Appendix D

Comments and Responses
Mr. Walter C. Waidelich, Jr.  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A  
Salt Lake City, Utah  84118-1847.

Dear Mr. Waidelich:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation for Hyde Park North Logan Corridor, City of Logan, Cache County, Utah. The Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the document, and submits the following comments.

Section 4(f) Evaluation

The current Section 4(f) analysis does not specify a Preferred Alternative, and without one, the Department cannot concur that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternative selected in the document, and that all measures have been taken to minimize harm to these resources.

Section 6(f) Evaluation

The National Park Service has reviewed this project in relation to any possible conflicts with the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery programs. We have found no other projects except what is already listed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

The Department has a continuing interest in working with the Federal Highway Administration and the Utah Department of Transportation to
ensure impacts to resources of concern to the Department are adequately addressed. For continued consultation and coordination with issues concerning section 4(f) resources, please contact the Regional Environmental Coordinator, Intermountain Regional Office, National Park Service, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, PO Box 25287, Denver, Colorado 80225-0287, telephone (303) 060-2851.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Willie R. Taylor
Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

cc:
Cory Pope, Regional One Director
Utah Department of Transportation
166 West Southwell Street
Ogden, Utah 84404-4194
Ref: 8EPR-N

Mr. Walter Waidelich
Utah Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
2520 West 4700 South, Ste. 9A
Salt Lake City, UT  84118-1847

Re: Hyde Park/North Logan Corridor Project, Proposed 200 East Transportation Corridor Between North Logan City and Hyde Park Draft EIS: CEQ # 20070121

Dear Mr. Waidelich:

In accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C Section 4231 et. seq., and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act 42 U.S.C Section 7609, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 8 (EPA) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Hyde Park/North Logan Corridor Project located at 200 East; 1400 North to 3700 North between North Logan City, UT and Hyde Park, UT.

EPA’s comments on this project focus mainly on water and air quality. Specific air quality concerns include PM 2.5 and PM 10 emissions and impacts, construction related emissions, and cumulative impacts from a number of projects in the area. Since EPA revised the PM 2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), the project area is expected to be designated a nonattainment area for PM 2.5. Although the project alone may not cause additional exceedances of the NAAQS, in combination with other area Highway projects, it will cause some air quality impacts that must be evaluated. The emissions for both PM 10 and PM 2.5 are likely to increase with increases in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), traffic and construction. EPA recommends that an emissions trend analysis be completed for PM 10 and PM 2.5 to evaluate whether the project contributes to or worsens an existing air quality problem.

Construction emissions, caused by the multiple-year construction period associated with this proposed project may result in human exposure to diesel exhaust, a likely human carcinogen. Given the proximity of this project to a school, where children are likely to spend significant amounts of time construction related emissions may be an issue. “Best practices” provides little indication of the measures that will be taken to control dust from exposed soil, re-entrained dust from construction vehicles, increase in dust resulting from soil tracked on existing roads from construction without proper control, and increases in toxic diesel emissions from both highway and non-road construction...
equipment. In addition, since this project is part of a series SR-91 projects and since a number of other projects are anticipated, analysis of air emissions for the cumulative and multi-year construction impacts is needed, especially PM 2.5 and PM 10.

We would also like to express an overriding concern with the environmental impacts of growth this project encourages. This corridor approach is likely to cause sprawl as well as many direct and indirect environmental impacts. Projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled, and incorporate walking and other modes of transportation and integrated land use, have the potential of reducing impacts on environmental resources.

EPA recognizes the important role that the Growth Choices process plays in working with the communities to develop transportation options and alternatives. EPA would like to meet with you and discuss strategies for educating the public, city and county planners and policy makers (during the Growth Choices Process) regarding integration of transportation with land use, types of density development, green infrastructure, and other ways to reduce impacts of development and transportation projects on environmental resources.

Pursuant to EPA policy and guidance, EPA rates the environmental impact of an action and the adequacy of the NEPA analysis. EPA has rated the build alternatives “EC-2” (Environmental Concerns-Insufficient Information). This “EC” rating means that impacts have been identified that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. The “2” rating means that additional information or data is needed to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. More specifically, for air impacts, an emissions trends analysis for PM 2.5 and PM 10, cumulative impacts analysis of PM 2.5 and PM 10, and construction emissions analysis is needed. For water impacts, a summary of water quality and water quantity impacts of the project on streams in the watershed and cumulative impacts on non-jurisdictional wetlands impacted by removal of irrigation on farmland is needed.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments, please contact me (303) 312-6004 or Robin Coursen (303)312-6695 of my staff.

Sincerely,

Larry Svoboda
Director, NEPA Program
Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation
cc: Ed Woolford, FHWA
    Alex D. Beseris, J-U-B Engineers
    Brad Humphreys, UDOT
    James McMillan, USACE

bcc: Robin Coursen, EPA
     Dave Ruiter, EPA
     Jeff Kimes, EPA
Purpose and Need:

- The purpose and need statement serves as the cornerstone for the alternatives analysis, but should not discuss alternatives. However, this purpose and need includes a statement that the need is to “Provide a roadway parallel to SR-91 . . .” This need is effectively an alternative, and its presence in the need statement could screen out other alternatives that are not parallel roads to SR-91. Reducing congestion appears to be the underlying purpose and need that drives a reasonable range of alternatives. For example, adding “parallel to SR-91” may eliminate one or more reasonable alternatives.

- EPA believes that FHWA and Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) should incorporate any analysis done on transportation demand management (TDM) into this DEIS and explain how, and if, TDM was used in development of alternatives or screening of alternatives. If this has been completed by the Municipal Planning Agencies, this information should be summarized. The explanation of TDM analysis provided on page 2-1 should contain further explanation of why various TDM solutions, combined, did not address the purpose and need and were screened out of the process.

Cumulative Impacts:

- Section 4.22.2 states: “Therefore, no cumulative impacts to land use are anticipated because the City plans have identified and support the changes in land uses within the study area.” EPA believes that without this road growth and land use would develop differently in location, density and type of development. In addition, it would happen at a much different pace. Finally, the proposed changes would have an economic impact on the area as well. Such cumulative economic impacts should be addressed in this section.

Water Quality:

- Section 4.22.4 Water Quality: Historically, irrigation infrastructure has been used for storm water management in this county. However, with any build alternative, the cumulative effect would be an increase in impervious surfaces, subsequent increases in storm water runoff, and subsequent needs to improve the capacities of irrigation canals and ditches for storm water management. EPA commends the analysis on cumulative storm water impacts completed in this DEIS. This analysis was done on a watershed basis and reflects potential cumulative impacts. The cumulative contribution of storm water for this study is 11 percent of the storm water runoff generated by all of the cities in the local watershed. Although it is anticipated that the City’s Storm Water Management Plans (SWMPs) and source water protection plans will
mitigate any impacts, direct or cumulative, EPA suggests that the City analyze the efficacy of utilizing “Green Infrastructure” for mitigation purposes. Green Infrastructure promotes ecosystem sustainability and helps to mitigate impacts from storm water runoff along with many other watershed and habitat benefits of this approach. The City, County, FHWA, UDOT, and Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOS) can use this “Pre-build-out” opportunity to plan Green Infrastructure into the overall land use and transportation planning process before build out and “Grey Infrastructure” makes it impossible to do so. This ecosystem approach could be used to create wetlands (e.g. mitigation of lost wetlands supported by irrigation), mitigate the additional storm water run off created by impervious surfaces, create green space for recreation (mitigate loss of Land Water Conservation Fund properties), create wildlife connectivity, reduce effects of habitat fragmentation, provide walk/bike corridors. More information on Green Infrastructure can be found at http://www.greeninfrastructure.net

- Section 4.22.5: As farmland is converted to non-agricultural land uses, the removal of irrigation would result in the loss or shrinkage of wetlands supported by man-made irrigation. These impacts to wetlands would contribute to the cumulative loss of wetland habitat in the local watershed. EPA recommends that these cumulative wetland impacts be evaluated pursuant to Executive Order 11990 Protection of Wetlands.

- Section 3.10.2: This section does not document the existing water quality. The DEIS needs to include the existing water quality and stream flow data of the streams in the project area so that an adequate impact analysis can be conducted. Currently, this data does not appear in the document. In addition, ground water quality should also be documented and analyzed.

- Section 3.11.1: The EIS indicates that United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) defines “normal circumstances” as the hydrological, soil, and plant conditions that are normally present in an area in the absence of human management. EPA’s understanding is that “normal circumstances” are the conditions that occur “normally” if human management occurs “normally.” For example, the habitat present as a result of the human management is the normal condition. Please contact USACE for the proper definition.

