

Chapter 30: Public and Agency Consultation and Coordination

30.1	Introduction	30-2
30.2	Stakeholder Working Group.....	30-3
30.3	Resident Working Group	30-6
30.4	Public Consultation and Coordination.....	30-9
30.4.1	Scoping	30-9
30.4.2	Purpose and Need.....	30-10
30.4.3	Alternatives Development.....	30-11
30.4.4	Environmental Justice Outreach	30-17
30.4.5	Public Meetings	30-19
30.4.6	Draft EIS Outreach and Public Hearings	30-20
30.5	Agency Consultation and Coordination	30-22
30.5.1	Scoping	30-22
30.5.2	Purpose and Need.....	30-27
30.5.3	Alternatives Development.....	30-27
30.5.4	Other Agency Coordination	30-28
30.6	Municipal and County Consultation and Coordination	30-28
30.6.1	Scoping	30-28
30.6.2	Purpose and Need Development, Preliminary Alternatives Development, Alternatives Screening and Refinement, and EIS Results.....	30-29
30.6.3	Draft EIS Outreach and Public Hearings	30-30
30.7	Nongovernmental Organization Coordination.....	30-31
30.7.1	General Coordination.....	30-31
30.7.2	Shared Solution Alternative	30-31
30.8	Consultation and Coordination Tools	30-34
30.8.1	Printed Publications and Collateral Materials.....	30-34
30.8.2	Electronic Communication Tools	30-35
30.8.3	Media Relations	30-42
30.9	Comments Received	30-44
30.10	Use of Public and Agency Comments in the Study Process Prior to the Release of the Draft EIS.....	30-50
30.10.1	Scoping	30-50
30.10.2	Purpose and Need, Preliminary Alternatives Development, and Alternatives Screening and Refinement.....	30-50
30.10.3	Responding to Questions and Anticipating Issues	30-50
30.11	Summary and Conclusion.....	30-51
30.12	References	30-51

30.1 Introduction

Throughout the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, the West Davis Corridor (WDC) team has proactively shared project information and sought comments from the public at large, resource agencies, federal and state regulatory agencies, Counties, municipalities, and other interested individuals and organizations. One of the goals of the WDC team from project initiation was to engage all project stakeholders in a proactive and cooperative manner to solicit feedback, resolve concerns, and build consensus throughout the process.

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU; Public Law 109-059; 23 United States Code [USC] 139) requires the federal lead agency for an EIS process to develop a plan for coordinating public and agency participation and comments early in the environmental review process. SAFETEA-LU also requires lead agencies to identify and invite cooperating and participating agencies, and to provide opportunities for the public and agencies to comment on the project's purpose and need, the range of alternatives to be considered, and the alternatives-screening methodology.

For the WDC Project, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) developed a SAFETEA-LU Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Plan that is posted on the project website (www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis). All of the coordination described in this chapter was implemented consistently with the coordination efforts identified in this plan.

This chapter summarizes the consultation and coordination activities implemented during scoping (see the *West Davis Corridor Scoping Summary Report* [West Davis Corridor Team 2010a]), development of the purpose of and need for the project (see Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action), alternatives development (see Chapter 2, Alternatives), and the EIS analysis. This chapter also describes the communication tools used to support the overall project. Figure 30-1a, Public Involvement Timeline, through Figure 30-1d, Public Involvement Tools and Study Results, in Volume IV summarize the public involvement process used for the WDC Project.

What is the WDC team?

The WDC team consists of the lead agencies for the WDC Project, which are the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT).

What are cooperating and participating agencies?

A cooperating agency is any federal agency, other than a lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or project alternative.

A participating agency is a federal, state, tribal, regional, or local government agency that might have an interest in a project.

30.2 Stakeholder Working Group

A Stakeholder Working Group was formed at the start of the EIS process. This group consisted of cooperating and participating agencies as well as various nongovernmental organizations representing community, environmental, transportation, and recreation/healthy lifestyle interests.

The working group's primary purpose was to guide the EIS process, provide input at key milestones, and build consensus on the EIS's findings. The WDC team regularly met with this group to provide project updates and gain input on the EIS process.

Most of the meetings were held immediately prior to public meetings or releases of information to the public. The purpose of this schedule was to ensure that the project information was clear and could be understood by the public. The group's responses were used to help clarify project information before it was released to the public. The group had no decision-making authority about the WDC Project, but the members provided valuable input about issues important to the organizations they represented. Membership changed over time due to turnover in local elected officials and because new organizations were identified to be represented in the process.

