, can accommodate large vehicles, and can be beautifully designed. They can fit within a relatively small footprint, are safer for pedestrians and non-motorized transportation, and don't inhibit the views that the people of this valley love. We feel it is also important to address the hierarchy that is communicated in both UDOT's proposed solution and in our proposed concept. With the large elevated roadways cutting through the south end of town, you are putting the traffic up on a pedestal, and saying that is what is taking priority. As a part of our concept, we propose that the roads that lead into "The Hub" roundabout have elevated pedestrian walkways that facilitate the safe crossing of pedestrians and cyclists. (See concept drawing) These emphasize the safety of pedestrians, allow for walkability and local connection, and could frame a beautiful gateway into the city. Wickenburg, Arizona is an example that we have drawn inspiration from as we have looked at incorporating roundabouts into the bypass. Located on the direct route between Las Vegas and Phoenix, Highway 93 sees a large amount of traffic, including freight traffic. From the 2000's up until 2024, seven new roundabouts have been constructed along 5 miles of the highway and have taken that highway traffic off of Tegner Street, allowing for a safer, more walkable, and more vibrant downtown. There are many other examples of roundabouts that have been integrated into US and State HIghways and Routes, especially in Washington, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. There are some municipalities, like Carmel, Indiana, that have fully embraced the roundabout, and have seen incredible benefits as they have converted traditional intersections into roundabouts. A recent study, "Livable Streets and Quality of Life," from the University of Utah's Metropolitan Research Center reports that "well designed traffic calming saves lives, improves safety, and enhances, not diminishes, the quality of life." This report was prepared for the Salt Lake City Transportation Division, but the evidence presented would be perfectly applicable in the Heber Valley, at roundabouts on the bypass, and at locations where highways interface with local roads. We would encourage UDOT to consider this report while looking into the application of roundabouts instead of the proposed interchanges. We believe that by taking these things into consideration, UDOT can come up with interchange solutions that are more appropriate than the ones presented. Please take a look at the attached files, and for more information, go to our website at: https://www.lythgoedesign.com/post/roundabouts-in-the-heber-valley-corridor-bypass-project. Also, feel free to reach out to us at lythgoedesign@gmail.com. We want to make sure that you receive this comment, and we would love to discuss our ideas in person and answer your questions. Thank you, Lythgoe Design Group Lane Lythgoe, MBA I Owner, Architect (UT #137121)

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Heber City, Utah XXXXX Office: XXXXXXXXXX | Cell: XXXXXXXXXX www.lythgoedesign.com (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
257	M Kirby	We do not want the wet lands through the North Fields to have a major road through them. We don't want the beauty of the open North Fields to have a very unattractive freeway run through our valley. The timing of 5 to 10 minutes should not be used to determine if a families lose their homes and lands. You don't live in our valley, thus you should not be the ones making this decision. Consider the fact you couldn't even put forth a working website, how is it you would expect us to believe you would make the right decision for the citizens of our community. Stop this decision. Alternative A is the only way to go, if we need to do this at all.
358	M Kirby	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later?

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name M Kirby Address XXXXXXXXXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
454	Malia Young	Attached is my letter of comment on the proposed Heber Valley Corridor. Thanks, Malia Young -- Malia Young (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
427	Marci Johnson	This proposal for the “bypass” in Heber needs to stop. Please do not allow this to take any form. When it’s all said and done, the traffic is still best left on Main Street, than in destroying the rest of the town and going thru the middle of our north fields wetlands. There is no reasonable alternative since the city waited decades too long to address this problem, please don’t make the mistake of ruining our valley. A few more lights along Highway 40 for safe left turns and add a climbing/truck lane for the highway up to park city would be better. Also, could we work on Provo canyon and get some underpasses and stop allowing the unprotected left turns that lead to fatalities and canyon closures multiple times a year? Thanks, Marci Sent from my iPhone
95	Maria Barndt	I’m in favor of Plan A, I don’t want to see the hwy go through the North Fields, but I don’t see where you are addressing Our wildlife that live in the South fields, Deer and the huge Snadhill Crane population. Can you tell me what your plan is there, or if Any? Kindly Maria Ploch Barndt
655	Marie Murdock VanDyke	The enivronmental impact that aleternative B has on wetlads and water sources is not worth the increased flow of traffic and reduction of congestion it will bring. Although alternative A has a graeter imapct on commerical and residential areas, those involved can be compenstaed for their lossess and relocated to equitable locations. The same is not true for the forever imapct and losses incurred to the wetlands and water resources that are found in the north fields. There is not equitable alternative or compensation for the potential harm and loss that alternative B could inflict. Please reconsider your choice and opt to use alternative A, rather than alternative B.
667	Marilyn Crittenden	To: UDOT Project Management Team Subject: Formal Opposition to Preferred Alternative B – Heber Valley Corridor Draft EIS I am writing to express my adamant opposition to the selection of Alternative B for the Heber Valley Corridor. As a resident of this valley, I believe the Draft EIS fails to properly weigh the permanent loss of our natural heritage against short-term traffic goals. I urge UDOT to reconsider based on the following critical points: 1. Irreversible Loss of "Sense of Place" and Open Space The North Fields are the defining visual and cultural characteristic of Heber Valley. Alternative B would create a permanent physical and visual "scar" on a landscape that is essential to our local identity. Under NEPA, the agency is required to evaluate impacts on the "human environment," which includes the aesthetic and cultural value of open space. Once this agricultural land is paved, the loss is irretrievable. 2. Significant Environmental Impact on Wetlands The Draft EIS acknowledges that Alternative B impacts 53.9 acres of wetlands—more than double the impact of Alternative A. These wetlands are critical for local hydrology and wildlife. Given that Alternative A exists as a viable path with significantly lower ecological damage, Alternative B should not be considered the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative" (LEDPA). 3. Induced Growth and High-Density Annexation The "No-Action" and "Alternative A" baselines do not fully account for the Induced Growth that Alternative B will trigger. By placing a corridor west of the current city limits, UDOT is effectively inviting Heber City to annex the intervening land. This will inevitably lead to high-density residential development in areas currently designated as open space. This bypass will not "solve" traffic; it will simply create a new urban sprawl engine that brings more vehicles into the valley. 4. Fiscal Irresponsibility The $48.6 million premium for Alternative B over Alternative A is an unjustifiable use of taxpayer funds, especially when that extra cost is being used to facilitate a route that causes more environmental degradation. Conclusion I request that UDOT reject Alternative B and look toward solutions that prioritize the preservation of the North Fields and focus on the existing US-40 footprint to minimize the destruction of our valley’s most precious resource. Sincerely, Marilyn Crittenden
416	Marina Thomas, Parr Brown Gee & Loveless	Please see the attached comment letter. Thank you for your consideration. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
646	Marjorie Lowder	From: Marjorie Nelson Lowder XXXXXXXXXX Heber, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 3/9/2026

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		To: Utah Department of Transportation Project Team – US-40 Heber Valley Bypass Subject: Opposition to Option B for the US-40 Bypass Through the North Fields Dear UDOT Project Team, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Option B for the proposed US-40 bypass through the North Fields in the Heber Valley. My concerns are based primarily on the need to protect the region's clean water resources and the scientifically recognized value of the North Fields' soils, wetlands, and groundwater recharge areas. The North Fields represent one of the most important natural water-filtering and recharge landscapes in the valley. The agricultural soils and wetlands in this area function as a natural sponge—absorbing precipitation, filtering pollutants, and slowly recharging the aquifers that support local drinking water and irrigation. Numerous hydrologic studies show that when these permeable landscapes are replaced by paved surfaces and road infrastructure, the water system changes dramatically. Impervious surfaces accelerate runoff, reduce infiltration, and carry contaminants such as heavy metals, petroleum residues, road salts, and tire particles directly into nearby waterways and groundwater systems. Option B would place a major transportation corridor directly through this sensitive landscape. Construction and long-term highway operation would introduce significant stormwater runoff and pollutant loading into areas that currently serve as natural water protection zones. Once these systems are disrupted, their filtration capacity cannot easily be restored. Protecting water quality in the Heber Valley is not simply an environmental concern; it is a public health, agricultural, and economic issue. Clean groundwater supports local farms, wildlife habitat, and the drinking water relied upon by residents. Scientific research consistently demonstrates that preserving natural recharge areas and minimizing impervious development near waterways is one of the most effective strategies for maintaining long-term water quality. For these reasons, I strongly urge UDOT to reject Option B and instead pursue alternatives that avoid the North Fields and minimize impacts to critical watershed functions. Transportation improvements should be designed in a way that respects the valley's hydrology and protects the resources that sustain our communities. Future generations will depend on the water systems we choose to protect today. I respectfully ask that UDOT prioritize science-based planning and safeguard the North Fields' natural role in maintaining the clean water that defines the Heber Valley. Thank you for your time and for considering public input on this important decision. Sincerely, Marjorie Nelson Lowder
493	Mark Allen	Please confirm receipt of this email March 7, 2026 Utah Department of Transportation Heber Valley Corridor Environmental Impact Statement Study Team Re: Public Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Statement – Heber Valley Corridor Introduction I respectfully submit the following comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the proposed Heber Valley Corridor transportation project. Public discussions surrounding the proposed bypass alternatives have referenced an estimated project cost approaching $760 million. Because of the scale, cost, and permanence of such infrastructure, it is essential that the Final EIS fully evaluate operational alternatives, groundwater protection, agricultural preservation, long-term maintenance costs, and evolving transportation technologies before committing to a freeway-scale corridor through the North Fields. The North Fields are not vacant land awaiting development. They are working agricultural lands that perform an important hydrological function through flood irrigation, allowing water to infiltrate soils and recharge the valley aquifer that supports wells throughout the region. Recent community gatherings—including the February 28, 2026 tractor procession across the North Fields—demonstrate strong public concern regarding the potential loss of agricultural land and groundwater recharge areas. These comments identify environmental, engineering, and planning issues that appear insufficiently analyzed in the Draft EIS and request that they be studied and formally addressed in the Final EIS. 1. Operational Improvements to Existing Corridor

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		The Draft EIS identifies congestion along U.S. Route 40 as a central transportation challenge. However, the Draft EIS does not appear to fully evaluate operational improvements that could increase corridor capacity without constructing a new roadway. Potential improvements include: • elimination of left-hand turns along U.S. 40 • construction of two grade-separated east–west overpasses • reduction in signalized intersections • coordinated signal timing improvements These improvements may significantly improve traffic flow while preserving agricultural land and aquifer recharge soils. Requested Response Were these operational improvements modeled in the Draft EIS traffic analysis? If not, why were they excluded from detailed analysis? 2. Artificial Intelligence Traffic Management Modern transportation systems increasingly rely on adaptive traffic management systems capable of dynamically adjusting signal timing and traffic flow. AI-based traffic coordination systems have demonstrated the ability to significantly increase roadway capacity without adding new highways. Requested Response • Did the Draft EIS evaluate adaptive signal systems or AI-driven corridor management for Main Street and U.S. 40? 3. Autonomous Vehicle Impacts on Traffic Projections Traffic modeling frequently assumes traditional human driving patterns. However, autonomous vehicles are expected to: • reduce following distances • coordinate speeds across traffic networks • optimize signal timing • reduce congestion caused by human reaction delays These factors could significantly increase roadway efficiency. Requested Response • Did the traffic model evaluate scenarios assuming partial or widespread adoption of autonomous vehicles? 4. Traffic Demand Management and Nighttime Capacity

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Traffic congestion appears concentrated during certain daytime hours, while substantial roadway capacity exists overnight. Potential demand-management strategies include: • incentives for freight traffic between 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM • scheduling adjustments for commercial trucking • freight priority windows outside commuter hours Requested Response What percentage of traffic consists of freight vehicles? Was freight demand management evaluated? 5. Rail Freight Alternatives Heavy tanker and truck traffic passing through the valley may originate from industrial or energy production areas in eastern Utah. Encouraging freight transport by rail rather than highway could reduce congestion and environmental risk. Requested Response Was modal freight shift to rail evaluated? 6. Aquifer Recharge and Agricultural Hydrology The North Fields serve as a natural groundwater recharge system due to flood irrigation practices. Water applied to fields infiltrates into soils and replenishes the aquifer that supports wells throughout the valley. Replacing these soils with impervious roadway surfaces could significantly reduce aquifer recharge. Requested Response • Was aquifer recharge modeling conducted? • What percentage of valley groundwater recharge currently occurs in the North Fields? 7. Groundwater Baseline Monitoring It is unclear whether a comprehensive groundwater monitoring baseline has been established prior to potential construction. Without baseline data, long-term groundwater impacts cannot be accurately measured. If baseline monitoring has not been conducted, a minimum 24-month groundwater monitoring program should be implemented prior to construction. Baseline testing should include: • nitrates and nutrients • petroleum hydrocarbons

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		• heavy metals • chlorides • volatile organic compounds • total dissolved solids Requested Response What groundwater baseline monitoring has been conducted to date? 8. Stormwater Runoff and Contamination Risk Highway runoff commonly contains pollutants including: • petroleum hydrocarbons • heavy metals • tire-derived microplastics • de-icing salts These contaminants may migrate into irrigation canals and groundwater recharge zones. Requested Response What stormwater runoff modeling has been conducted for the proposed corridor? 9. Long-Term Maintenance and Winter Operations Roadways in Wasatch County require extensive winter maintenance, including plowing and application of de-icing salts. A large above-ground bypass corridor may require: • increased salt application • additional plowing operations • expanded drainage infrastructure Over time, salt runoff can contribute to chloride contamination of groundwater and surface water systems. Increased winter maintenance could therefore increase pollutant loading to waterways already subject to impairment concerns. Requested Response • Has the Draft EIS evaluated long-term maintenance costs associated with winter operations? • What modeling has been conducted regarding salt runoff and chloride accumulation in nearby waterways or aquifers?

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		10. 303(d) Waterway Impacts Under the Clean Water Act, waterways listed under Section 303(d) require pollution reductions. If increased salt application and roadway runoff discharge toward waterways connected to Utah Lake, additional analysis may be required. Requested Response • Are receiving waters listed under the Section 303(d) impaired waters list? • Was Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) compliance analyzed? 11. Noise and Light Pollution Construction of a major corridor through rural farmland will introduce new sources of: • roadway noise • nighttime lighting • headlight glare across open land • truck braking noise These impacts may affect residents, livestock, and wildlife. Requested Response What noise modeling and nighttime lighting analysis were conducted? 12. Wildlife Movement and Habitat Fragmentation The North Fields provide open habitat and potential wildlife movement corridors. Construction of a limited-access corridor may fragment these habitats. Requested Response Were wildlife movement corridors mapped and analyzed? 13. Emerging Transportation Technologies Transportation systems are evolving rapidly. Future systems may include: • autonomous vehicles • vehicle-to-infrastructure communication • AI traffic coordination

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		• drone logistics networks These technologies may reduce congestion and alter long-term traffic demand. Requested Response How were emerging transportation technologies considered in long-term traffic projections? Engineering Alternative: Option C – Agricultural Cap / Bermed Corridor An alternative engineering design should be evaluated as Option C. This design would construct the roadway slightly below grade or within a reinforced structural corridor and cover portions with soil to create a vegetated agricultural cap or berm. Under this concept: • vehicles travel through a structural corridor • soil and vegetation are restored above the structure • farmers may continue agricultural production on top of the corridor Benefits may include: • preservation of farmland • reduced visual impact of infrastructure • reduced noise and light pollution • potential wildlife crossings • protection of scenic views Hazardous materials transport could remain on U.S. Route 40, while the bypass primarily serves passenger vehicles. Requested Response Has the Draft EIS evaluated buried or bermed roadway alternatives? If not, will the Final EIS analyze this concept as Option C? Procedural Issues Requiring Clarification Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement If new information arises regarding groundwater impacts, aquifer recharge, maintenance costs, or alternative engineering designs, a supplemental EIS may be required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Requested Response

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		What criteria would trigger preparation of a supplemental EIS? Reasonable Alternatives Requirement NEPA requires agencies to evaluate reasonable alternatives capable of meeting the project purpose with lower environmental impact. Operational improvements, AI traffic management, and the Option C agricultural-cap corridor may represent such alternatives. Requested Response Why were these alternatives not analyzed in detail? Induced Growth Analysis Major highway construction can induce development and increase long-term traffic demand. Requested Response Was induced growth associated with the corridor analyzed? Failure to Demonstrate Project Necessity Large infrastructure projects require clear demonstration that they are necessary and that reasonable alternatives cannot adequately address the transportation problem. Several factors raise questions regarding the necessity of constructing a $760 million bypass corridor: • operational improvements to existing roads • adaptive traffic management technologies • autonomous vehicle adoption • available nighttime roadway capacity • freight demand management strategies • potential freight diversion to rail If these alternatives significantly reduce congestion, the need for a large bypass corridor may be reduced. Requested Response Please explain how the Draft EIS determined that a new corridor is necessary rather than implementing a combination of operational improvements and emerging transportation technologies.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Conclusion Transportation challenges along U.S. 40 deserve careful and responsible solutions. However, before committing to a $760 million corridor through the North Fields, the Final EIS should ensure that: • groundwater baselines are established • aquifer recharge systems are protected • agricultural land is preserved • long-term winter maintenance impacts are evaluated • emerging transportation technologies are considered • lower-impact alternatives such as Option C – an agricultural-cap corridor are fully analyzed I respectfully request that the issues and questions raised in this comment receive detailed responses in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Sincerely, Mark S. Allen Wasatch County State and County Delegate Concerned Citizen (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
304	Mark Gingrich	As a resident in Jordanelle Ridge, I want to express my support for the Alternative B proposal. It is the best long-term solution for the valley, and will allow a higher quality of life for those in the Coyote Canyon area. Mark Gingrich XXXXXXXXXXXXX. Heber City
160	Mark Sprunt (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	This project should have been done 20 yrs ago and now we are left with two unattractive choices. That being said I believe I prefer choice B. The route laid our is more acceptable than choice A but I vehemently hate the simulations shown. The overpasses and interchanges are not how our community of Heber should look. They do not portray the image of our mountain community and show a lack of design. In place of interchanges and overpasses I would much rather see you us round-abouts to navigate through Heber. They would be cheaper to build, faster to finish and more esthetically pleasing and probably have a lower ecological impact. Seems like a win-win to me, I don't know why you haven't considered it. I would appreciate a reply indicating you have considered round-abouts and why you would move ahead with overpasses and interchnages anyway. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
665	Mark Webb	I cast my opinion against the proposed bypasses. Both options. I love the beautiful Heber Valley and drive through several times a year. Last weekend I participated in the tractorcade with my Grandsons. As we drove through the "North Fields" I could see the aquafir. It was about 12" below our dirt road surface. Very evident in the drainage ditches and the vegetation growing there. It is very evident to me that any major interruption to that aquafir would be catastrophic and non repairable. A major highway across that area would be disruptive unless it was built as a supported bridge on posts. That water is free flowing just under the surface. A few drainage pipes under the roadbase would not be sufficient. I will draw your attention to the Great Salt Lake and the Railroad causeway punched straight across the lake. It has like two or three drainage pipes. The water does not flow well enough with the disruption. Every year part of the lake turns red, the other stays blue. I agree that something needs to be done to assist traffic, but this bypass is not the solution. I understand that it would be a majorly expensive project. In my opinion it won't solve the main traffic issue. As we sat eating in town I noticed oil trucks traveling hgwy 40. They don't turn and go down Provo canyon. Much of the traffic In Town passes through staying on 40. Thank you, Mark Webb Riverton, Utah
604	Mark Wilson	Sent from my iPhone (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
52	Marvin Rust	I'm firmly in favor of Alternative B for the following reasons: Alt. A is a "kick the can down the road solution". There is so much activity/development north of where that would empty into Main Street that traffic would become super congested in that area. Really doesn't solve the traffic congestion problem as much as Alt B will do. 2. It appears Alt B takes into consideration limiting any development along the area where it goes through the North Fields that has many people concerned. Alt B is just the far superior alternative.
663	Mary Crittenden	I am writing to express my adamant opposition to the selection of Alternative B for the Heber Valley Corridor. As a resident of this valley, I believe the Draft EIS fails to properly weigh the permanent loss of our natural heritage against short-term traffic goals. I urge UDOT to reconsider based on the following critical points: 1. Irreversible Loss of "Sense of Place" and Open Space The North Fields are the defining visual and cultural characteristic of Heber Valley. Alternative B would create a permanent physical and visual "scar" on a landscape that is essential to our local identity. Under NEPA, the agency is required to evaluate impacts on the "human environment," which includes the aesthetic and cultural value of open space. Once this agricultural land is paved, the loss is irretrievable. 2. Significant Environmental Impact on Wetlands The Draft EIS acknowledges that Alternative B impacts 53.9 acres of wetlands—more than double the impact of Alternative A. These wetlands are critical for local hydrology and wildlife. Given that Alternative A exists as a viable path with significantly lower ecological damage, Alternative B should not be considered the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative" (LEDPA). 3. Induced Growth and High-Density Annexation The "No-Action" and "Alternative A" baselines do not fully account for the Induced Growth that Alternative B will trigger. By placing a corridor west of the current city limits, UDOT is effectively inviting Heber City to annex the intervening land. This will inevitably lead to high-density residential development in areas currently designated as open space. This bypass will not "solve" traffic; it will simply create a new urban sprawl engine that brings more vehicles into the valley. 4. Fiscal Irresponsibility The $48.6 million premium for Alternative B over Alternative A is an unjustifiable use of taxpayer funds, especially when that extra cost is being used to facilitate a route that causes more environmental degradation. Conclusion I request that UDOT reject Alternative B and look toward solutions that prioritize the preservation of the North Fields and focus on the existing US-40 footprint to minimize the destruction of our valley’s most precious resource.
275	Mary Kennedy	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing as a taxpayer and resident of the State of Utah to formally oppose any proposed bypass alternative that would construct a major roadway through wetlands, over aquifer recharge areas, or across productive agricultural land. Utah is one of the driest states in the nation. We are in a prolonged drought with no credible evidence of long-term hydrologic recovery. In this context, it is deeply troubling that UDOT would consider infrastructure that threatens wetlands and groundwater resources that are essential to our state’s water security. Under the **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4332**, federal and state agencies are required to take a “hard look” at environmental consequences, including **direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts**. This includes impacts to water resources, climate resilience, and induced growth. Routing a bypass through wetlands and aquifer recharge zones raises serious questions as to whether these impacts are being adequately disclosed or mitigated. Additionally, any discharge of fill material into wetlands requires compliance with **Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1344)**. The Act requires avoidance and minimization of wetland impacts, not simply mitigation after the fact. Destruction of wetlands during a statewide water crisis is fundamentally inconsistent with both the spirit and the letter of this law. Utah Code **Title 73** emphasizes the protection and beneficial use of water resources. Allowing a transportation project to degrade aquifer recharge areas during a drought contradicts the state’s own statutory priorities and long-term water planning goals.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		From a fiscal perspective, this proposal represents an irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. Billions are spent statewide urging residents to conserve water, while public funds are simultaneously proposed for a project that risks permanent harm to water systems we cannot replace. Once wetlands are filled and aquifers compromised, they are effectively lost. Finally, there is widespread concern that the true purpose of this bypass is not traffic relief, but rather to facilitate growth and new development along Highway 40. If this is the case, then the **Purpose and Need statement** for this project may be legally deficient under NEPA and FHWA guidance. Roads built to induce development, rather than solve demonstrated transportation failures, are not an appropriate use of public funds. More sustainable and cost-effective alternatives exist, including: - Enhanced transit and employer-supported bus systems for new developments - Demand management strategies - Incremental improvements to existing infrastructure These options would reduce congestion without sacrificing Utah's most critical natural resources. We should be better stewards of our land and water—not sacrifice them in pursuit of marginal travel-time savings. A few extra minutes of traffic does not justify permanent environmental damage. I respectfully request that UDOT remove any bypass alternatives that impact wetlands or aquifers and fully reconsider whether this project is justified at all under state and federal law. Sincerely, Mary Kennedy Concerned Utah Taxpayer - Heber Valley
321	Mary Kent	My concern about the current route deals mainly with the impact of the open space, water, and agricultural land. We want to have the natural beauty of the current landscape. Having this road cut through the fields would disrupt not just the beauty, but have negative impacts on our water. My other concern is for the homes that would be so close to traffic, noise, pollution and eliminating the mountain views. Could the bypass begin at the Smith's traffic light instead of farther out near Potter lane? Could it join Southfield Road to 189 instead of cutting into the backyards of homes by 1300 S? I find it very unfortunate that the people making descions for this bypass seem to disregard so many comments of the citizens who do not want this road to cut the valley apart. Please save our open space.ll
217	Mary-Jaclyn Murphy	Hello My name is Mary Murphy and I live on XXXXXXXX in Heber City. As you can imagine based on where I live, as a homeowner, I have some strong concerns regarding the most recent rendition of UDOTs Heber Valley Bypass. Specifically, the 1300 South portion of the bypass, echoing the concerns in the recent letter sent by the Heber City Mayor and Council. But first, I have a question, why is UDOT not able to utilize the current 4 lane highway portion of 189 instead of spending excess funds, time and aggravation building a new road? I am truly curious how much time building a new road about a half a mile away will be saved by the average commute. Can you please provide me with this information? And I would like to ask if that time per vehicle worth ruining my and my neighbors property values, increasing noise and air pollution in my neighborhood? And while ruining our lives as we know it, UDOT will also be restricting access to the bypass on Industrial Parkway to those of us most affected to the 1300 South portion of the bypass! I understand this is not your neighborhood or your backyard, but truly, I would like to invite you to my home so you can come and stand in my backyard and envision how building 1300 South directly behind my fence will feel. Not look on paper, or drawn up as the "best model". But come experience how it will feel for us. Come see how it will drain our property values and equity, potentially causing financial burdens. How it will feel to have loud trucks driving by at 10pm while my children are trying to fall asleep. Come sit on my patio and imagine trying to read a book while inhaling vehicle exhaust. I understand there needs to be improvements made regarding traffic in Heber and on Main Street. But before paving the length of the whole valley, couldn't some smaller impact projects be considered? Projects like removing parallel street parking on Main Street to add a right turn only lane, designate thru or truck lanes. Have no left turns on Main street and implement "jug handles" utilizing 100 West and 100 East (see jug handles in New Hampshire if you are unfamiliar). Adding a large freeflow roundabout at the intersection of US-40 and 189 on the south end of town and on and off ramps at the North end at the River Rd/SR-32 and US 40 intersection. Wouldn't all or any of these options improve traffic on Main Street with less impact than the Bypass? If some of these options were considered, would the bypass be necessary? Thank you for your time and consideration, Mary Murphy
219	MaryAnn Campbell	Thank you for allowing the public to comment on Alternate Bypass Plans Please consider Plan A over Plan B. Plan B is a better choice!

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Mary Ann Campbell
704	Matt Dunkel	To Whom It May Concern, I am a Sugar House resident, a Utah taxpayer, and a downstream water user whose drinking water, recreation, and financial obligations are directly affected by UDOT's proposed Heber Valley bypass—particularly Alternative B. The impacts of this project extend far beyond Heber City, yet the vast majority of Utahns who rely on this watershed and who will pay for this project were never notified or given a meaningful opportunity to participate. That is not a minor oversight. It is a procedural failure with legal consequences. Failure to Notify All Impacted Persons Under Utah Code § 63G-3-301(10)(Administrative Rulemaking Act), agencies must provide notice to "all persons who may be affected" when actions have statewide or regional impacts—not just those living adjacent to the project. A transportation project that affects: a regional drinking water aquifer, a federally restored blue-ribbon fishery, a major tourism corridor, and statewide tax burdens clearly triggers this requirement. UDOT did not meet this obligation. Limiting notice to a narrow geographic area while excluding the hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Utahns who rely on this watershed is a violation of both the spirit and the letter of the law. Major Federal and State Legal Concerns I just barely learned of this bypass- but really a huge freeway design - and have not had enough time to do the research I would like, but I hurried to review the limited information available and it appears UDOT is advancing Alternative B in a manner inconsistent with several binding legal frameworks: NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332) — requires rigorous, good-faith evaluation of allreasonable alternatives. UDOT appears to have prematurely dismissed less damaging options. Clean Water Act § 404(b)(1) Guidelines— require selection of the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). Alternative B is the most damaging, not the least. Clean Water Act § 301 & § 303 — prohibit degradation of waters of the United States, including wetlands, streams, and aquifer recharge zones. Utah Water Quality Act (Utah Code § 19-5-107) — prohibits actions that risk contamination of public drinking water sources. Utah Administrative Procedures Act (Utah Code § 63G-4-201) — requires transparent, fair, and inclusive public processes. Utah Code § 72-1-201 — requires UDOT to plan transportation projects that protect public safety, public resources, and fiscal responsibility. This is not a small list, and I'm sure I've missed plenty. And it is not optional. Water, Aquifer, and Environmental Risk I recreate in the Heber Valley and along the Provo River. I have seen firsthand the wetlands, springs, and groundwater recharge zones that Alternative B would cut through. This alignment would: jeopardize a federally restored blue-ribbon fishery, introduce salt, de-icing chemicals, petroleum runoff, and heavy metals into wetlands and groundwater, threaten a regional drinking water aquifer, threaten spawning of Brown Trout in the Rock Creek streams, and degrade a major tourism and recreation economy. Utah is in a long-term drought. Water is not replaceable. And this is one of the few pristine aquifers left that's a sole source. I am formally requesting a written guarantee that this project will not contaminate the aquifer or the Provo River. I know such a guarantee cannot be given—and that fact alone should disqualify Alternative B. Fiscal Responsibility and Statewide Priorities As a taxpayer, I am alarmed by the cost. And I understand the advertised number is only the base estimate, excluding: wetland mitigation, groundwater engineering, hazardous materials controls, additional studies,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		land acquisition, long-term maintenance, and cost overruns typical of high-risk environmental corridors. Utah is facing unprecedented growth pressures. Our tax dollars must go toward statewide priorities, not the most expensive, most environmentally destructive option that saves a few minutes of drive time for a small number of drivers. I drive from Provo to Heber and through to Park City. Never once have I expected—or wanted—a massive new walled-in freeway to shorten my trip. And the proposed overpasses are wildly out of scale for the rural character and needs of the valley. Better, Legal, and Responsible Alternatives Exist Heber's traffic issues are real, but the problem is Main Street, not the west side of the valley. Fixing Main Street is the logical, least damaging, and most fiscally responsiblesolution. It also aligns with LEDPA requirements under the Clean Water Act. Demand for Accountability I am requesting that UDOT and state leaders: Comply with Utah Code § 63G-3-301(10) and notify all affected Utahns before making a decision. Correct the procedural failures under APA, NEPA, LEDPA, and the Clean Water Act. Protect the Heber Valley aquifer and Provo River under every circumstance. Remove Alternative B immediately. Prioritize fiscally responsible, legally compliant alternatives. Slow down growth-driven mega-projects until existing infrastructure can support them. Uphold the highest standards of transparency and public trust. This project was advanced without proper notice, without correct information, and with multiple potential violations. Utahns deserve better from the agencies whose salaries we pay. Makes me really wonder who is driving this? That' I'd also love full transparency on. Sincerely, Matthew Dunkel Sugar House, Utah Resident Utah Taxpayer and Downstream Water User
273	Matt Parker	I believe that alternative A is much better because Heber City has added two new signals on US-40 since this environmental document started. The delays on US-40 would continue to get worse if the bypass was tied into US-40 as proposed in alternative B. There is no reason to do a 1/2 bypass. That is like doing a bypass surgery on a heart and only bypassing 1/2 of the problem. The other concern I have is that Heber City is not providing an alternative to US-40. They are relying on US-40 to move traffic similar to what Saratoga Springs has done in the past. When there are accidents, there will be no alternatives and there will be gridlock. If we have an alternate route, there will be redundancy and provide better service. I do think that a trail should be provided adjacent to the new route for those wanting to avoid traffic. I believe the city can and should provide a trail along the existing US-40 route as development occurs to service the people in the new developments and UVU. By having both, you allow people to choose which route serves them best. They can choose either to avoid potential conflicts at intersection at signals on US-40 and be safer by having a separation from traffic, or to take the existing US-40 route and stop at every cross-street but have accessablity to the services and destinations desired.
173	Matthew Reschke (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hi, there. My name is Matt Reschke. I am a small business owner. I have a tiny little pizzeria in Midway, and I had no intention of speaking when I came here tonight, and I had no intention of being the grand finale. So you're welcome. But I came here tonight with my daughters who -- I had them stay until Athina talked because we love everything that Athina says and then let them get out of here. But I started to think of my seven-year-old who begged me a few months ago, when she was wanting to walk home from school by herself -- she -- she asked if I -- if I knew the mayor of Midway and if I could ask if they could work more on getting crosswalks built. And so I said, "You should go talk." And so she went to a meeting and talked. And I was like, okay, and as I start to -- as I started to think of her in ten years as this project is being built and starting to think about just, like, activist Francis being so mad at her dad for just letting this land just be given away, taken, abused, and misused. I moved here six years ago -- well, seven years ago, and -- and that was just kind of at the -- at the peak, when everything just, like, exploded, and it's been shocking to see what has happened to the whole valley. And -- and the feeling that I'm left with above all is that -- that we're giving away -- we're selling our birthright. We're -- we're not asking for enough for what we've given away. We live in the most beautiful place, and people love this place, and they would pay anything to come live here. And for some reason, we've just let them just have it. We've let developers buy the land for cheap and sell it for gobs of money instead of requiring them to -- to ask for all of these things that they could ask for. You know, if I had to choose one, obviously I would be against Option B because of the North Fields, but I think both plans are garbage. It feels like -- like just this hodgepodge of trying to solve everything by making the most messy plans available. There's so many more options out there. There's so many more things that we could do. Why -- why -- I love the idea of -- of giving a time for trucks to come down Main Street. Why don't we charge them so much money to use the road and to -- I would pay a dollar more per gas if it meant that they had to -- they would always find another way. But thank you. We can do better.
695	Matthew Williams	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed plan. While both option A and B create challenges, If forced to choose, I would favor alternative A.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Back Story We are now residents of Heber (Wasatch County), fulfilling a wish from nearly 20 years ago. When we lived in Salt Lake County from 2007-2015, we would frequently drive up over Guardsman Pass and into Heber and Midway. In the summer months, we would get Ice Cream and inevitably end up in the North Fields to visit one of the few places where Bobolinks can be found in Utah. Intensified agriculture has impacted these amaziing and unique songbirds through much of their range but the combination of wetlands limiting access, less-intensive grazing and responsible farming this remnant population has been preserved. After seeing the Bobolinks and being in awe that there existed a place like the North Fields, we would ask each other "Wouldn't it be great to live up here"? The distance and my commute to work prevented this from gaining any serious traction...until later. In 2015, on my final day in Utah before we moved to the east coast, I chose to take my family "up and over" Guardsman Pass into Midway and Heber (one last time, so we thought). I eventually got a job working remotely and our path led us back to Heber, where we have lived for the past 7 years. My wife and I frequently walk in the north fields along the dirt roads that only add to their charm...washboard and all. Thank you for letting me share my story. While not technical, I think it captures the essence of why so many, like us, have chosen to live here and why whenever I tell anyone from Utah where I live, they (always) respond "I love Heber!". To ignore the reasons why people love Heber and casually choose to put a highway through this land so travelers THROUGH town (not IN town) can (theoretically) save seconds is irresponsible and does not reflect the desire of the residents of this community who love all the value that the fields provide. To suggest that impacting a couple more privately-owned properties (with Option A) is more challenging or damaging than impacting wetlands that fundamentally shape the water and air quality along with the agricultural heartbeat of Wasatch County is short-sighted and wrong. Plan B avoids impacting or displacing a few and instead negatively impacts EVERY CURRENT AND FUTURE RESIDENT OF WASATCH COUNTY. The open spaces and rustic charm are worth far more. Not to mention the rural beauty that also contains wetlands and all the ecological diversity that goes with it. Main Street Charm While a walkable main street with small-town charm is romantic, that is not a reality, even if the trucks are gone. While development and improvement of Main Street can and should occur, this bypass is not going to meaningfully turn 4 lanes of in-town traffic into a quaint place. Main Street Crossings I have already seen one pedestrian bring Main Street to a halt and create backed-up traffic. This problem will worsen. Significantly. Bridges, tunnels or other crossing solutions that don't stop traffic at the pedestrian's whim must be implemented. Alternatives While it is clear that there needs to be automobile and truck traffic passing through Heber, the report has not sufficiently considered or evaluated the power and capabilites of public transit to allow for sustainable growth. Early on, one of the presenters of alternatives commented on how much of the traffic (especially along Main Street) was currently and would continue to be people going from one point to another point in Heber/Midway and NOT the big, bad trucks passing through. This plan seems to be more concerned about traffic moving through Heber than solving the current and future mobility issues of residents who actually live here. High Valley Transit data already shows more rides than the plan estimated when they decided to not consider Public Transit more thoroughly. This should be evaluated further, certainly before we impact or sacrifice any place as unique as the North Fields to a highway. Again, The fields, once impacted, cannot be brought back. Please do not move forward with any plan that compromises them to the extent of Option B. Sincerely, Matthew Williams Heber City, UT XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
566	MBN Neibaur	To the UDOT Review Team, I am submitting this comment to address significant procedural deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) analysis for the proposed bypass. The record does not demonstrate compliance with NEPA’s requirement to rigorously evaluate reasonable alternatives, nor with the Clean Water Act’s mandate to select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). NEPA’s Requirement to Evaluate Reasonable Alternatives Under 40 C.F.R. §1502.14, agencies must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, including those that avoid or minimize environmental harm. Courts consistently describe this section as the “heart of the EIS.” Additionally, 40 C.F.R. §1503.4requires agencies to respond to substantive comments by modifying alternatives, supplementing analyses, or providing a reasoned explanation for declining to do so. The Draft EIS does not meet these standards. Failure to Evaluate Feasible, Less-Damaging Alternatives Submitted by the North Fields Irrigation Company

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Approximately one year ago, the North Fields Irrigation Companymet with UDOT officials and presented multiple roadway alignments that were: More cost-effective Less damaging to wetlands, canals, and irrigation ditches Protective of all existing homes Operationally compatible with the valley's irrigation infrastructure This was technical, system-level evidence from the entity responsible for managing the region's water delivery network. Under NEPA, these alternatives qualify as reasonable and must be evaluated in detail. Yet the Draft EIS contains no acknowledgment, no screening, and no analysis of these alternatives. Eliminating a feasible, less-damaging alternative without explanation is a direct violation of NEPA's alternatives requirement. Failure to Modify the Boundary to Allow Completion of the NRCS Conservation Easement UDOT was asked to modify the project boundary so that the NRCS could finalize a conservation easement that had been years in development and was ready to close. This easement would permanently protect agricultural land consistent with county preservation plans and public intent. A minor boundary adjustment would have allowed federal funding to proceed. UDOT declined to make this adjustment, effectively blocking the easement. NEPA requires agencies to consider alternatives that avoid or minimize environmental harm, including boundary modifications or design adjustments. The Draft EIS does not analyze this option or explain its exclusion. Reliance on a Speculative Road Network Instead of Existing Conditions The Draft EIS repeatedly justifies Option B by citing "consistency with the North Village road network." However: The North Village road network does not yet exist Its configuration is not fixed and can be altered at any time The annexation and developer agreement were advanced under terms that financially benefit developers if UDOT selects an alignment through their newly annexed land NEPA requires alternatives to be evaluated based on existing conditions, not speculative future development scenarios. Reliance on a hypothetical road network—while ignoring feasible, less-damaging alternatives already presented—is inconsistent with NEPA's standards for objectivity and rigor. Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) LEDPA Violations Under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 230, the Corps and the applicant must select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). The LEDPA must: Have the least impact on wetlands and waters of the United States Be practicable in terms of cost, logistics, and technology Be selected even if it is not the applicant's preferred alternative Option B cannot qualify as the LEDPA for the following reasons: It impacts the greatest acreage of wetlands among the options considered It disrupts the most irrigation infrastructure, including canals and ditches It conflicts with agricultural preservation plans and shallow aquifer recharge zones It performs worse on local traffic efficiency than other feasible alignments It ignores technically supported, less-damaging alternatives submitted by the irrigation company A practicable, less-damaging alternative was presented directly to UDOT—yet it was not evaluated. Under the 404(b)(1) Guidelines, failure to evaluate a feasible, less-damaging alternative is a per se violation of LEDPA requirements. Advancing the Most Damaging and Least Efficient Alignment Despite the availability of less-damaging alternatives, UDOT advanced the alignment that: Impacts the most wetlands Causes the greatest disruption to irrigation systems Blocks a federally funded conservation easement Relies on speculative development roads