- Chapter 4: The No Build Alternative documents the impacts on the existing environment of the No Action Alternative. These impacts can be compared with the Build Alternatives as well as existing environment. Chapter 4 should document the impacts of the alternative, including No Build, on the existing environment. Some of the “media” sections, such as air, compare this in the tables (page 4-46) but others do not; e.g. Wetlands (4-71). EPA recommends that all media sections describe the No Build impacts and include them in any tables presented.

**Air Quality:**

- Table 3.8.1.1: Cache and Weber Counties are exceeding the PM2.5 standard and are likely to be designated as a PM 2.5 non-attainment area. This fact should be discussed and the associated monitoring data for PM 2.5 so noted. Any available monitoring data should be
listed in this table and in the following section for PM2.5 and all other air pollutants for which it is available.

- Section 3.8.1.2: Given the fact that this area has significant issues with PM2.5 this section should discuss PM 2.5.

- Section 3.8.2: The frequent winter temperature inversions and associated air quality conditions need to be discussed in much more detail in this section on “existing conditions.” The inversion have a great impact on the air quality in this project area.

- Section 4.1: This section should indicate the impacts of corridor-type development. For example the likelihood of increased vehicle use and the environmental impacts associated with both. See the Smart Growth heading of these comments for further comment on land use.

- Section 4.1.3.2: The statement that there would be no indirect impacts associated with the project is not well substantiated and should be discussed further. In addition, it is extremely unlikely that PM 10 emissions resulting from road dust will be less considering that there will be increased VMT. Please include tables indicating the current estimated emissions and VMT or Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) and the estimated future VMT or AADT of the alternatives (including no-build).

**Smart Growth**

- The corridor approach of nonintegrated land use and transportation development fostered by the Growth Choices process is likely to cause sprawl as well as many direct and indirect environmental impacts. Though the geographical constraints of the mountains (on one side) and the marshes and farmland (on the other) somewhat dictate development in this corridor, transportation design in this growing community will permanently dictate the growth patterns and ability of the community to access services, posses mobility and control connectivity. A higher density, well planned development concentrating the City Center, “community development,” recreation center and Utah State University Campus all within walking distance of each other and intersected by numerous low traffic, grid patterned streets would greatly enhance the mobility and attractiveness of the area and possible reduce VMT and associated impacts or at least slow the growth rate. Projects that follow such an approach often reduce impacts on environmental resources as well.
Response to EPA Comments on Hyde Park North Logan Corridor DEIS

1. EPA COMMENT
Purpose and Need:

- The purpose and need statement serves as the cornerstone for the alternatives analysis, but should not discuss alternatives. However, this purpose and need includes a statement that the need is to “Provide a roadway parallel to SR-91 . . .” This need is effectively an alternative, and its presence in the need statement could screen out other alternatives that are not parallel roads to SR-91. Reducing congestion appears to be the underlying purpose and need that drives a reasonable range of alternatives. For example, adding “parallel to SR-91” may eliminate one or more reasonable alternatives.

RESPONSE:
The need statement has been eliminated

2. EPA COMMENT

- EPA believes that FHWA and Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) should incorporate any analysis done on transportation demand management (TDM) into this DEIS and explain how, and if, TDM was used in development of alternatives or screening of alternatives. If this has been completed by the Municipal Planning Agencies, this information should be summarized. The explanation of TDM analysis provided on page 2-1 should contain further explanation of why various TDM solutions, combined, did not address the purpose and need and were screened out of the process.

RESPONSE:
Transportation System Management (TSM), Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and modal alternatives may be considered reasonable alternatives at first glance, but were eliminated as feasible separate alternatives because they would not completely address purpose and need. TDM technologies are more appropriate on facilities that already exist and offer services such as direct messaging, website travel information, and other measures promoting alternatives to single occupant vehicle for reducing traffic congestion. However, some elements of TSM and TDM have been incorporated into all of the Build Alternatives where suitable. For example, direct messaging along SR-91 would likely provide commuter traffic pertinent information on delays, accidents, etc. to consider alternate routes.

3. EPA COMMENT
Cumulative Impacts:

- Section 4.22.2 states: “Therefore, no cumulative impacts to land use are anticipated because the City plans have identified and support the changes in land uses within the study area.” EPA believes that without this road growth and land use would develop differently in location, density and type of development. In addition, it would happen at a
much different pace. Finally, the proposed changes would have an economic impact on
the area as well. Such cumulative economic impacts should be addressed in this section.

**RESPONSE:**

Section 4.22.2 has been revised:

As described in Sections 4.1 and 4.5 of this FEIS, the Logan portion of the study area is near
build-out, whereas the Hyde Park and North Logan portions of the study area are growing and
have an appreciable amount of undeveloped land that is planned for residential and commercial
development. This growth is likely to occur regardless of the proposed action, but at a much
slower rate due to inadequate access and mobility to this land. As land is developed and new
businesses and residents move into the study area and adjacent areas, the existing transportation
facilities are used more heavily and the demand for improvements increases. Conversely, as the
transportation system is improved, new areas become accessible for land development, and the
opportunity for new development increases.

Cumulative impacts to land use and economic conditions are anticipated as a result of each Build
Alternative in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.
Historically, land use within Hyde Park and North Logan has been used for agriculture. As
population has increased and urban development has encroached into agricultural areas, land
owners have become more willing to sell for residential or commercial uses. Numerous
residential and commercial developments have occurred within the study area over the past
decade. This type of development is anticipated to continue in the future in accordance with the
general plans for Cache County, Hyde Park, North Logan, and Logan.

Major transportation improvements, such as the improvements associated with each Build
Alternative, may influence the rate at which development occurs. Additionally, transportation
facilities can influence the location, density, and type of development that would occur in the
study area. Land use and development patterns are established primarily by local and regional
long-range planning and zoning efforts. The Cities have identified the location and type of
development that is appropriate and consistent with the long-range plans. The Build
Alternative(s) will stimulate the transition of land uses as identified in the Cities’ general plans.
Implementation of a Build Alternative will provide direct access to undeveloped property within
the study area and will likely expedite commercial and residential development within the study
area. Although the Build Alternatives will have a cumulative impact to land use when
considering past, present, and future projects; the cumulative impact to land use is not anticipated
to be substantial and will be in accordance with City and County land use plans.

Section 4.22.3 has been revised:

The proposed Build Alternatives would contribute to the cumulative economic impact
anticipated within Hyde Park and North Logan. It is likely that the existing economic
development patterns and trends would continue, but at a slower rate, if implementation of a
Build Alternative did not occur. Private investment in new roads and utility infrastructure would
likely be slow until the demand for this type of development is high. Implementation of a Build
Alternative would provide access to undeveloped lands making them more feasible and desirable
for private investors to develop. Development is anticipated to continue in the region consistent
with the Cities’ general plans. Over the past several decades, land use has transitioned from
agricultural uses to undeveloped, vacant land not utilized for agriculture. The land use transition from undeveloped agriculture to residential and/or commercial development would result in a positive change for the property tax base and a net increase in revenue from property taxes. Implementation of a Build Alternative in conjunction with past and future development would result in a positive cumulative economic impact to the cities of North Logan and Hyde Park and the region.

4. EPA COMMENT

Water Quality:

- Section 4.22.4 Water Quality: Historically, irrigation infrastructure has been used for storm water management in this county. However, with any build alternative, the cumulative effect would be an increase in impervious surfaces, subsequent increases in storm water runoff, and subsequent needs to improve the capacities of irrigation canals and ditches for storm water management. EPA commends the analysis on cumulative storm water impacts completed in this DEIS. This analysis was done on a watershed basis and reflects potential cumulative impacts. The cumulative contribution of storm water for this study is 11 percent of the storm water runoff generated by all of the cities in the local watershed. Although it is anticipated that the City’s Storm Water Management Plans (SWMPs) and source water protection plans will mitigate any impacts, direct or cumulative, EPA suggests that the City analyze the efficacy of utilizing “Green Infrastructure” for mitigation purposes. Green Infrastructure promotes ecosystem sustainability and helps to mitigate impacts from storm water runoff along with many other watershed and habitat benefits of this approach. The City, County, FHWA, UDOT, and Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOS) can use this “Pre-build-out” opportunity to plan Green Infrastructure into the overall land use and transportation planning process before build out and “Grey Infrastructure” makes it impossible to do so. This ecosystem approach could be used to create wetlands (e.g. mitigation of lost wetlands supported by irrigation), mitigate the additional storm water run off created by impervious surfaces, create green space for recreation (mitigate loss of Land Water Conservation Fund properties), create wildlife connectivity, reduce effects of habitat fragmentation, provide walk/bike corridors. More information on Green Infrastructure can be found at http://www.greeninfrastructure.net

RESPONSE:

Impacts to water quality will be mitigated by designing, operating, and managing the Build Alternatives such that they comply with the Cities’ storm water management plans, source water protection plans, and source water protection ordinances. During final design, the use of vegetated swales for roadway runoff will be evaluated and used where possible. When the roadway section is fully built out to five lanes with curb and gutter, vegetated swales may not be feasible. If vegetated swales are not feasible, other water quality treatment measures (e.g., oil/water separators) will be evaluated. If the end of pipe discharge for a new storm drain system exceeds 5 cfs, plan elements for storm water runoff control and treatment will be submitted to the Utah State Division of Water Quality for review.
Wetland mitigation for unavoidable impacts will be negotiated with USACE as part of the required 404 permit. Conceptually, mitigation will be provided by creating, restoring, enhancing and/or preserving wetlands off-site. It may be possible to use the Bear River Bottoms wetland mitigation site. This site is being created by UDOT as mitigation for other projects in the area. The wetland mitigation ratio will be negotiated with the 404 permit.