Table 30-1 lists the meetings with the Stakeholder Working Group. Table 30-2 below lists the current members of the Stakeholder Working Group at the date of publication of this Final EIS.

Table 30-1. Stakeholder Working Group Meetings

Date	Location	Group	Purpose
February 17, 2010	Davis County Legacy Events Center	SAFETEA-LU participating agencies	Scoping and EIS kickoff
February 17, 2010	Davis County Legacy Events Center	Stakeholder Working Group (includes SAFETEA-LU and non-SAFETEA-LU representatives)	Scoping and EIS kickoff
May 19, 2010	Syracuse Community Center	Stakeholder Working Group	Purpose and need evaluation
August 3, 2010	Sunset City Hall	Stakeholder Working Group	Preliminary alternatives development
February 8, 2011	West Point City Hall	Stakeholder Working Group	Alternatives screening and refinement
September 9, 2011	Kaysville City Hall	Stakeholder Working Group	Alternatives screening and refinement update
October 10, 2012	Syracuse Community Center	Stakeholder Working Group	Alternatives refinement update
May 16, 2013	West Point City Hall	Stakeholder Working Group	Release of the Draft EIS
May 24, 2016 ^a	Syracuse Community Center	Stakeholder Working Group	Shared Solution Alternative screening results

^a There were no stakeholder working group meetings between 2013 and 2016 because the WDC team was developing and evaluating the Shared Solution Alternative and updating the WDC analysis for the new Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) travel demand model (version 8.1) and 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan.



Table 30-2. Stakeholder Working Group Membership

Stakeholder working group members have changed over the course of the EIS process. This list represents the current Stakeholder Working Group members.

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Steve Anderson	West Haven City	Rob Jensen	Ducks Unlimited
Carmen Bailey	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	Mike Jewell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Candace Bear	Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	Linda Johnson	Breathe Utah
Allen Berrett	Weber County Farm Bureau	Joel Karmazyn	Utah Division of Air Quality
Mark Biddlecomb	Ducks Unlimited	Elizabeth Kitchens	The Nature Conservancy
Bryce Bird	Utah Division of Air Quality	Pam Kramer	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Johnna Blackhair	Bureau of Indian Affairs	G.J. LaBonty	Utah Transit Authority
Elise Boeke	Natural Resources Conversation Service	Kyle Laws	West Point City
Suzanne Bohan	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Adam Lenhard	Clearfield City
Sharon Bolos (Mayor)	West Haven City	Chuck Leonhardt	Ogden Weber Chamber of Commerce
Roger Borgenicht	Utahns for Better Transportation	Beverly Macfarlane (Mayor)	Sunset City
Brody Bovero	Syracuse City	Dick Marvin	Bureau of Reclamation
Corrina Bow	Paiute Indian Tribes of Utah	Peter Matson	Layton City
Neal Briggs	Davis County Farm Bureau	Julia McCarthy	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Sterling Brown	Utah Farm Bureau	Brigham Mellow	Syracuse City
Tom Burkland	Farr West City	Thayne Mickelson	Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Paul Burnett	Trout Unlimited	Brett Milburn (Commissioner)	Davis County Commission
Keith Butler (Mayor)	Marriott-Slaterville City	Dave Millheim	Farmington City
Mike Caldwell (Mayor)	Ogden City	Richard Mingo	Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission
Steve Call	Federal Highway Administration	Ed Naranjo	Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation
Nile Carlson	Davis Conservation District	Mike Nepstad	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Lynn Carroll	Wasatch Audubon Society	Terry Palmer (Mayor)	Syracuse City
Betsy Chapoose	Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Ute Indian Reservation	Randy Parker	Utah Farm Bureau
Mark Clemens	Sierra Club	Steve Parkinson	Roy City
Dennis Cluff	Clinton City	Dave Petersen	Farmington City
Willard Cragun (Mayor)	Roy City	Jack Ray	Utah Waterfowl Association
Erik Craythorne (Mayor)	West Point City	Russ Roberston	Federal Highway Administration
Larry Crist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Laura Romin	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Paul Cutler (Mayor)	Centerville City	Jennifer Schuller	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Bill Damery	Utah Department of Environmental Quality	Norm Searle (Mayor)	Riverdale City

(continued on next page)



Table 30-2. Stakeholder Working Group Membership

Stakeholder working group members have changed over the course of the EIS process. This list represents the current Stakeholder Working Group members.