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Provides the least efficient local traffic performance Selecting the most environmentally damaging alternative while failing to evaluate feasible, less-harmful options is incompatible with both NEPA and the Clean Water Act. Conclusion The Draft EIS does not satisfy NEPA's requirement to rigorously evaluate reasonable alternatives, nor does it meet the Clean Water Act's LEDPA standard. The omission of the irrigation company's technically supported alignments, the failure to analyze boundary modifications needed for the NRCS conservation easement, and the reliance on speculative development roads collectively represent a procedural failurethat must be corrected. A legally adequate EIS must include a full evaluation of all reasonable, less-damaging alternatives and must demonstrate compliance with the Clean Water Act's LEDPA requirement. Sincerely, A concerned Wasatch County Resident
379	McKinley Mullins Gregory	I prefer option A since it causes less disturbance to aquifers, wetlands, wildlife, and fields.
573	Megan Archibald	This is a very divisive, complicated issue and I hope everything will be done to preserve what we can of the North Fields. I have read both sides of the issue and am no expert but it feels like there are no perfect options. I just ask that decisions are NOT rushed. It is my understanding that the southern section if moved 200 feet further south raised platform won't be needed and it would provide more distance from homes. I support this change.
186	Melanie Seus	I am opposed to the all bypass options available. There are too many detrimental impacts (both ecological and cultural) from a bypass at this stage. I would much prefer to live with the heavy traffic on Main Street than to create slightly faster bypass routes that would only invite more growth in the valley. I believe there is much more that UDOT and the city can do to synchronize traffic lights and encourage public transit options like Park City's bus system.
267	Melody Gritton	I am very concerned about both of these alternatives. Going back to the Envision Heber meetings before Covid hit, the residents of Heber made it VERY CLEAR the North Fields are NOT to be touched. These need to be preserved as one of the last natural areas of Heber Valley. There are some historic buildings left but nothing showing the history of the Valley beside the North Fields. These need to be left alone. As noted in the public comment period, most of the traffic on Main Street through Heber is local. Adding either route may help temporarily but everything is still going to be backed up and get worse as Heber and Wasatch County continue to approve more and more dense housing with the only access out of town via Main Street. Even with the by-pass roads, you will have to travel on Main Street to get North or South. The only people this is going to benefit are those who live around 1200 South or further South. The impact to the environment is not worth this road and the damage it is going to cost to the Provo River and our water supply. Mitigation efforts do NOT change what we already have and won't benefit the North Fields. Melody Gritton XXXXXXXXXXXX
577	Meranie Karren	I don't care if it takes twice the amount of time to get from one end of town to the other. I would gladly do that to keep and save our sacred agricultural land!!! Once our land is filled with concrete and houses we can't get it back. It's history, the future, hard work, and the story of this valley. My guess is that those from udot working on this don't live in this valley. You just see a job. It doesn't affect you. But we live here and it affects us greatly!!!!! Please keep the concrete away from the North Fields!!!!
246	Mia Yue	While we greatly appreciate the considerations of a trail in the North Fields going to Potter Lane, a critical part of this project would be connecting existing sections of trail along existing HWY40. We already have developers building their individual sections, however, from an active transportation and safety standpoint, a fully connected trail along 40 would be a huge benefit to the community. I strongly encourage you to consider this as part of the project. -Mia Yue, Heber POSTT (Parks Open Space Trails Trees), Wasatch Trails Foundation
569	Micaela O'Leary	As this proposal threatens the very core of the Heber Valley, I share the following to encourage you to reconsider the bypass proposal. I am a Midway resident and business owner who depends upon Heber City Main St. for daily commerce. I am familiar with the traffic patterns both on Main St. and in the greater valley, as well as what is at risk should a new major highway be added into the already overdeveloped and quickly disappearing open space. I ask that you thoughtfully reconsider the following points: The environmental impacts of BOTH proposed routes cannot be understated. The damage done to the sensitive and critical north fields will be irreversible should either project move forward. The local watershed will be negatively impacted, affecting not only Heber Valley residents but those down river. The water studies in the Fields were taken at low level time of year, a full year study is advised to gauge a more clear picture of the impact to the water level and environmental effect. The air quality of the valley is already becoming a worsening issue with the rapid growth. To remove a significant portion of the local aquifer whilst adding an additional commercial roadway, will only increase the number of poor air quality days and negatively impact everyone in the valley, not only those adjacent to the roadway. The majority of traffic using Highway 40 and Main Street is local traffic—people who have a daily purpose in Heber. The "dangerous" commercial traffic that simply passes through downtown is minimal in comparison, which is reflected in your own studies. I regularly drive east on 40 toward Colorado, where the commercial traffic is headed, and the smaller hamlets of Duchesne, Roosevelt, and even Vernal, do not experience the same traffic congestion as Heber does, despite the same commercial traffic moving through. The Heber Valley's unchecked growth is to be addressed if we want to take pressure off of Main St. Heber City is the last major stop for those driving East on 40. There is not another town with similar diversity in food choices, lodging, gas, etc. for over 100 miles. Convincing long haul commercial drivers that they should skip this last outpost of reliable services to take a bypass that will save them a matter of seconds is unrealistic. To move forward with a bypass plan that does not meet the needs of those for whom it is built is irresponsible and ill-advised. Heber has not yet fully addressed its own internal traffic issues. Until meaningful solutions are pursued locally, this project should not move forward. Heber is largely flat and well suited for alternatives such as electric bikes, bike lanes, bus systems, and other forms of mass transit that should be explored before considering a project of this magnitude. There has been little discussion around implementing meaningful commercial vehicle tolling. Charging commercial vehicles a higher rate to pass through could encourage them to reconsider their route, potentially

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		shifting traffic back toward the Duchesne corridor through Price and onto I-15. This approach would reduce both miles traveled and the environmental and community impact currently experienced here. I urge you to consider regional traffic rerouting and potential highway construction in areas where congestion already exists. Either bypass option will impact the lives and environment of multiple cities and counties, broader due diligence—and potentially voting measures beyond Heber alone—should be considered. Thank you for taking the time to consider the long-term impact this project will have on the people who live here, not just considering non-local commercial businesses seeking a faster route through our valley. Micaela O'Leary Midway Resident and Business Owner
323	Micah Houssian	Hi, I would like to add my input into this project 1. I think that overall, the goal and output of this project is good. I think that doing this adds space for people in Wasatch County. Here are my highlights and criticisms. Also, I should mention here that this only talks about alternative b. This is because alternative a is not very well designed. 2. Criticisms: The single point urban interchange at Midway lane seems overbuilt. This design is also not effective for the easiest new opportunity here — this road is very good at getting people between midway and Heber. It should be accessible by protected bicycle lanes (and not the silly shoulders we call bicycle lanes sometimes. Looking at you 2100 north Lehi.) The area is already at one lane efficiency. Multiple studies have shown that on roads with frequent stoplights, a capacity over the theoretical limit of 1800 cars per hour in one vehicle lane are not feasible unless insane overbuilt solutions are presented. Moving this interchange into more of a dumbbell design would likely forever decrease the amount of pavement required to be maintained, and improve efficiency and safety. I understand why this might be overlooked, but this next one is especially strange. The proposed new road running east to west just south of 1200 north and just north of the interchange I just spoke of seems a bit mishandled. This road is quite large for the amount of traffic it is going to handle, and its interchange with the new highway seems quite overbuilt. In this case, it should not be made, and a simple dumbbell/ possibly hybrid tight diamond would be effective. This would effectively remove the possibility of a t-bone at this interchange. The same is true for US-40 and river road. Speaking of the new road, it has another problem — one seen with the bypass as well. The goal of projects like this should be to make transportation more efficient for all users while optimizing land use. These roads have a very wide median inbetween travel directions. It is possible to make a high speed road while having only a median barrier or a short gap in between directions. This would also likely reduce the cost of bridges in the project, since in many cases only one bridge would need to be built over an existing or new roadway. This plan also ignores the overbuilt road through the downtown of the city, where through traffic should not mix with local traffic. There should be plans to improve the area. To start, try removing one car lane and adding space for other types of transportation. Also, just need to mention that Commons Boulevard does not need two lanes to feed into the existing roundabout. In addition, I do have one complaint about the bypass from us 40 west to 189 South. This may be unfounded, as I have not taken the time to check, but I hope there is a median barrier in the high speed travel lanes that go directly to the new high speed Y interchange. I also hope that speed limits are not set arbitrarily. Especially with the main bypass, the speed limit should be high. At least 65 mph, and hate comes another problem: I have seen multiple limited access routes that are not higher than 65 in speed limits here that can be. Like us 40 in summit county, or this new route. Remember that Utah state law allows for an increase of up to 75 mph on roads such as this (not that 75 would be appropriate in this case, but that is possible. Maybe something to be considered for the more rurally built summit county area). I also hope that these bypass routes will take upon the names of the us highways, and that the current routes are either/both given to the city or named as business routes. Lastly, the southernmost interchange is mostly good in my opinion. There is one problem with it though: one of the movements does not make sense. I am not sure who is going from the bypass heading southbound, and then turning onto us-189 north. There is only one driveway currently there in between the area and the next accessible areas with the aforementioned east-west bypass on the south side of town, and it can be accessed by the bypass, so who is making that movement? It is the only non-high speed/stop required part of the interchange, and it seems both dangerous, bad for traffic, and not useful. It is also unlikely that more driveways will be added, considering that the airport is one one side of the road. This means that the previous interchange (just north of this one) does not need two southbound thru lanes (unless the route is planned to become an interstate [I-580 as a good name btw you're welcome] in the future, in which case, also disregard the advice about median widths, since the requirements for that are stupid, er, um, inflated to higher than what they should be), and can instead have one lane go thru and one lane merge in, which can lead to one lane merging south and no one doing this useless left turn. 3. Highlights: Taking the time to analyze a project like this, which will definitely help the economy in the area and the future growth of Utah is well worth it, and I appreciate putting in the effort now rather than later when it will be become more expensive and require more property acquisition. The route that you have planned takes a very optimal path, and it's clear that a lot of thought was put into where to place these new interchanges and roads. I like what you've done with the industrial Parkway interchange. I like that you've effectively separated the movements for local access and through traffic. The size of the intersection with Daniels Road and US 189 is well thought out, and minimize pavement usage. I like that you've made it possible for through traffic to stay outside of the city so that the city can become better and have less cars in it in the future. I also hope to see a limited access project for us-189 in Provo canyon. Maybe even extend limited access to I-15 via 800 North in Orem. Something to consider, albeit for a future date. Such projects couldn't even be started for at least another 8 years with the Olympics and

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		MVC and all. Just don’t limit access all the way to I-15 through Provo downtown and near byu. That would never work. Overall: yeah, you could build it in its current state. Not all of these changes are easy to implement, but I feel they would significantly improve the outcome of the project. With love and a probably healthy obsession of transportation, -M. Houssian
127	Michael Devonas (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Good evening, everyone. I think I'm the youngest person in this room. Well, let me know if that's not true. I've been in Heber for about five years with my family. So I'm not one of the long timers, but we moved here because of how beautiful the valley is. And I, first off, want to say thank you to UDOT and the county and the city of Heber and everybody else who have given a lot of input. There's certainly many perspectives, and it's a really complicated issue, and I appreciate all of that. What I say reflects my opinion, and I'll tell you what I think reflects the opinion of many others, and I'll give you some empirical reasons to believe that, but I recognize that not everybody is going to be happy, and we're going to have to find a way to find consensus ground this. I strongly believe we should choose Option A over Option B. The biggest reason for that -- well, there's a number of reasons I think that are important there. Number one is that we are impacting the viewshed and the watershed in a way that is irreversible. Once you build the highway through the North Fields, you can't change it. You made the decision to put it there. You paved the portion of the North Fields. You can never -- you can never undo that decision. If you choose Option A, you actually preserve optionality for the future, and I think that's a very important point to consider. The number two is the watershed issue. I'm not an environmental engineer, but enough people have raised concerns around the level of studies that have been done and the potential impact on the water that I think is very material, and we need to do more work there to understand it. We supply -- a large portion of the water that goes into the Provo River is coming right through the North Fields, and it ends up in the Provo River. It ends up in Utah Lake, which then flows to the Jordan River. It flows to Salt Lake. It ends up in the lake. So anything that happens upstream of it is going to have a very material impact, and that needs to be considered in a way that I don't think has been adequate today. And then number three, there -- you know, most of the time when I hear comments supporting Option B, it boils down to we don't believe the truckers are going to take the highway. UDOT's only own analysis is, yes, they are going to take the highway. It's continuous flow. It will be a junction flowing into the 40, and the trucks will keep moving that way. They're not going to choose a route that has them stop eight times at traffic lights going through Main Street. It will fix the problem, and I think that UDOT's own model has suggested that. I think we should trust it. The last thing I'll say is Heber Valley is a beautiful place, and it's been made that way because people have crafted and curated farmland over 150 to 200 years and respecting and honoring that tradition, I think, is very important. Putting a highway right through the middle of North Fields -- there's a reason that it hasn't been built out to date -- will -- will -- you know, it impacts that heritage, and that's something that's special that's common to all of us. We get to enjoy it. It's positive recreationality. It's something that we all benefit from, and I think that should also be taken into account. So I realize that UDOT has settled on Option B as their preferred path. I put together a petition asking them to consider A. We have 500 signatures in less than a week. We're adding 500 to a hundred more signatures pretty consistently, and so I encourage you to sign as well. Thank you.
161	Michael Dixon (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	The private road that I owe in front of my house should stay private. When the North Village Annexation was approved by the city council the access to River Rd was going behind my house within the new development not in front of my house. The developers should fund the road not UDOT and stick to the original road. Also I have a drain field and septic tank in my front yard which will be impacted. We don't need constant traffic on my road, or bike train infron of my house all this will do is help the developers which is why we have the traffic problems now. I don't want Finch Creek having access in front of my house. My property and my neighbors is rural, we need to keep it that way. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
37	Michael Sandherr	Congratulations on the final determination of Alternate B. All things considered there is no other viable options. The extent of current development already precludes further considerations. The race is on. Now this needs to be funded ASAP so construction can be completed before the 2034 Winter Olympics. There is likely to be some blowback from some in the community regarding the North Fields, it must be communicated that preservation was seriously considered but the reality is Alternate B is the only best route. It's already too late to do anything else. My only disappointment is the by-pass doesn't connect with the route 32 intersection which would have been more effective. Mike Sandherr Heber City
520	Michael Sheleretis	Hello, As a Heber resident for 18 years, I’m writing to express my support for the Heber Valley Corridor project. As growth continues in the area, thoughtful planning and infrastructure improvements are essential to maintain mobility, safety, and quality of life for residents and visitors. Investing in this corridor will help address current traffic challenges while preparing the region for future demand. I appreciate the work being done to study solutions that balance transportation needs with the character of the valley. Thank you for considering community input as this important project moves forward. Sincerely, Michael Sheleretis

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
390	Michelle Kellogg	I support Alternative B with conditions. The community has spent time and money ensuring the North Fields are preserved and undeveloped. The County Council tried twice to change the zoning to allow denser development and the community responded with two referendums, which passed and nullified the rezoning efforts. We also passed a bond to give farmers preservation easements. Now we are in terrible need of relief on US 40 (Main Street). I know there are limited options and that is why I support Alternative B. It is direct and helps commuters and semitrucks pass through town in a timely way, while easing congestion on Main Street for local trips. Please preserve the North Fields. I hope this route is similar to Guardsman Pass. Everyone loves to drive on Guardsman to see nature's beauty and there is nothing up there but the road. Please minimize concrete to the extent possible and definitely prohibit anything beyond right of way. Thanks, Michelle Kellogg
679	Michelle Sorger	Greetings, I am emailing to confirm that my brief comment (below) has been received. The web page was continuously reloading throughout my attempt to write a comment. So it was not only difficult and frustrating to construct, but also impossible to tell if comments were actually being submitted. Thank you for your time. Michelle Sorger Comment Below: Greetings, Water is the big issue. This bypass will destroy habitat and other watershed areas if it proceeds. There are other ways to mitigate and prepare for growth. We already have a water issue in the valley that is getting worse with the explosion of construction in the area. It feels like all these projects are get rich quick schemes for the participants. Growth that happens at this rapid pace cannot be sustained. Slow down. Once the green lands are gone, they will be hard to get back. Please rethink the bypass. Then go to other options like rail, or pipelines to transport oil and other goods. Thank you.
512	Mick Thueson	UDOT needs to go with option A and not option B. The aquafer needs to be protected. Listen to the farmers, I'm sure that they know quite a lot more about this issue than UDOT thinks they know. Listen to the farmers and residents not UDOT'S officials!
428	Mike	The proper thing to do would be to DO AS THE LOCAL RESIDENTS DEMAND, and I agree. Go with plan A. I am a local of Kearns Utah. I have found that the locals know what is best for their community. -- I LIVE TO SERVE, and SERVE TO LIVE Mike
98	Mimi Nuelle	Hi, I have been dreading this news for years. The North Fields are a tranquil oasis in an increasingly noisy, dirty, stressful area. People need open space and nature for their physical, emotional and mental health. I have seen bald eagles, moose, fox, deer, hawks, etc. in the area. We must protect what makes Heber special. Please change the decision to Option A. I know it would mean acquiring more homes but I think ultimately no one is going to want to live next to a bypass anyways. Thank you Mimi Nuelle
123	Mimi Nuelle (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hi. I'm Mimi. I represent a group of horse owners at North Field Stables in the North Fields. We live in one of the most beautiful places in the country. We've seen bald eagles, deer, moose, foxes, cranes in the North Fields. We don't feel like it's a place for a freeway. Just a note. We've seen the trail systems on either side of the freeway. We'll just say we know we're a small group of horse owners, but we wouldn't use a trail system right next to the freeway. Anybody who owns a horse knows that. And if we're going to do a trail system, we got to put some more thought into it. I would just say that I've lived in Utah for 25 years, and I've always felt that Utah has had a little bit of a underdog mentality, and as a result, it's been very pro-business and very pro-development. But, like, something that's changed in the last ten years, we're at the big kids table in Utah, and I think it's, you know, a strength taken too far as a weakness. And I think we need to start thinking differently about -- about how -- the decisions that we make so that we will save what keeps this valley special for, you know, future generations and so that we can all continue to enjoy it as we do. So thank you.
526	Mindi Finlayson	Hi, I am a resident of Heber Valley and want to express my sincere opposition to bypass option B!!! I support the letter submitted by NFIC and am in strong opposition of alternative B! I demand responsibility from

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		UDOT! please respect and hear our voices!! very concerned citizen, Mindi Finlayson
244	Missy Ames	Hello, I've been reading about the plans to make a bypass and I think it is a great idea in general - Heber City has long suffered from high traffic brought by highway 40 right through the heart of the town. HOWEVER - PLEASE don't ruin the north fields to do so. It might be a cheaper option but the North Fields are a jewel of the community and once it is gone it will never come back. That drive in where you can see the setting sun over Timp and the cows and horses in the fields - not only is it beautiful but it provides valuable wetlands and that has historic and tourist charm in promoting Heber as a destination. Don't just pick the quickest route - pick the route that is BEST for Heber as a city in it's long-term plans. I know that if push came to shove, the residents might be able to find the money to make up the cost if you allow that as an option. People really care about beauty and it is the prettiest spot in the whole valley. Midway would never let this happen. Park City would find a way around it - Don't be the people who sign the death certificate of a beloved landmark. The North Fields have a lot of value. Thank you for your time, Missy Ames
255	Missy Maughan	Please revisit the design to the south end of the bypass. This creates a lot of change in that area and impacts a lot of neighborhoods. Specifically, Country Meadows Estates, Alpine Acres, the homes near Walmart, Alpine Meadows, and the traffic around Heber Valley Elementary and Rocky Mountain Middle School. The access points to the bypass make it so you have to drive in the wrong direction for a while before you can head where you need to for anyone living in this area. It also creates a lot of traffic on 650 South. This is a neighborhood and a school zone. Kids walk to and from school on this street, and it should NOT be a high-traffic through street for bypass access or access from the bypass to businesses east of that area. I don't see the bypass as a solution for local traffic, which, according to your studies, is the majority of traffic on Main Street in Heber City. We need to explore other traffic solutions that will actually do something to ease local traffic. Oil tankers on Main Street and other large trucks are the least of my worries. Let's look at other solutions that actually help those of us who drive around this town everyday.
365	Molly Schneider	We are homeowners in Park City and have been part of the greater community for over 30 years. The area along River Road and the North Fields and the preserved access for fishing is a spectacular area of natural beauty and quiet. The preserved area is pristine - like the Garden of Eden. Routing trucks through that area is sinful. Full stop. Please protect what little remains of God's sublime creation in the valley. Molly Schneider XXXXXXXXXXXX Park City, UT
234	NA	 Alternative B makes the most sense because of faster traffic flow with fewer residential and commercial impacts. Also, it will be a safer option during winter weather with a more direct north to south direction.
647	Nacia Franco	Good afternoon, On behalf of the North Field Irrigation Company (NFIC), I am submitting the following documents as NFIC's formal comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement: • NFIC Formal Comment Letter • NFIC DEIS Deficiency Index (Exhibit A to the Formal Comment Letter) Please confirm receipt of this submission and that both attachments have been received and will be included in the administrative record. Thank you, Nacia -- Nacia Franco President, MPA, Licensed Land & Water Title Agent Desert to Mountain Services Water | Land | Minerals PO Box XXXX Midway, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		XXXXXXXXXXXXX www.d2mutah.com (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
648	Nacia Franco	Good afternoon, On behalf of Mark Wilson, as an individual, I am submitting the following document as Mark Wilson's formal comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement: • Mark Wilson's Formal Comment Letter Please confirm receipt of this submission and that the attachment has been received and will be included in the administrative record. Thank you, Nacia (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
650	Nacia Franco	Good afternoon, On behalf of The John Robert and Alice Hicken Family, I am submitting the following document as The John Robert and Alice Hicken Family's formal comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement: • The John Robert and Alice Hicken Family's Formal Comment Letter Please confirm receipt of this submission and that the attachment has been received and will be included in the administrative record. Thank you, Nacia (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
671	Nacia Franco	Dear Heber Valley EIS Project Team, Desert to Mountain Services, LLC (DMS) is submitting the attached formal public comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement (January 2026) by the March 9, 2026 deadline. This comment is filed in support of comments submitted by the North Field Irrigation Company, Friends of Heber Valley, Wasatch County, and all other commenters who reject Alternative B and recommend Alternative A or a modified Alternative A. It identifies nine specific deficiencies in the DEIS — including errors in the base mapping of Rock Creek and other North Fields water sources, a near-total failure to characterize the water rights held by and flowing through the North Field Irrigation Company system, and the absence of any analysis of Alternative B's double harm to the Class IA Heber Valley aquifer. It formally demands that UDOT issue a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement addressing those deficiencies before any Record of Decision issues. Please confirm receipt of this submission by reply email. DMS reserves all rights to supplement this comment and to participate in any further proceedings concerning the Heber Valley Corridor project. Thank you, (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
649	Nadya Borst	To the UDOT Project Team, I am writing to provide formal feedback regarding the current proposals for the Heber Valley Corridor. While I appreciate the opportunity to offer suggestions for improvement, I am writing to express my strong opposition to Alternative B. This proposal is fundamentally flawed for the following reasons:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		* Legal and Environmental Violations: Alternative B violates the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) and the Clean Water Act. * Impact on Agriculture: Farming was not adequately protected under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). This oversight undermines our existing county bonds and will ultimately force local residents to pay more in taxes to mitigate the fallout. In addition to opposing Alternative B, I request that UDOT incorporate the following design changes to better serve the Heber community: * Relocate the 1300 South Intersection: Based on the high number of affected residents, I propose moving the main intersection (currently shown as 1200 S/1300 S) further South. There is ample existing space to accommodate this move without bisecting active, working farms or negatively impacting established local businesses. * Maintain At-Grade Design: Elevated freeways were not part of the original designs and are inconsistent with the character of our valley. Keeping the roadway at grade is essential to managing noise, light pollution, and traffic speeds. We aim to preserve our rural aesthetic and avoid the over-engineered look of the Wasatch Front. I expect these concerns to be included in the official project record. Our community is committed to a solution that respects the environment, our agricultural heritage, and the long-term fiscal health of our county. Sincerely, Nadya Borst Midway, UT
557	Nancy Ann Armstrong	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Nancy Ann Armstrong Name Nancy Ann Armstrong Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		(For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
175	Nancy L Seraphin	I am deeply opposed to Alternative B as it slices right through our treasured North Fields. I feel as if this whole bypass is 20 years too late and wonder what efforts, if any, have been made to stop the fuel trucks from barreling through our valley versus being diverted through Colorado from Vernal. They are the biggest impact on traffic and environmental danger. The wetlands of North Fields and our drinking water source being right below the proposed Alt. B are two huge reasons to negate this option.
240	Nancy M Trunnell	Hello,I live in Heber City. I'd like to express my displeasure towards the proposed bypass option B. The North Fields are so lovely and pristine. Some folks would lose their homes and their land. I worry terribly about the aquifer and damage to wildlife and other aspects of the environment. No options are included for what would happen if Highway 40 was improved. I just want to go on the record as opposing option B. I think something better should be considered. Sincerely, Nancy M Trunnell
92	Nate Knight	Hello, I would just like to implore the committee and UDOT to find a solution that is the least intrusive to the rural feel of Heber. A feeling that is being lost at a rapid rate, and the less this project contributes to the destruction of the valley, the better. The idea of concrete overpasses littering the landscaping is disheartening. Also, the destruction of the north fields and the impact of removing residents from their homes is disheartening to say the least. All that said, I recognize that any solution is going to hurt the valley. I just ask that all these things be thoughtfully considered, and the least intrusive measure be selected. Thank You, Nate Knight XXXXXXXXXX, Heber City, UT XXXXX
575	Nathan Dulong	I am against option A and B I think that you should put it on pause and reevaluate and come up with a better the plan alternative. Personally I think you should route it through the Main Street going through Heber city and just deal with the traffic.
687	Nathan Moulton	A raised section of road on 1300 South just seems like such a waste of money and such a detriment to the communities along that road. Would it not be better to shift that road south and follow 189 until the airport, where it can then cut through the sewer fields directly west to South Field Road? That seems like the least impactful, least expensive way to go. As a resident living near 1300 S, I would greatly appreciate that adjustment, but it also just seems to make more sense, especially now that Heber City has also requested a similar change. Thank you.
256	Nathan Washington	I am saying NO to the bypass and YES to the BackRunner. The formal submission demands the state evaluate the Hidden Rail Alternative: • The Orem-to-Ogden Spine: A high-speed, weather-proof rail line for commuters and medical patients. • Local TRAX Loops: Bringing light rail to Heber, Midway, and Park City to save our "farmhouse feel" and stop the sprawl. • The 2034 Stress Test: If a system can't handle the Olympic surge and a blizzard at the same time, it shouldn't be built. I am a citizen of District 20, and I demand that UDOT evaluate the BackRunner Rail Spine and TRAX integration as the only design-safe alternative under the Safety Commitment Standard. Stop the bypass sprawl. We aren't just fighting a road. We are fighting for a state where Public Safety is a right, not a luxury. Let's reclaim our valley is our push!! Nate Washington
261	Neil Harfert	Hello - I am providing feedback as our house (XXXXXXXXXXXX) will be within XXX of Option A / B and will reduce our sight-lines to the south, add a dramatically more noise (especially overnight), and more dust / debris. All the houses on our block have 2nd floor master bedrooms that directly face south to the proposed elevated roadway, so it will make sleeping challenging. I have added a google maps photo with our house indicated with a red marker. Thank you. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
134	Nick Lopez (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Good evening. My name is Nick Lopez. I'm a Heber City resident. I want to thank UDOT for this opportunity to speak and share my concerns and make some constructive suggestions. Unfortunately, this is not always the case with public meetings in Heber City where some elected officials attempt to silence residents' comments. So thank you for letting the residents voices be heard. I have three items I would like to address. Number one, nothing about Alternative B is good for this community, Wasatch County, or the state of Utah. A billion-dollar price tag for a route that will permanently destroy vital wetlands, historical agricultural farms, beautiful wildlife habitat, and the life source of peace and tranquility for all who have experienced our valley home. Two, in both Alternative A and B, there is nothing good that comes out of the planned 1300 South section of the bypass. This planned route will adversely impact two residential developments and business properties. It will destroy the peace and lives of 28 families whose backyards will share a common fence line. Those 28 families and their neighbors will have their quality of life and health detrimentally impacted by poor air quality, consistent loud trucks, and the use of compression brake noise. These -- these family homes will not benefit from our valley's cool, healthy air. They will be replaced with vehicle exhaust, brake dust, fuel, oil, antifreeze contaminants that will overwhelm their homes. They will need to worry about fully loaded trucks carrying hazardous materials that could potentially slide off an icy elevated highway and into their backyards day and night. All of this can be avoided if UDOT scraps the planned 1300 South section and return to the drawing board, utilizing the talents of UDOT engineers, making Highway 189 the route. The lives or our residents are as important as the preservation of the North Fields, and, without a doubt, more important than shaving a few minutes off a commute. Finally, this project is dedicated -- or is a decade away, and this community and those who travel through our county deserve some serious changes to US-40 and Highway 189 now. Traffic lights are -- need to be safely timed with fully functional left-turn signals. Safer crosswalks, dedicated right-turn lanes, especially on Center Street and 100 South, and additional travel lanes on U.S. 40 and Highway 199. These changes were needed yesterday. I would ask you to please consider all comments from the residents first. Our voices have value. This is our home. Everyone else are warmly welcomed visitors. Thank you.
633	Nick Lopez	There is no reasonable justification for building a highway across the North Fields. If any bypass must be built, I support Route A, though even Route A has serious design and viability concerns. First, there is ample room to widen US-40. From 600 North to I-80, US-40 should be expanded to six lanes to handle current traffic and the projected growth of Wasatch County, and possibly even eight lanes in the future. Even if a bypass is built, widening US-40 to six lanes is still necessary. Second, the planned flyover at 900 North is one of the poorest overpass designs I have seen. Requiring traffic to exit to the right and then make a sharp, unsafe left curve over potential development and private property is unnecessary. If the overpass instead exited to the left and followed the same path as the current southbound US-40 right turn movement, the curve could remain within the UDOT highway boundary and safely accommodate higher speeds. It should be designed similarly to the US-40/I-80 interchange. A similarly flawed right-exit concept is also planned for the southern part of the bypass, where traffic would leave US-40 and connect to the proposed elevated highway at 1300 South. That design is equally unnecessary and problematic. There is no reason the southern portion of the bypass cannot remain at ground level. The intersection at US-40 and US-189 could be redesigned to handle traffic efficiently. This could include two left-turn lanes on northbound and southbound US-40 and eastbound US-189, two eastbound through lanes on US-189 onto 1200 South, two northbound and two southbound through lanes on US-40, and two westbound travel lanes from 1200 South to westbound US-189. It should also include a continuous right-turn lane from southbound US-40 to westbound US-189, at least one continuous right-turn lane from US-189 to southbound US-40, and designated right-turn lanes from US-40 to 1200 South and from 1200 South to northbound US-40. If the vacant property on the southwest corner of US-189 and US-40 were acquired, there would be sufficient room for a proper redesign. Widening US-189 to six lanes from US-40 to 3200 West would further improve traffic movement. There is no need to route bypass traffic onto 1300 South, a city street, and create a two-lane elevated highway that would become a choke point. Moving traffic off Main Street only to reroute it onto another city street adjacent to two residential neighborhoods defeats the purpose of a bypass. Likewise, the concept of building parallel highways alongside US-40 makes little sense when widening US-40 itself would address the same transportation issues more directly and efficiently. Main Street also needs immediate redesign. It must have designated right-turn lanes with proper deceleration lengths so turning vehicles do not block through traffic. Narrow raised center islands, designated left-turn lanes, and fully operational left-turn signals are also needed. Better timing of the Center Street and 100 South traffic lights would improve efficiency. Looking ahead, Main Street may need to be redesigned to accommodate six lanes. Limited street parking could be relocated behind local businesses. Heber City has the ability to make rear parking a reality, including by converting the old fire station and Heber Light & Power property into a street-level parking lot. Finally, concerns about “free-flow” traffic appear inconsistent. It makes no sense to insist on a free-flow bypass in the north when southern US-40 would still be interrupted by traffic lights at 1500 South, Airport Road, and Center Creek. If free flow is truly the goal, then it should also be addressed south of town. If a free-flow solution is desired, it can be achieved north of 900 North by raising US-40 over the major intersections and placing a single traffic light underneath the underpass, similar to many interchanges on I-15. I would urge decision-makers to focus first on widening and improving US-40 and redesigning existing intersections before pursuing a costly and harmful bypass through the North Fields. Nick López
354	Nicole Ferguson	I was so for the bypass, but I feel like that will not be the solution we are all searching for. After watching The Slopes come to our valley and the heartache that had brought, I can't support the bypass going through the last beautiful fields we have. I haven't heard of a good solution, but looking at the design The Lythgo Group presented, I think this actually might work. Is also encourage small retail shops and eateries to start moving to 100 West and the Tabernacle. That seems to be the only viable place to make a walkable/shopable section. I'm a retail business owner in Main Street and I don't see Main Street being viable for

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		businesses like mine anymore. It Main Street currently consists of Car stuff (dealerships, parts, etc and professional) Midway has done a fantastic job of utilizing their town square with old small homes, turned retail/food, and it has become a hub for shopping. The bypass won't take the traffic from our Main Street, the homes keep coming! Please consider the Lythgo Design. Please don't ruin our beautiful valley. Let's move our shopping and make a real walkable area. (Not the city Park!)
611	Niko George	As this proposal threatens the entrance to what is arguably one of the most bucolic valleys in Utah, I feel it is my duty to share my comments and urge you to reconsider this project. I am a Midway resident who spends at least half of my family's commerce in Heber proper, and I am very familiar with the traffic patterns as well as the beauty of the surrounding valley. I ask that you thoughtfully reconsider the following points: The water studies in the Fields were taken at low level time of year, a full year study is advised to gauge a more clear picture of the impact to the water level and environmental effect. In addition, the aquifers serve as a sequesterer for air pollution. Once drained, we have the unfortunate ability to have the air quality of SLC. The majority of traffic using Highway 40 and Main Street is local traffic—people who have a daily purpose in Heber. The "dangerous" commercial traffic that simply passes through downtown is minimal in comparison, which is reflected in your own studies. There has been little discussion around implementing meaningful commercial vehicle tolling. Charging commercial vehicles a higher rate to pass through could encourage them to reconsider their route, potentially shifting traffic back toward the Duchesne corridor through Price and onto I-15. This approach would reduce both miles traveled and the environmental and community impact currently experienced here. I urge you to consider regional traffic rerouting and potential highway construction in areas where congestion already exists. Heber has not yet fully addressed its own internal traffic issues. Until meaningful solutions are pursued locally, this project should not move forward. Heber is largely flat and well suited for alternatives such as electric bikes, bike lanes, bus systems, and other forms of mass transit that should be explored before considering a project of this magnitude. This isn't just about Heber, it will impact the lives and environment of multiple cities and counties, broader due diligence—and potentially voting measures beyond Heber alone—should be considered. Thank you for taking the time to consider the long-term impact this project will have on the people who live here, not just considering commercial businesses seeking a faster route through our valley. Sincerely, Niko George Midway Resident
252	Nina & Ed Clyde	Yes, we need something. Yes I'll agree, but is that something to kick out the last agriculture we have in the valley. The road through the Northfield ends farming and ranching for those of us who have been working this ground keeping it green for generations. Mine is seventh generation.udot and Heber city are pushing Plan B, which again forces the farm and rancher out. two people I talk to with udot made the comment Plan B aligned with Heber city's future plan the other gal said it aligned with Heber city's vision Is that the vision of Wasatch County is that the vision of the people of Wasatch County? They want 2 to 15 acres forevery acre taken by the road mitigated and condemned into wetlands. This will not be green agriculture open space. it will look like the river open space . it will look like the peace south of the back 40 not green Agland. Yes, we need something but are we willing to let our North field heritage way of life go Heber city Wasatch County we need help! Once we get rid our farmers and ranchers we will say we should have done something different too late no one knows the effect the water will have on our wells or the aquifer or the effect of those downstream. We will try to move it back to plan a even try to negotiate together a better plan A We need the road as close to the bench as possible If we go with Plan B, we all lose. It's too late. We need help to stop this land grab