All right-of-way acquisitions of the Cache County Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) property for conversion would be in accordance with Section 6(f) of the LWCF Act through the approval of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior. As a result of Section 6(f) requirements, property from the Cache County LWCF that would be displaced or acquired must be replaced with other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location.

All of the Build Alternatives would provide connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists along the roadway, including the creation of non-motorized trail routes, sidewalks and bike paths as part of the roadway (see Figures 2.2-2 and 2.2-3).

5. EPA COMMENT
   • Section 4.22.5: As farmland is converted to non-agricultural land uses, the removal of irrigation would result in the loss or shrinkage of wetlands supported by man-made irrigation. These impacts to wetlands would contribute to the cumulative loss of wetland habitat in the local watershed. EPA recommends that these cumulative wetland impacts be evaluated pursuant to Executive Order 11990 Protection of Wetlands.

RESPONSE:
As discussed in Section 4.22.2, the Logan portion of the study area is near build-out, whereas the Hyde Park and North Logan portions of the study area are growing and have an appreciable amount of undeveloped land that is planned for residential and commercial development. This growth is likely to occur regardless of the proposed action but at a slower rate due to inadequate access and mobility. As farmland is converted to non-agricultural land uses, the removal of irrigation would result in the loss or shrinkage of wetlands supported by man-made irrigation. These impacts to wetlands would contribute to the cumulative loss of wetland habitat in the local watershed.

6. EPA COMMENT
   • Section 3.10.2: This section does not document the existing water quality. The DEIS needs to include the existing water quality and stream flow data of the streams in the project area so that an adequate impact analysis can be conducted. Currently, this data does not appear in the document. In addition, ground water quality should also be documented and analyzed.

RESPONSE:
The Water Quality Section was sent to EPA for a second review. They have concluded that the information does exist in subsequent pages.
7. EPA COMMENT
- Section 3.11.1: The EIS indicates that United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) defines “normal circumstances” as the hydrological, soil, and plant conditions that are normally present in an area in the absence of human management. EPA’s understanding is that “normal circumstances” are the conditions that occur “normally” if human management occurs “normally.” For example, the habitat present as a result of the human management is the normal condition. Please contact USACE for the proper definition.

RESPONSE:
Text was revised as follows, “Generally, USACE defines normal circumstances as the hydrological, soil, and plant conditions that are normally present in an area under normal conditions.”

8. EPA COMMENT
- Chapter 4: The No Build Alternative documents the impacts on the existing environment of the No Action Alternative. These impacts can be compared with the Build Alternatives as well as existing environment. Chapter 4 should document the impacts of the alternative, including No Build, on the existing environment. Some of the “media” sections, such as air, compare this in the tables (page 4-46) but others do not; e.g. Wetlands (4-71). EPA recommends that all media sections describe the No Build impacts and include them in any tables presented.

RESPONSE:
All media sections have specific text descriptions for the “No Build Alternative”. The No Build Alternative would have no affect to some media sections such as Wetlands, Land Use, Historic Resources, etc. If nothing is built, no change would occur. However, in the case of Air Quality, we have the modeling technology which identifies conditions for No Build v. Build for the year 2030. Whereas, other media sections don’t necessarily rely on modeling such as the media sections mention formerly.

9. EPA COMMENT:
Air Quality:
- Table 3.8.1.1: Cache and Weber Counties are exceeding the PM2.5 standard and are likely to be designated as a PM 2.5 non-attainment area. This fact should be discussed and the associated monitoring data for PM 2.5 so noted. Any available monitoring data should be listed in this table and in the following section for PM2.5 and all other air pollutants for which it is available.

RESPONSE:
Discussion has been added to Section 3.8.3 of the FEIS.

Cache County is presently in non-attainment for PM_{2.5}. Under 40 CFR 93, new conformity determinations are required to be completed for all newly designated PM_{2.5} non-attainment areas within one year of their designation. The Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO)
submitted a conformity determination on October 21, 2010, to FHWA. FHWA found that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) conformed to the adopted State Implementation Plan and the requirements of 40 CFR 93. The conformity finding is dated November 29, 2010, and is available in Appendix A of the FEIS.

PM\(_{2.5}\) in the Cache Valley is made up of both primary and secondary particles. Primary PM\(_{2.5}\) is emitted directly into the atmosphere from sources such as wood-burning and vehicle emissions, while secondary PM\(_{2.5}\) is formed in the atmosphere when other gaseous pollutants combine under the right conditions. The majority of PM\(_{2.5}\) in the Cache Valley consists of secondary particles. Logan City, the Bear River Health Department, and USU have taken proactive measures in the past three years to try to reduce PM\(_{2.5}\) emissions, including red-yellow-green burn days, police enforcement, a hotline, free access to the Logan Rapid Transit Bus system, and synchronized traffic lights.

10. EPA COMMENT
- Section 3.8.1.2: Given the fact that this area has significant issues with PM2.5 this section should discuss PM 2.5.

RESPONSE:
Discussion has been added to Sections 3.8.1.2 of the FEIS:

**Particulate Matter (PM\(_{2.5}\))**
The pollutant PM2.5 is derived from both regional background and local sources, and is both a regional and localized air quality concern under specific circumstances. While it is true that secondary formation from PM2.5 precursors is a critical component to the regional PM2.5 air quality problem, directly emitted PM2.5 from certain local sources has the potential to cause or contribute to elevated localized PM2.5 concentrations. Such elevated concentrations, which exceed applicable standards, can affect local communities and populations that the PM2.5 standards were designed to protect. The final ruling focuses on evaluation of mobile sources associated with diesel operations, based on findings that these sources contribute disproportionately to the particle concentrations (black and elemental carbon) along roadways.

11. EPA COMMENT
- Section 3.8.2: The frequent winter temperature inversions and associated air quality conditions need to be discussed in much more detail in this section on “existing conditions.” The inversion have a great impact on the air quality in this project area

RESPONSE:
Additional discussion has been added to Section 3.8.2 of the FEIS:

The Cache Valley has recently experienced a number of poor air quality events resulting from atmospheric inversions during stagnant winter conditions. These events have led public officials, university researchers, and state air quality specialists to more carefully look at air quality problems within the Cache Valley. In particular, concern for air quality has centered on PM2.5. Air quality monitoring stations in central downtown Logan City have recorded a number of NAAQS exceedances over the past 4 years. In 2005 the NAAQS for PM2.5 was exceeded five
separate times, and this is the only pollutant of concern that has exceeded NAAQS standards (Table 3.1-8).

The highest levels of CO and PM$_{10}$ typically occur in Cache Valley during the colder months of the year. PM$_{10}$ exceedances of the NAAQS traditionally occur when the air is stagnant, snow is on the ground, and temperatures are low. The cold winters and the surrounding mountains create conditions for prolonged wintertime inversions in the area. During the winter season, temperatures inversions usually occur which have increased the PM$_{10}$ levels, close but never to exceedance.

12. EPA COMMENT

- Section 4.1: This section should indicate the impacts of corridor-type development. For example the likelihood of increased vehicle use and the environmental impacts associated with both. See the Smart Growth heading of these comments for further comment on land use.

RESPONSE:
The North Logan City’s general plan identifies a limitation on the amount of “Corridor-type development” and encourages node or compact type development. The locations or intersections such as 1800 and 2200 North are ideal to accommodate this type of development, consistent with their general plan. Additionally, the type and scale of commercial development adjacent to residential areas is scrutinized through their approval process to minimize the incompatibility of uses. Hyde Park’s General plan identifies residential type development to occur along the proposed 200 East corridor. The new facility would allow the City’s to guide the type of growth consistent with their general plans and determine the limits of commercial growth.

13. EPA COMMENT

- Section 4.1.3.2: The statement that there would be no indirect impacts associated with the project is not well substantiated and should be discussed further. In addition, it is extremely unlikely that PM 10 emissions resulting from road dust will be less considering that there will be increased VMT. Please include tables indicating the current estimated emissions and VMT or Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) and the estimated future VMT or AADT of the alternatives (including no-build).