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Boyd Davis	West Point City	Bucky Secakuku	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Lynn de Freitas	Friends of the Great Salt Lake	Mark Shepherd (Mayor)	Clearfield City
Z. Lee Dickemore (Mayor)	Farr West City	Matt Sibul	Utah Transit Authority
Kerry Doane	Utah Transit Authority	Carolyn Smith	Shoshone-Bannock Tribe
Heather Dove	Great Salt Lake Audubon	Jim Smith (Commission Chair)	Davis County Commission
Najah Duvall- Gabriel	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Cory Snyder	Centerville City
Judy Edwards	Governor's Office of Management and Budget, Resource Development Coordinating Committee	Sandra Stavnes	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Steve Erickson	Great Salt Lake Audubon – Utah Audubon Council Legislative Advocate	Bob Stevenson (Mayor)	Layton City
Jake Garn (Councilman)	Kaysville City	Troy Stout	Weber Basin Water Conservancy District
Jason Gibson	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Phil Strobel	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Kerry Gibson (Commissioner)	Weber County	Jim Talbot (Mayor)	Farmington City
Stephanie Graham	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Andy Thompson	Kaysville City
Korry Green (Mayor)	Hooper City	Scott Van Leeuwen	Marriott-Slaterville City
Karen Hamilton	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Eddie Wadda	Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation
Steve Hardegen	Federal Emergency Management Agency	Tim Wagner	Utah Physicians for a Healthier Environment
Darren Hess	Weber Basin Water Conservancy District	Shane Warner	Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation
Martin Hestmark	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Robert Whitely	Syracuse City
Steve Hiatt (Mayor)	Kaysville City	D.J. Williams	Utah Waterfowl Association
Bruce Higley (Mayor)	Plain City	James Woodruff	Layton City
Mark Holden	Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission	Darrin Wray	Hill Air Force Base
Toby Hooker	Utah Division of Water Quality	Will Wright	Clinton City
Bill James	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	Ben Wuthrich	Utah Transit Authority
Cory Jensen	Utah Division of State History		

30.3 Resident Working Group

Two Resident Working Groups were formed in 2011 in response to the growing need for involvement by residents in the WDC study area. These working groups consisted of representatives from homeowners’ associations (HOAs) and neighborhood groups, owners of large properties, and individual homeowners throughout the WDC study area. A wide cross-section of representatives was assembled to represent the varying points of view throughout the WDC study area and to provide fair geographical representation.

What is the WDC study area?

The WDC study area is the area described in Section 1.2, Description of the Needs Assessment Study Area.

The working groups’ primary purpose was to gather public input and involve local residents in the EIS process. The Resident Working Group representatives served as central points of contact to communicate the EIS process and developments to their neighbors. These representatives streamlined communication between large neighborhood groups and the WDC team. A secondary purpose of the Resident Working Groups was to provide a forum for these various groups to hear and understand each others’ concerns and points of view. Membership in the Resident Working Groups grew over time as some regions required more representation to reflect area-specific interests and concerns.

Table 30-3 lists the meetings with the Resident Working Groups (both north and south). Table 30-4 below lists the current members of the North Resident Working Group at the date of publication of this Final EIS, and Table 30-5 below lists the current members of the South Resident Working Group at the date of publication of this Final EIS.

Table 30-3. Resident Working Group Meetings

Date	Location	Group
June 21, 2011	Endeavour Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
September 19, 2011	Endeavour Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
September 20, 2011	West Point Elementary School	North Resident Working Group
December 6, 2011	Endeavour Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
January 18, 2012	Syracuse Community Center	North Resident Working Group/ Syracuse Residents
June 5, 2012	Endeavour Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
June 6, 2012	West Point Elementary School	North Resident Working Group
October 4, 2012	West Point Elementary School	North Resident Working Group
October 10, 2012	Endeavour Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
May 29, 2013	Endeavor Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
May 30, 2013	West Point Elementary School	North Resident Working Group
May 31, 2016 ^a	Endeavor Elementary School	South Resident Working Group
June 2, 2016	West Point City Hall	North Resident Working Group

^a There were no resident working group meetings between 2013 and 2016 because the WDC team was developing and evaluating the Shared Solution Alternative and updating the WDC analysis for the new WFRM travel demand model (version 8.1) and 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan.