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Ed Clyde
489	Nina Clyde	Please adjust Plan B for a better fit to our county
20	No Name Provided	Alternate B will spell the end to all agriculture in the valley. This is not an exaggeration.
28	No Name Provided	I agree with UDOT in the choice of their preferred route. Choosing the other route will not address the the problem that this bypass is designed to solve. Please don't cave to the pressure Mayor Franco will try to put on you.
96	No Name Provided	Minimal impact to environment and existing homes/fields/neighborhoods is favorable for everyone. Plan A sticks closer to the city center and I think would make more sense in that aspect, however, I think an alternate mode of travel would be best environmentally. A train or tram or buses that go to and from Orem/Provo through park City help people avoid traffic and help the environment while doing it.
221	No Name Provided	This is an excellent plan. Heber needs the bypass asap. Don't let the nimbys get in the way.
269	No Name Provided	I live in south west part of summit county, I travel to Heber all the time. To do business to do grocery shopping to run errands I travel Hwy 40 all the time. Heber Main Street has become majorly congested with heavy traffic its joke trying to get from one end to the other end. Hwy 40 by pass needs to happen. It needs to be built to relieve the high traffic congestion and pressure from Main Street . The by pass would be beneficial to the traffic flow and traffic growth in the Heber valley .
276	No Name Provided	Bypass roads and highway expansions often fail to alleviate traffic long-term due to "induced demand," where increased capacity encourages more driving, filling new lanes within 5-10 years. This phenomenon, sometimes linked to Braess's paradox, means new, faster routes quickly become congested as commuters shift behaviors. Key reasons why bypass roads do not solve traffic: Induced Demand: When road capacity increases, the cost of driving decreases, leading to more trips, longer commutes, and a shift from public transit to private vehicles. Development Sprawl: New roads encourage developers to build further out, creating more car-dependent suburbs and increasing total vehicle miles traveled. Traffic Re-routing: While initially reducing congestion in town centers, bypasses can quickly become congested themselves. Long-Term Ineffectiveness: Studies show that a 1% increase in lane miles leads to a 1% increase in driving, meaning traffic levels return to previous, congested states. Effective alternatives to alleviate traffic focus on managing demand rather than increasing supply. We don't have to compromise the North Fields to provide monetary gain to a small, select few. UDOT uses our tax dollars to fund these projects, so the taxpayers should be able to vote/choose, not rely on a subjective decision by UDOT! Leave the North Fields alone. How would any of these proposed alternatives affect the water downstream, let alone the obvious compromise to the wetlands themselves? How would the wildlife be affected? There are models out there that have proven their effectiveness over time, such as Sun Valley, Idaho: Sun Valley, Idaho, maintains its small-town,, unpretentious, and, authentic, feel despite its status as a world-class luxury resort, by focusing on, a, walk-able, Village, layout,, strict, zoning, laws,, and, a, culture, that, prioritizes, outdoor,, lifestyle, over,, flashy, consumption. The area's,, "mountain, town," vibe is preserved through a, community, that, often, closes, businesses, on, powder, days, and, embraces, a, "work, hard, play, hard", mentality. Here are the specific ways Sun Valley maintains its small-town feel: 1. Urban Planning and Design The Walkable Village: The Sun Valley Village is designed to be self-contained and easily walkable, featuring a compact arrangement of restaurants, shops, a movie theater, and a bowling alley, reducing the need for cars. Strict Zoning Ordinances: To preserve the natural, scenic, and aesthetic character of the area, strict regulations are in place to limit development on hillsides, ridges, and, skylines. Maintained Footprint: Future development plans, such as the 15-20 year master plan, focus on updating existing structures rather than massive expansion or sprawl. Dark Sky Designation: As part of the Central Idaho Dark Sky Reserve, the community enforces strict lighting ordinances to minimize light pollution, maintaining a rustic, natural night environment. 2. Cultural and Lifestyle Choices The "Slow Down" Ethos: The community, including local leaders, encourages residents and visitors to, slow down and enjoy the,, slower, pace, of, life,. Prioritizing Experiences over "Partying": The area is described as, a, place, for,, authentic, adventure, rather, than, a, wild, party, scene,. Friendly Community Atmosphere: The, "small-town" vibe is, upheld, by, residents, who, know, one, another, (often compared to the TV show Cheers), where, it, is, common, to, wave, at, neighbors, and, help, out,. Focus on Local Business: The town supports local businesses and, artisans, rather, than, large, chain, stores,. 3. Community and Environmental Focus High Engagement in Outdoor Recreation: The lifestyle is defined by,, daily, outdoor, activity—skiing,, hiking,, and, fishing—which, fosters, a, shared, respect, for, nature. Local Governance: The area is, managed, by,, people, who, are, invested, in, the,,, long-term, well-being, of, the, town,. Proactive Community Support: The, "small-town" feel is maintained by a tight-knit community that looks out for one another, especially during busy tourist seasons. These factors combine to allow Sun Valley to, retain, its,,, historic, charm and,, welcoming,, atmosphere, despite, high-end, tourist,, traffic. Thank you for taking the time to read this commentary and abandoning the idea of a bypass road. We need to be caretakers of this area, not takers and road makers.
285	No Name Provided	I support this project, and specifically this design alternative because it is the only one that actually solves the problem we asked UDOT to solve. This design, combined with the widening of US-189 around Deer Creek Reservoir, will provide an uninterrupted 4 lane highway connecting I-15 near Provo to I-80 near Park City and will take all of those drivers off Heber Main Street. This design will also remove the bulk of the trucks and recreational drivers with boats, RV's, etc from Heber Main Street. I know there will be those affected more by this design, but it is the only one that would actually solve the problem of too much traffic through town and I appreciate the work UDOT has put into narrowing down the designs to find the one that works best. My only suggestion for improvement would be to make sure this is marked as a "Truck Route" or to re-designate US-40 and US-189 after construction to actually remove these highways from main street. Without doing this, GPS systems will still route traffic through town.
288	No Name Provided	I prefer Alternative A
363	No Name Provided	This is a confusing and very buried comment process. After several clicks and lots of scrolling, I'm finally at the place where I think I'm supposed to type my comment. But its unclear whether this box is for my name and email or the comment itself. Then I see below that there is another box for my name, which is optional. More confusion. Did anyone edit this comment process? Or is it deliberately obfuscating? Assuming for the moment that this box is for the actual comment: It looks like the local population in Heber Valley is waking up to the fact that the bypass is a very bad idea for the environment and character of the Heber Valley. I know that you at UDOT have put a lot of work into this plan, but I think you should just scrap it. No "mitigation" of "concerns" will help enough. I think you need to give it up.
370	No Name Provided	US 40 and River road are already a nightmare at many tomes of the day. It looks like alt b will mame the backups even worse. It will not alliviate the backups at the rover road light. I do not see how trucks merging in a potter lane are not going to cause more congestion at the light.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
371	No Name Provided	I feel that alt a would couse much less impact on the congestion at river road.
406	No Name Provided	Alternative A offers a more sustainable option that protects the landscape, while facilitating growth in the valley.
413	No Name Provided	Please protect and preserve the North fields, as they are the crown jewel to our Beautiful Heber Valley. you have done the EIS so you know the great value of the North fields to our community. in 1954 when the subject of a bypass road was being talked about, that is when Heber City and UDOT should have put some ground aside for when growth started to take place, but instead it was ignored and here we are today with out of control growth and a need for a bypass road. Please DO NOT use Alternate Route B as this will be so devasting to so many land owners, Cattle producers whom help feed America, our water resources, Wildlife, our residents who enjoy taking their families on a walk, or walking their dogs, runners Etc. Please listen to we the people, let our voices be heard!!!
435	No Name Provided	At this point, I would recommend eliminating the entire bypass option. it is going to take a significant amount of time and money and take years to complete. From my understanding, the majority of the traffic on main street is local traffic and the bypass won't actually eliminate a significant amount of traffic. I think it makes more sense to look at ways to keep traffic flowing smoothly given the current structure. Has it ever been considered to make the Highway 40 and SR-32 an overpass? Can we time lights better to reduce the amount of time traffic stops on 40? The new Coyote Lane light triggers way too often causing slow downs. I don't seem to see as much of a problem at the Airport light. And we really should implement frontage roads on growth from Heber to the SR-32 intersection. Frontage roads allow for traffic to flow with less lights impacting your main roads. Allow for the frontage roads to merge in easier ways onto 40 without having to implement more lights. I think there are better ways to move traffic without building a major road at a significant cost in an area that is controversial. I realize this is not likely going to happen as the discussion for a bypass has been on the table for years, but maybe it is best to look outside the box for a better and cheaper solution. Heber City is the cause of main street being busy with the amount of growth they have approved over the last 10 years. As long as they continue to approve more development, traffic on main street is going to continue to get busier. Locals are not going to use the bypass and we are getting more locals all the time. This is honestly not going to alleviate the amount of traffic people are hoping.
539	No Name Provided	Please do not build option B. It disrupts wetlands that don't need to be disturbed. Option A accomplishes what you need to do.
560	No Name Provided	Alternative A should be the chosen alternative. We should be prioritizing environmental protection in the valley and north fields. In either option, existing homes/planned new developments may be affected - but the environment should come first for the long term.
580	No Name Provided (Comment translated from voicemail)	hi Im a Sinister Ive been a citizen in Wasatch County for some amount of time and I know today was the last day for public comment on the proposed bypass and I wanted to reach out and put in my two cents and honestly hear from you guys and see what some of the proposed real options might be but I think no bypass is a goodbye the issues long term that were going to be facing it I think a quick fix money grab to try to make people happy but it is not really going to solve the problem I think we need to take a deep look and see a lot of other options that are really on the table that no one is currently discussing option A and option b or not the only options theres a lot more things that need to be on the table and talked about before we go written up all that land Id love to get a call back from you guys to know that someone at least received this phone call but please no XXXXX bypass no more roads no more XXXXXXX fix what you guys can fix Id love to get a call back XXXXXXXXXX will email you guys as well please no bypass do not ruin Wasatch County any more than have a great day thank you
316	Pam Ramult	Dear UDOT, As a local resident of the Heber Valley, I am writing to formally express my opposition to Alternative B. Water is a precious resource, and the North Fields consist of vital wetlands with a high water table. Constructing a bypass through this area will negatively impact both the land and the surrounding environment. I ask that you instead pursue Alternative A or explore other options that do not involve the North Fields. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Pam Ramult Midway, UT XXXXX
336	Patrice Hansen	To Whom It May Concern, I feel strongly about NOT adopting "Alternative B" for the bypass road in Heber Valley. It destroys the beauty and functionality of the North Fields, which are a beautiful and highly valued part of the culture and history of Heber Valley. Alternate A would take up much less of the North Fields and not be near as destructive of this treasured part of our valley. In addition, Alternative B destroys 53.9 acres of wetlands vs. 22.5 acres under Alternative A. Also, the price tag of over $1 billion dollars for Alternative B is CRAZY, when Alternative A is not only a better choice for the above reasons, but its cost is at least $48.6 million less than Alternative B. The potential damage to the water system is super important to consider as well---All of this to save minutes in travel time? The consequences are irreversible once this is done. I strongly oppose Alternate B. Patrice Hansen Realtor Cell: XXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Serving Heber Valley for 45 years! XXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah Office: XXXXXXXXXX Website: https://daviscolemanrealty.com/ Instagram: XXXXXXXXX
708	Patricia Thompson	Patricia Thompson XXXXXXXXXXXXX Prefer B
359	Patricia Merkley	March 2, 2026 Dear UDOT- Look long at these two attached pictures of the North Fields in Heber painted by my two daughters* This space is the heart of Heber Valley beyond even the downtown. We are not Park City. In our bones we are a rural community with over 125 dairy farms and endless alfalfa farms before the world found us. My mother's ancestors went back to the first three farmers in Heber Valley who already had crops in the ground when Brigham Young send men to settle it. Please consider carefully what this open space means to this valley. The priorities are not just about cost and expediency, but about respect for the history and beauty especially this remaining open space called the North Fields. If a bypass needs to go up in the Heber Valley, please go with Alternative A which dissects the North Fields the least. Besides ripping a scar through the entire North Fields, you have already noted the other potential negative impacts of Alternative B such as destroying the 54 canals, ditches, streams, and the wetlands being severely impacted. Alternative A would do the least damage and would keep the sacred view of Timpanogos through the North Fields fairly in tack. But whether Alternative A or B is chosen, the ultimate UDOT promise needs to be exactly as you've stated that you "will prioritize the North Fields for wetland mitigation" and the "mitigation acres are protected in perpetuity. They will NOT be privately owned or up for development." We hold you to that priority. Hear our pleas Do not destroy the heart of our valley. Sincerely-Patricia Merkley XXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT *Sarah Merkley Morrow at: https ://sarahmerkleystudio.blogspot.com/p/landscapes.html *Missy Merkley Ames at: https://missyames.com/ (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
458	Paul Abate	Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, Please see the attached comment letter from Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission and let us know if you have any questions regarding this submittal. Thanks,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Paul Abate Paul Abate | Project Coordinator Utah Reclamation Mitigation & Conservation Commission XXXXXXXXXXXX | Salt Lake City, UT | XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX | XXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
212	Paul Kendall	As a longtime resident of Heber City I fully support the bypass road through the north fields. I only wish it began closer to the river road intersection. Thanks, Paul
291	Paul Kruger	My name is Paul Kruger, I am a Heber Valley full time resident, grew up in Utah. I believe Heber Valley needs to be proactive in absorbing the growth and UDOT certainly is doing the right thing by planning ahead. I am writing in strong support of Alternative A in the Heber Valley Environmental Impact Statement process. Heber Valley's historic agricultural lands are not vacant or transitional spaces — they are foundational to the valley's identity, economy, and heritage. These working farms have been continuously cultivated for over 150 years and are embedded in the cultural fabric of the community. Preserving this agricultural ground is not simply about open space; it is about protecting a living legacy that defines Heber Valley and distinguishes it from the rapidly urbanizing Wasatch Front. Equally important is the protection of the valley's sole-source aquifer system. The agricultural lands under consideration serve as critical recharge zones for groundwater that feeds the Provo River and ultimately supplies culinary water to millions of Utah residents. This groundwater system is sustained in part by historic canal infrastructure dating back more than a century. Large-scale roadway construction through these recharge areas introduces long-term risks: soil compaction, altered drainage patterns, increased runoff contamination, and permanent disruption of natural infiltration processes. Under the principles of the Clean Water Act, protecting water quality and watershed function should be a central priority in evaluating alternatives. It is also important to acknowledge who this bypass primarily serves. The proposed route is designed largely to benefit through-traffic — including regional commuters and freight movement — rather than addressing localized transportation needs within Heber Valley itself. While regional mobility is important, it should not come at the irreversible expense of prime agricultural land and critical water infrastructure. Saving a limited number of minutes for pass-through traffic does not outweigh the permanent loss of productive farmland and watershed integrity. Additional considerations supporting Alternative A include: Cumulative growth pressure: Major transportation corridors induce development. A bypass through agricultural land would likely accelerate subdivision and commercial sprawl, compounding long-term impacts on open space and water demand. Economic resilience: Agriculture contributes to local economic stability, food security, and tourism character. Once converted, prime farmland cannot be reclaimed at meaningful scale. Community character and scenic value: Heber Valley's rural landscape is central to its identity and quality of life. Infrastructure that fragments this landscape diminishes both resident experience and visitor appeal. Long-term infrastructure cost: Extending utilities, services, and maintenance obligations into new growth areas creates fiscal burdens that persist for generations. Alternative A represents a prudent, forward-thinking approach that balances mobility needs with environmental stewardship and preservation of irreplaceable community assets. I respectfully urge the Utah Department of Transportation to prioritize long-term water security, agricultural preservation, and community integrity by advancing Alternative A. Thank you for your consideration.
162	Paula Dean (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Alternative A is better option of the two. Less than half the destruction of wetlands and less impacts to our beautiful valley. That extra minute of travel time will allow the traveller to view a beautiful green valley out their window. The noise from the current highway can already be heard from miles away, all the way to the river. Please read the article "The Blab of Pave" in the High Country News from a few years ago. The author describes a "Phantom Rd Study, analyzing the surprising effects of the highway noise on wildlife. The North Fields and the Provo River corridor should not be dissected by a highway, no matter what. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
562	Paula Dean	Hi, I submitted these on your website also, but the format got all messed up, so here's a file that might be easier to read. Thanks for reviewing these comments regarding noise impacts on wildlife and reconsidering your preferred alternative. A majority of the community is against Alternative B that runs through the North Fields. -- ~Paula (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
80	Phillip Hammonds (Comment translated from voicemail)	yes I am calling regarding the project the bypass option b in Heber I want to express my grievance about this option I dont think that it is appropriate to put a highway through pristine nature and and the property especially with all the water that is runoff that feeds the Provo River I think its appalling we dont have enough Open Spaces it is my name is Philip a Hammonds my phone number is XXXXXXX I am a constituent of Midway thank you
239	Porter Spencer	Good afternoon, as a lifelong resident of the Kamas Valley near Heber, I have driven through Heber Thousands of times. This roadway isn't just for the residence of Heber. It is for everyone, These people can complain and yell at you and tell you how bad it is, but in reality alternative be is the only thing that will alleviate the congestion from growth now and in the future. I love Heber and I think alleviating the congestion on Main Street would allow Main St. to become more of a main street and not a deadly roadway. Improved walk, ability, pedestrian, and bicycle access. Would all take place with alternative B.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Having the traffic go out and around is the only way to solve the problem bringing it right up to the city and then making it go around the city is just a waste of money. It's gonna destroy it, barely any of the north fields, And nobody even uses them or does any activities in them right now. A lot of people are going to complain to you guys Complaining about how this isn't what Heber needs and this isn't what Hebrew wants, but this isn't just for heber, This is a crucial infrastructure improvement for the entire Wasatch back. You have mine as well as many other people that don't live in Hebrew support. Don't let them tell you otherwise they can get me in and get loud and get angry, but a lot of of them aren't the ones that Would use it daily, many of them avoid going out in peak Travel times, And I think it's a great idea and I think you don't know what needs to be done and I'm super happy you picked alternative B!
638	Preserve Midway	Draft Environmental Impact Statement Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Project Re: Bypass Alternative B Submitted by: Preserve Midway Affiliation : Nonprofit Address or Connection to Area: Date: 3/6/26 I. PURPOSE OF COMMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD NOTICE We submit this comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Project to identify specific deficiencies in the analysis of Bypass Alternative B under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This comment is intended to ensure that the agencies take the required "hard look" at environmental consequences, indirect and cumulative impacts, and reasonable alternatives, and to preserve these issues for the administrative record. II. FAILURE TO ADEQUATELY ANALYZE INDIRECT AND GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS NEPA requires agencies to analyze reasonably foreseeable indirect effects, including growth-inducing impacts and changes in land-use patterns. The DEIS evaluates Alternative B primarily as a transportation facility and does not adequately analyze how new roadway capacity in a rural valley will foreseeably induce development, alter land values, and change land-use patterns over time. This omission is particularly significant because the proposed alignment crosses land formally designated as an Agricultural Protection Area (APA) under Utah Code § 17-41-101 et seq. APAs exist specifically to preserve agricultural land and prevent premature conversion. Any action that undermines an APA's purpose requires heightened scrutiny, yet the DEIS does not analyze how a high-capacity bypass would accelerate: Conversion of agricultural and open lands Secondary infrastructure demands and public service costs Increased land speculation and rezoning pressure Loss of conservation funding opportunities tied to APA preservation Without this analysis, the DEIS understates the foreseeable environmental consequences of Alternative B. This omission also conflicts with Wasatch County's and Heber City's adopted General Plans and long-standing community visions, including Envision Heber 2050, whose top priority is the preservation of rural character. The DEIS does

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		not reconcile these conflicts or acknowledge that Alternative B would undermine the very planning objectives the communities have formally established. III. FAILURE TO ADEQUATELY ANALYZE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS The DEIS does not adequately evaluate cumulative impacts as required by NEPA. Rather than analyzing the incremental impacts of Alternative B in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, the DEIS treats impacts in isolation. This approach fails to address cumulative effects such as: Fragmentation of agricultural systems protected under APA designation Long-term loss of rural character Combined effects with ongoing development and transportation projects Increased pressure for annexation and rezoning Because APAs are created through a public process and protected under Utah Code § 17-41-301, the cumulative weakening of these protections must be analyzed. The DEIS does not do so. IV. INADEQUATE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND QUALITY-OF-LIFE EFFECTS NEPA requires consideration of impacts to the human environment, including community character and quality of life. The DEIS does not adequately analyze how a high-capacity, high-speed bypass corridor would affect: Noise and light levels near residential areas Valued viewsheds and open space Neighborhood connectivity and cohesion Recreational, aesthetic, and cultural resources These impacts are particularly relevant in a valley where agricultural landscapes, wetlands, and open space define community identity and where residents have repeatedly expressed preservation priorities. V. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS RELIES ON UNREALISTIC LAND-USE ASSUMPTIONS The traffic analysis appears to assume static land-use conditions, ignoring the well-documented phenomenon of induced growth. This assumption is inconsistent with foreseeable development responses to new roadway capacity. Available information indicates that between 8,000 and 16,000 residential units are already approved or in the development queue on the east side of the valley, though the DEIS does not disclose or verify these figures. Traffic generated by these units would access Main Street directly from the east and would not be captured by the proposed bypass, thereby exacerbating congestion on the very corridor the project purports to relieve. A legally adequate analysis must therefore evaluate these foreseeable land-use changes and assess operational improvements to Main Street as an immediate and practicable alternative.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Because the proposed alignment would directly affect APA-designated land and surrounding agricultural parcels, the DEIS must integrate induced-growth scenarios into traffic forecasting. Without this, the DEIS does not adequately disclose whether congestion relief would be temporary or illusory. Studies were only done at peak hours, not consistent and needs to be fully evaluated. The DEIS also does not accurately characterize freight movement in the region. Appendix 2E (p. 17/38) notes that while oil tankers predominantly use South US-40 due to its connection to resource-extraction areas, existing traffic data show that US-189 carries a higher total volume of trucks than South US-40. This discrepancy is material because it undermines assumptions about which corridor freight traffic would realistically use and whether the bypass would meaningfully alter truck routing patterns. Further, the DEIS limits its travel-time comparisons to PM peak hours. Trucks operate throughout the full 24-hour cycle, and congestion diminishes substantially outside peak periods. As a result, freight operators may have little incentive to divert to a longer bypass route during off-peak hours. A legally adequate analysis must therefore evaluate truck behavior across all time periods—not only during PM peaks—to determine whether the bypass would meaningfully reduce congestion on existing corridors. VI. PURPOSE AND NEED MAY IMPROPERLY CONSTRAIN ALTERNATIVES The framing of the project's purpose and need emphasizes long-term vehicular capacity expansion in a manner that appears to presuppose a bypass-scale solution. NEPA prohibits defining purpose and need so narrowly that it forecloses reasonable alternatives. The DEIS does not adequately evaluate whether project objectives could be met through: Smaller-scale or context-sensitive improvements Hybrid alternatives combining limited bypass elements with existing corridor upgrades Transportation demand management or transit strategies Phased implementation tied to demonstrated need Because the proposed alignment affects wetlands and aquifer recharge areas, federal law — including the Clean Water Act Section 404 LEDPA requirement — obligates UDOT to evaluate alternatives that avoid these impacts. The DEIS does not demonstrate that this has occurred. VII. FAILURE TO EVALUATE A REASONABLE MODIFIED OR HYBRID ALTERNATIVE NEPA requires analysis of reasonable alternatives that would reduce environmental harm while meeting project objectives. The DEIS does not adequately evaluate a Modified or Hybrid Alternative that could include: Alignment refinements to avoid APA lands Limited access to reduce growth-inducing effects

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Context-sensitive roadway design Phased construction tied to actual need Given the presence of wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and APA-designated land, such alternatives are not only reasonable — they are legally required under both federal and state environmental protections. VIII. DEFERRAL AND VAGUENESS OF MITIGATION MEASURES The DEIS relies on generalized or deferred mitigation measures, indicating that impacts will be addressed through future studies or later decisions. NEPA requires mitigation to be discussed in sufficient detail to demonstrate that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated. This is especially problematic because: Wetlands and aquifer recharge areas are functionally irreplaceable Utah groundwater protection rules (Utah Admin. Code R317-6) require prevention of irreversible contamination or hydrologic alteration The DEIS proposes mitigation ratios (e.g., 2:1) that do not reflect the permanent loss of wetland function Once wetlands are disturbed, hydrologic changes can cause flooding, reduced recharge, and long-term water-quality impacts. These consequences cannot be undone, and the DEIS does not meaningfully address them. The proposed mitigation ratios also fail to demonstrate whether replacement acreage would be preserved in perpetuity or merely maintained as cleared, non-functional land. As noted in the 1/27/26 public Zoom meeting, “mitigation” may consist only of weed-free maintenance rather than true ecological replacement, which does not satisfy NEPA’s requirement for meaningful mitigation or the Clean Water Act’s standards for functional wetland preservation. IX. SEGMENTATION AND CONNECTED ACTIONS To the extent the proposed bypass corridor is functionally linked to other transportation improvements, development actions, or future expansions, the DEIS must analyze these actions together. Failure to do so risks improper segmentation and understates cumulative impacts. This is particularly relevant because the bypass would open new areas to development, requiring additional infrastructure that is not analyzed in the DEIS. X. LOCALIZED IMPACTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVE (PRESERVE MIDWAY) As a nonprofit organization, Preserve Midway is dedicated to thoughtful growth and to providing landowners with meaningful options to preserve the rural character, open space, and agricultural heritage of Midway, Utah. Our mission is to protect the historic rural identity and safeguard the agricultural and open lands that define this valley. The North Fields — including the wetlands, aquifer recharge areas, and agricultural parcels affected by Alternative B — are central to that mission.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Preserve Midway represents a community of more than 1,400 residents, landowners, and supporters who have consistently expressed a clear preference for preservation-minded planning and context-sensitive transportation solutions. Our members have asked us to convey, unequivocally, that Alternative B is not an acceptable solution. It is incompatible with the rural landscape, the agricultural protections already in place, and the long-standing community vision for the Wasatch Back. We are not the Wasatch Front, and we do not seek Wasatch Front–style infrastructure imposed on a valley whose identity, economy, and ecological health depend on open space, agriculture, and groundwater integrity. Our concerns are grounded not only in mission, but in lived experience. We have observed firsthand how disturbing wetlands — even at the edges of a project area — can alter hydrology in ways that are not always foreseeable. When nearby wetlands were disturbed in our community, water began flowing differently, creating flooding in areas that had never flooded before. These changes happened quickly and could not be reversed. This is precisely why wetlands and aquifer recharge areas are protected under both federal and Utah law: once disrupted, the consequences extend far beyond the project footprint. The wildlife that depends on the North Fields — migratory birds, raptors, amphibians, and mammals — relies on the shallow groundwater and wet meadow systems that define this landscape. Many wells in the valley depend on the same groundwater. Displacing or degrading these wetlands could have serious, long-term consequences for water quality, aquifer recharge, and ecological stability. These risks are not adequately addressed in the DEIS. Our community has also already suffered a measurable financial loss tied directly to the preservation of this land. The proposed bypass alignment signaled that the land might not remain protected and immediately a conservation easement, years in the making, lost federal funding, which stopped the conservation. These funds were intended to safeguard the very resources now threatened by Alternative B. Now lost, they cannot be recovered. Proceeding with an alignment that undermines an Agricultural Protection Area disregards both the statutory purpose of that designation and the clearly expressed desires of taxpayers who voted to preserve these lands. For all these reasons, Preserve Midway urges UDOT to pursue alternatives that align with the scale, values, and environmental realities of the Wasatch Back — alternatives that respect the community's long-standing commitment to preservation, protect irreplaceable water resources, and avoid irreversible harm to the North Fields. XI. CONCLUSION AND REQUEST FOR REVISION For the reasons stated above, the DEIS does not yet satisfy NEPA's requirements or applicable state and federal environmental protections.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		We respectfully request that the agencies revise the DEIS to: Fully analyze induced growth and indirect land-use impacts Evaluate cumulative impacts Reassess traffic outcomes using realistic land-use assumptions Reevaluate purpose and need to ensure reasonable alternatives are not foreclosed Analyze a Modified or Hybrid Alternative that avoids APA lands and wetland resources Demonstrate compliance with the Clean Water Act LEDPA requirement Provide enforceable and clearly defined mitigation measures consistent with Utah groundwater and wetland protection laws Thank you for the opportunity to submit this comment for inclusion in the administrative record. Respectfully submitted, Preserve Midway 3/6/26
302	R. Schlopy	No new highway thank you. I have lived here since 1986 and am watching our mountain communities fighting for their very lives - water, traffic, character and overcrowding of a fragile high desert environment. STOP AND THINK! R. Todd Schlopy 1st Assistant Cameraman XXXXXXXXX
702	Rachel Bodily	Hello, I submit this comment for the administrative record to identify significant statutory, regulatory, and procedural deficiencies in UDOT's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Heber Valley bypass, specifically Alternative B. The Draft EIS does not demonstrate compliance with NEPA, Utah environmental statutes, the Utah Agricultural Protection Act, or federal requirements governing wetlands, floodplains, and aquifer protection. As written, the Draft EIS cannot support a lawful Record of Decision. UDOT asserts that a primary purpose of the bypass is to "preserve historic Heber downtown," yet the Draft EIS provides no measurable criteria, no operational definition of "preservation," and no evidence that Alternative B would achieve this outcome. Independent analysis by tourism consultant Roger Brooks concludes that Main Street cannot become walkable or pedestrian-oriented under Alternative B's traffic patterns. Under NEPA, the Purpose and Need statement must be reasonable, evidence-based, and not constructed to predetermine a preferred alternative. A purpose that is unsupported by evidence or contradicted by expert analysis fails this standard. Statutory basis: NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. § 1502.13. The Draft EIS also fails to address Agricultural Protection Areas (APAs) as required under Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 81. Productive farmland within the APA would be permanently taken or rendered non-viable under Alternative B, yet the Draft EIS does not evaluate these impacts or propose mitigation. APAs were created by the Utah Legislature to protect agricultural operations from fragmentation and incompatible land uses. By failing to analyze APA impacts, UDOT exposes landowners to eminent domain without the procedural protections intended by statute. This omission also violates NEPA's cumulative impact requirements, which mandate analysis of foreseeable land-use conversion. Statutory basis: Utah Code § 17-81-101 et seq.; 40 C.F.R. § 1508.1(g). Environmental oversights are equally significant. Alternative B crosses wetlands, hydric soils, floodplains, and primary aquifer recharge zones. The Draft EIS does not demonstrate compliance with the Utah Floodplain Administration Act, the Utah Water Quality Act, or the Clean Water Act § 404. The EIS does not show that UDOT evaluated the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA), nor does it provide hydrological analysis demonstrating avoidance or minimization of impacts to wetlands and aquifers. Statutory basis: Utah Code Title 73, Chapter 29; Utah Code Title 19, Chapter 5; Clean Water Act § 404; NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332. The Draft EIS also fails to provide a complete cumulative impact analysis. NEPA requires agencies to evaluate impacts that result from the incremental effect of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The Draft EIS does not adequately analyze cumulative impacts to agricultural land, groundwater recharge, wetlands, floodplain function, long-term agricultural viability, or the economic and functional health of downtown Heber. Statutory basis: 40 C.F.R. § 1508.1(g); NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). In addition to these deficiencies, the Draft EIS relies heavily on vague, undefined, and non-transparent mitigation commitments that do not satisfy NEPA or Utah statutory requirements. For agricultural land, the EIS provides no explanation of how UDOT intends to mitigate fragmentation, irrigation severance, equipment access, livestock movement, or the loss of field continuity. There is no identification of agricultural crossings, irrigation protections, fencing plans, or access routes. Without these details, the claim that agricultural impacts will be "mitigated" is unsupported and cannot be evaluated by the public or affected landowners. NEPA requires agencies to disclose mitigation measures with enough specificity to allow informed public review; UDOT has not done so.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		For wetlands, hydric soils, and aquifer recharge zones, the Draft EIS does not identify avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation strategies. There is no demonstration that mitigation is feasible given the shallow groundwater and hydrologic sensitivity of the North Fields. Under the Clean Water Act, mitigation cannot substitute for avoidance, yet the Draft EIS relies on vague future mitigation to justify siting the alignment in the most environmentally sensitive portion of the valley. For floodplains and stormwater, the Draft EIS does not identify how UDOT will mitigate increased flood risk, altered drainage patterns, or displacement of floodwaters onto adjacent properties. Utah's Floodplain Administration Act requires mitigation of flood hazards, but the Draft EIS does not provide engineering detail, modeling, or design concepts demonstrating that mitigation is possible. For Agricultural Protection Areas, the Draft EIS does not identify any mitigation measures at all. Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 81 requires agencies to avoid incompatible land uses and protect agricultural operations from fragmentation. Mitigation cannot be deferred when the statute requires avoidance. Across all resource categories, the Draft EIS relies on broad, undefined statements such as "mitigation will be developed during final design," which is insufficient under NEPA. Courts have consistently held that agencies must identify mitigation measures with enough detail to allow the public to evaluate their effectiveness and feasibility. Undefined mitigation cannot serve as the basis for a lawful Record of Decision. Statutory basis: NEPA, 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.14, 1502.16; Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 81; Clean Water Act § 404; Utah Code Title 73, Chapter 29. Based on the deficiencies outlined above, Alternative B does not comply with NEPA, Utah environmental statutes, the Utah Agricultural Protection Act, or federal requirements governing wetlands, floodplains, and aquifer protection. The Draft EIS must be revised to include a defensible, evidence-based Purpose and Need; full analysis of Agricultural Protection Areas under Utah Code Title 17, Chapter 81; comprehensive wetlands, floodplain, and aquifer impact analysis; specific, enforceable mitigation measures; and a complete cumulative impact assessment consistent with NEPA. Until these statutory and regulatory deficiencies are corrected, Alternative B cannot lawfully advance toward a Record of Decision. Respectfully, Rachel Bodily
387	Rachel Gilette	I support the letter submitted by NFIC and oppose alternative B! Protect our aquifers at all costs- the North Fields is the ONLY source of surface water left. We demand fiscal responsibility from UDOT- they have intentionally refused cheaper alternatives presented by several entities and refused to realign the bypass to allow funding of a conservation easement. This will greatly affect our taxes without solving the problem. Rachel Gillette
432	Rachel Kahler	Community Alliance for Main Street Mission Statement: Heber City will transform its downtown into the economic and cultural heart of the Heber Valley—a thriving center for commerce, entrepreneurship, and community connection. This vision focuses on cultivating a vibrant business district that attracts investment, supports local enterprises, and enhances the visitor experience, all while preserving the historic character and charm that define downtown Heber. (Please include our letter of support with our mission statement.) (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
691	Rachel Kahler	Heber City's downtown is not an abstract idea, it is a living, working place shaped by generations of pioneer heritage, entrepreneurship, and community investment. Main Street remains the commercial heart of our community, serving more than 800 businesses and anchoring the small shops, restaurants, professional services, and historic buildings that give Heber City its identity. Yet today, Main Street is being asked to function as both a regional highway carrying roughly 40,000+ vehicles a day and a thriving commercial district. It cannot successfully serve both roles, and the burden falls on the people who live, work, and invest there. Central Heber is the commercial hub of Wasatch County, meaning transportation decisions made here impact the entire valley. Without thoughtful planning, continued congestion will push investment toward the edges of town, weakening Main Street and placing our historic downtown at risk. Historic surveys indicate that hundreds of Old Town properties may meet state and national historic standards, representing real homes, businesses, and private investment. As traffic increases, vehicles are already diverting onto neighborhood streets that lack sidewalks, curbs, and infrastructure designed for through traffic, creating growing safety concerns. The bypass conversation should not be framed simply as a choice between protecting land and relieving traffic. At its core, this issue affects people, those who live and work downtown every day. Traffic volume, noise, safety, and air quality directly shape their quality of life and the viability of local businesses. A well-planned bypass can reduce congestion, remove heavy truck traffic from Main Street, improve safety and air quality, and support reinvestment in the historic downtown while still protecting the North Fields. Additionally, Heber City has hired historian Kirk Huffaker of Preservation Strategies to conduct a reconnaissance-level survey of over 1,110 properties in Central Heber. This work will help determine eligibility for a National Historic District, strengthening long-term preservation efforts. The findings will provide critical historical context that should be considered as transportation decisions move forward. Please contact Kirk Huffaker, XXXXXXXXXXX or online at: https://www.kirkhuffaker.com/ to obtain the details of his historical research prior to finalizing the EIS Draft, as I believe the information is a vital piece of why this bypass is critically important to the downtown of Heber City. A healthy community requires planning for the long-term health of its heart. I encourage this council to pursue a balanced solution that addresses regional transportation needs while protecting the vitality of Heber City's historic downtown and the people who depend on it.
185	Rachel Mitchell	Neither of these options offer any real solutions. A three-lane highway from the base of Daniels canyon all the way to 80 is the only reality based solution. Wherever you have the bypass, entering a two-lane highway solves nothing . Why damage the northfields for it to not even work? There is plenty of parking behind the buildings on the 100s for the businesses on main Street Heber. Rachel Mitchell XXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
305	Rachel Mitchell	Hi, I've been commenting for years on this and it's getting pretty exhausting. We do not want the bypass through the North Fields. There are better options. Like opening 40 to three lanes. There's plenty of room. People can park in the back of the businesses. There's lots of parking in the back. Or build parking structures. Instead of New roads. Trailers can be instructed, just like in Moab, to use the left lane going through town. This opens two lanes for the residents to use the third being used by the tractor trailers. We do not need a new road. We just need to improve the existing highway 40. Adding more lanes all the way to Park City would be great too. Resident since 1997. I birthed both my children in the Heber hospital. Rachel Mitchell XXXXXXXXX
330	Rachel Mitchell	I've lived in Heber for 33 years. I vote NO on the bypass, plan B. My opinion is we should open main Street to three lanes. Put parking in the back of the main Street businesses. Even if a parking garage is required, a lot cheaper than a whole new road. Put a sign on either end of town letting tractor trailers know to use the left lane going through town, they do this in Moab. This would leave two opens lanes for the locals . There's already enough room on main Street. Main Street has always been a highway. A highway that serves the businesses and truckers. We can improve the existing road to serve both . An expensive bypass At the cost of, agricultural land, water, and the beauty (that the reason why people are moving here), be the cost of losing the north fields is short-sighted and irresponsible.
444	Rachel Mitchell	I have lived in Heber for 30 years. I vote no to plan B. Irresponsible and a waste of time and money for everyone Rachel Mitchell XXXXXXXXX
376	Rachel White	Please support Alternative A for the proposed transportation corridor to connect US 40 and accommodate growth in Heber Valley. Alternative A is a less intrusive option and the least destructive to the community it is ostensibly designed to serve. Thank you.
54	Randall Williford	We're pleased with the decision to use Alternate B. It preserves our 120-year-old historic home that we spent three years restoring for personal occupancy. We had intended to live out our years here and now that again seems possible. We believe the two strongest points favoring your decision were the likelihood that a larger majority of trucks will use the bypass under the Alternate B scenario, and it creates a backup route north out of Heber in case of emergency. A great many people are concerned about the impact on their view of the North Fields, but we believe their concerns would be reduced if you prepared simulated views from Valley Hills Boulevard and US 40 in the vicinity of Key View 3. Distance and tree cover make for a fairly minimal impact. A bicycle and pedestrian path through the North Fields would be much more attractive than one along US 40, especially if it were enhanced by sustainable landscaping. With the shallow water table out there, only a limited number of species will grow, but they will get their water without irrigation.
260	Randi Stephens	this is running right through hundreds of peoples backyards!! Not giving any care to our property values when you try to build a 20' highway literally right behind houses when you have plenty of space to build this AWAY from peoples homes. This needs to go on 189 NOT next to walmart. and businesses on BOTH sides and homes. I am for a bypass but not next to homes that have been here OVER 10 years. The western bypass makes no sense anyways. The majority of traffic comes from the east side. If there was to ever be a bypass it should be on that side where ppl would utilize it. It will take just as much time to get on the bypass as it already does just to drive through town. It will not save anytime. The route should be on 189 not on a road that every uses to get to and from their neighborhoods. Clearly no one has done a study on the amount of ppl that use that side road that has neighborhood entrances and walmart business center off of. Clearly the ppl making decisions do not care about the residents of this town if you put a highway through their neighborhood. There are parks and trails DIRECTLY ON THE ROUTE! How dare you take our amenities away from us! And make our neighborhood unsafe for our children! Shame on you!!!!!!!!
636	Randy and Candi Christ	Hello, We would like to address the question of water in the northfields. We know this subject is covered in the report, but we would like to add my observations having been residents of the northfields for the past 10 years. Some say that this area has a pristine aquifer and that adding more roads will somehow destroy it. The truth is that the northfields are an open septic bowl with many roads already bisecting it. The cows are the real problem. The dead and decaying ones left on the ground as well as the living (please see the attached photos) The fields are covered with urine and feces and the creeks are carrying E.Coli (per Heber City). All this material is carried by the flood irrigation down into the groundwater and into the Provo river. The cities that receive water from the Provo river must treat it with chemicals to disinfect it before use. As has been shown by many studies, cattle farming is a detriment to the environment. This activity uses an immense amount of water and land just to make money. Most of the landowners are absentee and don't even live here. A new Highway 40 route through this area may be just the thing that saves the northfields! Would U-Dot consider designing and building a true system of water filtering and purification along with the new road, that would clean up the mess? That would be a win for everyone. If U-Dot can move a mountain (Highway 189), I'm sure such a system could be built to ensure clean water for everyone. Everyone knows that Preferred Alternative B is the answer to our transportation problem in the Heber Valley. Yes, it has been talked about for years but due to self interests nothing has been done. Those days are gone, the public demands a fix, a correct long term fix to the problem. Please proceed with the prefered route B without delay. Addressing water quality enhancements could be something to be included in future EIS studies. Sincerely, Randy & Candi Christ (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
25	Randy Christ	January 12, 2026 Hello U-Dot Team, I was so Happy to receive the announcement that the new Heber Valley Bypass will be using the Western alignment! I understood long ago that the Western route was the only one that really made sense for the long term. Anything else would just be a bandaid. Having been on my property at XXXXXXXXXX for 10 years now I are very aware of the issues that are occurring on a daily basis along our stretch of Highway 40. I live it everyday and have long advocated for a second route to the west of existing Highway 40 to take the heavy thru traffic and commuters off of our city streets. I support the Western bypass alignment 100%. As you know, Heber City has annexed most of the land north and east of Highway 40 and has approved a massive amount of new homes in this area. It is clear that this construction and development explosion could trigger a public safety crisis for thousands in our community. In the likely event of an emergency our first responders may not be able to reach the victims or respond in a timely way due to there only being one road that we all rely on. In the event of a major incident Highway 40 would become a parking lot for thousands of vehicles trying to get away. Power outages, medical emergencies, home fires, floods,vehicle collisions,wildfires, a plane crash, trucking hazmat accidents, earthquakes, civil unrest and other events call for multiple transportation options. This new western bypass will provide a second avenue of escape, an evacuation route, another way for police and fire to get where they are needed. The addition of the new Western bypass will be a time saver for everyone everyday and a lifesaver in times of crisis. I suggest that U-Dot add some kind of metric to the evaluation process that would take these factors into consideration. I can tell you from first hand experience that even a small fender bender at 900 North Highway 40 causes an immediate backup to start on all of Highway 40 both north and south. As the backup builds north of 900 N que of vehicles reaches my home at XXXXXXX. in minutes and has lasted depending on the severity of the accident sometimes for hours. As the backup continues to build back to the north people start to exit Highway 40 at Potter Lane and drive at high speeds along the gravel road 600 west. I can witness all this from my west facing living room windows and it makes quite a dust storm as the cars and trucks zip along to escape the backup. Please consider these additional factors in your evaluation and thanks again for selecting the Western Bypass Route. It is by far the best choice. Sincerely, Randy Christ
479	Randy Christ	U-Dot This week I attended the Heber City Council Meeting on the evening of March 3, 2026. During the meeting a letter was presented that was totally produced by "AI" in opposition to U-Dots plans to build a bypass through the Heber Valley. The council was asked to add their names to the letter and 3 of the 5 Council members refused to sign it stating that the U-Dot preferred route was the correct place for the new road to go and that the city should get on board with it or we may get nothing. The City Engineer Mr. Funk spoke with his support of the preferred west route stating that everything is in alignment and setup for the west bypass to connect the road system together. Please see the video recording of these proceedings on the Heber City website. My observation is that the two Council members that added their names to the letter did not even know what was in it. Their only concern seemed to be that it was negative of the U-Dot plans. We need a second road now. Traffic will be at a standstill here in two years. The EIS that was just completed shows that the proposal is good. Nothing is perfect but the west bypass is the best option we have left. Thank you R W Christ
436	Rebecca Devonas	I strongly oppose UDOT's option B route through the North Fields of Heber Valley and Midway. While I am not opposed to all healthy development, Utah does not need every inch of land handed over to developers, and if we're not wise with how we develop, we will do irreversible damage. My reasons for not supporting it are aligned with those stated in the change.org petition (https://www.change.org/p/stop-option-b-choose-a-smarter-bypass-for-heber-valley), so I will copy and paste them here: - Building through the North Fields puts a highway through the LAST large, beautiful contiguous agricultural area left in the Valley. - Portions of Option B would be elevated, permanently altering the valley view. - If long-term growth requires additional mitigation, that can be addressed through access management, frontage roads, and operational changes without routing a new highway through the North Fields. - The North Fields also have a high water table and watershed sensitivity, which is the entire reason they have not been developed yet. - Utah faces statewide water supply and water quality constraints; building major highway infrastructure in this location increases long-term risk. There are also farms and homes in the North Fields that would be plowed over, and that is private property. While I think Option B is the worst of the options, I don't think Option A is any better. If I'm not mistaken, it would be run parallel to the new high school where kids will be walking and playing sports, and the noise and dangerous implications of a highway are unacceptable close to a school. I am VERY interested in an underground tunnel as a solution. It's not difficult to build a one-way tunnel for a few miles. Cities like Boston, New York, and Washington, DC have built far more intricately complicated subway systems underneath the oldest and most historic structures of the country, and they did so successfully. Building a singular tunnel underneath untouched earth or even Main Street in Heber is not impossible, and I think it should be seriously considered. I expect to see UDOT listen to the residents' of Utah and other concerned parties comments on this bypass, and take immediate action to stop their plans to build through the fields. Thank you. Rebecca
437	Rebecca Devonas	To Whom It May Concern, As a resident of Park City, I strongly oppose UDOT's option B route through the North Fields of Heber Valley and Midway. While I am not opposed to all development, if we're not wise with how we develop, we will do irreversible damage. My reasons for not supporting it are aligned with those stated in the change.org petition (https://www.change.org/p/stop-option-b-choose-a-smarter-bypass-for-heber-valley), so I will copy and paste them here:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		- Building through the North Fields puts a highway through the LAST large, beautiful contiguous agricultural area left in the Valley. - Portions of Option B would be elevated, permanently altering the valley view. - If long-term growth requires additional mitigation, that can be addressed through access management, frontage roads, and operational changes without routing a new highway through the North Fields. - The North Fields also have a high water table and watershed sensitivity, which is the entire reason they have not been developed yet. - Utah faces statewide water supply and water quality constraints; building major highway infrastructure in this location increases long-term risk. There are also private farms and homes in the North Fields that would be destroyed, as well as animal habitats that need to be preserved. Just yesterday, I was driving through the preserved fields of Park City where I saw hundreds of elk peacefully grazing. We get to live among them because we respect their home. While I think Option B is the worst of the options, I don't think Option A is any better. If I'm not mistaken, it would run parallel to the new high school where kids will be walking and playing sports, and the noise and dangerous implications of a highway are unacceptable close to a school. I am very interested in an underground tunnel as a solution. It's not difficult to build a one-way tunnel for a few miles. Cities like Boston and New York City have built far more complicated subway systems underneath the oldest and most historic structures of the country, and they did so successfully. Building a singular tunnel underneath untouched earth or even Main Street in Heber is not impossible, and I think it should be seriously considered. I expect to see UDOT listen to the residents of Utah and other concerned parties' comments on this bypass, and take immediate action to stop their plans to build through the fields. Thank you. Rebecca
622	Renea Nilsson	To Whom It May Concern: As this proposal threatens the entrance to what is arguably one of the most bucolic valleys in Utah, I feel it is my duty to share my comments and urge you to reconsider this project. I am a Midway resident and own a business that operates in Heber. In addition, my family and I spend at least half of my family’s commerce in Heber proper, and I am very familiar with the traffic patterns as well as the beauty of the surrounding valley. I ask that you thoughtfully reconsider the following points: The water studies in the Fields were taken at low level time of year, a full year study is advised to gauge a more clear picture of the impact to the water level and environmental effect. In addition, the aquifers serve as a sequesterer for air pollution. Once drained, we have the unfortunate ability to have the air quality of SLC. The majority of traffic using Highway 40 and Main Street is local traffic—people who have a daily purpose in Heber. The “dangerous” commercial traffic that simply passes through downtown is minimal in comparison, which is reflected in your own studies. There has been little discussion around implementing meaningful commercial vehicle tolling. Charging commercial vehicles a higher rate to pass through could encourage them to reconsider their route, potentially shifting traffic back toward the Duchesne corridor through Price and onto I-15. This approach would reduce both miles traveled and the environmental and community impact currently experienced here. I urge you to consider regional traffic rerouting and potential highway construction in areas where congestion already exists. Heber has not yet fully addressed its own internal traffic issues. Until meaningful solutions are pursued locally, this project should not move forward. Heber is largely flat and well suited for alternatives such as electric bikes, bike lanes, bus systems, and other forms of mass transit that should be explored before considering a project of this magnitude. This isn't just about Heber, it will impact the lives and environment of multiple cities and counties, broader due diligence—and potentially voting measures beyond Heber alone—should be considered. Thank you for taking the time to consider the long-term impact this project will have on the people who live here, not just considering commercial businesses seeking a faster route through our valley. Sincerely, Renea Nilsson, LCSW Midway Resident and Heber Business Owner
82	Rich Doxey	Heber Valley EIS, I recently watched your video Presentation and within the Presentation you displayed the below image. Why is the rectangular parcel just north of 1200 S proposed as a "full acquisition"? (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
258	Rich Doxey	Please find the following comments on the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Draft: 1. Incorrect Full Acquisition Designation, Parcel XXXXXXXXXXXX In both Alternative A and Alternative B, parcel XXXXXXXXXXXXX (“Parcel”) is marked in full red to indicate a “full acquisition parcel”. I attended the January 28, 2026 meeting and after speaking with multiple UDOT representatives, they confirmed that it appears that “full acquisition” is an error that needs to be corrected. The Parcel is one 20-acre parcel within 95+ acres of contiguous land owned by the same owner. There are already plans for the development of the Parcel and an adjoining parcel. Development will occur prior to the UDOT’s timeline for building the highway. Access. There are currently two access points to the Parcel. First, there is access from the owner’s other parcels west of the Parcel. Driveways and roads are in the process of development and approved with development plans. Second, there is a right of way through parcels XXXXXXX and XXXXXXX to the Parcel described as follows: A Right-of-Way 1 rod wide, beginning at point 11.55 chains East of the Southwest Corner of the Southeast Quarter of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXX Salt Lake Base and Merdian and running thence East 1 rod; thence XXXXXXX; thence XXXXXXX rod; thence XXXXXXX XXXXXXX to the place of beginning. Required Right-of-Way. Additionally, UDOT representatives confirmed that the Parcel was not an entire parcel within a required right-of-way. The maps in the Draft EIS and at the meeting also do not show the entire Parcel is needed. The Draft EIS appears to need less than 3 to 5 acres of the Parcel for the highway and does not indicate why the Parcel’s full 20+ acres would be needed. The designation appears to be arbitrary given the surrounding parcels are not designated as full acquisition parcels and there is no on or off ramp nor physical characteristics of the highway in the Draft EIS that would indicate the need for full acquisition. Based on UDOT’s representations and the EIS report, it appears that 1) access to the Parcel can be maintained through owner design measures and the existing easement thereby eliminating the need for full acquisition of the entire Parcel; 2) the full parcel is not required for the highway; 3) the designation of full acquisition appears to be arbitrary based on surrounding parcels; 4) UDOT has failed to provide adequate information on why full acquisition would be necessary. Based on the Draft EIS definition of full acquisition and UDOT’s representations at the meeting, the Parcel should be reclassified as a partial acquisition because construction of the project does not require acquisition of the entire Parcel. 2. Utilities. Both Alternative A and B fail to adequately address locations where utilities cross the highway. Given the projected growth in the valley, as indicated by UDOT in the EIS, utilities routes are a foreseeable part of the impact on the location of the highway in the Heber valley. Whether Alternative A or B is chosen, the highway is cutting the valley in half and there are no designated utility corridors, utility capacity availability, or described environmental impacts within the draft of the EIS. It is foreseeable that the EIS needs to include plans for utilities that connect the valley. 3. Confirming No Frontage Road and No Change to Route impacting Parcel. At the January 28, 2026 meeting, while getting explanations of the maps, UDOT representatives confirmed there are no plans for a frontage road east of the proposed highway where Parcel XXXXXXXXXXXXX is located. Additionally, UDOT representatives confirmed that the location of the proposed highway where it touches Parcel XXXXXXXXXXXXX will not be materially moved (e.g. more than ¼ acre movement) without a new EIS study being done. 4. Highway Height at Parcel XXXXXXXXXXXXX. The Draft EIS acknowledges that portions of the project will be elevated (e.g., embankments, overpasses, elevated arterials). Elevation directly affects noise propagation and visual impacts. At the January 28, 2026 meeting, UDOT representatives indicated that the highway may be elevated due to an overpass near the Parcel, but there was conflicting information among UDOT representatives and it was confusing. Without disclosure of relative roadway height along individual parcels, particularly the Parcel, the Draft EIS understates and obscures foreseeable impacts, preventing meaningful public review. Given residential development is occurring on the Parcel and a church is nearby the Parcel, request is made to minimize and have as little impact on the Parcel (and surrounding land) as possible, including minimizing noise propagation and visual impacts. Thank you for your consideration, Rich Doxey on behalf of Nymphas Murdock Springs, LLC
661	Richard & Kristin Finlayson	March 9, 2026