RESPONSE:
Additional discussion has been added to Section 4.1.3.2:

For all the Build Alternatives it is likely that PM$_{10}$ emissions will increase along the new corridor due to an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as identified in Section 2.3, Traffic Analysis. However, the implementation of the new corridor will alter traffic patterns on US 91 likely reducing the PM$_{10}$ level on US 91. As identified in the Section 2.3, Traffic Analysis, all Build Alternatives will contribute to a decrease in traffic volumes on US 91. Additionally, local meteorological conditions (wind, rain, etc) facilitate the dispersion of PM$_{10}$ and are not expected to change in the future. As a result, the indirect increase in PM$_{10}$ is likely to be minimal and not reach exceedance levels.
Additional discussion has also been added to Section 4.8.3:

**Particulate Matter**

Clean Air Act section 176(c)(1)(B) is the statutory criterion that must be met by all projects in non-attainment and maintenance areas that are subject to transportation conformity. Section 176(c)(1)(B) states that federally supported transportation projects must not cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area; increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area.

To meet statutory requirements, the March 10, 2006, final rule requires PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ hot spot analyses to be performed for projects of air quality concern. Qualitative hot spot analyses would be done for these projects before appropriate methods and modeling guidance are available and before quantitative PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ hot spot analyses are required under 40 CFR 93.123(b)(4). In addition, through the final rule, EPA determined that projects not identified in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) as projects of air quality concern have also met statutory requirements without any further hot spot analyses (40 CFR 93.116(a)).

EPA specified in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) of the final rule that projects of air quality concern are certain highway and transit projects that involve significant levels of diesel vehicle traffic, or any other project that is identified in the PM$_{2.5}$ or PM$_{10}$ Statewide Implementation Plan as a localized air quality concern.

The final rule defines the projects of air quality concern that require a PM$_{2.5}$ or PM$_{10}$ hot spot analysis in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) as the following:

- New or expanded highway projects that have a significant number of or significant increase in diesel vehicles
- Projects affecting intersections that are at LOS D, E, or F with a significant number of diesel vehicles, or those that will change to LOS D, E, or F because of increased traffic volumes from a significant number of diesel vehicles related to the project
- New bus and rail terminals and transfer points that have a significant number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location
- Expanded bus and rail terminals and transfer points that significantly increase the number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location
- Projects in or affecting locations, areas, or categories of sites that are identified in the PM$_{2.5}$ or PM$_{10}$ applicable implementation plan or implementation plan submission, as appropriate, as sites of violation or possible violation

According to 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1)(i) and (ii), any new or expanded highway project that primarily services gasoline vehicle traffic (i.e., does not involve a significant number or increase in the number of diesel vehicles), including such projects involving congested intersections operating at LOS D, E, or F is not considered a project of air quality concern.

Since this project is not expected to attract a large number of diesel vehicles, it is not considered a project of air quality concern and no further analysis is required.
14. EPA COMMENT

Smart Growth

- The corridor approach of nonintegrated land use and transportation development fostered by the Growth Choices process is likely to cause sprawl as well as many direct and indirect environmental impacts. Though the geographical constraints of the mountains (on one side) and the marshes and farmland (on the other) somewhat dictate development in this corridor, transportation design in this growing community will permanently dictate the growth patterns and ability of the community to access services, possess mobility and control connectivity. A higher density, well planned development concentrating the City Center, “community development,” recreation center and Utah State University Campus all within walking distance of each other and intersected by numerous low traffic, grid patterned streets would greatly enhance the mobility and attractiveness of the area and possible reduce VMT and associated impacts or at least slow the growth rate. Projects that follow such an approach often reduce impacts on environmental resources as well.

RESPONSE:

A locally and nationally recognized Non profit organization “Envision Utah” has been instrumental in awareness and outreach to local communities on smart growth issues. They have presented to the local planning commissions and councils in Cache County and have offered smart growth planning services to these communities. The Cache County Metropolitan Organization (CMPO) is also a proponent of smart growth and community sustainability.

While these communities may embrace the principles, implementation is difficult if it is not tied directly to the zoning code. Additionally, in as much as a new transportation facility promotes vehicle usage, it also creates a more efficient network for mobility both motorized and non-motorized. Secondly, whereas the new transportation facility will also likely facilitate new development consistent with the cities general plans, this also provides the cities with an opportunity to provide housing closer to employment and shopping centers thus reducing VMT and fostering walkable communities.
About this analysis

This report is a summary document for comments received during the Public Hearing held April 24, 2007 which presented the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement published March 2007.

About data collection

The survey data was received in the form of transcripts from a public hearing, comment cards, and emails. The format for all three was freeform.

Explanation of Data

A summary table of all comments was used to as the comment data. Comments were examined for remarks of support or opposition regarding alternatives. Each expression was recorded individually under the alternative to which it referred, and recorded as either a supportive or opposing remark. If an alternative was not mentioned in a comment, no remarks were recorded for that alternative.

The supporting and opposing remarks for each alternative were tallied individually and calculated as a percentage. Some commenters remarked on more than one alternative. Some commenters also submitted comments more than once.

Data Summary

The following list summarizes general facts and figures regarding the comments. Summaries of remarks are also listed.

- Fifty-five unique commenters made comments
- Seventy-four remarks regarding specific alternatives were recorded
- Comment cards were the most popular way to submit comments (19 comments submitted), follow by speaking at the public hearing (16 comments), then email (11 comments). There were 4 comments where the source of comment was unclear
- Overall, safety, especially that of young children, was expressed as the strongest concern
- Removal of the charter school was expressed as highly undesirable
- The Cache Meadow Dairy was noted as eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places
- Alternative 6B received the strongest response, receiving 34 total comments, 76% of those comments indicated 6B was the favored alternative
- Alternatives 6A and 5 received a smaller response, but both were rated nearly half negatively
- Alternatives 4 and 7 received the smallest response, receiving only 1 remark each.
- Alternative 3 was noted to likely be the fastest route, located in a safer location, and have less impacts on properties, but some commenters noted that it would be more disruptive to businesses on Main Street.
- Negative observations about alternative 5 included safety. Positive remarks included the route design following the grid pattern of the current city master plan.
- Negative comments on alternative 6A noted that it impacted many properties including the removal of the charter school.
- Positive observations about alternative 6B included fewer impacts to residential areas than other alternatives, no impact to the charter school, viewed as the safest option. Negative observations included the proximity of the road to a school (safety).

**Figure 1: Distribution of remarks.** Seventy remarks total were counted in the analysis. This graph shows the response level that each alternative received, as well as the distribution of favorable and negative remarks for each alternative. Alternative 6B received the strongest response, receiving 30 total comments, 87% of which indicated it was the favored alternative. Alternatives 6A and 5 received a smaller response, but both were rated nearly half negative remarks. Alternatives 4 and 7 received the least response, receiving only 1 remark each.
Figure 2: Comments received by type. The most popular way for respondents to submit comments was via comment cards. Speaking at the public hearing came in at a close second. Four comments were included in the JUB materials that did not indicate how they were submitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment Synopsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larry Soule, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B because it avoids residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Craig Bracken, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Dislikes Alt. 5. Concerned about residential area and charter school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aubrey Bracken, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Concerned about safety of children in the residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Craig Bracken, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 3. believes it would be the “fastest route”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nick Peterson, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 4B. Thinks the project should move forward more quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jonathan Choate, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Russell Goodwin, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Does not like any of the alternatives. Believes developers should pay for an alternative, not the local governments. Concerned about the length of the EIS process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roswitha Brown, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Richard Olson, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alts. 3, 5, and 6B. Dislikes Alt. 6A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jim Peterson, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>If Alt. 6A is built, suggests that gymnasium side of the school is maintained. Suggests a combination of Alt 6A and 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monica Hall, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guy Farley, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Dislikes Alt 6A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hannah Farley, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Dislikes Alt 6A goes through their property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Guy Farley, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kirt Poulsen, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Order of preference – Alt. 6B, Alt. 3, Alt. 6A, and Alt. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jason Christensen, Public Hearing Transcript</td>
<td>Prefers an alternative built on 10th West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dave Wilson, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alts. S and 6B. Dislikes 6A because of costs and property impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>J Poulsen, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Suggests adding two lanes to SR-91 and improve public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Christopher Lloyd, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers no build option, and then Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jim Peterson, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alts. 6A and 3. Dislikes Alts. 6B and 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name and Comment Card Type</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jessica L Embry, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Dislikes roundabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nancy Jensen, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers an alternative on the west side of Main Street. Of the listed alternatives prefers 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lynn Belnap, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Blake Ballard, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Anna Porter, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 3 or 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Julie Ballard, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ronald Jensen, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jack Cheney, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nick Peterson, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Roxanne Bilbao, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mike Jensen, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>James Porter, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Loetta Farley, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B, than Alt. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Jerilynne Lloyd, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Larry Soule, Public Hearing Comment Card</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Brian Taylor, Letter Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Jonathan Choate, Letter Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Loralee Choate, Letter Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Robert C. Mitchell, Letter Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ted Bear, Email Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt 3 or Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Jeffrey Low, Email Comment</td>
<td>Dislikes Alt. 5 because of safety issues. Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Rodney S. Nyman Family – Edith Nyman Gunnell, Jeniel Nyman Harris,</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 5, then Alt. 6A or Alt. 3. Dislikes Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributors</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mark Wilkinson, Email Comment</td>
<td>Prefers the no build alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>LaRee Mitchell, Email Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Melanie Taylor, Email Comment</td>
<td>Prefers Alt. 6B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stephanie Bear, Email Comment</td>
<td>Dislikes Alt. 5 and Alt. 6A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. SOUL: I'm just here with the North Logan Hyde Park Corridor deciding the road today, and I just want to put my input in that 68 looks like the best choice for me because it respects the property owners north in Hyde Park, and it also diverts away from the neighborhood along 2500 North and 2700 North.

