



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.

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	XXXXXXXXXXXX (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 XXXXXXXXXXXX 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

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: XXXXXXXXX fax: XXXXXXXXX site: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX email: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX address: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
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
		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 XXXXXXXXX. 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 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX

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: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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
		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 XXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXX Sent from my iPhone
301	Ann Zimmerman	Ann Zimmerman XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXX February 28, 2026 Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR Engineering XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XX 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
		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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
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
325	Belinda Power	Heber Valley Corridor EIS c/o HDR XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX To: hebervalleys@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 B and 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Phone Number XXXXXXXXXX Email Address XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 Hlghways 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 XXXXXXXXXX, on XXXXXXXXXXXX heber city in XXXXXXXXXX the northfields). However, I'm certainly concerned given the bypass may be within XXXXXX of my XXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXX
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 XXXXXXXXXX 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: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Mail Address: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Midway, Utah XXXXX

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	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 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 XXXXXXXXX Cell/Text XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 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.

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		### **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, 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

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		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: 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

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		Moderate urban utility conflicts ● Manageable Project Scope Assumptions Length: 2.0 miles (10,560 linear feet) 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

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		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 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

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		\$295M
		\$242M
		Portal Structures
		\$16M
		\$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

Comment Number	Commenter Name	Comment
		\$10M \$20M \$15M 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