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		(Submitted by both Richard Finlayson and Kristin Finlayson residing at XXXXXXXXXXX, Midway, UT XXXXX as two separate emails to hebervalleyeis@utah.gov as part of the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Open Comment Period.) Utah Department of Transportation Environmental Planning Division Salt Lake City, Utah Re: Public Comment — Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Study, Opposition to Option B Dear UDOT Planning Team: I write as a concerned citizen to submit formal opposition to the Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Study as currently framed. My comments address two distinct but related failures in UDOT's analysis, and I ask that both be treated as substantive objections in the public record. First, Option B is unjustifiable on its own terms. Routing a freeway-style highway through the North Fields would permanently threaten the valley's aquifer, destroy irreplaceable agricultural land, and impose nearly a billion dollars in public cost — for a project that UDOT's own traffic data shows will not solve the congestion problem Heber City residents actually experience. Option B must be removed from consideration. Second, and more fundamentally, UDOT has not demonstrated that this project clears the basic threshold of public justification at all. Before choosing between alternatives, UDOT must answer a prior question: why does a $760 million highway investment make sense when only 25% of Main Street traffic is the through traffic a bypass would address, the Olympic deadline used to drive urgency is not realistically achievable, and a less expensive alternative already exists that captures most of the mobility benefit? If UDOT cannot answer that question with a rigorous, published cost-benefit analysis, the correct answer is to do nothing — and preserve the North Fields, the aquifer, and the public's money. These comments address both questions in turn. If UDOT ultimately determines that some project is warranted, Alternative A is the only option that does not impose irreversible environmental harm. But that determination must be earned through honest analysis, not assumed. I. The North Fields Aquifer Cannot Be Adequately Protected Beneath the North Fields lies one of Heber Valley's most critical natural assets: the aquifer that supplies clean groundwater to the region. Routing a major highway directly above it creates a permanent contamination risk that no engineering mitigation can fully eliminate. Highway runoff carries a toxic cocktail of petroleum residues, heavy metals, tire particulates, and de-icing chemicals. Over decades, even well-designed drainage systems fail, and the consequences of aquifer contamination are effectively irreversible. UDOT's environmental review should treat the aquifer not as one factor to be weighed against others, but as a hard constraint that limits where a highway can responsibly be built. Option B fails that test. II. Once Farmland Is Paved, It Is Gone Forever The North Fields represent some of the last large, contiguous agricultural lands remaining in Heber Valley. They are not simply open space — they are productive working farms that have sustained the valley's economy and identity for generations. Option B would permanently convert this farmland to transportation infrastructure, a loss that is, by definition, irreversible. Utah's agricultural lands are under intense development pressure across the Wasatch Front. Every acre converted to pavement is an acre that can never be restored to production. Regional planning should treat the preservation of these fields as a priority, not a concession to be traded away for incremental improvements in traffic flow. III. Elevated Freeway Structures Would Permanently Disfigure the Valley Heber Valley's scenic, open rural landscape is not a secondary amenity — it is a defining feature of the community and a significant economic driver through tourism, recreation, and quality-of-life considerations that attract residents and businesses. Elevated freeway-style structures rising above the valley floor would irrevocably alter that character. Any highway improvement in the valley should be designed to integrate with the landscape — remaining at grade, minimizing visual intrusion, and respecting the scale of the surrounding environment. Option B does the opposite. IV. The Travel-Time Benefit Is Too Small to Justify the Harm

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Available information suggests the travel-time difference between Option B and surface-level alternatives may be only one to a few minutes under typical conditions, and unlikely to exceed five to ten minutes even in the most favorable scenarios. This is not a negligible consideration — it is the central one. When the benefit of a project is this modest and the costs are this permanent, the burden of justification falls heavily on those who propose the more disruptive option. I understand that Heber City leaders are rightly concerned about Main Street congestion. That is a legitimate problem worth solving. But solving it does not require destroying an aquifer, eliminating irreplaceable farmland, or erecting elevated freeway structures across the valley floor. Plan A and other at-grade alternatives can address congestion without those consequences. V. Option B Would Accelerate Sprawl Into the North Fields Transportation infrastructure does not merely serve existing development — it shapes future development. Decades of planning research and on-the-ground experience throughout the Mountain West confirm that new highway corridors attract commercial nodes, rezoning requests, and residential expansion, regardless of stated intentions to limit access. Once a freeway is constructed through the North Fields, the surrounding agricultural land will face relentless pressure for conversion. UDOT's environmental review should explicitly model this induced development risk and account for it in the analysis. The direct loss of farmland from highway construction would be compounded over time by the indirect loss of surrounding agricultural land to sprawl — a cumulative impact that belongs in the record. VI. $760 Million Cannot Be Justified — The Olympics Rationale Is Unrealistic, and the Math Doesn't Work Option B now carries a price tag of $760.5 million — up nearly $177 million from UDOT's own estimate just nine months earlier — and UDOT has acknowledged it could rise further before construction begins. When examined against what this project actually delivers, and for whom, the expenditure cannot be justified. Start with UDOT's stated timeline. UDOT has publicly described completing Option B before the 2034 Winter Olympics as a priority goal. But when UDOT announced its preferred route in January 2026, Wasatch County's own manager said on the record — reported by KPCW — that Option B is 'a monumental undertaking for a state agency, and one that I think is going to be difficult to meet and have completed by the 2034 Winter Olympics.' This is not an outside critic speaking. This is the senior administrative official of the county that stands to benefit most from the project. UDOT's budget documents reinforce the concern: all anticipated revenues are already committed through 2031, meaning Option B cannot even break ground until the Legislature allocates new funding through the State Transportation Improvement Program — a process with no guaranteed outcome or timeline. The public and UDOT should be asked to confront what this means in practice. There are two possibilities, and both are bad. Either Option B is not completed before February 2034 — in which case the Olympic rationale for choosing it over Alternative A evaporates entirely, and the valley will have committed to a more destructive and more expensive alternative for no Olympic benefit whatsoever. Or construction is underway during the Games themselves — in which case the U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 corridor through Heber Valley, the very route that the Provo Scenic Skiway promotes as a gateway to Deer Valley and Park City, will be an active construction zone during one of the largest international sporting events Utah has ever hosted. Either outcome is damaging. UDOT has not explained how it avoids both. The Olympic deadline is not a justification for Option B — it is an unresolved liability. Even setting the timeline aside, the cost-benefit arithmetic is devastating. UDOT's own traffic analysis found that only 25% of Main Street traffic is genuine regional pass-through traffic. The remaining 75% is local or commuter in origin — traffic that a bypass will not remove from Main Street, because those drivers are going to destinations in Heber Valley, not through it. Option B is therefore not a solution to Heber City's congestion problem. It is a $760 million freeway built for a quarter of the traffic. What does that quarter of the traffic actually gain? By UDOT's own projections, Option B reduces travel time along the corridor to approximately 10 minutes, compared to a no-build scenario of 20 minutes. Alternative A achieves most of that same result at $49 million less. The incremental benefit of Option B over Alternative A — a few additional minutes of travel time for through traffic — is what the extra cost buys. No serious transportation cost-benefit framework supports spending hundreds of millions of additional dollars to save a few minutes for vehicles that represent a quarter of total corridor traffic. It is also worth asking plainly who that 25% of through traffic consists of. In December 2025, Provo Airport, Deer Valley Resort, Sundance Mountain Resort, Ski Utah, Visit Park City and other partners formally launched the 'Provo Scenic Skiway' — a joint marketing initiative designating U.S. 189 as a named scenic corridor from Provo Airport through Heber Valley to the Park City and Deer Valley ski resorts. The stated purpose is to promote Provo Airport as a resort gateway. Deer Valley is also an official venue for the Utah 2034 Winter Olympics. The U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 corridor through Heber Valley is the connecting link between these commercial interests. UDOT owes the public an honest answer to this question: is Option B primarily a solution to Heber City's local traffic problem, or is it a high-capacity resort-access freeway whose primary beneficiaries are ski tourists and commercial resort operators? If it is the latter, that should be stated plainly in the environmental record — and the cost-benefit analysis should reflect who is actually being served by a $760 million public investment. Heber Valley's farmland and groundwater are not a fair price for a freeway that won't be built in time for the Olympics, won't fix local congestion, and exists largely to move visitors more quickly from Provo Airport to Deer Valley. Summary of Requests

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I respectfully urge UDOT to address the following two threshold questions before proceeding further with this project. On the threshold question of whether any project is justified: • Publish a rigorous, itemized cost-benefit analysis for the project as a whole — including a breakdown of Main Street traffic by origin (local, commuter, and true pass-through), a transparent accounting of which populations and interests are the primary beneficiaries of a bypass, and a clear explanation of why $760 million in public funds is warranted when only 25% of corridor traffic is the through traffic a bypass addresses; • Provide an honest assessment of whether the 2034 Olympic timeline is achievable given that UDOT's own budget is committed through 2031 and Legislative appropriation has not been secured — and explain what happens to the Heber Valley corridor if construction is active but incomplete during the Games; and • Seriously evaluate the no-build alternative on its merits. If this project cannot clear a transparent cost-benefit threshold, the correct outcome is to do nothing — preserving the North Fields, protecting the aquifer, and returning the public's money to higher-priority uses across Utah's transportation network. If UDOT determines that a project is warranted, on the choice between alternatives: • Eliminate Option B from further consideration — it cannot be justified environmentally, fiscally, or on traffic grounds; • Treat protection of the North Fields aquifer as a non-negotiable constraint on any route, not a factor to be weighed against other project goals; • Commit to at-grade, surface-level solutions within or adjacent to existing corridors; and • Include induced development analysis in the environmental review, with explicit modeling of land-use changes attributable to each alternative. Heber Valley is one of the few places along the Wasatch Front where productive agriculture, clean water, and genuine rural character still coexist. That is not an accident of geography — it is the result of deliberate choices made by previous generations of planners, farmers, and residents. This generation faces a choice of the same kind. The burden of proof in this process rests with UDOT, not with the public. It is not the responsibility of Heber Valley residents to prove that a $760 million freeway through irreplaceable farmland is a bad idea. It is UDOT's responsibility to prove — with transparent data, honest cost-benefit accounting, and a credible timeline — that it is a good one. On the evidence currently available, it has not come close to meeting that burden. Until it does, the right answer is to build nothing, harm nothing, and spend nothing. Thank you for considering these comments. Sincerely, Richard & Kristin Finlayson XXXXXXXXXX. Midway, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
686	Richard and Linda Turner	We live on XXXXXXXXXXXX the southern end of the proposed Heber City bypass corridor. Our preferred alternative for the bypass is the “no-build" alternative. Huge swaths of Heber Valley’s agricultural land taken for large roundabouts, exchanges, wide, four-lane roads with medians, etc. would destroy the beauty and appeal of Heber Valley and our quality of life—just so the occasional travelers who have no connection or interest in our valley can save a minute or two. If a bypass system is forced upon us, we want it to be as minimally invasive as possible. We are opposed to the proposed route that would take so much of the “North Fields” of Heber Valley, but we are also opposed to large tracts being taken at the southern end of the bypass corridor for an excessively wide road and a huge roundabout. As local residents, we are willing to live with the inconvenience of increased traffic through Heber City rather than the far more disruptive (to us) bypass and the destroyed esthetics of our valley. Heber Valley is beautiful and charming. We believe people traveling through would not miss the few extra minutes spent savoring it.
56	Richard Cote	As a resident of Heber City, I applaud U-DOT for recognizing the impact that long range commercial traffic, especially large double load tractor trailers, has on the traffic, commute times and quality of life in the city. I believe that Alternate Plan B is the only viable plan. It is the only one that will mitigate traffic in downtown Heber and it has less impact on existing homes and businesses. Further, although Plan B will have a slightly greater impact on the north field wetlands in the short term, it appears that the mitigation plan and nature corridor will more than compensate, because these areas are likely to be sold off for commercial development

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		if Plan B is not approved, thus having a far greater impact on these areas. In short, Plan A makes no sense as it does not serve the purpose of traffic mitigation, preservation of downtown Heber, will have a deleterious effect on existing property values and will degrade the quality of life of the area.
36	Richard Eichner	My wife a d I are opposed to th3 proposed bypass favored by UDOT. It will not take truck traffic off Main Street and destroy a valuable trout fishery on the Provo River. Sent from my iPad
632	Richard Finlayson	March 9, 2026 (Submitted by both Richard Finlayson and Kristin Finlayson residing at XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Midway, UT XXXXX as two separate emails to hebervalleyeis@utah.gov as part of the Heber Valley Corridor EIS Open Comment Period.) Utah Department of Transportation Environmental Planning Division Salt Lake City, Utah Re: Public Comment — Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Study, Opposition to Option B Dear UDOT Planning Team: I write as a concerned citizen to submit formal opposition to the Heber Valley Transportation Corridor Study as currently framed. My comments address two distinct but related failures in UDOT's analysis, and I ask that both be treated as substantive objections in the public record. First, Option B is unjustifiable on its own terms. Routing a freeway-style highway through the North Fields would permanently threaten the valley's aquifer, destroy irreplaceable agricultural land, and impose nearly a billion dollars in public cost — for a project that UDOT's own traffic data shows will not solve the congestion problem Heber City residents actually experience. Option B must be removed from consideration. Second, and more fundamentally, UDOT has not demonstrated that this project clears the basic threshold of public justification at all. Before choosing between alternatives, UDOT must answer a prior question: why does a $760 million highway investment make sense when only 25% of Main Street traffic is the through traffic a bypass would address, the Olympic deadline used to drive urgency is not realistically achievable, and a less expensive alternative already exists that captures most of the mobility benefit? If UDOT cannot answer that question with a rigorous, published cost-benefit analysis, the correct answer is to do nothing — and preserve the North Fields, the aquifer, and the public's money. These comments address both questions in turn. If UDOT ultimately determines that some project is warranted, Alternative A is the only option that does not impose irreversible environmental harm. But that determination must be earned through honest analysis, not assumed. I. The North Fields Aquifer Cannot Be Adequately Protected Beneath the North Fields lies one of Heber Valley's most critical natural assets: the aquifer that supplies clean groundwater to the region. Routing a major highway directly above it creates a permanent contamination risk that no engineering mitigation can fully eliminate. Highway runoff carries a toxic cocktail of petroleum residues, heavy metals, tire particulates, and de-icing chemicals. Over decades, even well-designed drainage systems fail, and the consequences of aquifer contamination are effectively irreversible. UDOT's environmental review should treat the aquifer not as one factor to be weighed against others, but as a hard constraint that limits where a highway can responsibly be built. Option B fails that test. II. Once Farmland Is Paved, It Is Gone Forever The North Fields represent some of the last large, contiguous agricultural lands remaining in Heber Valley. They are not simply open space — they are productive working farms that have sustained the valley's economy and identity for generations. Option B would permanently convert this farmland to transportation infrastructure, a loss that is, by definition, irreversible. Utah's agricultural lands are under intense development pressure across the Wasatch Front. Every acre converted to pavement is an acre that can never be restored to production. Regional planning should treat the preservation of these fields as a priority, not a concession to be traded away for incremental improvements in traffic flow. III. Elevated Freeway Structures Would Permanently Disfigure the Valley Heber Valley's scenic, open rural landscape is not a secondary amenity — it is a defining feature of the community and a significant economic driver through tourism, recreation, and quality-of-life considerations that

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		attract residents and businesses. Elevated freeway-style structures rising above the valley floor would irrevocably alter that character. Any highway improvement in the valley should be designed to integrate with the landscape — remaining at grade, minimizing visual intrusion, and respecting the scale of the surrounding environment. Option B does the opposite. IV. The Travel-Time Benefit Is Too Small to Justify the Harm Available information suggests the travel-time difference between Option B and surface-level alternatives may be only one to a few minutes under typical conditions, and unlikely to exceed five to ten minutes even in the most favorable scenarios. This is not a negligible consideration — it is the central one. When the benefit of a project is this modest and the costs are this permanent, the burden of justification falls heavily on those who propose the more disruptive option. I understand that Heber City leaders are rightly concerned about Main Street congestion. That is a legitimate problem worth solving. But solving it does not require destroying an aquifer, eliminating irreplaceable farmland, or erecting elevated freeway structures across the valley floor. Plan A and other at-grade alternatives can address congestion without those consequences. V. Option B Would Accelerate Sprawl Into the North Fields Transportation infrastructure does not merely serve existing development — it shapes future development. Decades of planning research and on-the-ground experience throughout the Mountain West confirm that new highway corridors attract commercial nodes, rezoning requests, and residential expansion, regardless of stated intentions to limit access. Once a freeway is constructed through the North Fields, the surrounding agricultural land will face relentless pressure for conversion. UDOT's environmental review should explicitly model this induced development risk and account for it in the analysis. The direct loss of farmland from highway construction would be compounded over time by the indirect loss of surrounding agricultural land to sprawl — a cumulative impact that belongs in the record. VI. $760 Million Cannot Be Justified — The Olympics Rationale Is Unrealistic, and the Math Doesn't Work Option B now carries a price tag of $760.5 million — up nearly $177 million from UDOT's own estimate just nine months earlier — and UDOT has acknowledged it could rise further before construction begins. When examined against what this project actually delivers, and for whom, the expenditure cannot be justified. Start with UDOT's stated timeline. UDOT has publicly described completing Option B before the 2034 Winter Olympics as a priority goal. But when UDOT announced its preferred route in January 2026, Wasatch County's own manager said on the record — reported by KPCW — that Option B is 'a monumental undertaking for a state agency, and one that I think is going to be difficult to meet and have completed by the 2034 Winter Olympics.' This is not an outside critic speaking. This is the senior administrative official of the county that stands to benefit most from the project. UDOT's budget documents reinforce the concern: all anticipated revenues are already committed through 2031, meaning Option B cannot even break ground until the Legislature allocates new funding through the State Transportation Improvement Program — a process with no guaranteed outcome or timeline. The public and UDOT should be asked to confront what this means in practice. There are two possibilities, and both are bad. Either Option B is not completed before February 2034 — in which case the Olympic rationale for choosing it over Alternative A evaporates entirely, and the valley will have committed to a more destructive and more expensive alternative for no Olympic benefit whatsoever. Or construction is underway during the Games themselves — in which case the U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 corridor through Heber Valley, the very route that the Provo Scenic Skiway promotes as a gateway to Deer Valley and Park City, will be an active construction zone during one of the largest international sporting events Utah has ever hosted. Either outcome is damaging. UDOT has not explained how it avoids both. The Olympic deadline is not a justification for Option B — it is an unresolved liability. Even setting the timeline aside, the cost-benefit arithmetic is devastating. UDOT's own traffic analysis found that only 25% of Main Street traffic is genuine regional pass-through traffic. The remaining 75% is local or commuter in origin — traffic that a bypass will not remove from Main Street, because those drivers are going to destinations in Heber Valley, not through it. Option B is therefore not a solution to Heber City's congestion problem. It is a $760 million freeway built for a quarter of the traffic. What does that quarter of the traffic actually gain? By UDOT's own projections, Option B reduces travel time along the corridor to approximately 10 minutes, compared to a no-build scenario of 20 minutes. Alternative A achieves most of that same result at $49 million less. The incremental benefit of Option B over Alternative A — a few additional minutes of travel time for through traffic — is what the extra cost buys. No serious transportation cost-benefit framework supports spending hundreds of millions of additional dollars to save a few minutes for vehicles that represent a quarter of total corridor traffic. It is also worth asking plainly who that 25% of through traffic consists of. In December 2025, Provo Airport, Deer Valley Resort, Sundance Mountain Resort, Ski Utah, Visit Park City and other partners formally launched the 'Provo Scenic Skiway' — a joint marketing initiative designating U.S. 189 as a named scenic corridor from Provo Airport through Heber Valley to the Park City and Deer Valley ski resorts. The stated purpose is to promote Provo Airport as a resort gateway. Deer Valley is also an official venue for the Utah 2034 Winter Olympics. The U.S. 40 / U.S. 189 corridor through Heber Valley is the connecting link between these commercial interests.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		UDOT owes the public an honest answer to this question: is Option B primarily a solution to Heber City's local traffic problem, or is it a high-capacity resort-access freeway whose primary beneficiaries are ski tourists and commercial resort operators? If it is the latter, that should be stated plainly in the environmental record — and the cost-benefit analysis should reflect who is actually being served by a $760 million public investment. Heber Valley's farmland and groundwater are not a fair price for a freeway that won't be built in time for the Olympics, won't fix local congestion, and exists largely to move visitors more quickly from Provo Airport to Deer Valley. Summary of Requests I respectfully urge UDOT to address the following two threshold questions before proceeding further with this project. On the threshold question of whether any project is justified: • Publish a rigorous, itemized cost-benefit analysis for the project as a whole — including a breakdown of Main Street traffic by origin (local, commuter, and true pass-through), a transparent accounting of which populations and interests are the primary beneficiaries of a bypass, and a clear explanation of why $760 million in public funds is warranted when only 25% of corridor traffic is the through traffic a bypass addresses; • Provide an honest assessment of whether the 2034 Olympic timeline is achievable given that UDOT's own budget is committed through 2031 and Legislative appropriation has not been secured — and explain what happens to the Heber Valley corridor if construction is active but incomplete during the Games; and • Seriously evaluate the no-build alternative on its merits. If this project cannot clear a transparent cost-benefit threshold, the correct outcome is to do nothing — preserving the North Fields, protecting the aquifer, and returning the public's money to higher-priority uses across Utah's transportation network. If UDOT determines that a project is warranted, on the choice between alternatives: • Eliminate Option B from further consideration — it cannot be justified environmentally, fiscally, or on traffic grounds; • Treat protection of the North Fields aquifer as a non-negotiable constraint on any route, not a factor to be weighed against other project goals; • Commit to at-grade, surface-level solutions within or adjacent to existing corridors; and • Include induced development analysis in the environmental review, with explicit modeling of land-use changes attributable to each alternative. Heber Valley is one of the few places along the Wasatch Front where productive agriculture, clean water, and genuine rural character still coexist. That is not an accident of geography — it is the result of deliberate choices made by previous generations of planners, farmers, and residents. This generation faces a choice of the same kind. The burden of proof in this process rests with UDOT, not with the public. It is not the responsibility of Heber Valley residents to prove that a $760 million freeway through irreplaceable farmland is a bad idea. It is UDOT's responsibility to prove — with transparent data, honest cost-benefit accounting, and a credible timeline — that it is a good one. On the evidence currently available, it has not come close to meeting that burden. Until it does, the right answer is to build nothing, harm nothing, and spend nothing. Thank you for considering these comments. Sincerely, Richard & Kristin Finlayson XXXXXXXXXXX Midway, UT XXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		XXXXXXXXXXXXX
300	Riley Leach	I believe the negatives for this project far outweighs the benefits/time savings you will get. The farmland should not be torn up to build this highway. A better alternative needs to be thought up for this. I would rather have semi-trucks drive through main street for the next 50 years than what has so far been proposed.
79	Rob	B. Please B. We need to consider long-term solutions to a growing community and not anticipate continuing growth.
171	Rob Bouwhuis (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Okay. So I just think -- I think we all need to realize that this needs to happen, as far as a bypass. I think to say it's not going to impact Main Street at all, we're kidding ourselves. If we look at the times and the projections that they have, it's not going from, you know, 90 seconds. It's saving -- if we do no action, it's talking about a 20-minute commute across Main Street to that area -- down to a 10 minute or 11 minute, whichever kind of scheme you choose. I think it's something that needs to happen. I do think that part of the -- there's a lot of negatives to some of the -- to both of the schemes they have here that are kind of getting over a little bit by the North Fields as well. That's been addressed a lot tonight. But the 1300 South area -- if you look at the renderings that they have out there, basically all the way from where, you know, you have the big wide intersection there, all the way down through, you know, past Walmart and America First, all those kind of areas -- it's all an elevated freeway, which is not something I think is appropriate for Heber Valley. I think that needs to change. It creates a massive wall between those two areas of the community, which I think is getting overlooked a little bit because of the North Fields issue. Also, I'd like to say -- you look at some of the renderings. You have some of the renderings of, like, from Muirfield Park. It looks like a great, you know, road. Open space around it on both sides. It looks great. I think more of the corridor needs to have that. And as you've all probably traveled through Park City from Kimball Junction to Main Street, you probably also have traveled from the intersection by the -- just up here closer and into there kind of by the high school and that kind of stuff. But you notice when you come in on that corridor, you have a lot of congestion there at the beginning by Kimball Junction, but then when you get down by the -- by the white barn and stuff like that, you have a lot of open space that's open to you. After you pass that a little farther, there's still a lot of open space on both sides of the road that makes it -- you do not realize how much development is actually close to you. And so -- but then that was done because they preserved the land and did what was necessary to preserve land along the corridor where which you're traveling. I think we need to basically learn from that. And whether it's Option A or Option B, honestly, both of them, we need to do the efforts to preserve the land around it. If we maintain area open along that corridor on either option, then it's going to be a lot nicer feeling than if we just let it go and happen whatever happens because it's going to become like a lot of the roads down on Wasatch Front and other things like that. Some said it's like a magnet, you know, bringing development on there. I think we need to make sure we open -- we create the open space and protect it in perpetuity, because when we want to drive along that corridor, we want to see the views. We want to see everything else. We don't want to just see a bunch of big boxes and stuff like that. So this -- and, also, it's needed, I think, to have the bypass, but it's also an opportunity to make sure we have smart growth and maintain some of that field that we can have if we protect that area for that. So I call on UDOT to do what they can do to do that, on the county, as well as Heber City to make the efforts to protect those areas along the corridor.
707	Rob Bouwhuis	To Whom It May Concern, My name is Rob Bouwhuis from Midway, UT. Thank you for your time and consideration regarding the routes proposed for the Heber Valley Bypass. I have a degree in Civil Engineering and understand traffic design concepts. I am also a licensed Architect and I value the sense of place created by the built environment. I volunteered on the Midway Planning Commission for many years and I love to see responsible and thoughtful development that maintains, and improves where possible, the quality of life. I have a few comments: I support the bypass road as I feel like it will greatly improve the flow of traffic in the valley and prevent it from getting worse as the population continues to grow. I hope that it will significantly improve traffic on Main Street in Heber, as I feel like it would. I prefer Option B for the route because of the following reasons: I love the rural feel in the Heber Valley and want to maintain it as much as possible. I would hope that as we develop within the valley that it will not create a feel of a typical suburban area. I think we should select Option B and we protect as much of the surrounding land from development. Doing so will help us maintain a rural feel when driving along this corridor. Driving along a roadway with open space around it will greatly improve the feel and help maintain the rural atmosphere that is so loved. With the necessary wetland mitigation, we could protect the land adjacent to the roadway and thus increase the protected open space. As I understand the wetland mitigation requirements, for every acre of wetlands impacted, an additional 2-15 acres of non-wetland must be protected. According to a UDOT employee I spoke with at the open house, UDOT is budgeting 5 acres of protected new wetlands for every impacted acre. I hope that this number remains this high or higher in order to protect additional open space. I know many have expressed concern over the potential damage to the quality of the wetlands and the aquifers. I would expect that the necessary mitigation measures will be used to protect the environmental quality of these natural resources. Please ensure you complete the necessary steps to achieve this. I do not want land around the new roadway to be developed with buildings and additional infrastructure. I would like to see as much land protected along the entire corridor as possible to help maintain the open space feel. The renderings and plans showing the bypass road in option A, which follows the existing alignment of Highway 40, do not create an inviting feel in that area. The addition of frontage roads and elevated bypass sections creates a physical barrier, making that area unpleasant. Development already in place in this section does not work as well along the bypass. While I don't necessarily like increased development, I feel that area should continue developing in a way that matches the existing surroundings. I love to see multi-use trails. I was the chairman for 8 years of the Midway Parks and Trails Committee. I think that trails improve the quality of life for all of the residents and visitors. A multiuse trail along Option B, surrounded by protected open space, would be a tremendous asset to the Heber Valley Population! Given the nature of the surrounding areas and the proposed design, a trail along the option A route would be less appealing (although still desired regardless of the selected option). Similar trails have become wonderful community assets in other areas such as Legacy Highway and similar areas in the state. I strongly feel like the elevated freeway section on the south side of the project (along 1300 South) will be very detrimental to this area. This solution seems much more appropriate in a heavily urban environment—