Also, we have -- the reason why it's the best solution also is because -- you have to know a little bit of the history and why this problem has occurred with this road. And that's because about 13 years ago, there was a gentleman who wanted to develop the one side. And this is on 200 East, and it's between 2600 North and 2700 North; and he owned the east side.

That was all four-plex zoned. It was our four. And he was going to build his four-plex, and he took some heat from the City. And they shut him down and said they couldn't. And so they brought in another investor to develop the other side who owned that end and developed together and put houses along there.

And the other side, the west side, was
Response to Comment # 1

Mr. Soule,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. In reference to your account of the history of area, planning or zoning decisions which took place prior to the onset of this project are not necessarily addressed in the Draft EIS. Through our analysis, we consider the existing land use plans, foreseeable development, and zoning and how the proposed action could affect the policy document. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #2 – Mr. Bracken

#2. MR. BRACKEN: I just want to voice my concern over alternative route Number 5 and how that would impact the residential houses that it would go past and that it would make the street unsafe for not only the school, the Thomas Edison Charter School, but also the residents there, and that they should consider the alternative other ones that would bypass the majority of residents that live along the corridor.

Response to Comment #2

Mr. Bracken,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your concerns to alternative 5. Safety is of utmost concern to project team and has been considered throughout our analysis. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #3 – Ms. Bracken

MS. BRACKEN: It’s just that everybody on the street has kids, lots of little kids, that like to play outside; and people go fast on that road anyway already. And, you know, if there’s a through road, then it’s going to be even worse. Also, he mentioned that the road is meant to help people commute from, you know, Smithfield into Logan, but that really it affects us the most. And so since we live there, we should have a bigger voice in what happens.

Response to Comment #3

Ms. Bracken,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. All roads must meet national safety standards to assure that pedestrian and vehicular safety is not compromised. Safety is of utmost concern to project team and has been considered throughout our analysis. We have identified specific mitigation or improvements to alternatives proposed through residential areas to increase safety for pedestrians and residents. That information is identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 of the draft document. If you need more information about the proposed mitigation, please feel free to contact me. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #4 – Mr. Bracken
Response to Comment #4
(Continued from Comment #2) -
Commute time is taken into consideration when selecting road alignments. Numerous other factors must also be considered including, regional connectivity, consistency with Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Long Range Plan, capacity for current and future traffic loads, etc... In addition to these factors, the project team takes into account impacts to natural and social environment. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #5 – Mr. Peterson

#5 MR. PETERSON: From what I can see, 4B looks like the best alternative. And the other thing is, it would be good to get it started as quickly as possible, because you never know what's going to happen out in those areas in the future.

Hopefully the right-of-way can get secure and just -- I think the other alternatives, there were major impacts I can see in every one of them that I really didn't care for; so by far, I thought that 6B was -- seemed like the best. So that's all I have to say. Thanks.

Response to Comment #5

Mr. Peterson,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. We are nearing the final steps of the EIS and are anticipating having a final document by autumn 2007. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #6 – Mr. Choate

#60 MR. CHOATE: I wanted to put in my support for plan 6B. I am the resident whose house will be torn down, and I support it. I think it's the best plan as far as a happy medium for all the parties involved, and I just wish a decision would be made so we can find out what's going on because it's been in flux for years now. That's it.

Response to Comment #6

Mr. Choate,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. We are nearing the final steps of the EIS and are anticipating having a final document by autumn 2007. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
MR. GOODWIN: As stated, my name is Russell Goodwin, and I'm attending the Public Hearing/Open House concerning the Hyde Park North Logan Transportation Corridor EIS that concerns the alignment of 200 East.

And as a long time participant in local transportation issues, I know that 2nd East has been identified as a preferred and, indeed, the best, most efficient, to quote former transportation planner, Tom Fisher, "the most bank for the buck" road, that we can build in the Logan urbanized area.

This has been known both intuitively and by scientific analysis and state of the art computer modeling since at least 1999, and here we are still debating where and how to construct 200 East. The alternatives presented are absurd, preposterous, gargantuan, unfoundable.

2nd East, as you consider, passes through almost unbroken residential housing areas of Logan city. It's working admirably well through those residential areas, carrying approximately 10,080 ADT. Maybe the immediate adjacent residents don't care for it, but transportation has to go somewhere.

And yet, we take this two-lane, 10,000 ADT, 2nd East, through residential areas of Logan city, and the presenters at this public hearing/open house are suggesting that we need to transform that into a two-lane, separated, freeway-style controlled access roadway for the length of approximately 7 blocks -- 7 to 11 blocks, depending.

It's completely preposterous and completely absurd. The two lanes with a continuous
Response to Comment #7

Mr. Goodwin,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. At this time the steering committee has not selected a preferred alternative for this project. Since this process began in 2004, several public open house meetings were held to garner input from residents and stakeholders in the area on potential alignments. This process resulted in fourteen original alignments that have now been winnowed to four alternatives that have been determined to best meet the purpose and need of the project. These original fourteen and the four build alternatives are identified in the draft EIS.

The project team has worked thoroughly to develop alignments which meet the cities', residents', and commuters' current and future transportation needs. The project team must also take into account the impacts of alignments to the natural and social environment. As such the project team began with fourteen alternatives, which have now been narrowed to five alternatives. Even though this project has been underway for the past two years, we are nearing the final steps of the EIS and are hoping to have a final document by the end of the summer. Your preference for an alignment which runs the length of 200 East has been noted by the project team.
We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #8 – Ms. Brown

MS. BROWN: 6B. I would just agree with 6B. the plan which is probably the one that has the least -- how do you say that -- well, the least damage, do you know what I mean, as far as the housing and the property and the commercial parts, that it doesn't go right through the middle, but it's kind of towards the end of the property line. So I feel that would be the best, and there's only like one house involved and a few sheds.

Response to Comment #8

Ms. Brown,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B has been noted by the project team. In developing alignments, the project team has identified four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #9 – Mr. Olson

MR. OLSON: My family are -- we are property owners, and we have 13.23 acres at approximately 3400 North off the State Route, and our property runs approximately one and a half blocks deep.

So we are opposed to -- we are opposed to proposal 6A and in favor of proposals Number 3, Number 5 and Number 6B, which impacts our property the least. One thing we would be opposed to, which is probably not determined at this time, is any road running east and west through our property.

Other than that, we don't have any major objections to the alternative routes, as they are the most favorable to us as property owners, running the highway along the corridor of approximately 150 East of the State Route -- State highway. I'm sorry. And that's it for the record.

Response to Comment #9

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternatives 3, 5, and 6B, as well as your opposition for alternative 6A. Our study is only evaluating a north/south route parallel to US-91 and has not evaluated any east west connections. I recommend that you contact the city to review with them any proposed east/west roads that might affect your property. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #10 – Mr. Peterson

MR. PETERSON: I am the founder of the Thomas Edison Charter School. Three or four years ago I wrote a letter and mailed it to Candy Miller, so I’ll just make that comment that I’ve written that in the past.

The comment I have is if option 6A were selected, which is the option that would take out the school, then I would suggest that the City and perhaps the federal highway people look at maintaining the gymnasium side of the school, plus the wing of classrooms, and leave that standing, such that the City could potentially use that part of the facility as a recreation center and perhaps as a place where classes could be held, as opposed to leveling the whole school.

And that would open up the opportunity for partial usage of that building rather than -- because I know there's a concern about the cost of taking out that whole school. Does that make sense?

Question, 6A and 6B, from 2900 North and north. I'm wondering if the 6B alignment could be a variation -- or could be used for the 6A alignment from 2900 North northward, because I'm aware that there are -- there's a property line there that the 6B alignment -- yeah. Apply the 6B alignment to the 6A alignment from 2900 North northward.