Table 30-4. North Resident Working Group Membership

North Resident Working Group members have changed over the course of the EIS process. This list is the current North Resident Working Group members.

Name	Part of Study Area	Representing
Korry Green, Mayor	Hooper	Hooper City
Marcia Sutton	Hooper	Lakeside Pines HOA
Cathy Welch	Hooper	5100 South, 5100 West to 5500 West
Justin Byington	Syracuse	Bridgeway Island HOA
Carter Haacke	Syracuse	1700 North – 3000W/Bluff Road
Aaron Hottel	Syracuse	3300 West, 1700 South to 2400 South
Steve Johnson	Syracuse	2700 South between 3000 West and 3500 West
Brandon Law	Syracuse	Black Island Farms
Phillip Mickey	Syracuse	Glen Eagle Golf Course Residents
Terry Palmer, Mayor	Syracuse	Syracuse City
Tim Rodee	Syracuse	Citizens for a Better Syracuse
Hal Seifert	Syracuse	2700 South, 4000 West to 3500 West
Jason Steed	Syracuse	700 South near 3300 West
Chad Williamson	Syracuse	Fremont Neighborhood
Sharon Bolos, Mayor	West Haven	West Haven City
Bryan Humphrey	West Haven	Fair Grove Estates – Senior Living Community
Vickie Richeson	West Haven	Fair Grove Estates
Allen Bennett	West Point	800 North, 4100 West to 3500 West
Sheryl Clements	West Point	4500 West, 800 North to 400 North
Erik Craythorne, Mayor	West Point	West Point City
Jack Diamond	West Point	1800 North, 4000 West to 3000 West
Bryce Garner	West Point	4500 West, 1300 North to 800 North
Glen Wade	West Point	Farm property owner

Table 30-5. South Resident Working Group Membership

South Resident Working Group members have changed over the course of the EIS process. This list is the current South Resident Working Group members.

Name	Part of Study Area	Representing
Doug Anderson	Farmington	Farmington City Council
Bruce Bassett	Farmington	www.savefarmington.org
Gene Done	Farmington	Neighborhoods near Shepard Lane, east of Interstate 15 (I-15)
Brett Evans	Farmington	Neighborhoods near Glovers Lane, east of I-15
Heidi Herron	Farmington	Spring Creek Neighborhood
Cody Hilton	Farmington	www.farmingtoncitizens.org
Lori Kalt	Farmington	www.savefarmington.org
Lance Moore	Farmington	Farmington Ranches HOA
Kristy Powell	Farmington	Farmington Ranches HOA
Jim Talbot, Mayor	Farmington	Farmington City
Jason Wheeler	Farmington	Hunters Creek HOA
Paul Allred	Kaysville	50 East Neighborhood
Nate Alvey	Kaysville	Schick Farms HOA
Dave Austin	Kaysville	Kaysville City Task Force
Clint Bodily	Kaysville	www.savekaysville.com
Chris Griffin	Kaysville	Quail Crossing HOA
Zeb Harris	Kaysville	Pheasantbrook HOA
Steve Hiatt, Mayor	Kaysville	Kaysville City
Tod Jones	Kaysville	Roueche Lane
Doug Leavitt	Kaysville	Equestrian Estates
Kevin Swallow	Kaysville	Suncrest Meadows HOA
Adam Schwebach	Kaysville/Farmington	Endeavor Elementary Community Council
Ryan Bankhead	Layton	Island View Ridge Estates
Molly Dixon	Layton	Kayscreek Estates
Carlee Hansen	Layton	Kershaw Estates
Bob Stevenson, Mayor	Layton	Layton City

30.4 Public Consultation and Coordination

30.4.1 Scoping

Scoping is a key part of the EIS process that involves soliciting public and agency participation in order to identify issues and develop alternatives. The official scoping phase for the WDC EIS began January 25, 2010, and ended March 22, 2010. As part of the scoping effort, the project was published in the January 25, 2010, Federal Register with an invitation for the public to provide initial scoping comments. A complete description of scoping activities and results is provided in the *West Davis Corridor Scoping Summary Report* (West Davis Corridor Team 2010a).

What is scoping?

Scoping is an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.