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		which is not this place! This is shown in the plans and the rendering of this area. This elevated section will create a massive physical barrier in this area and will destroy the surrounding communities and developments. Please explore other options here! In speaking with UDOT personnel at the open house, I was told this was intended to keep as many existing movements and crossings in place as possible in this area. Limiting the number of roadway crossings in this area would be worthwhile if it means avoiding massive bridges and elevated freeway sections. In my opinion, this is one of the worst aspects of the presented design. I am concerned with the number of proposed bridges and overpasses. There are no bridges in the valley other than those that cross rivers. This proposal adds a LOT of them. I understand the need for them from a traffic perspective. I hope that as these are developed attention is given to minimize their impact. The rendering provided for the area by Muirfield park is very nice comparitive to many of the others. The overpass that is shown is visually minimized and creates less of an eyesore. The earthen embankments on the sides of the roadway are preferable to the large concrete retaining wall sides shown in many of the other renderings. Where possible please provide earthen sides rather than concrete retaining walls. I understand this takes up more land but it is worth it for the improved quality of the areas. The design shown in this rendering is great for maintaining the rural feel and open space highly prized in this valley. Please create as much as possible like this along the entire corridor. I would be happy to discuss these ideas if helpful. This email or my cell phone woudl be great to get hold of me. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
241	Rob Young	Please change the plan to use 1300 South as the elevated portion of the bypass. How is it called a bypass when this portion puts high volume traffic in a residential and already congested part of town? Bypass is good. Make it a real bypass by diverting traffic out to existing more open land next to the airport on the South side . Rob Young Sent from my iPhone
683	Robert Howell	Dear UDOT, I'm writing this quickly because I just learned through the news that a major bypass is being proposed through the Heber Valley near the watershed that feeds Deer Creek Reservoir. I live along the Wasatch Front, and like most people here I depend on that water. From everything I understand, Deer Creek supplies drinking water to roughly 75% of the Wasatch Front. That makes it one of the most important water sources in the entire state. So I have to ask — why are so many of us just now hearing about a project that could potentially affect the quality and quantity of that water once heavy construction begins? If a project has the potential to impact a water supply used by millions of people, it seems like basic common sense that those people should be notified directly. Many of my neighbors are shocked that they never heard anything about this until recently, and now we're learning that public comment periods end today! I also have family in Wasatch County and know the valley well. From everything I'm reading, the proposed Alternative B route appears to be the most damaging option on the table. It cuts through wetlands, farmland, and wildlife habitat in an area that is already under tremendous development pressure. I've also fished the Provo River many times over the years. It's a well-known blue-ribbon fishery, and large portions of that system have important protections because of their ecological value. So I'm struggling to understand how a massive highway project right through that watershed is even being considered without serious scrutiny. It makes me wonder whether there is a major oversight happening here. From what I've learned, disturbing wetlands and waterways connected to a system like this can trigger review under the Clean Water Act, especially if the project affects waters connected to a major reservoir and drinking water supply. If that hasn't been fully evaluated yet, it certainly should be before any route is finalized. There is also the issue of drinking water source protection. Deer Creek is not just another reservoir — it is a critical drinking water supply for most of the Wasatch Front. Projects that threaten sediment, runoff, or groundwater disruption in a watershed like that deserve the highest level of scrutiny. In fact, when a single watershed provides drinking water for such a large population, it raises the question of whether this area effectively functions as a sole-source water supply for much of the region. If that is the case, placing a major highway project directly through that watershed seems like the opposite of responsible planning. At the very least, it deserves a far more careful review than what it appears to be receiving. This is especially concerning in a drought-prone state like Utah. Protecting water quality and quantity should be the number one priority of state government. It's hard to justify risking a watershed that serves millions of people just so commuters heading toward places like Park City might save a few minutes of travel time. And let's be honest — calling this a "bypass" feels misleading. The scale of what's being proposed looks much more like a major freeway. Anyone who knows that valley can see the difference. The cost is another serious concern. Once land purchases, mitigation, and inevitable overruns are included, this project could easily exceed $1 billion in today's dollars. Meanwhile there are traffic problems all over Utah that actually need attention. Spending that kind of money on a project that may not even solve the main traffic issues is irresponsible. The impact to wildlife alone should give pause. Bench development is already pushing animals into those fields. A highway of this size would permanently endanger habitat and force even more displacement and safety risks.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I also don't understand why smaller, more targeted solutions aren't being considered — the kind of bypass connections and improvements that have been used successfully in other parts of Utah to move traffic around downtown areas without destroying entire landscapes. One of my neighbors happens to be an attorney, and after talking about this project he said something that stuck with me: if the state pushes forward without fully addressing these environmental and water concerns, the lawsuits will be immediate and significant. That means years of delays and millions more taxpayer dollars wasted. So why not step back now and get it right? I've watched enough of these processes over the years to know that once a preferred route is announced, agencies tend to dig in and defend it. But in this case the concerns seem too large to ignore — water, wildlife, farmland, cost, and a lack of public awareness. At some point agencies have to remember that the public pays for these projects and the salaries of the people making these decisions. When so many residents, water experts, and local officials are raising alarms, it's time to listen. Please take a hard look at the concerns being raised and reconsider this route before moving forward. Sincerely, Robert E. Howell
130	Robert John Hicken (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Good evening. My name is Robert Hicken. I'm here representing the natives, the pioneers, the settlers of this valley, and the farmers. This goes right down the middle of our property. And I want to lead a -- I want to read a letter from Ulysses S. Grant. This is a land patent that our family received, and we still have the original signature. It says, "United States of America, to all who shall come, presents and it deposits in the general land office of the United States a certificate of register of the land office of the Salt Lake City, Utah territory. Whereby it appears that pursuant to the act of Congress approved May 20th, 1862, to secure homestead to actual settlers on the public domain." This is how Heber Valley was started to many of us. It goes on to say, "Know ye that there is, therefore, granted by the United States unto the said Thomas Todd to have and to hold this said tract of land with the -- said unto the Thomas Todd and to his heirs and assigns forever subject this land." It goes on and it says, "In testimony of, I, Ulysses S. Grant, President of the United States of America, have caused this letter to be patented." This is the heart of our valley. This is what brought us all here. Please, please, please, let's do not sell our soul for sixty cents. A little history -- when my great, great grandparents had this property, they dedicated some property to -- to Heber City, and that was where Main Street was going to be. And back in the day, in their wisdom, they realized that this was the heart of the valley. This is where wetlands are. This is -- this was not the place to put Main Street in Heber City. So let's remember to not do the same again today. Thank you.
138	Robert K Simmons (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Well, I've only been here a couple of decades, but I've had the opportunity to walk all over the North Fields summer, winter, fall, spring, dry years, wet years. And the North Fields is an area that is a complex interaction between natural streams, irrigation, ditches, laterals, and groundwater, and this is a very complicated situation. When -- if and when they build Alternative B, you're basically going to create a dam that cuts across the valley. The water flows from northeast to southwest. It's going to stop and -- and irreversibly change that flow of water. The -- when you build a road, you're going to compact the ground immensely. The hydraulic conductivity is going to radically change, and water is just not going to move the way it used to, and that will cause irreversible damages. Now, I'm probably the only one in this room other than UDOT who has conducted EISes all over the country and internationally. I've submitted comments to these effects, but I have not seen any response by UDOT. In my opinion, the -- these water issues are very important, and in my opinion, again, the EIS is fatally flawed.
625	Robert McDOnald	March 9, 2026 To Whom it May Concern: Located on the back of the Wasatch Mountains is one of the most beautiful valleys in the world. It has been featured numerous times in different publications for its pastoral beauty. Early Salt Lake pioneers trekked over the mountains and were excited to see a beautiful valley to the East and returned home to spread the word. The first summer a company of pioneers camped at London spring overlooking the North Fields while they built their homes in Heber. Through the years the settlers farmed in the North Fields and kept free from development for the next 150 years. Today as you travel South on Highway 40 into Heber Valley you get the grand view of the green open fields with Mount Timpanogos in the background. It seems unfathomable that the Utah State Highway Department would want to or even suggest running an almost 300 foot road through the middle of this beautiful gem. With all of the environmental problems that have not been completely addressed with this proposal, foremost should be the protection of this beautiful view shed and historical agricultural area.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Wasatch County Council, North Fields Irrigation, George Hansen and the Friends of Heber Valley and many others have written letters defining the deficiencies of Alternate B. It appears that UDOT's DEIS values historic property over historic wetlands and historic agricultural land. I've been a resident of Heber Valley my whole life. I was born 73 years ago while living in the North Fields and still live here today. I'm curious what it takes to be considered a historic building. There is not one structure on the West side of Highway 40 that hasn't been built in my lifetime, most of them in the last 50 years, not anything that should be called historic. They certainly are not on any State or Federal Historic Registers. It seems the use of historic in this case only fits UDOT's narrative. The complexity of the irrigation, subirrigation, irrigation tail water drainage, springs, canals, ditches, streams and sub surface water has not been addressed or considered with the excavation and then placement of mountains of earth and fill that will be placed to build Alternate B that intersects this whole agricultural and riparian area. Please reconsider the long term destruction of this beautiful agricultural area that will be gone forever if you proceed with Alternate B. Sincerely yours, Robert McDonald Debra McDonald XXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah
522	Robert Simmons	Attached are two files providing comments on the DEIS, one previously provided from 2022 and another dated 3/7/2026 (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
63	Rod Schrock	All, I support the Heber Valley Corridor recommendation by UDOT, so pls. count this as a positive supporter of Alternative B! One key comment concerns the River Road Interchange as I live on the north side of Midway, along with the majority of Midway residents: * The amount of traffic from Midway using River Road to Highway 40 during commute hours is already exceeding the intersection capacity. Most commutes require 2-3 light interchanges before one can exit River Road onto Highway 40. * Even given the recommended intersection with the Heber Valley Corridor with a flyover in central Midway, the most populated (and fastest growing) northern part of Midway will still prefer to take River Road to Highway 40. Going to the planned flyover in central Midway will be backtracking for the northern half of the city, and increase the left turn commute traffic from River Road to Main Street (which already backs up during commute time and has only a stop sign intersection). * As a result, I ask that you continue to pay extra attention to the River Road interchange to Highway 40. This should be considered a high traffic interchange to a highway and SHOULD OFFER 2 LEFT TURN LANES ONTO THE NORTHERN FEEDER ROAD TO HIGHWAY 40 FROM RIVER ROAD. River Road will continue to be the highest capacity left turn interchange throughout the Heber Valley Corridor, so pls. don't make the mistake of underdesigning the capacity needs of northern MIdway to get to Highway 40! Thanks in advance,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Rod Schrock Cell: XXXXXXXXXX
627	Ron Carlile	Our family has been property and livestock owners in the North Fields since its inception in 1860. We continue to own property there and cherish that area as a jewel of the valley, with the beauty, serenity and agricultural value that it provides. These features, along with their ecological beauty, make it a priceless treasure. Having said that, I believe it is important to state clearly that Option B is the only viable bypass choice. When discussion of a bypass first began 45-50 years ago, there were other more attractive and desirable options available. The most notable and practical route around the East side of Heber City would not have implicated the North Fields at all. Option A is a complete waste of taxpayer money. No sane trucker or traveler coming from the Uinta basin would take the bypass at 1300 South, go around Heber and rejoin Hwy 189 at 900 North. There is no incentive to do that. Traffic will continue to be at a standstill on main street. To keep the traffic moving and encourage the use of the bypass, overpasses need to be installed at intersections. Any thought of using roundabouts will only use up more valuable land and create more congestion. A real bottle-neck point will be at the intersection crossing SR-113 where traffic for the new Deer Creek High School and County Administration Building will generate much more traffic than is even there now. Overpasses are the key to success along the bypass route. With Option B being the only route that should be considered, great financial care should be taken to reimburse impacted property owners, who like our family, have been running livestock for generations. Because much of the North Field area is deemed “wetlands” extensive water flow, including aquifer mitigation planning needs to be made to maintain the ecological beauty of this valley. For the greater cause, Option B needs to be selected to get our Heber City Main Street back to manageable order and rebuild Heber City’s character.
198	Ron Clarkson	I read in the Wasatch Record today that "Residents push back on bypass". I want to voice my opinion in favor of Option B. The truckers will never take Option A bypass and we will still have the noise and congestion on main street. Option B provides the truckers a route at a higher rate of speed on a dedicated road. I envision fewer trucks on main street with Option B. I understand residents wanting to maintain the north fields. However, where were they when the developers of The Slope presented plans to the city and county? Progress is inevitable. Thanks Ann Clarkson XXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Ut Sent from my iPad
187	Ronald Moosman	I support route B. route A dose not encourage anyone to bypass Heber down town. if anything route A just recreate the problem in 15 years. The best solution would be taking the bypass all the way to river road. Not Potter lane.
68	Rosie Moore	Sent from my iPad - pardon typos, please (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
412	Roxanne Mula	Hello, My name is Roxanne and I am a resident of Heber Valley. I have reviewed both routes for the bypass options. I think option A is preferable for the sake of preserving as much of the natural beauty of the valley as possible. So many people choose to live here for the views, and so much is already changing and impeding that. If there were an alternate route to go on the east side of the valley, that would be even more preferable. Thank you for your time, Roxanne
225	Russell (Comment translated from voicemail)	yeah my name is Russell live in Heber looking at your alternative B that looks great traffic in Heber is just absolutely almost at a failure its crazy every day I drive it everyday the other thing we need is a bypass or an overpass at 40 and 32 there every night its backed up all the way up to Mayflower so alternative B thanks
498	Russell Piper	I have reviewed the draft plans for both alternatives, A and B. My wife and I both believe that plan B is by far the most logical alternative, to divert the most heavy truck traffic off of Heber's Main Street, with far less negative impact on the city, the planned expansion of the northern area of the city, and on both residences and businesses. In fact, I think it would be even better to start the northern end of the route much closer to the River Road intersection, but I am sure it is too late to start another alternative proposed route. In our opinion, building a bypass around much of Heber City is probably being finalized about 30 years after it should have been done, to have options for the absolute best bypass route. The traffic on Main Street makes walking along the downtown area of Main Street painfully noisy and dangerous. Traffic has been diverting along several adjacent streets running north/south and east/west to try and achieve better flow.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		There are limited opportunities to cross Main Street, and many of the traffic lights do not provide dedicated left turn arrows (now just providing blinking yellow arrows), so few vehicles can exit Main Street at a time, further slowing traffic flow and making Main Street more congested than necessary. This diverted traffic flows as far west as 600 West, and as far east as Mill Road (1200 East). Please finally make the decision and start construction. This project is long overdue and needs to be done as quickly as possible to improve our traffic problems. Thank you, Russell Piper (Heber City resident)
242	Rusty Pollard	Please don't ruin our beloved north fields! One of the few remaining treasures of the valley. No bypass—we don't want it!!! Downtown is already busy and just a thoroughfare. The bypass will not fix anything. Please don't ruin the north fields too. Logan tried a bypass as well and they ended up with two main roads and neither are effective. You would end up doing the same thing here and ruin the valley. No bypass! Rusty Pollard XXXXXXXXXX
505	Ruth Holmes	Dear UDOT, I am writing to request clear and complete written answers regarding the environmental impacts and mitigation strategy associated with Alternative B. Based on the environmental documentation, this alignment crosses numerous wetlands, springs, irrigation ditches, and groundwater features connected to the Provo River watershed and the aquifers feeding Deer Creek & Jordanelle Reservoirs. These resources are protected under the Clean Water Act, and impacts will require permitting through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as you have stated at the public meeting Federal law requires that projects affecting wetlands select the Least Environmentally Damaging Alternative. Given the number of wetland and water crossings associated with Alternative B, the public deserves a clear explanation of how this alignment could meet that requirement. Wetlands and Route Selection Please provide the following information: • How many total wetlands and jurisdictional water crossings occur under Alternative B compared with each other alternative studied? • If Alternative B crosses more wetlands than other routes, how can it be considered the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative? • Why was an alignment selected that appears to pass through some of the most environmentally sensitive wetland areas of the valley when nearby alignments appear capable of avoiding many of these impacts? Mitigation Banking, Credits, and Potential Mitigation Obligations Everything in the he EIS is quite detailed except the mitigation topic. It is very ambiguous and unclear regarding how wetland destruction associated with Alternative B would be mitigated Given the scale of wetland impacts proposed, the public deserves clarity now—not after a route has already been approved. Please provide clear written answers to the following: • Does UDOT intend to offset wetland impacts through mitigation banking or mitigation credits within the Heber Valley? • Does UDOT currently have outstanding wetland mitigation obligations or credit deficits from other projects that could potentially be addressed through mitigation sites created here? • Could wetlands created or restored in the Heber Valley be used to satisfy mitigation obligations held by UDOT or other agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? Equally important is the issue of long-term land control. • If wetlands are created or restored here as mitigation, who will own that land?

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		• Will those lands be controlled by UDOT, the Army Corps, a mitigation bank operator, or another public or private entity? • Will conservation easements or permanent land-use restrictions be placed on those lands, and who will hold those easements? These questions matter because mitigation banking can permanently transfer control of land and water resources. Residents must know whether wetlands in the Heber Valley could be used not only to offset impacts from this project but potentially to resolve mitigation obligations from other projects elsewhere. The EIS currently provides no clear explanation of these issues and instead defers key decisions to future permitting processes. That lack of clarity makes it impossible for residents to fully understand the long-term implications of this project. Aquifer and Water Supply Protection Because wetlands and springs are closely tied to groundwater recharge and valley hydrology, please clarify the following: • What hydrological modeling demonstrates that altering wetlands and groundwater features will not change aquifer recharge patterns in the valley? • What monitoring programs will be implemented to detect changes in groundwater flow or water availability over time? • What guarantees exist that this project will not affect the quantity or quality of water feeding the Provo River system and Jordanelle & Deer Creek Reservoirs? Mitigation Track Record UDOT has faced challenges with mitigation success in other parts of the state. Because of that history, the public deserves transparency. • What documentation demonstrates that previous UDOT wetland mitigation projects have met federal performance standards? • What long-term monitoring and enforcement mechanisms will ensure that mitigation sites associated with this project actually function as wetlands and protect groundwater systems? Transparency and Public Accountability If Alternative B truly is the least environmentally damaging option, UDOT should be able to clearly demonstrate that now. If it cannot, the alignment should be reconsidered or realigned to avoid unnecessary wetland impacts. These options do exist Choosing a route that crosses extensive wetlands and groundwater systems raises serious questions about environmental compliance and responsible planning. Residents of the Heber Valley deserve full transparency and clear documentation before any decision is made that could permanently affect our water systems, land, and future. We would also like the overall design to be like original plans without the overpasses and massive height changes This is the Wasatch Back where we value a slower pace and rural lifestyle and setting. The unbridled growth is difficult enough but most everyone I know will spend a few extra minutes in traffic to avoid destroying our fields and water and farmers and adding massive infrastructure Please respect the will of the people, as it's been made known well before you selected this path of destruction. By law in NEDPA, that is to be taken into consideration. Please be more transparent and move forward with integrity Sincerely, Ruth Holmes (we owned 100 acres in the north fields — the blue roof arena from 1997-2012
698	Ryan Hoffman	I am fully in support of the preferred alternative B route. If the bypass is too short, then not enough people will take it and it will cause too much backed up traffic on the north side of Main Street. I would even propose that it connects to hwy 40 further north.
15	Ryan Stack	This email is sent to confirm receipt of my public comment (below). Thank you.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		-Ryan Stack - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving regional mobility in the Heber Valley. This issue's importance is critical as we grow and plan for the Olympics. Two comments: 1) the western bypass (Alternative B) MUST become new US-40. If not, then this entire exercise will have been in vain. This is key to remove the semi (and tanker) traffic away from Heber's Main Street. Please make the bypass new US-40 and turn Main Street back over to the City as a City street. This is critical; and 2) please ensure this goes on the stip for the 2027 legislative session. Without funding and a plan, this will remain an empty promise to the Heber Valley. This bypass is integral to the valley's long term livability.
348	Sally Grant	We are writing to reject Alternative B, which proposes routing the project through the North Flats and here are our reasons: This presents serious risks to the underlying aquifer. The North Fields play an important role in groundwater recharge and water movement. Construction activity, soil disturbance and a long term roadway create significant aquifer contamination and causes degradation of water quality. We don’t think these risks are justified given the importance of this aquifer to local agriculture and surrounding properties. Additionally, we have concerns raised by the North Fields Irrigation Company as to the irrigation infrastructure, delivery systems, water rights administration and long term reliability. The proposed Alternative B threatens existing canals, laterals and access routes for the prior system maintenance and water distribution. This disruption will have lasting effects on agricultural use.. We strongly oppose Alternative B and request that UDOT remove tis from further consideration. Sincerely. Steve and Sally Grant Hideout, Utah
657	Sally Read	To Whom it May Concern--which is all of us!! Gerard Manley Hopkins wrote a poem that is meaningful for us and this valley we're trying to protect. (See below.) Our hope is that you will be thoughtful in how you proceed protecting our valley and our lives and for generations to come. Please consider these questions and statements as you make considerations: Why do people not recognize beauty in creation? Why do we allow our destructive work by exploiting creation? Our destructive work is making our valley less divine and more human. Sadly, our humanness is hurting the planet and our beautiful VALLEY and will hurt all of us--we are becoming ever more alienated from nature—we no longer touch it directly Please listen to the new proposals of roundabouts, and PLEASE do not destroy our North Fields. Greed is overcoming the beauty of what we want. Please do NOT succumb to greedy businesses like the Slope and other areas that are being overdeveloped. Sincerely, Sally Gardner Read God’s Grandeur Gerard Manley Hopkins (1844-1889) The world is charged with the grandeur of God. It will flame out, like shining from shook foil; It gathers to a greatness, like the ooze of oil Crushed. Why do men then now not reck his rod? Generations have trod, have trod, have trod; And all is seared with trade; bleared, smeared with toil; And wears man's smudge and shares man's smell: the soil Is bare now, nor can foot feel, being shod. And for all this, nature is never spent;

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		There lives the dearest freshness deep down things; And though the last lights off the black West went Oh, morning, at the brown brink eastward, springs — Because the Holy Ghost over the bent World broods with warm breast and with ah! bright wings.
684	Sam Deaver	To the UDOT Heber Valley Corridor EIS Project Team: I am writing to oppose UDOT's preferred Alternative B for the Heber Valley bypass and to urge the agency to either select a route with significantly fewer environmental impacts or pursue alternative traffic solutions that do not require a highway through the North Fields. The cost-benefit case is weak. UDOT's own data indicates that only approximately 25% of Main Street congestion is attributable to through traffic. Spending over $760 million a figure likely to grow well beyond the 2050 horizon year to address a fraction of the valley's traffic problem is a poor use of public resources. Critically, there is no mechanism to compel trucks or through traffic to use the bypass rather than Main Street, meaning the project's core promise may never be realized. The threat to the Heber Valley Aquifer is unacceptable. Both alternatives sit above a Class 1A aquifer — among the cleanest groundwater classifications under Utah State Code, which mandates protection "to the maximum extent feasible." A four-lane highway introduces chronic stormwater runoff pollutants (heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, de-icing chemicals) and catastrophic spill risk from the very diesel trucks the bypass is meant to reroute. The Draft EIS does not adequately demonstrate that long-term water quality can be guaranteed, particularly given the shallow water table in the North Fields. The destruction of the North Fields is irreversible. Alternative B bisects some of the valley's most productive farmland and ecologically significant wetlands land that has been in agricultural use for generations. UDOT's 2:1 wetland mitigation commitment, while noted, does not replace the loss of contiguous agricultural landscape, functioning irrigation systems, or the cultural and scenic character that defines this community. Once a highway is built through these fields, the damage cannot be undone. Alternative B's advantages are marginal at best. The travel time savings over Alternative A amount to roughly 40 seconds, yet Alternative B impacts substantially more wetlands and farmland. The Draft EIS identifies Alternative A as having fewer impacts to resources in the North Fields, fewer noise impacts, and less disruption to the natural landscape. If a bypass must be built, Alternative A — or the eastern realignment proposed by Wasatch County leaders that hugs closer to the existing US-40 corridor — would achieve transportation goals with far less environmental and community harm. I urge UDOT to: Reject Alternative B as the preferred route. Conduct a rigorous, independent analysis of whether targeted improvements to Main Street (signal optimization, truck restrictions, transit investment) could address congestion without a bypass. If a bypass is deemed necessary, adopt a route that minimizes intrusion into the North Fields by aligning as closely as possible to the existing US-40 footprint. Provide binding, enforceable protections for the Class 1A aquifer that go beyond the general commitments outlined in the Draft EIS. The Heber Valley's water, farmland, and open space are not acceptable tradeoffs for marginal travel-time savings. I respectfully ask that UDOT listen to this community and pursue a solution that does not sacrifice what makes this valley worth living in. Sam Deaver
613	Sara Coomes	UDOT committee: I’ve been involved in Heber meetings for years, and UDOT knows exactly how the people here feel. The middle of the North and South Fields is sacred farmland — the heart and life of this valley. Livelihoods for many. Yet the EIS ignores that reality and ignores the laws meant to protect it. I know you asked for public input related to the EIS so I will start with that. You disregarded the Agricultural Protection Area. You disregarded the Clean Water Act. You openly chose the route with the most wetland impacts, which means you disregarded the LEDPA requirement as well. It feels like UDOT believes it’s above both state and federal law. Why is that? Who is protecting you from accountability? You chose the most expensive route and expect taxpayers to pay more for less. Then you added massive overpasses, sound walls, and structures that were never shown in previous renderings and don’t reflect our valley at all. Where are your engineers? Why are we suddenly looking at a giant dike and a 65-mph highway through wildlife and livestock habitat — just so you can claim Route B saves a minute? And that minute isn't saved by locals, only those driving through. You ignored alternatives from local water experts. You refused to shift the alignment even slightly to accommodate a conservation easement of hundreds of acres that took over five years of painful progress. And then you claim you’re “preserving land”? You haven’t explained what mitigation will look like. You just defer. With this much land at stake, we deserve answers beforeyou move ahead with Alternative B — which is unlawful and should not move forward another minute. Pull it now and go back to the drawing board. UDOT only offered two alternatives and a “do nothing” comparison. That is not a real evaluation. And under NEPA, you’re also required to analyze long-term consequences — which you didn’t. We are the taxpayers.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		We pay your salaries. We are the residents. We are the ones who will live with the consequences of outside developers who show up to make a quick buck and leave us with the damage. The way UDOT has handled this shows a lack of respect for the people who actually live here and pay for these decisions. At the high school open house, after almost every comment opposed Alternative B, a woman asked a UDOT representative, I believe it was Craig or Carlos, how much weight public input carries. His answer? That UDOT “needs to educate us better.” That is belittling and infuriating. We are the ones educating you about our home. I was also at the Slope annexation meetings. They rushed it through while openly saying they’d get top dollar from UDOT when you need their land. In fact, the EIS says you will use master planned roads of the North Village. Have you looked at those roads? Of course not - they don't exist! So you are appeasing developers over landowners? You are being played. Heber City Council is selling us out and refusing to listen to the public — which is exactly why they want a bypass. Then they and CAMS come to you claiming their Main Street plaza can’t happen if the road is noisy. Meanwhile, they’re pushing overlay zoning downtown that will increase density and traffic even more. The public doesn’t want it. But developers on the council — and their friends — benefit. Instead of fixing the roads and traffic they already control, they blame UDOT for everything and demand a bypass while they continue approving projects that increase traffic. We are basically being held hostage here while they push UDOT to clean up their mess. They aren’t doing their part. And now we hear the governor saying Heber needs more low-income housing. The whole process feels like a joke. Your traffic studies were done on busy holiday weekends and only at “peak hours.” I request studies at all hours to show a true reflection. If we had basic measures in place now — timed lights, turn arrows, turn lanes, a climbing lane toward Park City — traffic would already be better. Heber needs to do its part, and so does UDOT. Every city in Utah is busy during peak hours. We do need measures in place now to help and we do need long term plans, but this bypass will only accelerate growth and further increase traffic, which the EIS lacks long-term growth induced impacts. And let's not forget that Main will also be the road used tor all the east -side developments, which is the vast majority right now. We really needed and still do need east side alternatives. And let’s talk about Park City. Their council told UDOT no to widening the road into their town, even though their own schools and resorts create the backup. UDOT listened. We expect the same here. UDOT and leaders cannot expect Heber to sacrifice our farmland, our water, and our health so their visitors can shave a few minutes off their commute. If Park City can wait in traffic, so can we. We can improve smaller corridors, manage flow, and make targeted fixes without destroying the North Fields. If you proceed, it will be in complete disregard for what matters most to the people who live here - our health, our water, and our air. The entire valley is frustrated. Do the right thing. We are not Park City’s thoroughfare just so visitors can save a few minutes. Park City and its hotel developers need to provide real transit options instead of pushing their traffic onto us. We are losing tourism, and that will raise taxes even more. Why are you just checking the public-comment box? You know there are real legal issues, yet you push forward anyway and waste our tax dollars as if it doesn’t matter. Who is pushing this? And why won’t you listen? I’m asking — no, I’m demanding — that UDOT stop pretending these are our only choices. We deserve real alternatives that follow the law, respect our farmland, protect our water, and reflect the people who actually live here. We deserve options that aren’t designed around outside developers, political pressure, or convenience for someone else’s growth. Give us solutions that honor this valley instead of sacrificing it. We are paying for this, we are living with this, and we will not accept anything less than responsible, lawful, community-driven options. Sincerely, Sara Coomes
117	Sara Kenney (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	I picked Heber to live in because I love the rural community and access to agricultural opportunities. I actually grew up in rural Virginia and have always lived in rural communities, and I used to have a bumper sticker on my car that says, "Farmland lost forever is farmland --" I mean, "Farmland lost is farmland lost forever." So we all know what putting a freeway in the middle of the North Field is going to do, and I've personally seen it happen before. According to the USDA, in five years between 2017 to 2022, we've lost 140,000 farms, or a 7 percent decline. And during the same time, we lost 20 million acres of farmland, which is the size of Maine. The same goes for our wetlands. Each year we lose about 60,000 acres of wetland. We've lost 27 -- almost 20 million acres of wetlands just since the mid-20th century. So we're just losing land and water that we value most to development and data centers and foreign interests. The North Fields are the heart of Heber Valley. It's the lifeblood of this community, and to destroy it for another highway would just be totally irresponsible in my opinion, along with destroying the environment for farmers who have planned for conservation easements on their properties. Many of them would likely be forced to sell their land because it will be unproductive, loud, and polluted. I don't like either bypass option because both would impact the land and do little to address the real problem. I think we should be planning more for the future and thinking about other modes of transportation, especially since most of the traffic is caused by local vehicles. So why not an expansion of Summit County's free high valley transit bus system with more daily scheduled routes between Heber and Park City. A lot of young people these days don't even want to get a driver's license. So why not public transportation, like ridesharing and bikes and, you know, safety measures like skyways or protected bike lanes. So the North and South Fields, to me, are not only invaluable farmland and wetlands, but they also are critical habitats to wildlife. People on Facebook are sharing pictures of deer and elk heards in the fields, and I just don't think I need to explain to you the importance of habitat for these animals. So I ask UDOT to go back to the drawing board and find a better solution than destroying the land that we all love. Thank you.
222	Sara Kenney	Hello, I’d like to know why UDOT is ignoring its open environmental impact study? Please refer to this article in the Tribune which points out how Alternative B has the most damaging impacts to our wetlands and

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		agricultural lands and does very little to reduce traffic compared to A. Why is the Clean Water Act being disregarded? There are other alternatives not even discussed such as public transportation expansion, night time schedules for big tankers and trucks, and others Thanks! Sara Kenney https://www.sltrib.com/opinion/letters/2026/02/04/letter-wetlands-or-driveways-that/
78	Sara Studebaker-Hall	Hello, I would just like to comment in favor of option B - if a truck has to come all the way to the new Smith as in option A, they will be more likely to just come through town. Though more expensive, option B seems to be best for the future vision of Heber we want. Thank you.
197	Sarah Treseder	I support alternative B if there HAS to be a bypass. The bypass is about 10 years too late. I hope you consider a northbound crawling lane to assist the truck traffic that a bypass will encourage. If there is a way to complete before the Olympics would be ideal. I appreciate all the time and effort that has gone into light coordinating on main st. To be honest I don't think we need the bypass at all as main st is overall easy to travel and only in peak hours is it a problem. Moab is a great example of just knowing the traffic is going to be shit and maybe avoiding peak times. Summer weekends are obviously brutal around here but otherwise it's all good. Sorry for the rambling, a lot of people won't bother to comment and I am just afraid Heber city Mayor is going to cause a lot of problems so want a Heber City voice to support the alternative B, that's not bypassing the bypass problem and alternative A destroys stuff the residents have already paid for and doesn't solve our problems. Thanks again. -Sarah Treseder XXXXXXXXXXX Heber City Sent from my iPhone
73	Sarah Ward	I'm in favor of Alternative B. I'm satisfied with the environmental mitigation plans for alternative B. Alternative A is just a short term solution as there will still be significant traffic backups.
145	Scott Brubaker (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hello, I'm Scott Brubaker, and this has been a great meeting. I think if it were something we could vote on, it's pretty obvious what we'd been voting on, but sometimes UDOT doesn't listen to us, and sometimes UDOT might accidentally get lost because they're a big bureaucracy. Just a little note. I've dealt with -- you know, I'm a developer, and so don't -- don't throw eggs, but I'm no longer acting as a developer, but I do sit on the planning commission for the county. I don't represent the planning commission in my remarks, but I can say that the county, over the last decade, has gone to extreme measures to promote and save the North Fields. There have been easements. There have been changes in the zoning law that will allow for these easements for the farmers to be able to stay on their land for them to be able to put perpetuity agreements in place. Okay. I think a lot of this has been said, but yet, when it really boils down to it, the parts that we can't really adequately address is the value of the North Fields to us. The value to the North Fields can't be calculated by the UDOT taking appraisals, and there will be appraisals made if they do takings. And it's been mentioned that the Option A is actually less expensive, and that includes taking businesses, homes, et cetera, but what does that mean to an administrator? Lots of work. You got to fight with homeowners. You got to fight with, you know, all these people. So there's all these takings that have to be taken care of. Now, if it were just me trying to get out of some work or not have the hassle, I'd just want to zip right through that clear patch of land where I don't have to deal with all those people, meaning maybe 8 or 10, but not 20 or 40 or whatever. So, you know, I would probably take -- want to that route if I were UDOT. Sometimes we forget -- in our business-like sense, we say, "This is business. It's worth X." This is open ground. It's not worth nearly as much as we got -- an appraiser would say there's the land value and there's the building value, but, in reality, we know where the value is for us. And to put a road that goes around -- around the value -- skip the North Field.
178	Scott Harrington	To the UDOT Project Team, I am writing as a resident of Midway to provide formal feedback on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Heber Valley Bypass. While I understand the transportation necessity behind Alternative B, I am concerned that a standard engineering approach will result in a permanent concrete scar across the North Fields—the heart of our valley. A standard highway design as currently proposed in Alternative B risks permanently dividing Heber and Midway while damaging our delicate hydrology. I urge UDOT to adopt a landscape-forward design that respects the unique character of this area, following these principles: Visual Recession: Maintain a low road profile and use earth-toned materials so the infrastructure recedes into the landscape rather than dominating it. Conservation: Utilize required wetland mitigation to create a codified Conservation Belt. This should act as a hard boundary to prevent future commercialization. Ideally, commercial access frontage roads should be removed from the proposal to ensure the bypass does not become a new commercial corridor. Rewilding: View this project as an opportunity to rewild the corridor, similar to the Provo River Restoration project, to mitigate the loss of agricultural lands. Utah's Legacy Parkway (SR-67) and US-191 near Jackson serve as excellent examples of how to integrate significant infrastructure with environmental stewardship. Given the projected cost exceeding $760 million, our community expects a solution that preserves the valley's future rather than a budget-driven design that compromises it. I look forward to seeing these technical and conservation-focused integrations addressed in the final EIS. Sincerely, Scott Harrington XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXX, Midway, UT XXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
205	Scott Jensen	Hello, My name is Scott Jensen. I am a Heber City landowner planning to begin residential construction within the next few years. As a current resident of Logan, Utah, I am writing to express my strong support for Alternative B as the preferred alternative for the Heber Valley Corridor. Having lived in Logan for over 40 years, I have witnessed firsthand the challenges of inadequate bypass planning. Our current "bypass" (10th West) has essentially become a second Main Street, burdened by commercial density and frequent traffic signals. This has resulted in two congested corridors rather than one efficient thoroughfare, significantly degrading the quality of life in our town center. I see this project as a critical opportunity for Heber Valley to avoid the mistakes made in Cache Valley. When examining Logan's 10th West Corridor, it is highly reflective of the design and likely outcomes of Alternative A. In my experience, that model has proven to be a disappointment, failing to provide true relief for the city center. Alternative A serves as a predictor of a similar failure in Heber: a bypass that quickly becomes just another congested local road. I believe Alternative B is the superior choice because it provides a true bypass, facilitating efficient regional mobility while preserving the historic character of Heber City's Main Street. By diverting through-traffic away from the town center, Heber City has a unique opportunity to revitalize its historic district into a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly space—avoiding the noise and congestion issues we currently face in Logan. Thank you for considering these insights as you finalize this much needed project! Best regards, Scott Jensen Best regards, Scott B. Jensen Scott B. Jensen XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXX
507	Sean Jordan	Please consider an alternative to the congestion in Heber Valley and elsewhere. Flooded (submersibles), partially flooded (boat), or air-filled tunnels (rail and vehicles). Consider the following visuals as concept designs. Multiple levels of tunnels for utilities, housing, and transportation. Rout from Pacific to Utah. Buoyancy forces displayed. Multiple levels of level loop tunnels for zoning development. Transitions between levels by vertical or sloped shafts. Problems: Rock salt stormwater runoff, winter weather driving conditions, barriers to wildlife migratory paths, old utilities, lack of water storage, rising fuel prices, decreasing land availability and affordability, lack of housing options, traffic congestion. Tunnels could solve all these problems. horizontal bar Mr. Sean Jordan Hummingbird Engineering, Owner Hummingbird Engineering XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXX Syracuse, UT XXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		(For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
628	Sean Summers	Structurally speaking it might be difficult, but it would alleviate traffic, never need to stop, and have no issues with snow or whether, do like the did in Boston (I think) put the "bypass" underground so it doesn't ruin the appeal of main street, improves traffic, encourages growth of plant life (reduces carbon/emissions), easier to maintain, doesn't need constant resurfacing/repairs due to weather/sun/plows.. there are much better options you could do than the ugly overpass/bypass or the dreaded roundabout that most don't know how to use/utilize properly. Option A goes right through my neighborhood and will ruin our homes and neighborhood. This is not Salt Lake or Provo and certainly not disgusting California. Option B will destroy the last remaining open land that we have, and people's farms! You should have thought about this and started long before now, you know when there weren't houses to worry about or no more land left! You don't care about the city, the people who live here, our homes, our land, nor the environment! The amount of pollution and run off and harm that will come from this will destroy the land, plants, water sources, our neighborhoods, our peace, and our safety. You are purposing option A that is right near schools, so your concern with the homes and schools safety for hundreds and hundreds of children mean absolutely nothing to you, or the Heber City council. They have ruined Heber and don't care about what the people want. Just shove more houses and businesses without a care in the world while enjoying our misery. They have failed to deal with the infrastructure and have a plan to handle the influx and this is what we are left with. No land, barely any water, traffic and idiots who can't drive, and the unsafe and damaged environment, plant life, land, and they have lost the people's trust. Honestly they should all be removed and Scott Phillips was no better. NO BYPASS!!!
24	Seth Glick	I believe you've made the best possible decision. While it may be emotional for some, it reflects a job done thoughtfully and well. I hope a multi-use trail through the north fields will be included to benefit the community. Thank you.
303	Severson B	Developing a road through the north fields of Heber Valley is destructive with very little benefit. I live in Midway. This would cause my kids to have to cross major traffic to get to their new high school. UDOT not considering midway's voice enough in this decision. They are listening too much to Heber city. Please take a county-wide poll and publish the results. This is unwanted by many
19	Shane	Thank you for your work. As hard as it is to have the route running through the north fields with the growth that has been approved by the county and the city the bypass needs to start farther north to avoid major issues over the coming years. Planning for the future is crucial. The best decision for the community was made.
105	Shannon Wilson (Comment translated from voicemail)	hi my name is Shannon Wilson w i l s o n Im a constituent and resident of Heber City Utah Ive been here for 23 years and I am greatly disappointed in the choice of putting a bypass road through Northfield especially an elevated bypass which as we know people in Utah are incapable of driving and keeping all four tires on the ground as is exampled in Provo Canyon on a weekly basis having a bypass road with an increase speed if theres an accident due to snow ice rain or stupidity could lead to an environmental hazard that could not only affect and hurt the population but also cause everybody to go on to Main Street which they already do at a lower rate it is ignorant and shortsighted and the time has passed for a bypass road Frontage roads are the only option that makes sense and protect our community and our environment as a whole you may give me a call back at XXXXXXXXXX if we would like to further discuss this my name is Shannon Wilson thank you and have a great day
565	SharDale Searle	I would support either one.But focus mainly on alternative b.But as a daily driver for employment from the u n to basin, the hebrew downtown has become a terrible scary and very life threatening drive.And as far as them worrying, whether people will lose on their tourism and their business.I never stop in hebrew unless it's at a gas station.We purposely bypass stopping there.Because of the traffic problems, we'd love to see this highway.Bypass, take effect a s a p
465	Shari Watkins	I am writing in opposition to Alternative B. This option would destroy the thing that makes Heber Valley a special place. I am 70 years old and have lived my entire life in Heber City. The North Fields have always been considered a unique and precious part of this valley. I do not understand why Alternative B is considered the preferred option by UDOT. The testimony is that Alternative B would only save a few minutes over Alternative A. Arguments for Alternative B include fewer disruptions or displacement for homes and businesses, but Alternative B is not without disruption. The major issue is that Alternative B would destroy that which makes this valley unique and precious. Alternative A will also disrupt businesses and homes, but it preserves more of the natural beauty of the valley. Officials may not be hearing from the majority of the residents. I can guarantee the vast majority of Heber Valley residents would prefer Alternative A over option B. There are a few vocal supporters of Alternative B, but the majority of the valley would greatly prefer Alternative A. Once the North Fields are destroyed by this road, there will be no going back. This disaster would be forever. Even New York City recognized the importance of open space. The North Fields are beloved by the residents. I urge UDOT to change its preferred solution to Alternative A.
703	Sharolyn Westra	Dear project team, I respectfully request that: 1. Aquifer and groundwater impacts be more rigorously analyzed and avoided where possible. We are in extreme drought conditions and all water sources should be avoided completely! 2. Lower design speeds be fully evaluated to reduce wildlife and safety risks 3. Existing infrastructure improvement alternatives be meaningfully studied 4. Growth-inducing impacts be fully disclosed and analyzed 5. The roadway classification be reconsidered to align with the stated non-growth purpose of the project and to reflect the agricultural area by minimizing overpasses and bridges. At grade options will suffice. We can live with intersections. 6. Be more fiscally responsible with our tax dollars. Alt B will cost way more than projected and this money should be used on other meaningful projects in our rapidly growing state.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you for the opportunity to submit a comment of record. I ask that these concerns be fully addressed before the project advances. Sincerely, Sharolyn
333	Sharon Kern	I am not in support of the new corridor proposed to bypass downtown Heber. Once again in life we would have to sacrifice our towns history, its beauty, the quality of small town life for concrete. The potential for disturbing the water source is too high of a risk especially since we are a state always at risk of drought. I know driving through Heber the roads are crowded and slow. But that's a choice everyone makes to either live in Heber or pass through. Please keep Heber beautiful. Kind regards, Sharon Kern Life is what you make of it. Seize the day!!
319	Sharyn Isom	Citizens of Wasatch County have been trying to save the Northfields (original spelling) in Heber Valley, Utah, for at least 19 years. I was involved in protesting a high-density development set for this sensitive area back in 2007. Please see the following archived article from the Salt Lake Tribune. https://archive.sltrib.com/article.php?itype=NGPSID&id=5569860 We, the people of this valley, overwhelmingly do not want UDOT's bypass to go through the Northfields that many of us have dedicated time and effort to preserving. This is our cultural heritage. This is our place to replenish. Please hear our voices. This project will ruin what people love best about living and visiting here. Since I am not a transportation expert, I am urging you to propose an alternative transportation option that truly meets the needs of this community. Please recognize that this proposal does not serve the residents, who have worked hard to preserve these fields and deeply value this open land. Respectfully, Sharyn Isom Midway, UT
616	Shauna Kieffer	Dear UDOT- I am writing as a local resident to formally submit concerns regarding the proposed bypass alternative as presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). My comments focus on water resource protection, roadway design speed, wildlife safety, inadequate alternatives analysis, and growth-inducing impacts that appear inconsistent with the project's stated purpose and need. 1. Protection of Aquifers and Water Resources The proposed alignment traverses areas critical to groundwater recharge and drinking water aquifers that serve Heber Valley and surrounding communities. Under the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. §§ 1251–1387) and Section 404 permitting requirements, projects must avoid and minimize impacts to waters of the United States, including wetlands and hydrologically connected groundwater systems. The DEIS does not adequately demonstrate avoidance or minimization of risk to aquifers, nor does it provide sufficient site-specific hydrogeologic analysis to support the conclusion that long-term water quality and recharge capacity will not be impaired. Given the irreversible nature of aquifer contamination, this omission represents a significant deficiency in environmental review. UDOT is not above the law. 2. Design Speed of 65 MPH and Wildlife Endangerment The proposed 65 mph design speed is the highest in the immediate region and exceeds speeds on surrounding connecting roadways. No adjacent or feeder roads operate at this speed. This discrepancy raises serious safety and environmental concerns. High-speed roadways are well documented to: - Increase wildlife mortality and habitat fragmentation - Reduce driver reaction time in rural and agricultural landscapes - Increase collision severity for both wildlife and motorists The DEIS does not adequately analyze wildlife mortality risk associated with a 65 mph design speed, nor does it meaningfully evaluate lower-speed alternatives that could reduce harm while still meeting transportation objectives. This is inconsistent with NEPA's requirement to rigorously explore reasonable alternatives (40 CFR § 1502.14). It appears this speed is needed to justify any time savings, a mere minute, over Alt A. This is irresponsible and unnecessary. We're not looking for a high-speed path for commuters. 3. Failure to Study Improvements to Existing Infrastructure The DEIS fails to sufficiently analyze what could be achieved through:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		- Improvements to existing roadways - Intersection redesigns - Traffic management strategies - Phased or incremental upgrades NEPA requires agencies to evaluate reasonable alternatives, including those that make use of existing infrastructure (40 CFR § 1502.14(c). The absence of a robust analysis of these options suggests that reasonable, lower-impact solutions were prematurely dismissed. 4. Growth-Inducing Impacts and Roadway Classification The proposed facility is classified as a Class III roadway, which explicitly allows for future on- and off-ramps at approximately half-mile intervals. This design standard is inherently growth-inducing. Despite this, the DEIS states that the project is not intended to facilitate growth. These two positions are incompatible. Courts have consistently held that agencies must analyze “indirect and induced growth impacts” under NEPA when infrastructure capacity enables future development. Designing a roadway that allows frequent future access points is a clear signal of planned growth, regardless of stated intent. This contradiction undermines the credibility of the DEIS and necessitates either: - A reclassification of the roadway to match the stated non-growth purpose, or - A full and honest analysis of growth-inducing impacts, including land use change, water demand, and secondary development. Failure to do so may also violate the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 706) by being arbitrary and capricious. 5. Inconsistency With Purpose and Need Finally, the proposed design speed, classification, and footprint exceed what is necessary to address local transportation concerns and appear inconsistent with the project’s stated purpose and need. NEPA requires that alternatives be aligned with the stated purpose, not expand beyond it to accommodate speculative future growth. As locals who drive the roads and are aware of future growth, primarily from the east side, this alternative will not help with local traffic, as most of us use Main Street to frequent businesses, schools, activities, etc. We need a better plan for Main Street itself. --- Conclusion and Request Given the deficiencies outlined above, I respectfully request that: 1. Aquifer and groundwater impacts be more rigorously analyzed and avoided where possible 2. Lower design speeds be fully evaluated to reduce wildlife and safety risks 3. Existing infrastructure improvement alternatives be meaningfully studied 4. Growth-inducing impacts be fully disclosed and analyzed 5. The roadway classification be reconsidered to align with the stated non-growth purpose of the project and to reflect the agricultural area by minimizing overpasses and bridges. At grade options will suffice. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I ask that these concerns be fully addressed before the project advances. Sincerely, Shauna Kieffer XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Midway, Utah
263	Shawn	I do not support any Heber Bypass. I prefer to prevent growth and encourage enhancement to existing infrastructure. I feel the council is selling out Heber and making a big mistake by allowing so much development, and any bypass will only encourage additional sprawl and isolate existing town center. However, given the choice between Option A and B, B makes the most sense. Option A would need to be expanded in only a few years to accomodations all these new houses and resorts being built.
83	Shawn Davis	Will the structure flyovers at Potter's Lane, 1300 S and Southfield Rd, US-189, and South US-40 at 1500 S be built wide enough to accommodate two future travel lanes, even though the flyover structures only show one lane of traffic? I foresee some of these flyovers becoming potential bottlenecks in the future, as two lanes of travel are merged into one lane of travel, especially at Potter's Lane. I do wonder if something was to happen with the Potter Lane flyover structure, the bypass section from 900 N to Potter Lane would have no exit onto existing US-40. I also see future roadway maintenance and UDOT construction projects having to deal with traffic control difficulties with narrow flyover structures when structural maintenance needs done. If the flyover structures are built with the potential to hold two lanes of travel, structural maintenance can be achieved with a lane shifts and future expansion can be achieved with widening roadway fills. I ask because the Provo River Bridge Structures on Highway 40, North of this project, were built the capacity to only hold two travel lanes, whereas the newer uphill bridge structures built at the Jordanelle / Mayflower have capacity to hold a third lane of traffic, if the climbing lane is added. Historically, if a structure has to be widened, it has to be torn down. You can always reach out to me if a better explanation is needed. Thank you.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
700	Shawn Miller	Dear UDOT: As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. 1. Non-Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. Lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company, were not properly advanced as required under LEDPA standards. 2. Foregone Conservation Opportunity - UDOT refused to adjust the project boundary to accommodate a federally funded NRCS conservation easement, disrupting plans to permanently protect nearly 300 acres of prime farmland. We can't continue to build our way out of the problems that all of the uncontrolled development brings. I vote for no bypass! Let the traffic be the check on all of this development here in the Heber Valley! Shawn Miller
71	Sheila Siggard	Dear UDOT Personnel Team for Heber Valley EIS, We Heber Valley Citizens are deeply concerned about plans for a bypass highway affecting our pastoral North Fields. ** "U.S. 40 is currently operating at failing conditions (level of service F) from 100 North to 100 South during the PM peak hour, and these conditions will continue to get worse through 2050. • Signalized intersections on U.S. 40 are currently operating at acceptable conditions, but many are expected to operate at failing conditions during the PM peak hour by 2050 if no improvements are made." Of course there is a problem. We should slow traffic rather than carving up the North Fields to accommodate it. **Forget not the agricultural protection areas! The North Fields is one of the few remaining areas for agriculture in Heber Valley. We land owners, as well as countless concerned citizens (residents and tourists alike) are uniting to block the destruction of these unique and irreplaceable resource areas. **The North Fields Extension Is unacceptable. Widen the Western Corridor if you must, but do NOT cut more into our pastoral North Fields! We have just returned from an 18-month mission in Montana. There we enjoyed seeing many open fields with cattle, sheep, and horses. This Big Sky Country has wisely preserved much of their open space for all to enjoy the agricultural benefits and natural beauty. Let us act wisely and do the same. Much of Utah has/is being "destroyed" by developers and builders who seem out of control. **Many concerns have been raised about preserving the wetlands and wildlife habitats. Let's do it!!!!!! These are things that cannot be replaced. Thank you for your consideration and for listening to and honoring our deeply held values. Sincerely, Sheila & Kerry Siggard
342	Sheila Siggard	Dear EIS Personnel: What will it take to have you listen to we citizens of Heber Valley? Option B would destroy our water supply as described by the North Fields Irrigation Company. Talk to these experts. They, the 165-year-old water company that built and continues to operate the canal system running through those fields indicate your data and studies are outdated and incomplete. We are ashamed of the 3 County Council members who support Option B. They are misrepresenting the citizens who elected them. This is not a matter of preferences: It's a matter of critical water supply and unrestorable open farm lands. Traffic preference should not override these critical needs! We just returned from an 18-month mission for our Church in Montana. There they have beautiful open fields of grazing cattle and abundant city parks. Other municipalities can guard and protect their open lands, and Utah should do so, too. Developers have been uncontrolled, but this idea of putting a highway through our pristine North Fields "to solve other problems" must stop!!!!!!!!!!!!! Perhaps some of those using the Heber Airport are pushing this plan, as well, but these are outsiders, and don't live in our valley. Please seems too weak when asking you to stop stating that Option B is the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative.". Yes, developments have created traffic problems., but creating other problems by destroying our water aquifer and our irreplaceable open lands is an erroneous, very unwise solution. Option A is the best plan which enables preservation of our water and farmlands. Your intelligent cooperation would be most appreciated and beneficial to Heber Valley. Sincerely, Sheila & Kerry Siggard Midway Residents and North Field Land Owners
676	Shem Valentine	No matter what option is decided on, the bypass will be a blight on this pristine valley. I encourage UDOT to explore ways to make the bypass unique, aesthetically pleasing, and respects the dark sky initiative.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
310	Sherrie Seawright	I was so disappointed to see the decision to impact more of the North Fields to save a minute of commute time! It is ludicrous that what is precious to residents of this valley is being sacrificed for travel time. I understand that a great deal of research has gone into many different components of solving the traffic problem but please give more value to the greatest variable, the people who live here, not the truck drivers passing though!
664	Simone Brown	To whom it may concern, I am in favor of the proposed bypass because it would help improve traffic flow and make travel safer and more efficient for our community. As our area continues to grow, the current roads are becoming more congested, which leads to delays and increased safety concerns. A bypass would allow through-traffic, especially large trucks and commuters who are not stopping in town, to move around the community instead of through it. This would help reduce congestion, improve safety for local drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists, and make daily travel easier for residents. I believe the bypass is an important step in planning for future growth while protecting the quality of life in our community. Simone Brown Heber City Resident Sent from my iPhone
631	Sonia Tasha Lingos	Public Comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Study Opposition to Alternative B – North Fields Bypass Submitted by: W. Brad Winegar Midway, Utah Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding UDOT's proposal to construct the Heber Valley Bypass and the designation of Alternative B as the preferred route through the North Fields. While addressing transportation challenges in the Heber Valley is important, the proposed bypass represents a very costly solution that does not effectively address the primary source of congestion and would permanently impact one of the valley's most valuable agricultural landscapes. For the reasons outlined below, I respectfully urge UDOT to reconsider Alternative B. 1. The Bypass Does Not Address the Main Cause of Traffic UDOT's own analysis indicates that approximately 70% of traffic on Heber City's Main Street is local "intra-valley" traffic, meaning trips that both begin and end within the valley. Examples include: Midway–Heber travel school trips local shopping and services recreation within the valley A bypass around Heber City will do little to reduce these trips because they are local trips, not through traffic. 2. A $1 Billion Highway Should Not Be the First Solution The bypass is projected to cost approaching or exceeding $1 billion. Before committing to such an expensive and irreversible project, lower-cost solutions should be implemented first, including: a valley-wide bus system