Response to Comment #10

Mr. Peterson,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternatives 6A and 6B. Depending on which alternative is selected, property acquisition and building relocation is carefully evaluated to determine opportunities for minimizing cost and preserving structures for reuse potential. The project team has also noted your suggestion for combining alternative 6A and 6B. During the early stages of this process, fourteen original alignments were previously identified through stakeholder and
resident input. These original fourteen alternatives have now been winnowed to four alternatives that have been determined to best meet the purpose and need of the project. These original fourteen and the four build alternatives are identified in the draft EIS. In developing the potential alignments, the project team has taken into account property impacts, as well as impacts to the natural and social environment. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #11 – Ms. Hall

MS. HALL: We like 6B. It impacts the fewest homes, and it seems to be the most straightforward.

Response to Comment #11

Ms. Hall,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #12 – Mr. Farley

MR. FARLEY: Now, we've checked these over. The one that we are not impressed with is this 6A. Well, what do you think? That's the one that goes -- see, it goes right through our properties right in here.

Response to Comment #12

Mr. Farley,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your concerns for alternative 6A. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #13 – Ms. Farley

#13 MS. FARLEY: It goes right through the main lot where the other three go kind of on the divide line between our property and the property to the west of us.

Response to Comment #13
(Please refer to responses to comment #12 and comment #14).

Comment #14 – Mr. Farley

#14 MR. FARLEY: Probably this alternate 3 is the -- is our preference. See, that will miss the schools, and it'll go just west of the ice arena. See, it kind of splits our piece and the neighbor's piece so that they get a little bit of both pieces of property.

So that's probably -- that alternate 3 is our preference, and we're landowners right where it goes through.

Response to Comment #14
(continued from comment #12)
The project team has also noted your preference for alternative 3. In developing the potential alignments, the project team has taken into account property impacts, and has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #15 – Mr. Poulsen

Mr. Poulsen: I'll just give you my order of preference. That would be -- number one would be Alternative 6B, number two would be Alternative 3, number 3 would be Alternative 6A, and number 4 Alternative 5.

Response to Comment #15

Mr. Poulsen,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted the order of your preferred alternatives as the following, 6B, 3, 6A, and 5. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.

Comment #16 – Mr. Christensen

Mr. Christensen: I live at 2600 North. I have three acres in there. There's two parcels of land. I own them both. The bottom line is I feel like it's a little unfair that the subdivision is getting that road dumped over onto me. That's the bottom line. I don't want to go. I don't want the money. I don't want the big money. I want to stay there on my three acres. I want it left alone.

I really think the road that will save Cache Valley is 10th West, nothing with the east. I think the east is heavily populated. 10th West to Smithfield would really make a difference for the congestion on the road, on the main road.

Response to Comment #16

Mr. Christensen,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team understands your concerns regarding the possible impacts to your property. In developing potential road alignments the project team has to taken into account impacts to property, as well as impacts to the natural and social environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much
as possible. The project team has documented affects from each alternative to provide enough information in selecting a preferred alternative to best meet the project Purpose and Need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #17

Mr. Wilson,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your opposition to alternative 6A and support for alternative 3 and 6B. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. The project team has documented affects from each alternative to provide enough information in selecting a preferred alternative to best meet the project Purpose and Need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #18

J. Poulsen,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. In developing alignments, the project team has identified four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. One of the original alternatives considered widening SR-91 to include additional travel lanes. This alternative however, was eliminated due the fact that widening SR-91 would cause substantial access problems for many of the uses along SR-91. To meet current access management policy, many of the access points would likely have to be eliminated or combined with other uses. This would require the preparation for internal circulation plans for all of the uses along SR-91 to accommodate this change in access. Many of the uses simply do not have the extra land to accommodate a change in access or a secondary access to rely on. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible even taking into account access issues along SR-91. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #19

Mr. Lloyd,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your concern for the future transportation improvements in Hyde Park and North Logan. The alignment development process originally began with 14 initial alignments to determine what future roadway would meet the long term development in the Cache Valley area. Through continued stakeholder involvement and evaluation, the project team winnowed the 14 alignments down to four alternatives that best meets the project purpose and need. This purpose and need considered both Hyde Park and North Logan’s transportation goals as well as the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO) long range transportation plan.

Additionally, our traffic analysis identified that a new roadway east of SR-91 would greatly reduce the forecasted future traffic volumes on SR-91. We also considered widening SR-91 to include an additional travel lane in each direction. This alternative was eliminated due to substantial access issues it would create to existing land uses along SR-91.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #20

Mr. Peterson,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your support for alternatives 6A and 3 and opposition to alternatives 6B and 5. The project team has documented affects from each alternative to provide enough information in selecting a preferred alternative to best meet the project Purpose and Need while trying to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much as possible. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #21

Ms. Embry,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has considered many options to improve traffic flow, reduce speed, and address safety along the proposed alignments including roundabouts and narrowing roadway widths. If the preferred alternative includes roundabouts, the Cities of North Logan and Hyde Park will provide education to the community about the use of roundabouts for driver and pedestrian safety along the corridor. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #22
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 3, as well as your concerns with the general location of the project. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have narrowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. In doing so, although some alignments are not necessarily straight, they do function well and meet the long term goals for both Hyde Park and North Logan.

Our alternative development did consider an alignment west of SR-91 (Northwest Field Canal Road). Our traffic analysis concluded that the further west or east a new alignment was proposed; it reduced the percentage of vehicles it would transfer from SR-91.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #23

L. Belnap,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 3. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #24

Mr. Belnap,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 3, as well as your concerns for the children living along the corridor. The safety of local residents is of utmost concern to the project team and has been at the forefront of the design process. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #25
Ms. Porter,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternatives 3 and 6B, as well as your concerns for the children living along the corridor. Safety is of the greatest concern to project team and has been considered throughout our development of alternatives. We have identified specific mitigation or improvements to alternatives through residential areas to increase safety for pedestrians and residents. Those include narrowing the roadway width and/or installing roundabouts at 2500 North to force drivers to proceed with caution through the area. That information is identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 of the draft document. If you need more information about the proposed mitigation, please feel free to contact me. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #26

Mr. Ballard,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 3, as well as your concerns for the children living along the corridor. Safety is of the greatest concern to project team and has been considered throughout our development of alternatives. Pedestrian sidewalks and roadway shoulders will be provided with all of the build alternatives. We have also identified specific mitigation or improvements to alternatives proposed through residential areas to increase safety for pedestrians and residents. This includes strategies for reducing the speed through residential areas and narrowing the roadway while still providing sidewalks and shoulders. That information is identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 of the draft document. If you need more information about the proposed mitigation, please feel free to contact me. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #27

Mr. Jensen,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 3. Safety is of the greatest concern to project team and has been considered throughout our development of alternatives. We have identified specific mitigation or improvements to alternatives proposed through residential areas to increase safety for pedestrians and residents. That information is identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 of the draft document. If you need more information about the proposed mitigation, please feel free to contact me. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #28

Dr. Cheney,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. Throughout the process the project team has considered the impacts to property owners, as well as general impacts to the social and natural environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #29
Mr. Peterson,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. Throughout the process the project team has considered the impacts to property owners, as well as general impacts to the social and natural environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #30
Ms. Bilbae,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team as noted your preference for alternative 6B. Throughout the process the project team has considered the impacts to property owners, as well as general impacts to the social and natural environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. The review process of environmental documents has many procedural requirements that must be followed and unfortunately they take time. However, the time is well spent to assure that the most appropriate alternative is selected. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #31 – Mr. Jensen

Response to Comment #31

Mr. Jensen,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B, as well as your opposition with alternatives 5, 6A, and 3. We are nearing the final steps of the EIS and are anticipating having a final document by autumn 2007. Throughout the process the project team has considered the impacts to property owners, as well as general impacts to the social and natural environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #32 – Mr. Porter

Response to Comment #32

Mr. Porter,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B has been noted by the project team. The project team has considered many options to improve traffic flow, reduce speed, and address safety along the proposed alignments including roundabouts and narrowing roadway widths specifically through the residential areas. Throughout the process the project team has considered the impacts to property owners, as well as general impacts to the social and natural environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #33
Ms. Farley,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternatives 6B and 3. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #34
Ms. Lloyd,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #35

Mr. Soule,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B has been noted by the project team. Representatives from the City of North Logan were invited to attend the public hearing. In addition, they also serve as a member of the project team steering committee that has provided project oversight and. The City representatives have been working with the project team throughout the process and have been committed to identifying an alignment that best meets purpose and need and achieves the long range transportation goals of the City. They are available during normal business hours and are more than willing to talk to you regarding transportation goals for the city.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #36 – Mr. Taylor

Response to Comment #36

Mr. Taylor,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #37
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meet the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #38
Ms. Choate,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B has been noted by the project team. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meet the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #39 – Mr. Mitchell

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I, owners of the property at 164 E. 2600 North, have great concern over which choice is made for the Hyde Park-Logan Transportation Corridor. We realize that going through our property is one of the four options, and could be selected. But we believe this is the right choice.