Public scoping outreach by the WDC team included the following elements:

- Media outreach
- Introductory meetings and presentation with mayors and city and county representatives
- Three scoping open houses in Farmington (south), Syracuse (central), and south Ogden (north) on February 23, 24, and 25, 2010, respectively
- Posters and flyers distributed to the city government offices at all 14 cities in the WDC study area to advertise the scoping open houses; this also included distribution to post offices, libraries, shopping centers, and Hill Air Force Base
- Door-to-door visits in Farmington to deliver postcards announcing the scoping open houses
- Facebook and Twitter updates through UDOT's social media
- A project website (www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis), e-mail address, office address (466 North 900 West, Kaysville), and telephone comment line

As a result of the efforts of the WDC team, more than 300 people attended the scoping open houses in February 2010. At these meetings, 189 attendees submitted comments. For the purpose of this chapter, a *comment* is a letter, e-mail, phone call, or other communication by which a person or agency provided input on one or more issues. Often a single comment included multiple issues or substantive points.

What is a comment?

A comment is a letter, e-mail, phone call, or other communication by which a person or agency provided input on one or more issues.

Public scoping comments revealed four distinct areas of interest and concern.

- First, the public recognized the work of previous studies in the area and encouraged the WDC team to consider or use previously adopted plans for a corridor route through the WDC study area.
- Second, citizens were concerned about effects on their quality of life, the division of existing neighborhoods, and impacts to community facilities.
- Third, the public was interested in the preservation of the environment and open space, and the importance of farmland.
- Fourth, the public expressed concerns regarding direct and indirect impacts to air quality, noise, and property values and the equity of acquiring right-of-way.

The WDC team compiled a list of about 149 transportation options and components based on public and agency comments. These transportation options and components were combined with those found in the WFRC Regional Transportation Plan and previous planning studies and were screened using a rigorous two-level screening process. A complete description of the screening process and results is provided in *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report* (West Davis Corridor Team 2012).

30.4.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose and need chapter for the WDC EIS (Chapter 1) was developed from the results of the initial scoping effort and input from local communities, agencies, and other interested groups coupled with field research and traffic analysis. The criteria set forth in the purpose and need chapter established why the WDC Project is necessary and what it should achieve, which helped the WDC team determine a range of alternatives. The draft purpose and need chapter of the EIS was made available for agency comment on May 5, 2010, and for public comment on May 7, 2010. The comment period lasted through June 7, 2010. Members of the public and agencies were encouraged to provide comments by e-mail, the project website, and postal mail.

Public purpose and need outreach by the WDC team included using the EIS's e-mail distribution list to announce the availability of the purpose and need chapter and the comment period. The team also posted a "Purpose and Need – Frequently Asked Questions" document online to address common questions. Presentations to Cities, agencies, elected officials, interest groups, and chambers of commerce were part of the outreach during this phase. The

team also held a Stakeholder Working Group meeting on May 19, 2010. A press release was published on May 6, 2010, and five newspaper articles were published about the WDC Project between May 5, 2010, and June 7, 2010.

A total of 47 comments were submitted regarding the draft purpose and need chapter. The team made small refinements to the purpose and need chapter in response to these comments. For a summary of the public and agency comments received on the purpose and need chapter, see Section 1.8, Public and Agency Involvement in Developing the Project's Purpose and Need.

30.4.3 Alternatives Development

30.4.3.1 Preliminary Alternatives

After gathering and evaluating public and agency input on the draft purpose and need chapter, the WDC team was able to determine a wide range of transportation options, including various modes of transportation. In the late summer of 2010, the WDC team introduced preliminary roadway and transit concepts to the public. Input on these alternatives also came from the scoping phase of the EIS, public and agency comments, and previous corridor studies that evaluated transportation needs in the WDC study area. For a complete description of the alternatives-development screening methodology, activities, and results, see *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report*.

In August 2010, the preliminary roadway and transit alternatives and the alternatives-development and screening process methodology (see *Technical Memorandum 13: Alternatives-Development and Screening Process* [West Davis Corridor Team 2011b]) were made available for public and agency comments. Both the alternatives and screening methodology were provided in hard copy to cooperating agencies and were made available to the public in electronic form via the project website or in hard copy at a series of preliminary alternatives-development open houses on August 3, 4, and 5, 2010. The three open houses were held at venues in Farmington, Sunset, and West Haven to accommodate stakeholders in the southern, central, and northern parts of the WDC study area.