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		intersection improvements improved local connectivity traffic signal coordination Transportation planning best practice is to implement demand-management solutions before building major new highways. 3. Transit, Bicycle, and Electric Bike Solutions Have Not Been Attempted The Heber Valley currently has no meaningful public transit system. A modest bus network connecting: Midway Heber City Jordanelle / Mayflower Deer Valley East Village schools and commercial areas could significantly reduce the short trips that dominate traffic patterns. The valley is also unusually well suited for bicycle transportation due to its relatively flat terrain. A mobility strategy could include: protected bike lanes connecting Midway and Heber safe routes to schools regional trail connections rental electric bike systems similar to those used successfully in Park City These lower-cost investments should be implemented and evaluated before constructing a new highway through farmland. 4. A Highway Through the North Fields Would Create Development Pressure Transportation infrastructure strongly influences future land use. Constructing a major highway through the North Fields would likely increase development pressure on one of the valley's most important agricultural landscapes. Historically, rural highways often become the catalyst for: residential subdivisions commercial development land speculation The North Fields are one of the defining landscapes of the Heber Valley and provide:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		productive farmland wetlands and wildlife habitat scenic viewsheds the rural character that residents value Once a highway corridor divides this landscape, it cannot be restored. 5. The Bypass May Primarily Serve Regional Through Traffic and Airport Access The proposed bypass would create a faster corridor connecting: Park City / Jordanelle Utah County the Wasatch Front Heber Valley Airport Provo Airport This raises an important policy question: Should one of the valley's most valuable agricultural landscapes be sacrificed primarily to facilitate faster regional travel or airport access? Transportation investments should primarily serve the needs of local communities, not simply regional through traffic. Conclusion The proposed North Fields bypass represents a high-cost project with significant environmental and agricultural impacts, yet it does not directly address the primary source of congestion in the Heber Valley. Before moving forward with Alternative B, UDOT should: implement transit and local mobility solutions develop bicycle and electric-bike infrastructure improve local road connectivity and intersections fully evaluate lower-cost alternatives The North Fields are one of the defining landscapes of the Heber Valley. Once a highway is constructed through them, the character of the valley will be permanently changed. For these reasons, I respectfully urge UDOT to reconsider Alternative B and pursue transportation solutions that preserve the agricultural and scenic resources that make the Heber Valley unique. Respectfully submitted, Sonia Tasha Lingos Midway, Utah (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
471	Sophia Frankenburg	Dear UDOT, As an Utah taxpayer and Heber Valley resident, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial, community character, and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. For the reasons below, I urge UDOT to rethink mobility alternatives in the Heber Valley: 1. Non-Compliance with Environmental Law - Alternative B impacts more wetlands, springs, irrigation infrastructure, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. Lower-impact alternatives, including those proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company, were not properly advanced as required under LEDPA standards. 2. Foregone Conservation Opportunity - UDOT refused to adjust the project boundary to accommodate a federally funded NRCS conservation easement, disrupting plans to permanently protect nearly 300 acres of prime farmland. 3. Incomplete Cost Disclosure - The EIS omits substantial costs, including utility relocation, irrigation reconstruction, agricultural crossings, stormwater infrastructure, and long-term maintenance — obscuring the project's true fiscal impact. 4. Understated Growth and Traffic Impacts - Induced growth is under-modeled. Highways generate development, and development generates traffic. Main Street congestion is largely local and will not be meaningfully solved by a bypass that simultaneously accelerates growth and doesnt account for the mass East-side developments. A large infrastructure project such as a highway on the west side of Heber will forever change the rural character of the valley and encourage sprawling development. Not only will this affect Heber, but also the quaint town of Midway. The transitional area that the heritage agricultural land provides between these two communities is invaluable. Vehicular traffic is not solved by building bigger and faster roads. It's encouraging people to move about their communities outside of vehicles and working on providing infrastructure that makes the community feel comfortable doing so. This cultural shift is the ONLY sustainable solution. 5. Irreversible Agricultural Loss - Alternative B converts prime farmland to pavement at the highest rate among options, fragments working farms, and relies on vague mitigation measures inconsistent with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and state land-use policies. 6. Water and Air Risk - The route cuts through aquifer recharge zones and wetlands that naturally filter runoff. A 65-mph design increases pavement width, noise, dangerous wildlife accidents, and the pollutant load running into groundwater and the Provo River. We have seen what sprawling development and vehicular-focused planning projects have done to the salt lake valley and the poor air quality that becomes increasingly worse with growth. Please do not implement this same strategy in our smaller, more compact valley. 7. Misaligned Public Purpose - The alignment prioritizes regional through-traffic and resort access over local mobility, contrary to adopted city and county preservation goals.Alternative B maximizes environmental harm, fiscal exposure, and long-term development pressure while offering limited traffic relief. UDOT must select the least damaging, fiscally responsible alternative — one that protects water, farmland, air quality, and the rural character that defines the Heber Valley. Sincerely, Sophie Frankenburg Heber Valley Resident
519	Stacey Brumfield	Please do not use Plan B for a bypass road on U.S. 40. We are too much into concrete and not enough into people. Farmers and the aquaculture are more important than a few minutes of time. Let vehicle drivers stop and smell the roses. The Heber Valley is beautiful! Please don't go with the bypass Plan B. Thank you.
706	Stacy Warmack	I appreciate that there will be a trail that we can use to get to the university area and trail systems without a car. Are the traffic impacts of the new high school being taken into consideration? It seems as if it will not be easy to access the western corridor from southfield road. Will the new high school have ready access? I agree with concerns that the city council raised with getting around near 1300 s. I do agree that we need a bypass and that it'll return some peace to our main street. I'm not alone in avoiding it most of the time. Alt A seems more disruptive to more homes and businesses and Alt B may have some impacts to our wetlands, but maybe these can be mitigated. -- Stacy Warmack Heber City Resident

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
163	Stephanie Neal (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	The North Fields are the life-blood of this community. Running "Plan B" directly through them would have devastating impacts on the water and air quality, wildlife, wetlands, and farms. It would go against all of the efforts that residents have put into preserving this land over the years, for veryt little effect on traffic. This is not the plan that the people that live here want!! (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
35	Stephanie Potempa	To Whom it May Concern, How can we destroy this beautiful valley even more by putting a highway through one of the only remaining points of beauty and uniqueness in the Heber Valley? How can the lack of foresight and disregard for regulations that are in place ruin such a special place more than it already has? Why is there no thought to the future or the safeguarding of what makes the Heber Valley so special? How can this continue to happen? The last 5 years have seen out of control growth and what seems like zero lack of thought for the future. While growth is inevitable - and we all knew it was coming - controlled growth is surely something that should be at the forefront of such impactful decisions – and yet. While I of course understand that the traffic issues need to be addressed, dragging heels for over 30 years to make this decision has left our Valley with few options, and the two that seem to be left aren't good ones. But are we really, once again allowing another decision to occur that will later be regretted and have no way to undo the damage of the environmental impact of destroying the wetlands and ruining the remaining beauty of our Valley. And all for one minute of saved travel time? Really? Please, I am begging – can someone who cares about this valley, not a UDOT official who sees it as the easier way - step in and LISTEN and make the better, the right and the only decision here. Don't destroy the one unique thing the Heber Valley is still holding onto. Thank you, Stephanie Potempa
43	Stephanie Potempa	Dear UDOT Project Team and Decision-Makers, I am writing to submit a formal public comment regarding the proposed Heber Valley Bypass and the evaluation of Alternative A and Alternative B. My first email, which I sent on January 16, was impassioned and true to my heart, but here are my thoughts that I wanted to present in an organized, thoughtful, and educated manner for the record as well. I appreciate the significant amount of analysis and public outreach that has gone into this project, and I understand the core goals UDOT has identified: improving regional mobility, reducing congestion on US-40 and Main Street, increasing safety, and supporting long-term transportation needs in Heber Valley. I also recognize that both alternatives aim to meet these goals. However, after reviewing the Draft EIS materials and the stated trade-offs between the two options, I strongly oppose Alternative B and urge UDOT to advance Alternative A or further refine options that avoid routing a highway through the North Fields. As presented in UDOT's own analysis, Alternative B performs somewhat better in traffic metrics, including travel time (just 1 minute of saved travel time), congestion reduction, and diversion of regional traffic from Main Street. It also requires fewer residential and business relocations. I understand why these factors weigh heavily in UDOT's evaluation, and I acknowledge that transportation efficiency is an important consideration. That said, the benefits of Alternative B come at a significant and irreversible cost. According to the Draft EIS, Alternative B would impact substantially more wetlands, waterways, and agricultural land than Alternative A and would directly bisect the North Fields—one of the last remaining large, contiguous open spaces in Heber Valley. This area represents far more than undeveloped land; it is critical to the valley's rural character, agricultural heritage, hydrology, wildlife movement, and scenic identity. Once fragmented by a limited-access highway, this landscape cannot be restored or meaningfully mitigated. While mitigation is proposed, replacement wetlands and offset lands do not replicate the ecological function, visual openness, or cultural value of the North Fields. The loss is permanent. In contrast, Alternative A largely follows an existing transportation corridor, minimizes impacts to undeveloped land, and avoids cutting a new highway through the heart of this open space. Alternative A is superior because it avoids cutting through intact open space and instead relies on corridors that are already disturbed or developed. While it may affect more existing properties, those impacts are more localized, predictable, and consistent with the responsibilities of improving an existing corridor rather than opening an entirely new one. This significantly reduces environmental damage, minimizes habitat fragmentation, and avoids introducing traffic noise, air pollution, and visual blight into one of the valley's most scenic landscapes. From a land-use standpoint, Alternative A better aligns with responsible growth management by discouraging sprawl into agricultural and open lands, results in fewer impacts to wetlands and farmland overall, preserves more of the North Fields, and limits sprawl-inducing infrastructure expansion into currently undeveloped areas. From a transportation planning perspective, Alternative A is also more sustainable. New bypasses built through undeveloped land frequently induce additional traffic and accelerate growth in areas that lack

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		supporting infrastructure, ultimately recreating congestion and increasing long-term public costs. Alternative A addresses traffic needs while limiting these unintended consequences, offering a solution that is more adaptable and fiscally responsible over time. Importantly, Alternative A still meets the project's stated purpose: it improves traffic flow, enhances safety, and provides meaningful relief to Main Street without sacrificing one of the valley's most valued natural and agricultural resources. Most importantly though, Alternative A reflects community values. Heber Valley residents consistently express a desire for thoughtful growth that protects open space, maintains scenic views, and preserves the valley's rural identity. Choosing Alternative A demonstrates that transportation improvements can be achieved without sacrificing irreplaceable land or compromising the qualities that make Heber Valley a special place to live and visit. The decision before UDOT is not simply about traffic efficiency—it is about long-term stewardship. Heber Valley will never regain the North Fields once they are divided by a freeway and overpasses. Choosing Alternative B prioritizes short-term transportation performance over the permanent protection of land that defines this community and is a decision that cannot be undone and will forever change the Heber Valley. I respectfully ask UDOT to reconsider its preferred alternative and advance a solution that balances mobility improvements with the preservation of open space, farmland, wetlands, and rural character. Sincerely, Stephanie Potempa
133	Stephanie Potempa (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	I'm Stephanie Potempa. I just want to first say I'm super heartened to see all of you and hear all of these comments. I'm trying not to cry. Like, I am so sad about the possibility of what could happen here. So here we go. First of all, I'm here to respectfully oppose the chosen bypass route through the North Fields. The North Fields are not vacant land. They're living, working, agricultural ground and one of the last continuous open landscapes that define who we are as a community. These fields represent our history, our real character, our wildlife habitat, and the sense of space that makes Heber Valley feel like home rather than just anywhere else. Once a highway cuts through this land, it's permanently altered. No amount of landscaping or mitigation can restore farmland, uninterrupted views, dark skies, or the beauty that defines this place. Roads don't simply move traffic. They bring long-term consequences, sprawl pressure, more development, and a gradual erosion of the very qualities that draw people here in the first place. So while building within the established corridors may cost more initially, those costs must be weighed against the long-term expenses of sprawl, loss of farmland, reduced tourism appeal, environmental degradation, and the irreversible loss of community character. When those factors are considered, preserving the North Fields is not the expensive option. It's the prudent one. I understand the need to improve traffic flow and safety. That's not in question. What is in question is whether we're willing to sacrifice our most irreplaceable land because it appears easier or less expensive in the short-term. Infrastructure investment should strengthen transportation systems, not carve through our most irreplaceable landscapes. This choice is about more than traffic. It's about stewardship. It's about whether we value open space enough to protect it when it matters the most. Once we allow a highway through the North Fields, we can't get them back. I urge you to reconsider the route and to pursue an alternative that preserves what makes Heber Valley unique, honors long-term community values, utilizes existing development pattern, and reflects long-term stewardship rather than short-term convenience.
451	Stephanie Potempa	To Whom it May Concern, I have previously submitted a letter and spoken at the hearing however, I would like to again ask Heber and UDOT to please address the following. 1. Show proof Route B will reduce traffic on Main Street? 2. Explain why 90 seconds of drive time worth destroying our wetlands? 3. What are the actual long-term costs the city will pay to maintain new roads and trails? 4. What is UDOT's future plan to stop subdivisions from funneling onto major arterials like Heber has done with Coyote and Daniel — and will likely do with Sorenson's and the Slope? 5. What's the plan for the real bottleneck toward Mayflower? I am very much oppose putting a highway through the heart of the North Fields and am appalled by the irreversible consequences this will have on our water, air quality, view corridors, wetlands, wildlife, urban sprawl, pressure for more development, and the gradual erosion of the very qualities that draw people here to the Heber Valley in the first place.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		I urge you to reconsider the chosen route and to pursue an alternative that preserves what makes Heber Valley unique, honors long-term community values, utilizes existing development patterns and reflects long-term stewardship rather than short-term convenience. Thank you, Stephanie Potempa
417	Stephen Lerner	Re: Public Comment on the Heber Valley Corridor Draft Environmental Study Dear Project Team, I am writing to express my opposition to the recommended bypass route for the Heber Valley Corridor, which would redirect U.S. Route 40 through the North Fields of Heber Valley. As a resident of the surrounding area, I have a direct stake in the future of this region, and I believe the proposed route would cause lasting harm to the agricultural heritage, water resources, and community character of Heber Valley. Impact on Agricultural Land and Rural Character. The North Fields are home to approximately 60 working farms and multi-generational ranches. A highway cutting through this open agricultural landscape would fragment these operations, potentially rendering many of them unworkable. Heber Valley's identity is rooted in these fields and the farming traditions they sustain. Once paved over, this land cannot be restored. Beyond the immediate loss of farmland, the bypass would almost certainly serve as a catalyst for further commercial and residential development throughout the valley, accelerating the very sprawl that many residents moved here to avoid. Threat to Drinking Water. The North Fields sit on a shallow aquifer, and for over a century, the traditional flood irrigation practices of local farmers have maintained the water table and fed drinking water wells across the valley. Organizers and water managers have raised credible concerns that highway construction and ongoing vehicle traffic could disrupt this system and introduce pollutants into the aquifer. The potential impact extends well beyond Heber Valley: an estimated 1.5 million residents across the Wasatch Front and Back depend on water that flows through Deer Creek Reservoir. The risk to this critical resource deserves far more scrutiny than the draft environmental study appears to provide. Questionable Cost and Benefit. The project carries an estimated price tag exceeding $700 million, with many residents and former elected officials suggesting that total costs, including land acquisition, canal repairs, wetland mitigation, and long-term maintenance, could approach or exceed $1 billion. Meanwhile, the projected benefit is a reduction of roughly 70 seconds in travel time through the valley. I urge UDOT to provide a full and transparent accounting of all anticipated taxpayer costs before any final decision is made. The public deserves to weigh whether a project of this scale and expense is justified by so modest a time savings. Wildlife and Environmental Concerns. The recommended route would cut through a wildlife corridor and ecologically sensitive wetlands. While UDOT has stated that it is prioritizing wetland protection, building a major highway through this area is fundamentally at odds with that goal. I encourage the department to give serious weight to the alternative route that would affect fewer wetlands and less farmland, or to explore other solutions entirely, such as traffic management improvements on the existing Route 40 corridor. Alternatives Deserve Further Study. I recognize that traffic congestion on U.S. Route 40 is a real and growing concern. However, the solution should not come at the expense of irreplaceable farmland, clean water, and a community's way of life. I ask UDOT to conduct a more thorough analysis of alternatives, including targeted improvements to the existing corridor, enhanced public transit options, and demand management strategies, before committing to a project of this magnitude.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you for considering my comments. I respectfully ask that UDOT reconsider the recommended bypass route and prioritize solutions that protect the North Fields, the valley's water supply, and the agricultural community that has defined this area for generations. Sincerely, Stephen Lerner
360	Stephen Rather	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name Stephen Rather Address XXXXXXXXXXX. Heber City, UT XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXX Email Address (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
87	Steve and Susie Heaps	See attached document (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
409	Steve Koporec	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing as a taxpayer and resident of the State of Utah to formally oppose any proposed bypass alternative that would construct a major roadway through wetlands, over aquifer recharge areas, or across productive agricultural land.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Utah is one of the driest states in the nation. We are in a prolonged drought with no credible evidence of long-term hydrologic recovery. In this context, it is deeply troubling that UDOT would consider infrastructure that threatens wetlands and groundwater resources that are essential to our state's water security. Under the **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4332**, federal and state agencies are required to take a "hard look" at environmental consequences, including **direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts**. This includes impacts to water resources, climate resilience, and induced growth. Routing a bypass through wetlands and aquifer recharge zones raises serious questions as to whether these impacts are being adequately disclosed or mitigated. Additionally, any discharge of fill material into wetlands requires compliance with **Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1344)**. The Act requires avoidance and minimization of wetland impacts, not simply mitigation after the fact. Destruction of wetlands during a statewide water crisis is fundamentally inconsistent with both the spirit and the letter of this law. Utah Code **Title 73** emphasizes the protection and beneficial use of water resources. Allowing a transportation project to degrade aquifer recharge areas during a drought contradicts the state's own statutory priorities and long-term water planning goals. From a fiscal perspective, this proposal represents an irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. Billions are spent statewide urging residents to conserve water, while public funds are simultaneously proposed for a project that risks permanent harm to water systems we cannot replace. Once wetlands are filled and aquifers compromised, they are effectively lost. Finally, there is widespread concern that the true purpose of this bypass is not traffic relief, but rather to facilitate growth and new development along Highway 40. If this is the case, then the **Purpose and Need statement** for this project may be legally deficient under NEPA and FHWA guidance. Roads built to induce development, rather than solve demonstrated transportation failures, are not an appropriate use of public funds. More sustainable and cost-effective alternatives exist, including: - Enhanced transit and employer-supported bus systems for new developments - Demand management strategies - Incremental improvements to existing infrastructure These options would reduce congestion without sacrificing Utah's most critical natural resources. We should be better stewards of our land and water—not sacrifice them in pursuit of marginal travel-time savings. A few extra minutes of traffic does not justify permanent environmental damage. I respectfully request that UDOT remove any bypass alternatives that impact wetlands or aquifers and fully reconsider whether this project is justified at all under state and federal law. Sincerely, Steve Koporec XXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX
268	Steve Phillips	Dcoument attached with my comments regarding the proposed Highway 40 by-pass. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
670	Steve Phillips	In reviewing Chapter 3 of the Draft EIS, I note that UDOT has not completed a quantitative, health-protective air quality assessment for the Heber Valley Corridor project, despite large forecast increases in traffic and vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) in an inversion-prone mountain basin. Section 3.10 ("Air Quality") describes the regulatory setting, explains that Wasatch County is in attainment for all criteria pollutants, and concludes that transportation conformity does not apply. UDOT then

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		designates the project as a Tier 2 Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) project and expressly limits the analysis to a qualitative discussion, stating that design-year 2050 traffic volumes (about 48,100 AADT on US-40 between SR-32 and 900 North) are below FHWA's 140,000–150,000 AADT threshold for quantitative MSAT modeling. The air quality analysis relies almost entirely on VMT and level-of-service as proxies for environmental impact, rather than on modeled pollutant concentrations or exposure. Table 3.10-2 shows that average daily VMT in the evaluation area is projected to increase from 276,000 miles per day (2019) to 623,000 miles per day under the 2050 No-action Alternative, and to 665,000 and 660,000 miles per day under Alternatives A and B respectively—VMT increases of 140.9% and 139.1% over existing conditions and 6.7% and 5.9% above the No-action Alternative. Despite these large VMT increases, UDOT concludes that "overall, vehicle emissions would be reduced" with either build alternative due solely to reduced congestion and travel times, without providing any quantitative estimates of PM2.5, PM10, NO2, CO, or ozone-forming emissions or ambient concentrations. Critically, UDOT explicitly dismisses the use of existing Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ) monitoring data from nearby nonattainment/maintenance areas, stating that "as of April 2025, there were no UDAQ air quality monitoring stations in Wasatch County" and that the nearest stations in Salt Lake and Utah Counties are "not applicable to the air quality evaluation area." This framing ignores the well-documented regional inversion dynamics along the Wasatch Front and Back and effectively treats Heber Valley as if it were not subject to the same cold-air pooling and pollutant trapping that drive PM2.5 exceedances just over the county line. The Draft EIS also declines to conduct any project-level, receptor-based "hot-spot" analysis for PM2.5 or NO2 and provides no quantitative estimates of pollutant concentrations (in micrograms per cubic meter or parts per billion) at residential, school, or other sensitive receptors along the corridor under any alternative. For MSATs, UDOT incorporates FHWA boilerplate stating that information is "incomplete or unavailable" to credibly predict project-specific health impacts and concludes that quantitative differentiation among alternatives would not be useful to decision makers, even as the project adds substantial new capacity and increases daily VMT beyond the No-action Alternative. Finally, in Section 3.10.4.5 and in the mitigation summary (Table 3.23-1), UDOT states: "No mitigation for air quality impacts from implementing either action alternative is proposed," limiting air-quality mitigation commitments to short-term construction dust controls rather than to long-term operational emissions in a rapidly growing valley. In my view, this approach may satisfy a minimum, attainment-area NEPA/transportation-conformity checklist, but it fails to provide the hard-look analysis the public expects for a major new freeway facility in an inversion-prone basin: No quantitative modeling of project-related PM2.5/NO2 concentrations or hot-spots. No evaluation of inversion-day conditions, cumulative exposure, or health risk for residents, schools, or vulnerable populations near the corridor. No use of regional monitoring or inversion data from adjacent nonattainment/maintenance areas to characterize risk, despite clear similarity in meteorology and topography. No operational air-quality mitigation measures, despite documented VMT growth and capacity expansion. I request that UDOT, prior to issuing any Final EIS or Record of Decision: Conduct quantitative project-level air quality modeling (including PM2.5 and NO2) for the No-action Alternative and for each build alternative, with receptor-specific results for nearby neighborhoods, schools, and other sensitive receptors. Explicitly analyze wintertime inversion conditions in Heber Valley, using available regional monitoring and meteorological data, and disclose how frequently project-related emissions would contribute to AQI values above 100. Perform a health-focused MSAT analysis that goes beyond generic FHWA boilerplate, or else clearly explain why a freeway-type facility with 200k+ additional daily VMT relative to existing conditions is still treated as "low potential" for meaningful MSAT effects. Develop and commit to specific operational air-quality mitigation measures (e.g., truck restrictions or operational changes on inversion days, speed/operations strategies to limit cold-start and idle emissions, enhanced transit and demand-management commitments tied to air-quality performance triggers). Because these deficiencies go to the heart of whether the project's air quality and public health impacts have been adequately disclosed and considered, I am submitting this comment during the Draft EIS comment period to ensure the administrative record reflects that concern for any future review. Steve Phillips