We realize, too, that we would lose an excellent rental property, which we had purchased as an investment for our old age. We are 70 and 73, respectively. But for the good of the community as a whole, we would relinquish the property to save major disruption in other nearby areas.

But despite any disruption to us, we feel that going through this property would be much more practical than to, for instance, disturb the Thomas Edison School, which has recently earned a Platinum Designation for teaching excellence, and which has become such an integral part of the community. Cutting through our 164 East property would be less disruptive, because there is much less to be disturbed than in other options.

For example, the option for Second East, would obliterate a significant number of well-kept houses and families in a long-established neighborhood. We feel the road project should be an asset for the community, not one that displaces established families, which are the real backbone of a good community. This is especially true when there is an alternative. The property we own, at 164 East would essentially displace just one family, who is planning to move anyway.

Then, too, there is the option of cutting through the Bullen property east of the Blair Daines home. Choice of this route would also be unwise. A successful business already there needs great property depth. Any future businesses needing property depth could be discouraged from establishing there. This plan would not only be a very close parallel to Main Street, but also would drastically limit the potential for future businesses between 26th North and 28th North.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Mitchell

Response to Comment #39

Mr. Mitchell,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B and opposition to alternatives 3, 5, and 6A has been noted by the project team. Throughout the process the project team has considered the impacts to property owners, as well as general impacts to the social and natural environment. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible while trying to meet the project purpose and need.
The project team truly appreciates your willingness to accept the alignment through your property if this does become the preferred alternative. You obviously understand the dichotomy that exists between meeting future growth demands while preserving and maintaining neighborhoods. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #40

Mr. Bear,
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternatives 3 and 6b has been noted by the project team. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and
need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #41
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B and opposition to alternative 5 has been noted by
the project team. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. Specific consideration has been given to reduce speed through residential and school areas. This includes narrowing the roadway width and installing roundabouts to slow the vehicular traffic. It is true that any impact to properties or businesses, they will be compensated for property acquired. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
To: Project Development Partners, i.e., City of Hyde Park, North Logan City, CMP, UDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration

From: The Rodney S. Nyman Family – Edith Nyman Gumell, Jeniel Nyman Harris, R. Brent Nyman, Sue Nyman Borchelt, Ted M. Nyman, Anita Nyman Watts.

This information also represents the view of many other local citizens and landowners in and around the Hyde Park / North Logan Transportation Corridor.

Subject: The Hyde Park / North Logan Transportation Corridor

It seems that the whole purpose of a transportation corridor from Logan to Hyde Park and beyond is to provide alternate routes (off the main highway) that people will want to use. Alignments that bend and weave around tiny pockets of development would have both a negative economic and negative environmental impact. Winding roads also create a myriad of safety concerns and are more costly to build. Not following the straight shot grids of the long standing Master Plan cuts up private property and divides land into odd shaped little pieces. This creates additional problems now and in the future. This land (especially the land along the 200 East corridor) is definitely not low-impact property. Land values and prices in this area are at a premium level and they continue to climb higher.

FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF POINTS THAT WE FEEL ARE CRITICAL AND THAT SHOULD BE LISTENED TO AND CAREFULLY CONSIDERED:

1. A connecting road from Logan to Smithfield needs to be as straight as possible.

2. Making multiple bends and winding around everything defeats the whole purpose of the road. People would not use it. Most of the traffic would still remain on the straight shot highway two blocks west.

3. 2500 North is already a wide east/west main-entry road leading to North Logan and other east side areas. Eventually there would need to be stoplights or stop signs at some locations where North/South bypass roads cross it. Why not make 200 E. a straight shot out to 2500 North and then if it has to go west (which is questionable) put in a light and route traffic west 1 block on an already established main road. Having one stop light where these two main roads connect or turning west one block would be far less of a slowdown than currently exists on the main highway with it's multiple lights.

4. The County and North Logan City Master plan has always listed 200 East as a through road even though it has not been paved or fully developed to this point.
Response to Comment #42

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preferences in the order of alternative 5, 6A or 3, and 6B have been noted by the project team. During the design process the project team has considered numerous alignments to improve transportation along the corridor and maintaining consistency with the city’s general plans and the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization long range transportation plan. Our process began with fourteen alignments and through careful consideration of the transportation

For many years 200 East went clear through to 2500 North until someone decided to put up a few mounds of dirt to close off the last block between 2400-2500 N.

5. Even now with all the existing development and planned future development, there is really nothing to get in the way of 200 East going all the way through to Smithfield. There are very few potential issues and most of them involve only a very short (three block) area from 2400 N to 2700 N. It is our feeling that these few potential issues could be very easily resolved.

- There is a dilapidated mobile home park and run a down fence on the east side of 200 East for one block (2400-2500 N). A good fence could be put up along this one block area and/or one row of MOBILE homes could easily be relocated.
- There are a few homes and the small Thomas Edison School along 200 E. from 2500 N. to 2700 N. (2 blocks) and then it is clear open space again. It would be simple for 200 East to go all the way through to Smithfield. Traffic could be slowed for this very short 2-block area and/or a fence could be put up around the school. In fact a partial fence already exists.
- People living along 200 East had to know when they moved there that this road would continue on north. It is not a cul-de-sac and it was never meant to be. The master plan should not be altered and multiple bends in the road should not be made around this small 2 block area especially when this is already a through street and all logic points to taking a straight route.
- If there needs to be one slight bend out past the ice arena in order to better line up with square grids and property lines, that could still happen without ruining the straight shot concept and cutting up several properties.
- With the new Bishops Storhouse now located along 200 East at 2200 North, making a bend in the road right behind this area could cause major problems for the many trucks coming into that area and for other traffic as well.

IN SUMMARY - The advantages of straight-shot-roads far outweigh any disadvantages. Straight through roads follow well-organized square grids and the current Master Plan. They provide better traffic flow, help eliminate safety problems, have a positive economic and environmental impact and they provide for much better future growth and development. Straight roads also do not cut up private land into small odd shaped pieces that are difficult to develop and difficult to use efficiently. Straight routes create roads that people will really want to use.

BEST OPTION – Alternative # 5
NEXT BEST OPTION – Alternative # 6A or Alternative # 3
WORST OPTION – Alternative # 6B
needs of the community, and the social and environmental impacts, the project team has considered four potential alignments that best meet the project purpose and need. The project team recognizes that all transportation alignments have impacts. While through an environmental decision making process, we view all property uses as equal and do not distinguish between mobile home uses vs. single family homes. In our evaluation these are considered residential uses and are evaluated as such. Additionally, whether or not property owners along 200 East knew that at some time in the future 200 East would be extended is inconsequential in our evaluation. We evaluate the existing conditions and the future effects to those uses from the proposed alternatives. The project team has tried to minimize or avoid impacts, as much as possible. In doing so, this does not always result in the straight alignment such as the four alternatives that been forwarded.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #43 – Mr. Wilkinson

Marti Hoge

From: Mark Wilkinson [wilx@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2007 4:45 PM
To: Marti Hoge
Cc: hjkhtar@hnews.com
Subject: Hyde Park North Logan Transportation Corridor Project

To the Hyde Park North Logan Project Team:

This is an open comment concerning the proposed transportation corridor. Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

I attended the Hyde Park North Logan Transportation Corridor Project, Draft EIS Public Hearing/Open House meeting on April 24 and reviewed the construction options. I’m writing to make comments on this proposed project. The purpose of this project is to improve North- South traffic flow between Logan and Hyde Park (1400 North to 3700 North). There are five options for this project still being considered. There is a “no build alternative” and four construction alternatives known as Alternatives 3, 5, 6A, and 6B. The no build alternative calls for improvements identified in the Hyde Park and North Logan General Plans. The other four alternatives call for the construction of a three to five-lane parallel roadway.

I would like to first comment on the positive aspects of this project. I feel the environmental impact statement (EIS) is very professional and very thorough. It does a good job of quantifying the impacts of each of the construction options. Unfortunately, I feel there are some major omissions. These are not necessarily impact statements; rather, they are common sense statements.

1. Excepting the no-build alternative, all four alternatives of the proposed transportation corridor will construct a five-lane, highway-like road which is only 3 miles long and only 500 yards away from a parallel highway (S.R. 91) at a cost of $10 to $20 million dollars.

We are proposing building a highway that is 500 yards away from an existing highway! This defies common sense. It reveals the transportation corridor for what it is, a stop-gap measure to provide marginal relief to a major problem at the lowest possible cost in an area of the least resistance.