To advertise the alternatives-development open houses, the WDC team delivered posters and flyers to the city government offices at all 14 cities in the WDC study area; mailed postcard invitations to about 5,400 properties identified by the WDC team as being near potential project alternatives; announced the events in city newsletters, city websites, and city marquees during June and July 2010; and e-mailed the information to the EIS e-mail list.

Project stakeholders throughout the WDC study area were invited using a variety of communication tools to provide input on the preliminary alternatives. The tools included the project website, news media, e-mail updates, print and online advertising, and public meetings. The project website had more than 4,000 visits during the preliminary alternatives-development phase. Twenty-two news stories were published in statewide daily and local weekly publications. Three e-mail updates were sent to the project stakeholder list asking for comments. Meeting announcements were published in the Ogden *Standard-Examiner* newspaper and website and the *Davis County Clipper* newspaper.

In advance of the three alternatives-development open houses, the WDC team convened the Stakeholder Working Group on August 3, 2010, to seek comments on the alternatives-development screening methodology and criteria and the preliminary alternatives. The Stakeholder Working Group, the general public, and agencies were given a 40-day review and comment period from August 3, 2010, through September 12, 2010.

During the week of August 16, 2010, the WDC team hosted a booth at the Davis County Fair to raise awareness regarding the preliminary alternatives and to solicit public feedback from attendees.

More than 500 stakeholders attended the alternatives-development open houses in August 2010. The WDC team received 394 individual comments regarding attendees' issues and concerns, 168 of which were submitted at the public meetings. The Stakeholder Working Group representatives submitted 17 comments on the alternatives and the alternatives-development and screening criteria.

The comments on the preliminary alternatives development suggested a variety of new alternative alignments to be evaluated during the alternatives-screening and refinement process. They also helped the team refine the existing alternatives and understand key issues at this stage of the EIS, including information regarding new residential developments or other community resources. Of the feedback about preliminary alignments, the alignments in Farmington received the largest number of comments.

The team also received comments regarding the alternatives-development screening process and criteria. For more information about the comments received during alternatives development, see *Technical Memorandum 13: Alternatives-Development and Screening Process*.

30.4.3.2 Alternatives Screening and Refinement

During the alternatives-screening and refinement process, the WDC team conducted comprehensive outreach that included about 250 meetings with individual stakeholders and larger stakeholder groups. During this process, from the fall of 2010 to the fall of 2012, the project website had more than 75,000 visits. In addition, 270 news stories were published in statewide daily and local weekly publications.

Level 1 Screening: Fall 2010

Following the preliminary alternatives-development comment period, the WDC team compiled 46 alternatives based on public and agency comments. The team then began the Level 1 screening process to determine which alternatives met the purpose of and need for the project. This screening reduced the original 46 alternatives to 14 alternatives that met the Level 1 screening criteria. The WDC team posted the results of the Level 1 screening process on the project website in November 2010. The team notified the public

What was the purpose of Level 1 screening?

The purpose of Level 1 screening was to identify alternatives that would meet the purpose of and need for the project.

regarding the Level 1 screening results by sending e-mails to the distribution list and by making presentations at city council and agency meetings throughout the WDC study area. Throughout the fall of 2010, the team posted a schedule of city council presentations on the project website and invited the public to attend. The WDC Project was the subject of 11 newspaper articles from October to December 2010.

In addition to public outreach, the WDC team held a Stakeholder Working Group meeting on November 3, 2010, to review the results of the Level 1 screening process with representatives from the participating and coordinating agencies.

Level 2 Screening: Fall 2010 – Spring 2011

Following the Level 1 screening process, the WDC team evaluated the 14 alternatives advanced to Level 2 screening to determine the alternatives' screening-level environmental and community impacts (that is, the impacts to the natural and built environments based on the preliminary alignments). This reduced the 14 alternatives to three, which were renamed Alternatives A, B, and C. The team published the Level 2 screening results on the project website on February 1, 2011, in *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report* and announced the results via e-mail.

What was the purpose of Level 2 screening?

The purpose of Level 2 screening was to determine which of the alternatives advanced from Level 1 screening were reasonable and practicable and would be evaluated in detail in the EIS.

The Stakeholder Working Group was reconvened on February 8, 2011, in advance of the February 2011 alternatives-refinement open houses to gather comments on Alternatives A, B, and C and the results of the Level 2 screening process. The WDC team hosted three alternatives-refinement open houses on February 8, 9, and 10, 2011, to present Alternatives A, B, and C to the public and to solicit comments. These events were held in West Point, Farmington, and West Haven. An “online open house” was also held on February 8 to allow the public to participate remotely and share their input. In total, about 3,000 people attended the alternatives-refinement open houses, and 125 participated in the online open house.