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
585	Steve Wilson	As a resident of the Heber Valley, Please change the route for the proposed Heber Valley Bypass road to option A. Saving 1 minute of travel time is not a good argument for option B, as the oil tankers and other trucks that will use this road, will likely lose that time on highway 40 going up the hill anyway as out of control development in the Wasatch back continues. Risking the future of the aquifers is also not responsible as our water supply seems to be diminishing. Thank you.
189	Steven Howes	I fully support going thru the North Fields. It's the common sense choice. The sooner It's done the better.
635	Sue Christensen	Please reconsider Alternative b and pursue transportation solutions that preserve this beautiful and sensitive area. Consider the generations to come and their air and water needs. The proposed bypass is extremely expensive and harmful to this valley. Once it is gone it can never be replaced. Thank you, Susan Christensen , Midway, Ut.
603	Sue Laneri	. As 45 year resident of Heber Valley I am writing to voice my opposition to Alternative B. If it comes to this alternative, certainly the raised bypass in such a populated area of 1300 South could be availed by simple going a little further south to meet up with 189, I know many resident fee the same. Sincerely, Sue and Steve Laneri
93	Sue Mantyla	Hi, I am writing concerning the bypass in our north fields in Heber city Utah. A bypass will not fix Main Street traffic, most congestion is local. It threatens our drinking water and aquifers it permanently destroys the north fields and will definitely increase our taxes, increase an accelerate high density which we are not in favor of, creates environmental impacts on our farms, homes and generational land owners and compromises community safety. We are not in favor of it so please be considered of the citizens in Heber and their desire. Thank you. Sue Mantyla Sent from my iPhone
601	Sue Mantyla	Dear UDOT, I live in the Heber Valley and care deeply about the future of this community. The more I have learned about the bypass, the more concerned I have become. At first I only had a general sense that something wasn't right, but after reading the EIS and listening to meetings, my concerns have only grown. Yes, I am worried about our water and the wetlands and the aquifers that feed our valley & most of Utah & Salt Lake Counties. I am worried about the farmland that could be taken through eminent domain and bisected so farmers lose their livelihoods, yet that's deemed less important than a few driveways that can be modified. But what worries me the most right now is how the mitigation for this project might actually unfold. The EIS is incredibly vague. You repeatedly use words like preservation and perpetuity, but don't clearly define what that actually means. Does that mean the land will be owned by the state? By a federal agency? By a mitigation bank? Or does it simply mean someone keeps weeds off it, as was suggested in UDOT's public meeting? Who owns that land after it is mitigated? Because if the state or federal government ends up owning and controlling that land, then our community loses the ability to make decisions about our own valley. I am very, opposed to that. Our community should not lose control of large areas of land because of a mitigation process that was never clearly explained to the public. Why is there not more transparency about this? Another issue is the route itself, the most environmentally impactful route possible. That is not just my opinion — that is supported by your own data. By law, the least damaging alternative is supposed to be selected. Yet you chose the opposite. That makes many of us wonder whether you intend to truly follow environmental law throughout this process? There is no proper recognition of the Agricultural Protection Area that exists to protect farmers and farmland. At the same time, there is no adjustment in an alignment that could have allowed a conservation easement to protect hundreds of acres of farmland - way more than you will replace, with a claim to support preservation in this valley. That simply does not add up. And what exactly will the land be after mitigation — wetlands or farmland? Many of us were under the impression that farmland would be purchased to match the acreage of wetlands disturbed, helping prevent future development. That sounded like something that could benefit the valley. But that does not appear to be what is actually planned. Instead, it appears wetlands might be “created” or mitigated while a massive freeway is built through the valley.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		What about the freeway. A 65 mph elevated road through a rural valley could be questioned, especially if you install sound walls. It feels like a number chosen simply to claim this alternative “saves time.” Meanwhile the road would be extremely wide, classified as a Class III freeway, with potential future off-ramps every half mile. Yet at the same time we are told there will be no access. So which one is it? Are you preserving land, or are you planning access every half mile in the future? And will existing access points be removed so that whoever controls the mitigated land has more control over access than the community itself? Right now this entire process feels incredibly unclear. We would like answers when our tax dollars are being used for a project that threatens our water, our air quality, and our farmland — all to save a minute or two for commuters traveling between Provo and Park City. The reality is that most locals will rarely use this route. It may temporarily shift some traffic off of Main until the immense slated growth ends up there- actually probably will already be here by the time this would be built. Growth analysis appears weak in the EIS. And there are no solutions of how Main Street will be handled? It's a problem that needs immediate attention. So the question many of us are asking is: who is really driving this decision? Who gave UDOT the directive to pursue this route? The Heber City council members do not speak for the entire valley. And if we submit GRAMA requests to see, have there have been closed-door meetings or decisions made without the public? That is something the community deserves to know about as well. This valley is our home. It is our water, our farmland, and our future. We deserve clear answers and real transparency before a project this destructive moves forward. At a minimum, Alternative B should be removed from consideration until the mitigation process, land ownership, access points, and agricultural protections are clearly defined and publicly disclosed. Sincerely, Sue Mantyla
141	Suellen Gregory Winegar (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	I really wanted to say I appreciate everything UDOT has done. We're lucky to have UDOT. They take good care of us in the winter. They have great signs on the highway that make me laugh, and I appreciate the work that's gone into this. However, I just feel that neither A nor B is the way to go. If there has to be a compromise, then I would vote in favor of Option A, but I feel it is a huge mistake to sacrifice the crown jewel of the valley, the icon of our valley. I sat through a lot of Heber council meetings where they struggled with "What's our identity? Who are we?" The identity of Heber Valley -- of Heber City is the Heber Valley and the North Fields. I feel like to sacrifice that to try to have a walkable downtown is honestly a little bit of a joke because I don't want to walk from Labrum Ford to Karl Malone Dodge. That doesn't work for me. And to just -- there might be two or maybe three blocks of Main Street that are still remaining that have some of the original charm and could be walkable, but an idea to float is switching Main Street walkability to, say, 100 West where they already have access to some of those shops from the back. But I don't think we're going to be able to resurrect and go back in time and recreate a walkable Main Street. And so to destroy the one thing that is precious to everyone does not make sense to me. I -- I know, from what I've understood from other people that say that the Legacy Highway, that when it was built, it had restricted access points just like this -- the EIS says the bypass would have, but there was a finite time period. We have now exceeded that time period, and the -- they are creating off-ramps and development along the Legacy Highway. That will come to the North Fields. The Logan bypass is newer, and it has not addressed the traffic. Main Street Logan traffic is -- has not been addressed. It is still bad. The West Valley Bangerter Highway was supposed to relieve traffic in West Valley. It did not. In fact, it's even worse. So what might be the best route for the road is not the best route for the valley. It might say five to ten minutes, but we have sold our souls. I also just want to address the fact that they say it will eliminate maybe 30 percent of the traffic, but we have to remember 8,000 homes have been approved. So whatever is today's 30 percent savings of traffic, you have to build into your mind that we're going to have 8,000 homes which will have two to three more cars. So Main Street traffic is not going to be addressed. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.
529	Suellen Winegar	Dear UDOT, I am registering vehement opposition to the Highway 40 bypass through the North Fields of Heber Valley. I oppose any western bypass through the North Fields--both Option A and B--but MOST STRONGLY OPPOSE Option B. While Alternative B may be the best route for the ROAD, it is not the best route for the VALLEY. While addressing transportation challenges in the Heber Valley is important, the proposed bypass represents a very costly solution that does not effectively address the primary source of congestion and would permanently impact one of the valley’s most valuable agricultural landscapes. My comments on UDOT's process are below: 1. Running a parkway through North Fields will irreparably harm the pristine Class 1A Aquifer. The North Fields is a huge underground reservoir with scientifically proven and measured increase in the Provo River as it flows through the Fields. A highway bisecting this will have an impact on the underground flow of water and the quality of water overall. We are in a historic mega drought and cannot afford to mess up the water system. Class 1A aquifers are very RARE today, and we must do everything we can to preserve it. Sensitive wetlands and wildlife/riparian/plant ecosystems are at high risk from the proposed parkway. It is shocking that wetland areas are even under consideration for a freeway. We have lived in other states where wetlands are sacred and untouchable for good reason. The EIS for Options A and B is fatally flawed. 2. Envision Heber 2050 lists the #1 priority valued by Heber residents as "OPEN SPACE/RURAL CHARACTER PRESERVATION." "...it was a loud and clear message, especially in regard to the North Fields." (Envision Heber City 2050 page 16 "What do Heber Residents Value?") The voice of the people is to preserve open space and rural environment, which IS the North Fields.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		3. Again, the people of Heber Valley have spoken loud and clear by voting three times to preserve open space. Wasatch County passed a $10 million bond and Midway passed two $5 million bond to preserve open space. A Wasatch County election voted to preserve 20-acre zoning for North Fields by 70% margin. The people want to conserve open space, not slice a 4-lane highway through it. 4. Carlos Braceras, your Executive Director, is on record from Wasatch County Council meeting confirming the bypass will not alleviate traffic from Heber Main Street as ~75% of the traffic is local, not through traffic. In addition, most of this Heber traffic is from the EAST side of Highway 40, which is where most of the new growth in the Heber Valley will be. A frontage road on the east side of Heber with focused entry points to 40 with a traffic signal would move traffic along the corridor more safely and efficiently. 5. Induced demand: Bangerter Highway has not reduced traffic loads in West Valley. It has made traffic worse. In Logan, the newer bypass west of Main has not reduced traffic in Logan Main Street. Building a freeway through Heber Valley will simply encourage more growth and more through traffic between Utah and Summit Counties. 6. The current plan for South Heber/1300 South with the huge raised freeways and underpasses is absolutely horrific. The overpass over Midway Lane west of the new high school is equally horrific. This is rural Heber Valley, not SLC/Orem/Provo. We do not need another I-15 up here in the Heber Valley. The bypass in Logan (population ~57,000) is much less invasive than these massive overpasses, elevated roadways and underpasses. Heber City has less than half the Logan population, not even 20,000 as of late 2025. This must be reworked--possibly using roundabouts at the critical intersections on Highway 189. And for safefy, how about simply reducing (and enforcing) speed limits. That costs nothing! Options A and B will completely destroy the South Fields areas and the residents who live nearby as well. Unacceptable! 7. Quality of life - the North Fields is the iconic gem of the Heber Valley. It is the feature photo on the cover of "Envision Heber 2050." It is shortsighted to destroy the reason people come to Heber in order to save 5 minutes during summer weekend rush hour. Once the open space is gone, it's gone forever. This quality of life is why the people live here. Please do not destroy it. We already have Highway 40. Improving the traffic arteries on the East side would be a much better investment and have a much greater impact on the traffic flows in Heber Valley. Transportation investments, especially when approaching $1 billion, should primarily serve the needs of local communities, not simply regional through traffic. Options A & B will not measurably reduce traffic on Heber Main Street over time. One of the state's most valuable agricultural landscapes should not be sacrificed primarily to facilitate faster regional travel or airport access. Sincerely, Suellen Winegar Heber Valley Resident
49	Summer Schlopy	Hello This is my second time commenting. Thank you for including us in this process. I live at XXXXXXXXXXXX. I am wondering what sound reduction for sound pollution you have planned. And have you considered any ideas from Europe. I took video of some on our last trip and I think they should be incorporated as much as we can on US 40 I am including one here. Please let me know that you have received them (that they went thru) Thanks Summer (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
249	Summer Schlopy	What are your plans for sound reduction I have images and video of Europe and their curved sound reduction walls on their highways. It is amazing and so forward thinking. I sent the images before but let me know if you need them again
131	Susan Cordone (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	I'm short. I want -- I don't -- well, so many amazing people are in this community. So many smart people, people that have dedicated themselves to checking in, checking up, and checking on each other. Right now, tonight, I can see that happening as well. There's been a lot of talk about passion. I am passionate about water conservation. This is something that if we do not have safe, reliable drinking water for our current generations, we will not have it for our future generations. This is an imperative aspect of what folks are talking about tonight. There's so many different aspects that are going to affect us all. This gentleman that was just here -- what -- what an incredible story. What an incredible thing for you to come out and say to all of us. You've touched my heart, and I'm sure many others. But what I want to say is if there's no clean, fresh drinking water, there is no life. Thank you.
418	Susan Cummings	Yes, Please build Option B in the Heber Valley. Those of us who have been here long enough that we remember the “Good ol Boys” group who stopped the road being built on the East side of our Heber Valley are so Over watching this issue being pushed down the road(no pen intended) over and over again and our city and county governments continue to hold us hostage to the growth happening, without moving forward with UDOTS propose solutions. Please I beg you, Build Option B!! Option C if it started at the Junction of RiverRoad/Kamas should have been a freeway overpass, but No, we have a stop light there and our city/county government has approved a whole new city on the south west side of 40 there, proof they do not look forward to “What’s Best for what use to be a Beautiful Valley to live in.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Please Please Please Build Option B! Thank you Shane & Susan Cummings Sent from my iPhone
398	Susan Phillip	Susan L. Philipp XXXXXXXXXXXX Park City, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX March 4, 2026 Utah Department of Transportation Re: Request for New Thinking – Heber Valley Bypass Project To Whom It May Concern, I am writing to respectfully urge the Utah Department of Transportation to reconsider the current direction of the Heber Valley Bypass project and to engage in broader, long-term thinking about what this decision will mean for generations to come - forever! I drive to Northfield Stables almost every day, and upon turning off U.S. 40, I am immediately embraced by the serenity and beauty of the Heber Valley. Those daily moments of awe—witnessing wildlife, simple fields of grazing cattle, and sweeping mountain vistas—instill in me a deep sense of responsibility to be a steward and ambassador for my community. It is this lived experience, not abstract opposition, that compels me to speak thoughtfully and earnestly about the future of this valley. The proposed bypass would sever land that has been continuously farmed for 167 years, permanently altering not only productive agricultural ground but also the heritage and identity of a small town like Heber City. Once divided and developed, this land cannot be restored. Its history, continuity, and contribution to the character of the valley would be lost. The environmental consequences are equally concerning. The fragile water aquifer and the Provo River represent critical natural resources whose long-term health must be safeguarded. Large-scale roadway construction introduces risks of runoff, pollution, and long-term degradation to water quality. These impacts may unfold gradually over decades, long after the immediate transportation objectives have been met or rendered obsolete by changing conditions. Infrastructure decisions of this magnitude should be evaluated not only for present-day congestion concerns, but for their viability in a rapidly changing world. Technological advances, shifting transportation patterns, environmental realities, and evolving community priorities may dramatically alter what future mobility truly requires. Committing to a permanent bypass corridor today may limit flexibility tomorrow. Heber is widely regarded as one of Utah's most cherished small towns. Its beauty, open landscapes, agricultural roots, and quiet valley setting are central to its identity. A bypass of this scale risks introducing long-term noise, visual disruption, air pollution, and water impact that would fundamentally change the character of the area forever. Land that should be preserved for its beauty and for future generations would be irrevocably transformed. I hope this letter can spark new thinking about the long-term future of Heber Valley and encourage exploration of alternative options that better align transportation planning with preservation of community character, environmental stewardship, and agricultural heritage. Many of those involved in shaping this bypass have understandably become immersed in the technical complexities of the project. In doing so, however, broader conceptual and forward-looking vision can be overshadowed by minutiae, as well as by political and institutional pressures. I respectfully urge UDOT to step back from the immediate mechanics of the proposal and thoughtfully reconsider the enduring legacy this decision will leave for decades to come.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Susan L. Philippwww.sphilippdesign.com (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
202	Susan Waggoner	Hi, I am a resident of Midway. I do not see any reason to build a bypass. The traffic going through Heber is what it is. There are times when there is no traffic, and other times there are a lot of trucks. Building a bypass will destroy the beauty of the Heber Valley. Please do not do this. It saddens me to think that this could happen. If you build this, more and more ugly development will be built along the bypass, not to mention you will displace the wildlife that lives in the North Fields. The more I think about it and discuss with my neighbors it seems ludicrous that anyone would even consider doing this. Listen to the residents of the Heber Valley. Susan Bruton Waggoner
598	Susie Palmer	To: Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Regarding: Opposition to Heber Valley Corridor North Fields Routes Dear UDOT Project Team, I am writing to express my firm opposition to the proposed Alternative B routes through the North Fields. This area is a critical resource for our community, and its preservation should be a top priority in your planning process. The North Fields provide essential green space and play a vital role in protecting our local water quality and wetlands. Paving over this land would be a permanent loss for our environment. Additionally, this project would be highly detrimental to our ranchers and agricultural heritage, making it difficult for local families to maintain their operations and livelihoods. A far more sensible and less intrusive solution would be to create a simple turn at or before 900 North that follows the existing power line corridor. This route has been shown to be the least impactful option for both the environment and the people who live here. I urge you to reconsider these plans and choose the path that protects the North Fields for future generations. Sincerely, Susie Palmer XXXXXXXXXXXXX
570	Suzanne	I am vehemently opposed to a byoass and espe ially to option B IF we do option A, then I am copying Aaron Cheatwoods suggestion for the lower section on either option. ...." I know there are many opinions, and we disagree on a lot, but we can all agree on some things. For instance, both of the options given included the same lower section. I think we all want the southern section to be different. if UDOT goes ~200 ft further south, they probably won't need to do the 30-ft raised concrete platform near Walmart and America First AND there will be hundreds of feet between the highway and existing homes instead of 30-50 ft. There are many other question marks about the plan, but this is one of those things that I think everybody agrees with. They have told us that they are open to changes where they have missed something." Please no bypass, but knowing youve already made up your mind, then option A with the southern section changed as noted above. Thank you for your time.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
389	Suzanne (No Last Name)	Good morning, I'd like to go on record again saying that I believe no bypass is the best option for our valley. We need to tell UDOT "no thank you". A bypass guarantees even more out of control development. If ,as many are saying, its not the trucks, its local traffic causing the problem, then a bypass won't fix that. Let's not take land from those who own it in north and south fields, lets not contaminate our aquifer. (How do we recover from that?) Let's think outside the box and that includes very simple steps as well as taking larger measures to SLOW our growth. We can time the lights on Main street so that if you are going the speed limit you get thru smoothly like they've done thru Old Town Provo. We can put real left turn signals on Main street instead of flashing yellows. We can time the green lights to be longer on Main St and shorter on side streets. We can get rid of parking on Main St and add a 3rd lane. We can add another light or 2 for cross streets to be safer. Im sure there are other little things that can be done to ease the situation. We need to SLOW OUR GROWTH. Period. We've had way too much already especially with our current sewage treatment facilities capabilities. Traffic is something people can learn to live with, but paving over our valley and developing every square foot changes us forever. There is no return from uncontrolled development for our beautiful valley. No bypass and a moratorium on development will truly save our valley. Thank you for listening.
433	Suzzane Spence	As a Utah taxpayer, I urge UDOT to remove Alternative B from consideration. It fails to meet NEPA, Clean Water Act, and LEDPA requirements and exposes taxpayers to unnecessary long-term financial and environmental costs. Less damaging, fiscally responsible alternatives exist and were not meaningfully pursued. It is an absolutely atrocious idea and please leave this beautiful area only. Suzanne Spence Heber City, Utah
533	Sydney Hedberg	Hi there, Submitting a large concern about this potential bypass. Water is such a scarce resource in Utah and I worry deeply about our future here. Creating this bypass that will eliminate wetlands and wreak havoc on our potential water supply is too big of a risk. I run a non-profit here supporting the trail systems, Alpreneur. I am a capitalist at heart. But these things need to be assessed with long term vision. My hope is everyone will reconsider. Many thanks, Sydney Hedberg
597	Tausha McDonald	To whom this may concern, I am writing because I am very concerned about the Heber Valley bypass and the negative impact alternative B would have on the Heber Valley. I am vehemently opposed to alternative B because it is the most damaging to the character, environment, and needs of Heber valley residents. I am a lifelong Heber Valley resident and grew up in the North fields that alternative B is proposing to run through. The north fields are some of the only open space remaining in the Heber Valley. They are protected by agricultural zoning and provide the opening welcome to our valley. We are an agricultural town at our roots. Even new residents have moved here seeking that space and that charm. Slicing through the north fields with a bypass would destroy that peaceful setting and the ability for farmers to access and use their land for their farming endeavors. Bypass option B is also the worst option because it is environmentally mentally detrimental. The north fields are a wetland and the source of major water supplies in the valley.. roads are a major source of pollution and so are the development. The pristine Fields would be forever polluted, and the wetlands which have homed many species of wildlife would be destroyed for those species , farm animals, and local residents. Heber Valley residents have repeatedly across political parties have voted to protect the north fields and the open space. We have voted this way again and again because the agricultural land is necessary for us. My family has farmed that land for many generations, but all of our remaining land is set to be destroyed. The open space is necessary for recreation, as well. People farm, walk, fish, and sometimes hunt in that land. It is also intrinsically valuable and infinitely valuable for mental health. Open space accessibility is linked in studies to mental health benefits. We need the open space and it would be damaging to everyone in our valley of option B is chosen. I am writing this not because my family home, the last of our ancestral family farmland is set to be destroyed by this bypass and my elderly parents will be left homeless by alternative A or B, but more important than the damage to my family is the irreversible damage to the residents of the valley that alternative B would cause. Because of the damaging effects that option B would cause, I urge you to pursue the alternative proposed by the county that would put the bypass parallel to the existing highway and limit the resulting damage.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you! Tausha Hewlett
688	Teresa Ruminski	Thanks for taking the time to consider our comments. I support the city counsel in requesting a different alternative to the bypass. Personally, I would prefer to not see a bypass at all. Yes, there will be more traffic, but that will also mean that people and business vehicles will look for alternate routes and/or decide that perhaps they don't want to live in Heber to commute to Salt Lake City every day. Moab and Provo have made it work with thriving downtown businesses. Wasatch county has grown too big too fast, and putting a highway through the valley is such a knife into the heart of what makes it special. I have great concerns about the future of our water in terms of access and quality, and I know you have heard from those folks with the details of those concerns. Please do not destroy the fields - let us have that.
568	Terri Goodall	Alternative A is a better option that B but still has it's issues. It was planned for years to bring in the Bypass north of 500 North but south of the Back Forty restaurant. The southern end of the Alternative should NOT include dumping traffic onto 1300 South. It is a busy commercial street with dense residential presence nearby. 1300 South should NOT be part of the Bypass plan. With locals already using 300 West the addition of Bypass traffic could cause traffic back-ups and delays. The Bpass should merge onto 189. An alternative Bypass explored at one point was to take the US 40 East traffic to Airport Road, while the 189 South traffic would merge onto 189 at the Southfield Road area. Please go back to the plan to keepBypass traffic on the Bypass all the way to 189 at least. Do not cause unnecessary traffic and noise on the commercail and residential streets by 1300 South.
14	Terry (No last name provided)	I love this idea of the bypass and agree completely with the choice of option B. I travel frequently between Duchesne and the Wasatch front. Traveling through Heber (as it is today) is frustrating and slow. Getting this bypass in place will be a fantastic improvement for travelers trying to get from point A to point B without needing to drive through the heart of Heber city. How soon can we get this built? Can we fast track it somehow?
250	Theresa Baronek	COMMENT Theresa Baronek, Treasurer/District Clerk XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX P.O. Box XXXXX Heber City, Utah XXXXX Office: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Direct Line XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX HOURS: M-T 7-5 (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
164	Theresa Wardell (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	On the rail trail instead of having it right in fron t of my house why not keep it going down Hwy 40 like it is. Why are you taking it from the Hwy to go up on my private road. I do not like that idea. We have a canal in the back of us that has to have a right a way on each side. Maybe you can take the rail trail that way also, please consider all options because I really don't think its a great choice to put it in "front" of everyones house. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
669	Thomas (Tuck) F Lowe	TO: Whom It Concerns, My concerns with Option B are... A 65 MPH limit for such a short distance is inappropriate and dangerous. (I believe most anything over 45 MPH in Utah is overly dangerous.) The necessary number of overpasses alone will ruin whatever scenery the bottom of the valley has left... Do we really need by-pass access for Rt 189 N to Rt 40 S?! And visa-versa? (Do we really need by-pass access for Strawberry Res./Daniels to Provo?!) This by-pass access will create a 3 level overpass! Really, really ugly! Do we really need by-pass access at 900 N? Two more really, really ugly overpasses! By the way, I believe tankers won't be around forever. Won't vehicles continue to back up the hill at the River Rd light? Even more so as time goes on?! Stopped cars in a 65 mph zone is dangerous! The first traffic light(s) on local routes should be after access to the by-pass. Can the College intersection be moved to River Rd? Sincerely, Tuck Lowe XXXXXXXXXXX
474	Thomas Christ	Hello U-Dot, I have been studying the maps in the area of Potter Lane trying to find a way that the connection at that location can be made to work better for everyone. You know most people want to turn south from College Way and travel towards Heber City. This could be possible if the connection of the preferred Alternative Route B was moved more northward. By doing this you could save the demolition of 2 family Homes. Very few

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		people, if any, cross Highway 40 from College Way to Potter Lane. The very few People entering Highway 40 from Potter Lane will most likely want to travel south to Heber City. The college students entering Highway 40 from College Way will most likely want to travel south to Heber City. If the new west bypass connection to Highway 40 were moved north and separated from the Potter/College connection it would make everything work out just fine. If that connection were moved 1000 feet to the north I think it would solve the problem. Please take a look at this idea. By the way I am very much in favor of the west bypass route. It will save so much time and make room for all the new folks that will be buying all the new homes that are being built. Heber City Main Street will be a pleasant place again? Thanks Thomas Christ
423	Tiffany Horrocks	I think at very minimum option B should be approved. The more options we get away from 40/Main Street the better it is going to be. The biggest issue right now is Main Street is the only main option. To help relieve the congestion on Main we need options away from Main Street. If we just reconnect the bypass after a short distance to Main or run parallel to Main that isn't really creating a bypass. I have noticed that there are other towns out there that are much smaller than we are and they have more street options than we do. They still have high traffic volume but not near the congestion we do. My husband is a lifelong resident and I have lived here for over 30 years. This bypass was needed 30 years ago and is long overdue and needs to plan for growth not only in the County but added traffic from tourists.
470	Tiffany Roberts	Public Comment on Heber Valley Corridor EIS – Opposition to Alternative B Dear Utah Department of Transportation, I respectfully submit this comment regarding the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed transportation corridor in Heber Valley. Based on the information provided, Alternative B should be removed from consideration because it does not appear to meet federal environmental review standards or the requirement to select the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative. 1. Failure to Meet LEDPA Standards Under Federal Wetlands Law Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, transportation projects that impact wetlands must demonstrate that the selected alignment represents the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). Alternative B appears to impact more wetlands, springs, irrigation systems, and aquifer recharge zones than other feasible options. If lower-impact alignments exist, federal permitting standards require those options to be prioritized. 2. Inadequate Consideration of Environmental Impacts Under NEPA The National Environmental Policy Act requires agencies to rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives. The Environmental Impact Statement appears to inadequately evaluate lower-impact alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to farmland, wetlands, and water resources. Failure to fully advance these alternatives undermines the purpose of the NEPA process. 3. Loss and Fragmentation of Prime Farmland Alternative B converts substantial acreage of prime farmland into roadway infrastructure and fragments active agricultural operations. This impact conflicts with the intent of the Farmland Protection Policy Act, which requires federal agencies to minimize unnecessary conversion of productive agricultural land. The North Fields represent some of the most productive and culturally significant agricultural land in the valley, and once lost to pavement these resources cannot be restored. 4. Water Quality and Aquifer Risk The proposed alignment crosses aquifer recharge zones and wetlands that naturally filter runoff before it enters the Provo River. A high-speed highway increases impervious surface area, stormwater runoff, and pollutant loading from vehicles, road salts, and tire debris. These impacts pose long-term risks to groundwater resources and downstream water quality. 5. Induced Demand and Growth Impacts Transportation research consistently demonstrates that expanded highway capacity generates additional traffic through induced demand. By opening previously undeveloped agricultural land to major highway access, Alternative B risks accelerating land-use change and development pressure throughout the valley. This outcome may ultimately worsen congestion rather than resolve it, while permanently altering the rural character of the region. 6. Incomplete Accounting of Fiscal Impacts The EIS appears to underestimate the full cost of the project by omitting or minimizing expenses related to irrigation reconstruction, agricultural access crossings, utility relocation, stormwater infrastructure, and long-term maintenance obligations. A complete accounting of these costs is necessary for taxpayers and decision-makers to understand the true financial burden of this alignment. Given these concerns, Alternative B appears to create the highest level of environmental harm while providing uncertain transportation benefits. UDOT should remove Alternative B from consideration and advance alternatives that better protect water resources, agricultural land, and the long-term character of Heber Tiffany Roberts Midway resident

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
469	Todd Anderson	Thank you for moving forward with this. The traffic in Heber City is only getting worse. The option that makes sense runs through the North Fields. Please stop the dance and start the process of building 'option B'
165	Todd Hicken (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Plan A or do nothing. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
172	Todd Hicken (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	My name is Todd Hicken, and you've heard from my mom, and you've heard from my brother. North Fields have been sacred in our family for years forever. And as I listen -- you know, I have a business on Main Street, and I hate the traffic. And -- and I always thought I wanted a bypass, but now after listening, I don't think we need it because the only people that are going to benefit from this bypass are people that don't live here. And why are we spending a billion dollars on someone that we don't even know? You know, we hate the trucks. You know, maybe there ought to be some way to say you can only bring trucks through Heber Valley from 10:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. and open up the -- the congestion. I mean, that -- that right there would do it, but I think there's other solutions. I don't think that, after listening to what's been said, that it's really going to fix the problem because it's just going to attract more people, more -- and we've got a city council that are -- that they love to develop. There's developers and bankers on -- UNIDENTIFIED COMMENTER: This one doesn't like to develop, just so you know. MR. HICKEN: All right. But -- but they just want to make money, and, you know, who doesn't? But as we go forward, I mean, we just need to kind of put the reigns on this valley and say enough is enough. And if you want to live here -- we've already ruined the Red Ledges area and a lot of the farmland that's been -- and open spaces up there that's completely private and -- and that's okay. We don't -- you know, you would never put it through Red Ledges because there's too much money up there and we'd have to fight it, and we don't have the money to fight it. So I would just encourage you to maybe just scrap the whole thing. Figure out how to get some surface streets without parking -- parallel parking on them that we can drive up and down and just continue with our lives.
448	Todd Jacques	I support other methods than the highway bypoass. Rail-first sequencing before any bypass through the North Fields is finalized. or pipeline. It is short sighted to keep destroying are enviroment with diesel trucking that is harmful to our enviroment. If freight rail or pipeline is completed and modeled first, projected truck volumes change. If truck volumes change, the justification for widening changes. That analysis belongs in the public record before permanent decisions are made. Freight first. Passenger next. Highway last — and only if still justified.
582	Tom Banta	To the UDOT EIS Team for the Heber Bypass March 9, 2026 From: Tom Banta Dear EIS Team, I am a resident of Midway in Wasatch County, writing as a concerned citizen regarding the proposed plans outlined in the Heber Bypass EIS (Revised 2/20/26). I have lived in Midway for about three years, and I believe this is a critical moment for the state to demonstrate innovation and leadership in addressing transportation challenges. After living for a decade in the NY/NJ area, I understand that discussions about a Heber bypass have been ongoing for years. Through conversations with residents and a local civil engineer, it appears the state has not seriously considered a tunnel alternative. While I recognize the potential costs and environmental challenges such a project would pose, this is effectively a 100-year decision—one that, with sufficient foresight, could deliver significant long-term benefits. Specifically, I propose constructing a tunnel from around Independence, Utah, to Silver Summit, connecting to I-80—a distance of roughly 24 miles. The estimated cost of this project would be around $2.4 billion, roughly four times that of the bypass proposal. However, it would offer far greater benefits: preserving scenic beauty, reducing environmental impact, and conserving land. With a toll of about $1 per mile per vehicle, the project could potentially pay for itself within about 21 years, assuming conservative traffic growth. I understand the difficulty and complexity of your work. Giving full and fair consideration to a tunnel alternative would demonstrate genuine vision and leadership—leaving a legacy that improves the quality of life for generations in this region. Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration. Sincerely, Tom Banta EM: XXXXXXXXXXXX Mobile: XXXXXXXXXX
499	Tom Reed	I am opposed to UDOT's choice of Alternative B for the highway bypass in Heber City see my concern below: Destruction of wetlands Damage to an agriculture protection area Potential pollution of groundwater from road salt, tire rubber particulates and petroleum residues Please consider realigning route B closer to Alternative A

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Thank you, Tom Reed XXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX
558	Tom Reed	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A. UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Tom Reed Name Tom Reed Address XXXXXXXXXXX, HEBER CITY UT Phone Number XXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
329	Tom Stenger	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleyeis@utah.gov Subject: Stop Route B - Choose Route A Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team, I'm writing to urge UDOT to reject Route/Alternative Band choose Route/Alternative A.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		UDOT' s mission includes enhancing quality of life. Route B fails that test for the people who live and work in the Heber Valley. It pushes the greatest damage onto the North Fields-wetlands, farmland, irrigation history, and water resources-while delivering only a small travel-time advantage. UDOT has stated Route B is preferred because it: • performs best on mobility, • pulls more trucks off Main Street, • causes fewer relocations, and • has fewer historic (4(f)) impacts. Before any Record of Decision, UDOT must show proof--not conclusions-and answer the following: 1. "Best for the community" What does "best for the community" mean, who is included in "the community," and what scorecard/weighting was used to choose B over A (including wetlands, farmland, noise, water risk, and rural character)? 2. Truck diversion Please provide the modeled heavy-truck volumes (trucks/day and%) on Main Street under No-Action vs A vs B (opening year and 2050), and the assumptions behind truck route choice. If trucks continue using Main Street, what is the justification for Route B? 3. Main Street totals, not percentages Please provide total projected Main Street traffic volumes (vehicles/day) for today vs 2050 under No-Action, A, and B. Percentages do not prove Main Street will be less busy with significant growth in local trips. 4. No-access enforcement What is the legal, enforceable guarantee that no new access points or interchanges will ever be added through the North Fields, and who can change that later? 5. Mitigation specifics now Please provide the number of mitigation acres, a map clearly separating highway right-of way from actual permanently protected mitigation land, and the funding plan for acquisition and perpetual management. 6. Stormwater and drinking water How does infiltrating highway runoff protect groundwater and drinking water sources? What treatment measures are guaranteed in design and budget, and what is the contingency plan if wells or irrigation water are contaminated? 7. Construction impacts Please provide a clear A vs B construction comparison: years of construction, closures/detours, and guaranteed protections for farms and residents (access, irrigation, livestock movement, dust/noise, emergency response). 8. Historic resources and consistent weighting Please provide the full list of historic resources counted and exactly how each alternative affects them, including historic irrigation/canal resources, and the "least overall harm" worksheet. 9. Local costs and responsibilities

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Please provide the written breakdown of what UDOT will maintain and what Wasatch County/Heber will be required to maintain (trail, snow removal, crossings, frontage roads, landscaping/irrigation, lighting, policing/EMS impacts), with annual lifecycle costs for A vs B. Route A meets the project purpose while avoiding the most severe and irreversible harms to the North Fields. If UDOT truly cares about quality of life and community impacts-not just travel time and construction convenience-Route A is the only defensible choice. Please confirm receipt of this comment and direct me to the tables and sections in the DEIS that answer the questions above. Sincerely, Name Tom Stenger Address XXXXXXXXXX. Heber City, UT XXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXX Email Address (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
85	Tony (No Last Name)	The presentation on Jan 27 was very thorough. I'm grateful that finally we are making the first steps to solve something that should have been solved decades ago. the level of detail you put into these studies is excellent. This is not going to be easy. Any option selected (A, B, Main Street... something else), will generate high emotions. And rightfully so. My advice: Seek to be compensate those who will be affected with emanate domain fairly. and those whose properties will be affected, seek to minimize noise. For me, Alternative B appears to be best. That's what I would vote for. As for short term (next 7-8 years) Can we consider one or more of the following: 1) synchronize main street lights with smart lights (to optimize the flow), 2) remove street parking near key intersections to make additional turning lanes? 3) divert truck traffic to 500 north to 600 W and next to the railway... and weave to S FLD Rd... of course, we will need to extend, expand certain areas... not optimal, but we could at least get the trucks off of Main Street. (I would not be happy about this as a resident in this area, but if I were given some sort of compensation for 6-7 years, it would make the sting less painful).
480	Tony Frates	See comments attached (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
373	Traci Lawrence	Alternative A offers a more sustainable option that protects the landscape while facilitating growth in the valley. Alternative B would impact over 50 acres of the North Fields wetlands, threaten aquifers supplying water to more than one million residents (including Provo), and disrupt soil, water, and wildlife. Because sustainability and growth can go hand in hand, I urge you to select Alternative A.
166	Tracie Heiner (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I am very concerned about the water that will be affected by this project. I feel it won't really resolve the issues with interstate 40. They need to find another solution. Plan A is the least aggressive option to the BYPASS - Please consider the wild life that is supported bythe North fields - you are not supposed to upset wet lands - it will affect the farmers and their cattle as well. It should not be considered a fix to traffic! (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
377	Tracy Oliveto	Alternative Aoff a more sustainable option that protects the landscape, while facilitating growth in Tracthe valley. Oliveto
119	Tracy Taylor (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hi, everyone. My name is Tracy Taylor with the Wasatch Taxpayers Association. I've had the benefit of listening to the conversations for the past ten years on this bypass, but there's many that know this has been discussed for 30 years plus. So I'm a little bit befuddled by what these plans -- these two plans ended up being after many, many comments and input by county council people, planners, you know, the people in our community that were trying to give input on what the community wants. Bottom line, this is a billion-dollar project that does not fix the problem, and it's only saving 90 seconds in drive time. 25 percent of Main Street traffic is going to be affected. Carlos Braceras showed up to a county council meeting October 2024, and he said, "We failed with these five options we have," and it's in a public record on a public meeting. And he said we need to bite the bullet and just widen 40, and let's just go around the city like we have been discussing for 25, 30 years of the original bypass that we unfortunately asked UDOT to help us with. Okay? The 404 Clean Water Act is a violation. The 4(f) historic buildings that they cite in Alternative A is a violation that is not even recognized at the state. The southwest corner and 13th South -- for those homeowners in that area, I feel your pain. I looked up Logan City, and they've got 53,000 people in Logan City. I saw their bypass. There's no elevated cement walls out your back door. There's none of that. They have 53,000 people. Heber City has 19,000. Our whole county only has, like, 38,000 people right now. I'm worried that they're cutting off connectivity. We're actually losing connectivity with this. It definitely affects our emergency response times. I am concerned about all our citizens being taken care of by fire emergency, EMS, ambulance. I -- I just -- I cannot believe this is the choice that we have. And the aquifer, if it is destroyed, I want to know how anybody on Main Street can get a drinking water at a restaurant on Main Street when we have no drinkable water. Thank you.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
32	Travis Foss	Hello, I've been following the UDOT email updates for the Heber bypass for some time now. I'm so happy to hear that plan B is the preferred route. With all the construction happening along hwy 40 by UVU campus it only makes sense that plan B is the route to take. I have concerns that future construction will get in the way of the bypass route. I would love to see the project get started as soon as possible.
596	Travis Price	Please do some more research about other avenues that may keep the path out of the way of the city not impacting the north fields and 1300 south. Is it possible to go along river road? The feel that this project will only reduce a small percentage of traffic. Most of the traffic in Heber is going to stay in Heber because of the growth on the east side of said new highway project, and residents will have a unsightly freeway too look at. This is a decision which has been up for debate for over 30 years. We can't go back however, it is possible to look outside the box for a better solution. Thank you for your time. Travis Price XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
106	Trevor & Alie Jackson	To: Heber Valley EIS Project Team From: Trevor Jackson & Aliesha Jackson Address: XXXXXXXXXXXX, Heber City, UT XXXXX Subject: Formal Support for Option B - Resident Safety Observations To the UDOT Study Team, As residents of the North Villages and long-term members of this community—having grown up in the valley and graduated from Wasatch High School—my wife and I are writing to express our full support for Option B as the Preferred Alternative. We have lived at our current residence for three years, overlooking Highway 40 and the Coyote Lane interchange. While we appreciate the Draft EIS analysis, we wish to provide specific "on-the-ground" observations regarding safety and local traffic patterns. 1. Safety Concerns & Personal Observations We consider ourselves safe, cautious drivers, yet the current infrastructure forces us into dangerous situations regularly. Frequency of Incidents: We experience "near-miss" collisions on River Road, Coyote Lane, and 800 N. nearly every quarter. It is a frightening reality of living in this part of the valley. Infrastructure Limitations: While the addition of the light at Coyote Lane has been a helpful improvement, it has not solved the fundamental danger of the corridor. The volume and speed of through-traffic are simply too high for the current residential interfaces. Risk Assessment: We often say that the single most dangerous thing we do each day is drive this specific stretch of Highway 40. We believe Option B is the only solution that effectively separates high-speed regional traffic from our local neighborhood streets. 2. Impact on Quality of Life & Property Value We strongly believe that Option B is the correct choice for the long-term health of Heber City. Option A Concerns: An expansion of the existing footprint (Option A) would decrease our quality of life and negatively impact the value of homes in our neighborhood due to increased noise and proximity to a major highway expansion. Option B Benefits: This alternative provides the best travel times and preserves the integrity of the North Village residential areas. 3. Response to Mitigation & Preservation While we value the heritage of the Northfields, the "crusty old timers" resistance to any bypass at all ignores the modern reality of our safety and growth. We love the Northfields, but the safety of the valley's residents must come first. The bypass is a necessity, not a luxury. We understand, appreciate, and recognize the value of UDOT prioritizing the North Fields for wetland mitigation. ("For every acre that we impact, we are required to provide mitigation at a ratio that is often 2:1 or higher.") 4. Conclusion Please move forward with Option B as soon as possible. We need this build to be prioritized to save lives, protect property values, and finally give the residents of the North Villages a safe way to navigate their own

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		community. Sincerely, Trevor & Aliesha Jackson XXXXXXXXXX
634	Tricia Carlson	Dear UDOT I have tried to write this letter multiple times and never have come up with the words needed to express my feelings and thoughts towards the proposed bypass. I do realize that Heber City is in a traffic crisis that they themselves have created or ignored for decades. While it is not something I deal with on a daily basis, it does affect me. I am not a land owner that this will affect but it does affect my lifestyle. I currently house 8 of my horses on privately owned property in the North Fields.. What I have learned over the last 20 years of farming in the North Fields. This area of our landscape is not just farmland, it is truly its own ecosystem. There are several Osprey nests and one Bald Eagle nest that I am aware of. The fox dens, racoon habitat, Sand Hill Cranes and a myriad of other animals make that area their home. Running a 4 lane cement elevated highway through there will permanently alter the ecosystem. The building process, materials, vibration and noise along with the maintenance and chemicals used. This area has a very substantial aquifer, and from my understanding this is one of the reasons that the bypass has not been built to this date is due to the wetlands issue and the fact that the roads just would not hold up to the moisture content underneath. (My Father was on the bypass committee as a UHP Sergeant in the 80's early 90's). By disrupting this aquifer, there will be ramifications that no one can predict. Water table disruptions can cause several issues including elevated temperatures, reduced oxygen regeneration and elevated air quality issues. The temperatures in this area can have a 10 -15 degree variance from the rest of the valley.. I do think that this alone warrants another option. I do not believe that this bypass will alleviate Heber's traffic problems. I believe that there is a large percentage of this traffic that is local and a bypass is not the answer. I also believe that Heber City is pushing this issue harder to make Main Street more visually appealing .. My personal preference would be to see 1. utilizing light timing to get the through traffic through quicker in high traffic times 2. incentivising commercial vehicles to use non peak times 3. A scaled down version of option A bypassing just for 189 traffic. 4. 189 bypass following the river's path. An elevated concrete structure with multiple overpasses and on off ramps will irreversibly damage the environment and ruralness of Heber City. Your decisions will forever alter the trajectory of our environment. Sincerely, Tricia and Richie Carlson -- Tricia Carlson Office Manager Canyon Dentistry XXXXXXXXXX
207	Trina Cooke	Hello - Please see the attached letter from Heber City, signed by the Heber City Council. Regards - HC_250.png Trina Cooke, MMC, UCC City Recorder Heber City

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		XXXXXXXXXXXX, Heber City, UT XXXXX Phone: XXXXXXXXX Email: XXXXXXXXXXXX (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
297	Trish Domenichetti	Heber Valley Corridor EIS I would like to voice my formal comments AGAINST specifically, Alternative B, for this project and prefer Alternative A as an alternate route for the following reasons: 1- We need to preserve NFIC's water system, as well as protect and maintain farming. Has this been sufficiently addressed and studied? Reference: DEIS ch. 4, pp 4-710 to 4-722 DEIS ch. 3, pp 3-210 to 3-218 DEIS ch. 3, Table pp. 3-62 to 3-68: NFIC comments DEIS ch. 4, Table 4.7-2 2- Is there a plan in place to addressed the municipal drinking water if this should be comprised during or after completion of this project? Reference: DEIS ch. 3, pp. 3-140 to 3-148 DEIS ch. 3 pp. 3-88 to 3-94 3-What about preventing the discharge of water heated by the sun on the roads that can lead to algae blooms, adversely affecting the water systems? Reference: DEIS Ch. 3, pp. 3-104 to 3-122 DEIS App, 3K, p 34; DEIS ch. 3, pp. 3-166 to3-169 4-The Clean Water Act required the least damage possible. Alternative B has an increase of 140% of aquatic resources compared to Alternative A. Reference: DEIS App. 3K, Ch. 3, pp. 3-166 to 3-169 DEIS Ch. 3, p. 3-169, DEIS App. 3K, Sec 2.4 5-It appears that the Wetland determinations were not performed during the spring run-off, which can modify the outcome . By changing these natural channels, Alternative B can destroy this valuable resource. Reference: DEIS ch. 3, pp 3-175 to 3-176 DEIS App. #N, pp. 99-1785 6-Has there been a study regarding potential impacts from petroleum products and road salts that can adversely affect the pasture lands and ultimately the livestock? Reference: DEIS ch. 3 (absent); DEIS App. 3K (absent) 7-What about the cost estimate for this project? When we are talking millions of dollars, Alternative A provides a significant savings. Reference: DEIS ch. 4, Sec. 4.7.7; DEIS App. 2E, p. 30 8-Is the time to bypass Heber with the projected bypass truly an improvement? Reference: DEIS ch. 2, pp. 2-5 to 2-12 9-Could there a better, less expensive and less destructive alternatives for Heber? Reference: DEIS ch. 2, pp. 2-244 to 2-252