2. For years I have listened to city politicians assure land owners their rights will be protected. The protection of these rights are continually assured to the detriment of society. Land use laws in Cache Valley are so lackadaisical I’ve considered building a personal-use nuclear breeder reactor in my backyard. Unfortunately, while Cache Valley city governments may not mind, I’m sure the federal government would have something nasty to say about it.

The protection of laissez faire land use has resulted in poor zoning and city planning. We place elementary schools along highways and other major transportation corridors. We fail to protect by-passes, which routes semi-trucks through the populated areas of town. We bottleneck traffic flow to the highway that the State of Utah manages (S.R. 91), which is our Main Street.

The proposed transportation corridor requires the use of eminent domain to force an opening through the city. I agree this must be done because of poor city planning, but I contend it is being done in the wrong place. It is too close to an existing major transportation corridor (S.R. 91).

3. There are no assurances that Logan (to the south) and that Hyde Park and Smithfield (to the north) will connect to this new corridor. This plan is being pursued in the expectation other cities will likewise adopt a 2nd East corridor, but we do not know their final construction plans. There is no guarantee it will connect to this new corridor, placing the project at significant risk of being ineffective. Significant risk is unacceptable for a 10 to 20 million dollar project in a small town.
Response to Comment #43
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. During the design process the project team has considered numerous alignments to improve transportation along the corridor. Our process began with fourteen alignments and through careful consideration of the transportation needs of the community, the social and environmental impacts, and consistency with the City’s land use plans, the project team has forwarded the four potential alignments as best meeting the project purpose and need.

Our traffic analysis has indicated in order to reduce vehicular traffic on SR-91, the proximity of an additional route is critical to the distance of SR-91. We evaluated alignments at 400 and 600 East and from a traffic function, the further from SR-91 the alignment became, the percentage of drivers potentially using this route dropped substantially. We also considered alignments west of SR-91 (Northwest Field Canal Road) and we obtained the same results. This information is included in Section 2.4, Traffic Analysis of the DEIS.

We also considered widening SR-91 to accommodate future demand. This analysis concluded that widening would create substantial access issues for individual properties along SR-91. These access issues would require controlled access at key intersections, also requiring joint access points from adjacent property owners. Many of these individual properties do not have adequate land available to accommodate a shared access or an alternate access location. As you know, many of the properties along SR-91 can only be accessed from SR-91 because no abutting road exists east of SR-91.

The long range commitment from adjacent communities such as Logan and Smithfield is identified in the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO) long range transportation plan. This transportation plan acquires the long range...
transportation needs from the municipalities in the region and includes them in one comprehensive planning document. This information is also used to prioritize the future projects based on future travel demand and projections and the affect it will have on the existing transportation network. The role of the CMPO is to continually update the long range plan and identify future projects to maintain efficiency in the existing and future transportation network through evaluating and making recommendations on long range transportation improvements.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #44 – Mrs. Mitchell

Response to Comment #44

Mrs. Mitchell,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your preference for alternative 6B, as well as your concerns regarding the other alternatives. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, unbuilt environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need. We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Comment #45 – Ms. Taylor

Marti Hoge

From: melanie.taylor [mmellybell@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 1:53 PM
To: Marti Hoge

Subject: regarding the Hyde Park North Logan trans. corridor draft eis

To whom it may concern:

As I have examined the options of putting in a road to take off some of the existing traffic from main street, I have some very valid concerns about certain of these options.

1. Alignment 5: Going through 2nd east would cause considerable increase in traffic in front of our wonderful charter school. It would also decrease the value of existing homes for many families; most of which have small children because of the size and cost of these homes causing a significant safety concern.

2. Alignment 6a: Going through Thomas Edison Charter School would be personally devastating to our family and many others; since this is largely the reason we chose to buy a home here. The charter school has provided a wonderful alternative to an educational system that was unable or unwilling to meet the special needs of 2 of my children. It has been a huge asset to our community and has become a platinum school in the short amount of time since it’s inception.

3. Alignment 3: Looking at this option at first seemed appealing, but in closer examination I have 2 concerns:
   a. It is too close to main street to make it truly a beneficial option as an alternate route for the majority of the people. The people who will choose an alternate route are the ones who live higher up from main street or go pick up children from the charter school so they might as well stay on main street; therefore defeating the purpose of this road.
   b. This option would also go through existing businesses which I believe would not only disrupt economy for current businesses; but would prevent new businesses from being able to locate there, discouraging economic growth and taxes to benefit our community.

4. Alignment 6b: This option would go behind the school that is currently fenced in making it less of a safety concern for our children, and would be considerably farther away from the child pedestrian walk ways. It would cause the least amount of upheaval for existing families, since only one family would need to relocate and I have heard that they have no objection to do so. The existing businesses would not be harmed and future economic growth there would be available for our community. I also know this to be one of the least expensive options putting less of a burden on our community.

I believe as you examine each of my concerns you will find them to be valid and compelling enough to vote for 6b as the only reasonable option for this road. Thank-you for taking the time to review and evaluate my letter.

Sincerely, Melanie Taylor
2625 Aspen Park Lane
North Logan, UT 84341

Download Messenger. Start an i'm conversation. Support a cause. Join Now!

5/23/2007
Response to Comment #45
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your preference for alternative 6B, as well as your concerns regarding alternatives 5, 6A, and 3 has been noted by the project team.

During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project.

This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need.

One alternative also considered widening SR-91 to accommodate future demand. This analysis concluded that widening would create substantial access issues for individual properties along SR-91. These access issues would require controlled access at key intersections, also requiring joint access points from adjacent property owners. Many of these individual properties do not have adequate land available to accommodate a shared access or an alternate access location. As you know, many of the properties along SR-91 can only be accessed from SR-91 because no abutting road exists east of SR-91.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #46

Ms. Bear,

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. The project team has noted your opposition to alternatives 5 and 6A. During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives that best meets the purpose and need of the project. This process takes into consideration affects to both the built, un-built environment, and the natural and physical resources in the area. Our process has tried to avoid or minimize the impacts from the alignments as much possible while still trying to meet purpose and need.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #47

Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your opposition to alternative 6B and support for alternative 5 has been noted by the project team. During the design process the project team has considered numerous alignments to improve transportation along the corridor and maintaining consistency with the city’s general plans and the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization long range transportation plan. The project team recognizes that all transportation alignments have impacts. The Cache Meadow Dairy has been reassessed, and it is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Property owners have to be willing and interested in pursuing the nomination to the NRHP. Our process documents those resources and to the greatest possibility tries to avoid impacts to those resources. Section 5 of the Environmental Impact Statement discusses avoidance and minimization to those resources while still trying to meet the projects purpose and need. And in doing so, the result is not always a straight road. The compromise of the “bends” and “curves” is a result of trying to strike a balance between minimizing impacts to all resources as much as possible.

During the alternative development process, the project team with input from residents and stakeholders originally identified fourteen initial alignments. As the process has progressed, we have winnowed those down to four alternatives with 6B identified as the preferred alternative that best meets the purpose and need of the project.

We recognize that you have attended many meetings in the past and have voiced your concern throughout the process. Those have been documented and evaluated. We evaluate all comments equally and without prejudice regardless of the location of the property.

We appreciate you taking the time to provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #48
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your opposition to alternative 6B and support for alternative 5 has been noted by the project team.

We recognize that you have attended many meetings in the past and have voiced your concern throughout the process. Those have been documented and evaluated. We evaluate all comments equally and without prejudice regardless of the location of the property. An environmental process seeks to minimize property and resource impacts as much as possible. While, it may not always appear that your concerns have been considered, we try to balance all concerns and comments while still trying to meet the project purpose and need. As a result, all four of the alternatives forwarded for detailed consideration contain shifts and meander to avoid impacts to all resources while still meeting project purpose and need. Unfortunately, impacts to properties and resources cannot be completely avoided.

We also realize resources in the area are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Property owners have to be willing and interested in pursuing the nomination to the NRHP. Our process documents those resources and to the greatest possibility tries to avoid impacts to those resources.

We appreciate you taking the time to provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #49
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS. Your opposition to alternative 6B has been noted by the project team.

We recognize that resources in the area are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Property owners have to be willing and interested in pursuing the nomination to the NRHP. Our process documents those resources and to the greatest possibility tries to avoid impacts to those resources.

We appreciate you taking the time to attend the public hearing and provide us your comments.
Response to Comment #50
Thank you for your input regarding the Hyde Park North Logan Draft EIS.

We recognize that resources in the area are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Property owners have to be willing and interested in pursuing the nomination to the NRHP. Our process documents those resources and to the greatest possibility tries to avoid impacts to those resources. If avoidance is not achievable, then we consider minimizing the impact if possible. If minimization is not possible then our next action is mitigation. Mitigation will have to be approved by the Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), FHWA, and UDOT.

Your opposition to alternative 6B and support for alternative 5 has been noted by the project team.

We appreciate you taking the time to provide us your comments