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		This email is only addressing a small number of my concerns regarding Alternative B. I was hoping to sustain your interest before in proceeding with this major project. Thank you for you time and attention. Sincerely, Trish Domenichetti HV resident since 2011
563	Troy Metcalf	Please postpone any further development in Wasatch County until an analysis of all water available is thoroughly studied. I am concerned the growth in our county is outpacing water availability, especially in drought years.
486	Trudy Brereton	I would rather keep traffic on hwy 40 through Main Street in Heber than have the bypass go through the north fields. It's the last open space in our valley and provides a beautiful view when dropping into Heber Valley from the north. The noise and pollution caused from traffic on the bypass will cause the quiet north fields, the residents, farm animals and wildlife who live there devastating effects and the wildlife will likely move on. Sadly, a bypass should have happened 20 years ago on the east side of the valley. UDOT missed the boat. I am a 33 year resident of Wasatch County and feel sick about the current bypass plan. Sincerely, Trudy Brereton Email: XXXXXXXXXXXX
34	Tyler Adams	I have resided in Heber City 43 years. There has been a lot of development in the valley during that time. From my observation moving US 40 will not reduce Main Street traffic because of the amount of local traffic. The major through traffic is double trailer tankers moving oil from Uinta Basin. Making a bypass for those trucks is logical but routing traffic headed east to the south west side of the valley is an odd choice. Once the new high school on midway lane is finished there will be another area impacted by local traffic. Only having one road between Heber and Midway is going to be a mistake once that school gets finished. Taking 500 North across to Midway could provide an additional route to reduce the traffic burden on 100 South/Midway Lane. If the city council would require developers to have roads match up in certain areas this could reduce a lot of the Main Street traffic as well. For example, 750 east turns into 820 but on the north side it ends at 600 north and the south side it ends at 1200 South. The west side has the same issue 300 West could be a great north south road or 600 West just through the old rodeo grounds/baseball diamonds. East to west 500 north has already been identified as a method to travel to Midway. Take out the old hospital/county building on 100 South and 500 East to tie 100 South to center street which would then provide a direct route from the farthest east side of the valley to the farthest west side. On 600 South when you take out the baseball diamonds to align 600 West you make 600 South gently move over to 650 and on the East side it would go to 2400 East. Mill road would be another great north to south option all the way through the valley. These options a lot of great routing for locals that could be extended into all the new developments. Thank you, Tyler Adams
339	Tyler Field	To Whom It May Concern: As a resident of Heber City that lives very close to the planned 1300 South extension (XXXXXXXXXXXX), I have major concerns about why it would be necessary to elevate the road. I mimic my fellow neighbors well thought out and researched comment: “I am a homeowner whose property directly borders 1300 South in Heber City, and I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor Project. My concern is specific. I oppose the proposed grade-separated flyover and frontage road system along 1300 South. After reviewing the Draft EIS and supporting technical materials, it is not clear that this alignment and level of infrastructure are necessary to meet the project’s stated purpose and need. It is also not clear, in plain terms, how the project moved from identifying mobility issues on U.S. 40 to selecting a new elevated facility immediately adjacent to homes and businesses along 1300 South. The Draft EIS describes the 1300 South segment as an elevated facility with one travel lane in each direction, combined with a one-way frontage road system intended to facilitate local traffic movements. It also states that the Industrial Parkway intersection would be removed and replaced with right-in, right-out access to frontage roads in order to consolidate access points and improve regional mobility. The intersection at 300 West would be grade-separated, and the Draft EIS explains that this is important because it would allow corridor traffic to move unimpeded. That explanation describes a design approach, but it does not clearly demonstrate why this approach is required rather than simply preferred. This design would place highway-scale elevated infrastructure immediately adjacent to existing homes and businesses. The Visual Resources Technical Report acknowledges that elevated structures in this area

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		would be prominent and highly visible, creating adverse visual impacts where none exist today. These impacts are not temporary. They are permanent operational changes that would affect daily life along 1300 South for decades, including sustained noise exposure, visual intrusion, and continuous traffic activity. While mitigation measures are discussed, mitigation does not change the fundamental character of an elevated roadway or restore the existing neighborhood environment. The flyover and frontage road configuration would also affect existing businesses along 1300 South. While the Draft EIS characterizes frontage roads as preserving access, it also shows that direct intersections would be removed or limited to improve corridor mobility. In practice, this means fewer access points, longer travel paths, and reduced visibility from through traffic. Many businesses along this corridor rely on direct east-west access and pass-by visibility. Frontage roads may preserve technical access, but they do not necessarily preserve the same level of convenience, visibility, or customer awareness. These foreseeable operational effects are not fully evaluated in the Draft EIS, particularly for small and service-oriented businesses. A central issue in reviewing the Draft EIS is that the decision pathway leading to the 1300 South flyover is not clearly explained in plain language. The Draft EIS states that the needs assessment evaluation area is focused on U.S. 40 from SR-32 to U.S. 189 and also includes portions of U.S. 189 and U.S. 40 near the hub intersection to account for system operations and provide logical termini. The project purpose and need focuses on improving mobility on U.S. 40 and allowing Heber City to meet its vision for a historic town center, while also providing opportunities for non-motorized transportation. Given that U.S. 189 is expressly included in the evaluation area and recognized as part of the regional system influencing corridor operations, the Draft EIS should clearly explain why improving or optimizing existing state highway infrastructure was not advanced as a primary approach before selecting a new grade-separated facility through a residential and business corridor. The Draft EIS explains why grade separation and access consolidation are desirable for unimpeded traffic flow, but it does not clearly document what performance thresholds require a grade-separated solution at this location, why less intrusive at-grade or access management strategies would fail to meet the stated purpose and need, or when and how the permanent impacts to the 1300 South corridor were deemed acceptable. The Preferred Alternative technical materials include cost estimates for the action alternatives in the hundreds of millions of dollars, including engineering, right-of-way, construction, utilities, drainage, and mitigation. Elevated structures and grade-separated facilities also carry long-term inspection, maintenance, and future replacement obligations that extend for decades. At the same time, the Draft EIS evaluates congestion and operations primarily using weekday peak-hour metrics and recognizes seasonal variation in traffic volumes. Designing a permanent elevated facility with permanent neighborhood impacts to address peak-period conditions raises reasonable questions about proportionality and long-term cost responsibility. The Draft EIS also emphasizes the goal of allowing Heber City to achieve its vision for a historic town center, including reduced traffic volumes on Main Street and improved walkability. These are legitimate policy objectives. However, when a local vision objective is embedded directly into the project purpose and screening criteria, the Draft EIS should clearly explain how that priority was balanced against permanent impacts to adjacent neighborhoods, business access, and long-term public cost. At present, that balancing explanation is not clear in the record. For these reasons, I respectfully request that UDOT provide clearer responses to the following: • How the 1300 South flyover and frontage road configuration were determined to be necessary rather than simply beneficial? • What specific criteria or performance thresholds required grade separation at this location? • Why less intrusive options were not sufficient to meet the project’s stated goals? • How long-term public costs and maintenance obligations were weighed in selecting this design? • How permanent neighborhood and business impacts were balanced against benefits that primarily serve corridor through traffic. I also request a clear, side-by-side comparison between an approach that prioritizes improvements to existing state highways within the project evaluation area and the proposed grade-separated flyover and frontage road design along 1300 South. This comparison should address traffic performance, construction and long-term costs, right-of-way needs, and permanent impacts to nearby homes and businesses, including noise, visual effects, and access. Without this information, it is difficult for the public to fully understand both the tradeoffs involved and the decision process that led to the selected alignment.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		After attending the last meeting, and listening to countless comments opposing the bypass for almost 2 hours, I came away with the strong notion that this is way more about money than about betterment of the community. The community, and many in the local governemnt do not want the bypass. That has been voiced many times in person and online, and yet the project continues to move forward. It begs the question: Who is pushing for and stands to profit off this project? I am conviced that there is alot of dark money being exchanged on this project. Otherwise why is UDOT so hell bent on giving the community the figurative middle finger in the midst of so much rejection? Follow the money and it always shows the true motives. Tyler Field Brady Flygare Homeowner XXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah” After attending meetings and reviewing comments about the bypass from my fellow citizens of Heber City, maybe the bypass should just not happen altogether. The destruction of wetlands and other property as well as the effect the bypass has on homeowners is not worth the little time saved by adding a bypass. I respectfully request that UDOT listen to the citizens and do what is right by them. Brianne Field Homeowner XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Heber City, Utah
477	Tyler Haroldsen	I would prefer the no-build alternative, with quality transit built instead. If not available, I would prefer alternative A. I think the best solution to traffic congestion in Heber is to build effective and useful public transportation. This would involve building a frontrunner or equivalent connection in Heber, as well as building local transit within Heber akin to streetcars used in many places. This would reduce traffic by redirecting trips to transit, instead of by requiring bigger roads. I think MAG's traffic demand model systematically overstates how much traffic would remain if better transit were built. As best as I can tell, this seems to be because they calibrate the model to data collected in the recent past. Considering that Utah (and most of the USA broadly) hasn't historically had a great transit system that's good enough to compete with the speed and usefulness of personal vehicles, the past data cannot reflect the future. As a result, MAG calibrating to past data can only produce more of the same system of the past. For this reason, I think UDOT should support more transit here instead of a road, as I think transit would be far more effective than MAG's traffic model predicts. Having said this, I understand the above comments may not be convincing enough. If a build alternative is chosen, I would prefer alternative A. It would have less impact on the natural landscape, which I care deeply about preserving for future generations to enjoy and benefit from as my generation has.
167	Una & Briton Yonge (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	Our property and life will be severely impacted by Alternate B. Our home life would be very different given the proximity of a large road (not at ground level). I don't understand how are kids are supposed to play outside during the construction of a major highway. We won't be able to access half our property. The route through the North Fields is allegedly trying to mitigate wetlands but on the maps I've seen there seems to be ample space with out wetlands that is going untouched. There aren't wetlands on 600 W so why can't the road go there? That will also reduce the need for very ugly fly overs, and elevated portions of the road. I know the road needs to happen to help growth in our valley but I don't think the current route through the North Fields makes sense. Please consider using the 600 W. (For this comment’s attachment or original format see Volume 2).
122	Unidentified (Spoke on behalf of Dan Simmons) (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	I'm not Christi Judd, but I am almost as radiant and brilliant. I'm reading a statement on behalf of Dan Simmons. I wish to thank UDOT for responding to my questions last night. It is because of the responses to those questions and to the questions of others that I am very concerned about both the intent of UDOT and Alternative B and the analysis that went into the EIS. Mr. Hancock said that they used Heber City's general plan in guiding their decision, and he said that the general plan clearly states to protect the North Fields. This is because the North Fields provide multifactorial benefits to all residents of Heber City, this valley, the state of Utah, and, indeed, the nation. The North Fields is the setting of the federal Provo River restoration corridor. The benefits of the North Fields are both economic and environmental. The North Fields also provide an aesthetic and lifestyle amenity because of this unique setting, which is why most want to live here. I quote from the general plan: "Guiding Principles: One, Heber actively works with neighboring community and the county on strategies to implement the permit, protection of farmland, natural open spaces, and rural character to maintain distinct separation between communities. Two, Heber will work with the county and surrounding communities to create permanent farm and mountain land protection through such mechanisms as conservation easements and partnerships." However, there are those who would profit from developing the North Fields, including those whose livelihood is tied to developers or business on Main Street and want Alternative B that breaks the current rural use of the North Fields, turns the current limited access US-40 highway into a road owned and controlled by Heber City through abandonment and allows the development from Heber City. The answers to the questions last night seemed to indicate that was the likely scenario that would occur from Alternative B. Specifically, UDOT seems to indicate that the bypass could or would be renamed Highway 40, and you failed to affirm that the current Highway 40 would remain a limited access road. Would UDOT support abandonment of present Highway 40 to Heber City so that the North Fields could be developed? If that is the case, relying on the Heber City general plan as justification for the project makes no sense, nor did the numbers and impacts discussed in the EIS study. Specifically, they don't assess the traffic and environmental impacts of highly increased use of present Highway 40 by development of the North Fields, which, besides further clogging Highway 40, would require stoplights to be longer to accommodate entry traffic from the 600 acres of development of the North Fields split off by Alternative B. The time needed to drive from River Road to Heber City would be interminable. This doesn't even take into account the environmental impact induced by UDOT on the North Fields by UDOT's actions on Alternative B.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
641	University of Utah Engineering Students	To the UDOT Heber Valley EIS Project Team, We write as engineering students at the University of Utah who are being trained under the highest standards of engineering ethics, public safety, and environmental stewardship. Our education emphasizes that engineers must protect the public, defend scientific integrity, and refuse to endorse projects that lack transparency or violate federal law. After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), we cannot support Alternative B. The proposal raises profound ethical, technical, and legal concerns that contradict the standards we are expected to uphold as future licensed engineers. 1. Ethical Breach: Withholding Critical Hydrologic and Groundwater Data The DEIS fails to disclose the hydrogeologic modeling necessary to evaluate impacts to the shallow aquifer that supplies drinking water to the Wasatch Back. Under the NSPE Code of Ethics, engineers must base decisions on complete, transparent, and accurate information. UDOT has not provided: contaminant transport modeling groundwater mounding analysis recharge-rate impacts spring and wetland connectivity data high-water-year field measurements Proceeding without this information violates the ethical requirement to “hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public.” When the resource at risk is a sole-source aquifer, withholding data is not just a technical oversight — it is an ethical failure. 2. NEPA and LEDPA Violations: Selecting the Most Damaging Alternative Alternative B crosses the most wetlands, most irrigation systems, and the most aquifer recharge zones of any alignment. Under NEPA (42 U.S.C. § 4332) and the Clean Water Act’s LEDPA standard, agencies must select the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. Alternative B is the opposite. The DEIS does not explain how the most destructive alignment could possibly satisfy LEDPA. Nor does it justify the dismissal of lower-impact alternatives proposed by the North Fields Irrigation Company — a clear procedural deficiency. 3. High-Speed Design Without Legal or Engineering Justification The proposed 65 mph design speed is unjustified, unsafe, and inconsistent with surrounding roadways. A high-speed rural corridor: increases wildlife and livestock mortality widens the roadway footprint increases noise and pollution raises collision severity expands spill-risk into the aquifer NEPA requires agencies to evaluate reasonable alternatives, including lower-speed designs. The DEIS does not do this. The only apparent purpose of the 65 mph design is to manufacture a marginal time-savings benefit — approximately one minute — which is not a lawful or rational basis for selecting a high-impact alternative. 4. Induced Growth Ignored Despite Clear Federal Requirements Alternative B is classified as a Class III facility, which allows future access points at half-mile intervals. This is a growth-enabling design by definition. Yet the DEIS claims the project is “not intended to induce growth.” This contradiction violates NEPA’s requirement to analyze indirect and induced growth impacts (40 CFR §§ 1508.1(g), 1508.1(h)). The DEIS does not model: west-side development pressure east-side approved growth increased water demand long-term traffic generation land-use conversion

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		infrastructure expansion Failure to disclose foreseeable impacts is grounds for an arbitrary and capriciousfinding under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 706). 5. Loss of Federally Funded Conservation Easement UDOT blocked a federally funded NRCS conservation easement that would have preserved nearly 300 acres and brought a halt of federal preservation funds to the community. This action contradicts: the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. § 4201 et seq.) local rural preservation plans the public interest The DEIS does not explain why UDOT chose to sacrifice irreplaceable farmland rather than adjust the project boundary. 6. Failure to Address Main Street Congestion — the Actual Problem Main Street congestion is driven by local trips, not regional through-traffic. Alternative B does not fix: failing intersections between 100 North and 100 South congestion at the Hub (Hwy 40 & 189) east-side growth impacts A bypass that does not solve the core problem is not a solution — it is a diversion of public funds. 7. Elevated Structures and Long-Term Maintenance Liabilities Alternative B introduces elevated structures that: increase cost increase noise increase maintenance burdens reduce property values expand environmental footprint The DEIS omits full lifecycle cost analysis, which is required for responsible public finance and transparent decision-making. At grade options were initially offered but then reversed. 8. Irreversible Environmental Damage Wetland mitigation cannot replicate the ecological function of existing wetlands. Aquifer contamination cannot be reversed. Farmland lost to development cannot be restored. NEPA requires agencies to avoid irreversible commitments of resources before completing a lawful analysis. Alternative B violates this principle. Conclusion: Ethical and Legal Standards Require Removal of Alternative B As engineering students at the University of Utah, we are being trained to uphold the law, protect the public, and defend scientific integrity. Alternative B fails every one of these tests. We formally request that UDOT: remove Alternative B from consideration comply fully with NEPA, LEDPA, and the Clean Water Act disclose all hydrologic and groundwater modeling evaluate lower-speed, lower-impact alternatives respect farmland protection laws and conservation easements prioritize solutions that address Main Street congestion commit to at-grade designs that protect rural character and public safety We will not accept a transportation project that compromises water security, violates federal law, and disregards the ethical obligations of the engineering profession. Sincerely, Engineering Students of the University of Utah Sent from my iPhone

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		(For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
388	Valerie Clark	My name is Valerie Clark; My husband's name is Dennis Clark. We are both solidly in favor of alternative A which is much preferable to the ecology and health of the Heber Valley Area. We want the wetlands and north fields to be protected. We live in Utah Valley and want our water supply to be protected. We want the soil, water and animal life to be protected. Please to not choose alternative B.
69	Valerie Roadfuss	How much traffic do you think it would actually take off main street? All the taxpayers money to put a potential risk for the water over the north fields, if a spill occurs you have contaminated the water supply, there's not enough big trucks on main street to build this costly thing, that should have been built over 20 yrs ago, One last question, do the trucks still go through town to the weight station out in Daniels?
168	Valerie Sorensen (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I vote for Alternative A. The other alternative B, does not solve the traffic problem. We also want to preserve and protect our water, air, farms, wildlife that makes our valley beautiful! Option B does not fix Main Street traffic - it threatens our drinking water. Destroys N and S Fields, and harms farmers. Not fiscally responsible. Please vote for Option A! (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
84	Vaughn Rasband	Enough with the studies and comments already. Alternative B appears to be by far the best option and always has been to anyone with common sense. Enough money has been spent and time wasted while the problem continues to get worse. Stop with all the studies and comments and GET IT DONE!!
16	Vicki Doud	This is all very exciting news to get big traffic off Main street. We were about to buy a home at XXXXXXXXXXXXXX, but would like to know how close the bipass road will be to this retirement development. I can't tell by the map. TY! Vicki Doud
104	Virginia Joyce (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Virginia Joyce. I'm a resident of Midway, and I'd like to put on the record that I am opposed to the bypass in any form. There are alternatives that should be pursued, possible railway connectors or rerouting of traffic on an hourly basis, for example, having trucks travel through downtown Heber at later hours in the evening; or possibly using a toll system to be -- that would impact travel on 40 based on the number of axels a vehicle may have, so the size and/or weight of the vehicle. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
169	Virginia Joyce (Handwritten comment submitted at public hearing)	I am opposed to the bypass. It would be a complete mistake to build a road anywhere near the North Fields and surrounding area. My thoughts are: 1. Build a railway system that would connect Park City through Heber and on to Provo. We already have Heber rail system to work with. 2. Toll, tax or charge vehicles based on a size and weight. 3. Completely rework traffic lights so that traffic flows more efficiently. 4. Doing nothing is a fine alternative. (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
322	Virginia Otteson	Don't go through the North Fields. Choose the alternate plan or develope a new one. Leave the North Fields alone
517	Wade Hansen	This letter is to acknowledge my total support for the UDOT preferred option (alternative B) for the bypass through the north fields. For 35 years I have lived on the highway on a hill that gives me a 270 degree view of the highway. My address is XXXXXXXXXXXX. My observations indicate a bypass is very much needed now, considering the increase in traffic due to current and future growth. I know the engineering is not there for the other alternative A (on US 40) option, considering the future growth especially. The vast majority of the people I know in Heber, support UDOT's preferred Alternative B corridor through the north fields. At last, we finally have momentum with UDOT in getting a much needed bypass corridor. Please move forward with your final decision as soon as possible. Sincerely, Wade M Hansen
262	Wayne	I live in the Cottages at valley station development on the south end of Heber right by the 1300 South interchange. It will destroy the view to the South, it will increase noise level significantly, and in my opinion, it will ruin the small friendly neighborhood for so many of us that have lived there right from its inception, and of course anyone who has moved in since. I understand it needs hook in somewhere, but surely Provo canyon a short distance to the south would be the ideal connection point, as it already exists, and not directly adjoining a quiet residential neighborhood.
384	Wendy Hyde	Please do not pave the North Fields! Keep the open spaces in Heber Valley open. There has been way too much growth too fast. Please pause all the growth and leave the open spaces as they are. Wendy Hyde Sent from my iPhone
48	Wendy Reni	Hello Heber Valley Corridor EIS Team,I'm writing during the Draft EIS public comment period to urge UDOT to reconsider the preferred alternative and select Alternative A (on US-40) as the best bypass solution for Heber Valley. I recognize the Draft EIS identifies Alternative B as the preferred alternative. However, after reviewing the Draft EIS summary and the Alternative A/B fact sheets, I believe Alternative A provides the better overall outcome when you weigh environmental impacts, long-term community values, and cost. 1) Alternative A significantly reduces impacts to waters/wetlands and the North Fields One of the clearest

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		differences between the alternatives is the scale of impacts to Waters of the U.S. (canals/ditches/streams/wetlands). Alternative A is listed at 23 acres, while Alternative B is listed at 54 acres—well over double. The fact sheets also state Alternative A is less impactful to wetlands, the North Fields, and agricultural uses, while Alternative B is more impactful to wetlands, the North Fields, and agricultural uses. For a project occurring in a valley where waterways, irrigated agriculture, and open fields are defining resources, those differences should carry more weight in selecting the preferred alternative. 2) Alternative A is materially less expensive The Draft EIS summary shows an estimated cost of $711.9M for Alternative A versus $760.5M for Alternative B (2026 dollars)—a difference of about $48.6M. Given the many competing transportation needs statewide, choosing the lower-cost alternative that also reduces wetland/water impacts is a responsible decision. 3) Alternative A better protects agricultural lands and reduces “new-corridor” pressure The fact sheets show larger agriculture-related impacts for Alternative B than A. Beyond acreage, Alternative B introduces a more substantial new facility through the North Fields area (including the segment between Potter Lane and 900 North described in public reporting), which risks accelerating long-term land use change pressures in precisely the area the community is most concerned about. 4) The mobility advantages of Alternative B are real but the gap is not large enough to justify the added resource impacts I understand UDOT’s stated reasons for preferring Alternative B, including better regional/local mobility and attracting more regional truck traffic away from Main Street. At the same time, the published performance differences are relatively modest in absolute terms when compared to the environmental and agricultural impacts: Regional travel time (SR-32 to US-189/3000 South): 7:25 (A) vs 6:15 (B) Local travel time on Main Street (SR-32 to US-189/US-40): 11:50 (A) vs 10:15 (B) Intersections at LOS F: 1 (A) vs 0 (B) If Alternative A is selected, I encourage UDOT to focus mitigation and design refinement on the specific operational pain points (e.g., intersection operations, access management, signal timing/coordination, and other targeted measures) rather than accepting the much larger wetland/water and agricultural tradeoffs embedded in Alternative B.5) Noise and community effects also favor Alternative A in important areas The fact sheets show more modeled noise receptors above criteria under Alternative B (277) than Alternative A (230). That matters ! Especially if growth continues in planned development areas where the project’s noise footprint will be felt for decades. Please select Alternative A as the preferred alternative, or at minimum re-evaluate the preferred alternative decision with greater weight on:the magnitude of Waters of the U.S./wetland impacts (23 acres vs 54 acres),agricultural land impacts, and the ~$48.6M cost difference. Thank you for considering my comments and for the work that has gone into the Draft EIS. I would appreciate seeing a clear response in the Final EIS explaining how the project team weighed these resource impacts against the relatively small travel-time advantages shown for Alternative B. Sincerely, Wendy Reni
595	William Bearden	The whole reason people flock to the Heber Valley is because of the natural landscape and open fields and clean rivers. The state getting rid of any of that in the name of progress is killing the goose the laid the golden egg. Enough of that has occurred due to development and the state should act thoughtfully with a truly long-term vision. Keep further infrastructure additions within already developed areas. Any highway 40 mitigation that takes over existing farmland or fields, like plan B does, is a long-term mistake. Please run any highway 40 remedies through already developed areas east of main Street, away from the aquifers which are the soul of the valley. Do not gobble up more open land please. Thank you and have a great day.
429	William E Barger	To Whom It May Concern, I have thoroughly reviewed the options outlined in the Heber Valley Corridor Draft EIS. As a geologist with more than 40 years of experience working with NEPA and EIS documents, and a resident of the Heber Valley for over two decades, I believe the study was conducted with reliable data and aimed at finding the best long-term solution for current traffic challenges in the area. I fully support the recommended Option B in the EIS. In my view, Option A only addresses short-term needs and will not resolve long-term traffic concerns. Furthermore, I am confident that environmental considerations have been properly addressed in Plan B. Respectfully submitted, William E Barger Heber City Utah
115	William Greene (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Hello. My name is William Greene. I am a Heber City full-time resident, and my background is over 42 years of real estate development, including very large scale regional community development. I would like to start my comments with the fact that the majority obviously in here don't appear to want this new bypass and clearly are being misled by what the impacts will be as a result of the proposed bypass. UDOT is proposing to build a high-speed freeway through the Heber Valley equivalent in all ways to the stretch of US-40 to the River Road in Park City and I-80. You may have -- you have manipulated the numbers on traffic improvement of designing a high-speed freeway to make those traffic flow times look better and then by only a few minutes. The Heber Valley will end up with a dramatic increase in noise pollution from trucks traveling at over 65 miles an hour on elevated right-of-way; visual pollution, including the overpasses; elevated roadways; 10- to 14-foot sound barrier walls everywhere; wetland impacts; and in the end, no real difference on Main Street after years of construction. UDOT likes to state that the new freeway will, quote/unquote, most likely attract commercial traffic away from Main Street. The real result is most likely will not. UDOT believes bypass is necessary to handle the growth that is anticipated through 2050. I believe it would be more impactful to have our local elected officials finally take responsibility and control over the growth and leave the Heber Valley absent of freeway. At least reduce the bypass to an arterial-level roadway, lower the speed limit, lessen the variety of large-scale impacts to the valley. Commit to restricting any commercial truck traffic, including hundreds of daily super tankers, from using Main Street, and at the very least restricted during designated hours. Commit to restricting any commercial development from ever occurring at intersections created by a new bypass. UDOT must commit now to removing the US-40 designation from Main Street and allow the city to gain full control over the desired improvements to Main Street. Residents must demand that city and county officials enact a responsible, long-term master plan for the Heber Valley. It's only so big. Right now there should be a documented and recorded Heber Valley master plan that sets in place a maximum lifetime cap on the number of residential-owned and commercial square footage that can be developed in this valley. There should be a thorough investigation into the potential water needs in Wasatch County based on current development and undeveloped planted parcels. All water usage numbers should be calculated as occupied space year round, not partial. No additional development permits should be approved if those audited calculations show that the current water storage is inadequate to support the potential future use of development permits allowed under a real master plan. Limit future growth.
346	William M	I feel as if there is a vocal minority who are advocating against going through the north fields. I want to advocate FOR option B with the following thoughts: - take a closer at bisecting existing ranching properties. Think about how these guys will have to access both segments of their bisected properties. If the alignment can be shifted to minimize bisecting properties, please do it - the models may show single lane entrance and exits to the bypass work but having them be dual lanes would be so much nicer for all three main junctions coming to and from the valley, which are already on dual

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		lane roads - please add connection of Southfield road to the interchange of hwy 189 rather than leaving it as a culdesac - please consider better north/south movements for traffic coming to and from Daniels road and crossing the bypass at 189 (carry the above ground portion further and have an underpass??) - please consider traffic movement as the highest priority for the valley and design. We all love the north fields but traffic will only increase over time and I feel we're doing a disservice to our future generations if we have to tear it all up again or if the traffic problem isn't solved after spending hundreds of millions of tax payer dollars William M.
76	Willie Holdman	Willie Holdman (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
88	Willie Holdman	Envision Heber 2050. Introduction "What do people want and how will our city provide it" Heber City Vision: Heber City is nestled in a green valley, brimming with historic agricultural uses, the beautiful Provo River, and unmatched views of the Wasatch Mountains. Our residents value this beautiful and unique settin and are committed to preserving its character while growing and nurturing out City. Together, we desire to: -preserve the beautiful open lands that surround us; - create friendly neighborhoods and centers that focus homes, jobs, shopping, and recreation into places where we gather and interact regularly; -enhance and strengthen downtown--the heart of our community; and - grow, promote and diversify our recreational opportunities. By focusing our growth in specific areas, we foster a vibrant community and a quiet countryside--aplace residents and visitors alike will enjoy for generations to come. Heber City Envision Doc: Open Space & Rural Character Heber City Draws a clear disctinction between what is city and what is county, maintaining a distinct city that is surrounded by open land, valuable for its beauty, ecology and agricultural fuction. Principles: 1. Heber actively works with neighboring communities and Wasatch County (and UDOT), on strategies to implement the permanent protection of farmlands, natural open speces, and rural character, to keep the distinct separation between communities. 2. Heber City will work with the County and surrounding communities to create permanent farm and mountain land protection through such mechanisms as conservation easements and partnerhsip. 3. Heber actively clusters development to focus growth and protect remaining open land from dispersed development. Plan b connects the city to the county or farm land. There will be no clear disctinction at all. Voters approved and 10 million open space bond in 2018 to help preserve the natural beauty and heritage of our community. 623.00 acres are preserved or proposed to preserved. Easement value of 66,179,350.00 from out 10 million bond. Now with the UDOT proposed bypass alternative b, that runs right through the North Fields, years of work will be erased protecting a key property, over 165 acres, that was ready to go until UDOT stepped in to put a highway through it. Back to the envision 2050, The most important thing the residences wanted to protect was the open space/rural character of the valley. 78% valued small town feel, 78% wanted goals for preserving open space, 77% wanted goals for preserving views and scenic beauty. Iencourage you to read Item number 6: Open Space and Rural Character chapter. Particularly page 62. On the future land use map, they lave all the North Fields as Agriculture Preservation line. The UDOT proposal of a major highway with on and off ramps through the crown jewel of the valley is a slap in the face to all the intelligence and desire of all the people in the community proven through the envision Heber city 2050 study. Diriving on Hwy 40 from river road to the city limits is prized for its view shed looking across the green fields to the snow capped Wasatch back. UDOT wants to take this away to save 1 minute of travel time? From Envision Heber 2050: Separation--maintaining open space between Heber and surrounding communities--is the second most important feature that defines "small town" for Heber residents (according to a recent survey completed as a part of the City's visioning process). Residents want to preserve larger open spaces that provide a rural feel and promote a distinct identity for each community in the Heber Valley. Plan B does the opposite. I've witnessed several taker trunks going over into deer creek and the provo river over the years. What happens when a few tankers with toxic material turn over into our aquifers and wetland of the North Fields contaminating our drinking water? In 1858, New York's central park was created to provide urban dwellers an experience of the country side, a place to escape from the stresses of urban life and to commune with nature. Its over 800 acres. smack dab in the middle of the bustling city. Even they had foresight to preserve this space, we can do the same. Please do not go against the community by making a highway through the North Fields that we fought so hard to protect.
128	Willie Holdman (Verbal comment made at public hearing)	Well, some of the things that I was going to say have been said by previous people, but I love the valley like most of you do. I'm just going to kind of fashion my remarks to the Envision Heber. A lot of things it talks about there were already resolved, and a lot of people already chimed in on what they value about the valley. I'm going to go over a couple of those here. It says, "The Heber City Vision. Heber City is nestled in a green valley, brimming with historic agricultural uses, the beautiful Provo River, and unmatched views of the Wasatch Mountains. Our residents value this beautiful and unique setting and are committed to preserving its character while growing and nurturing our city. "Together, we desire to preserve the beautiful open lands that surround us. By focusing our growth in specific areas, we foster a vibrant view and a quiet country side, a place for residents and visitors alike to enjoy for generations to come." That's the vision statement. I think it's pretty obvious that putting a road through the North Field starting at Potter Lane will just kind of destroy that whole vision of Heber City. The whole city process was made for us. You know, we already chimed in on that. "Heber City draws a clear distinction between what is city and what is country, maintaining a distinct city that is surrounded by open land, valuable for its beauty, ecology, and agricultural function." Those three principles -- I just want to say, again, I think are so important. "Heber actively works with neighboring communities and Wasatch County" -- and I'm going to add in UDOT -- "on strategies to implement the permanent protection of farmlands, natural open spaces, and rural character, to keep the distinct separation between communities." "Two, Heber City land protection through such mechanisms as conservation easements and partnerships. Heber actively clusters development to focus growth and protect remaining open land from dispersed development." So Plan B connects the city to the country and the farmland. In my mind's eye, there's no clear distinction at all once you put that road through the North Fields. We have the Heber City and we have this beautiful county over here in the North Fields. That road connects them, and that gets rid of that whole feeling. And we all know what happens when a highway goes through somewhere. They say there's not going to be development there. We all know there's going to be development there. Guess what? Guess how big the walls are going to be on that? They're going to be

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		about this tall. 30 feet. That's huge. And that's all the way across the North Fields. Going across halfway up the Provo River, what are you going to see? You're going to see this big cement wall right there. And that's our sacred land; right?
170	Willie Holdman	Envision Heber 2050. Introduction: "What do people want and how will our city provide it" Heber City Vision: Heber City is nestled in a green valley, brimming with historic agricultural uses. the beautiful Provo River, and unmatched views of the Wasatch Mountains. Our residents value this beautiful and unique setting and are committed to preserving its character while growing and nurturing our City. Together, we desire to: • preserve the beautiful open lands that surround us; • create friendly neighborhoods and centers that focus homes, jobs, shopping, and recreation into places where we gather and interact regularly; • enhance and strengthen downtown-the heart of our community; and• grow, promote and diversify our recreational opportunities. By focusing: our growth in specific areas, we foster a vibrant community and a quiet countryside-a place residents and visitors alike will enjoy for generations to come. Heber City Envision Doc: Open Space & Rural Character Heber City draws a clear distinction between what is city and what is country, maintaining a distinct city that is surrounded by open land, valuable for its beauty, ecology and agricultural function. Principles: 1. Heber actively works with neighboring communities and Wasatch County (and UDOT), on strategies to implement the permanent protection of farmlands, natural open spaces, and rural character, to keep the distinct separation between communities. 2. Heber City will work with the County and surrounding communities to create permanent farm and mountain land protection through such mechanisms as conservation easements and partnerships. 3. Heber actively clusters development to focus growth and protect remaining open land from dispersed development. Plan b connects the city to the county or farm land. There will be no clear distinction at all. Voters approved an 10 million open space bond in 2018 to help preserve the natural beauty and heritage of our community. 623.00 acres are preserved or proposed to be preserved. Easement value of 66,179,350.00 from out 10 million bond. Now with the UDOT proposed bypass alternative b, that runs right through the North Fields, years of work will be erased protecting a key property, over 165 acres, that was ready to go until UDOT stepped in to put a highway through it. Back to the envision 2050, The most important thing the residences wanted to protect was the open space/rural character of the valley. 78% valued small town feel, 78% wanted goals for preserving open space, 77% wanted goals for preserving views and scenic beauty. I encourage you to read Item number 6: Open Space and Rural Character chapter. Particularly page 62. On the future land use map, they have all the North Fields as Agriculture Preservation status, with a (SB) scenic buffer zone, from the roads edge to the Agriculture Preservation line. The UDOT proposal of a major highway with on and off ramps through the crown jewel of the valley is a slap in the face to all the intelligence and desire of all the people in the community proven through the envision Heber city 2050 study. Driving on Hwy 40 from river road to the city limits is prized for its view shed looking across the green fields to the snow capped Wasatch back. UDOT wants to take this away to save 1 minute of travel time? From Envision Heber 2050:

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Separation-maintaining open space between Heber and surrounding communities-is the second most important feature that defines "small town" for Heber residents (according to a recent survey completed as a part of the City's visioning process). Residents want to preserve larger open spaces that provide a rural feel and promote a distinct identity for each community in the Heber Valley. Plan B does the opposite. I've witnessed several taker trunks going over into deer creek and the Provo river over the years. What happens when a few tankers with toxic material turn over into our aquifers and wetlands of the North Fields contaminating our drinking water? In 1858, New York's central park was created to provide urban dwellers an experience of the country side, a place to escape from the stresses of urban life and to commune with nature. Its over 800 acres. smack dab in the middle of the bustling city. Even they had foresight to preserve this space, we can do the same. Please do not go against the community by making a highway through the North Fields that we fought so hard to protect. Willie Holdman (For this comment's attachment or original format see Volume 2).
468	Zach Bitner	UDOT Evaluation Team, My name is Zach Bitner and I live in Heber City at XXXXXXXXXX. I am submitting comments regarding the Environmental Impact Statement for the Heber Valley Corridor project. My comments focus primarily on the south end of the proposed plan, which appears to be largely the same under either alternative. After reviewing the materials and videos provided by UDOT, I strongly disagree with the proposed alignment that follows 1300 South. This route would effectively divide my neighborhood and significantly reduce convenient access to nearby commercial services that residents currently rely on, including the car wash, bank, Sunbelt Rentals, mechanic shop, dentist, and other businesses along this corridor. Today these services are easily accessible for residents in this area, but the proposed alignment risks cutting off or complicating access. I agree with the position expressed by the Heber City Council, which stated: "Heber City would have preferred to see the South Highway 40 leg – planned to run along 1300 South – located further south through the undeveloped area to reduce impacts on residential and commercial properties along 1300 South." I strongly encourage UDOT to reconsider routing this segment further south through currently undeveloped land. Doing so would reduce disruption to established neighborhoods and existing businesses. Additionally, the current proposal risks creating an isolated triangle of residential and commercial properties between two freeway corridors. This configuration will make access significantly more difficult and will negatively affect the long-term viability of businesses in the area, as customers may find it inconvenient or confusing to reach them. There are also connectivity concerns. Currently, many drivers use Daniel Road to access commercial areas such as Walmart and nearby businesses. Under the proposed design, there does not appear to be a direct connection from Daniel Road to this commercial area. As a result, traffic that currently uses Daniel Road would likely be diverted to Main Street, which does not appear to support UDOT's stated goal of reducing congestion and improving traffic flow through the valley. Furthermore, the concept of a raised freeway through this relatively tight residential and commercial area does not seem appropriate given the surrounding land uses and community character. The design of the south end of the project, as currently proposed, does not appear to reflect the preferences expressed by many residents in my neighborhood and throughout the valley. I would also like to address speed and noise impacts associated with the Highway 40 expansion. The maximum speed for this corridor should not exceed 55 mph. Increasing the speed limit to 65 mph would significantly increase traffic noise in nearby neighborhoods. From my home, which is approximately 0.62 miles from Highway 189, I can already hear traffic despite the current 55 mph speed limit. UDOT should consider incorporating noise-mitigation strategies similar to those implemented on Legacy Parkway. These measures could include maintaining a 55 mph speed limit, installing quieter pavement surfaces, constructing sound walls where appropriate, and using landscaped berms to help reduce noise impacts on surrounding communities. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during this process. I encourage UDOT to carefully reconsider the alignment of the south segment and prioritize solutions that minimize impacts to established neighborhoods, maintain access to local businesses, and reduce long-term noise impacts for residents. Sincerely,

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Zach Bitner XXXXXXXXX Heber City, UT XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX

This page is intentionally left blank