The WDC team used a comprehensive approach to reach potentially affected stakeholders along the identified roadway alternatives. This included delivering posters and flyers to the city government offices at all 14 cities in the WDC study area in January 2011 to raise early awareness about the February 2011 alternatives-refinement open houses. In January, about 6,700 postcards announcing the open houses were mailed to stakeholders who might be directly affected by the alternatives as well as potential future users of the alternatives. Information regarding the February 2011 open houses and the upcoming release of the Level 2 screening results was published in city newsletters in January 2011 to draw attention to the open houses. This information was also advertised through e-mail updates leading up to the events.

Additional coordination meetings were held with key stakeholders throughout the alternatives-screening and refinement process. For example, the WDC team met with property owners and HOAs as part of its coordination effort through “neighborhood

meetings,” which were typically hosted by residents in their homes with a gathering of neighbors. From the fall of 2010 through the spring of 2011, the team held about 116 stakeholder meetings (large and small) and community presentations.

In addition to public outreach, from the fall of 2010 through the spring of 2011, the WDC team met regularly with agencies, the Utah Transportation Commission, and municipal and county governing bodies to keep them informed about the EIS’s progress. The WDC team met with the resource agencies six times during this period. The team also made presentations at city council meetings for each potentially affected municipality and at council of government meetings for Davis and Weber Counties. The WDC team met with each of these groups once in November or December 2010, and again in January or February 2011.

The public and agency comment period extended from February 1, 2011, through March 25, 2011. During the comment period, the WDC team received about 4,500 public or agency comments. Due to the high volume of public input, the comment period was extended from March 8, 2011, to March 25, 2011, to give the public more time to review the alternatives and provide detailed comments. The WDC team used a variety of communication tools to invite public feedback, including the project website, news media, e-mail updates, print and online advertising, and the public and online meetings in February 2011. Public meeting announcements were placed in the Ogden *Standard-Examiner* newspaper and website, in the *Davis County Clipper* newspaper, on the website for television station KSL, and on Facebook. The WDC Project was the subject of 108 newspaper articles from February to April 2011.

The public comments during this phase of the EIS continued to focus on issues related to the direct or indirect impacts of the WDC on residences, farms, and businesses located on or near a potential alignment. The public comments also expressed concerns about the neighborhood and community impacts of the potential alignments. The public conveyed a strong desire that a decision should be made as soon as possible. Because multiple alignments were under consideration, people who lived near any alignment wanted to know when they would find out whether their property would be affected. They were also very concerned about the effect of the proposed alternatives on their home’s value.

The public suggested new connection points for the alternatives in addition to making refinements to Alternatives A, B, and C. Other comments focused on environmental and human impacts. The public was highly skeptical of wetland classifications and stated that their rights and interests (for example, homes, farms, businesses, and neighborhoods) were as important as protecting wetlands. Other comments regarded safety in proximity to a highway and the division of communities by a new highway. Agricultural impacts and the impact on the local economy were also major concerns.

In response to the large public attendance at the February 2011 alternatives-refinement open houses and subsequent coordination meetings, the WDC team decided to create two Resident Working Groups, one for the cities in the south (Farmington, Kaysville, and Layton) and one for the cities in the north (Syracuse, West Point, Hooper, and West Haven). The Resident Working Group members were tasked with being liaisons between their communities and the team and with sharing information and feedback in both directions. The first South Resident

Working Group meeting was held on June 21, 2011, and the first North Resident Working Group meeting was held on September 20, 2011.

Level 2 Screening: Summer 2011 – Fall 2011

Based on the changes in the May 2011 WFRC Regional Transportation Plan 2011–2040 and associated travel demand model, in the summer of 2011, the WDC team decided to reassess the alternatives-screening process. The methodology and results of the rescreening process are described in *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report*.

Based on public and agency input during the fall of 2010 and the spring of 2011 and on its reassessment of the screening due to the revised WFRC travel demand model, the WDC team advanced two alternatives, Alternatives A and B, each with two northern options and two southern options, to be considered for detailed study in the EIS.

About 70 meetings and community presentations with city, county, agency, and stakeholder groups were held during this time.

On September 8, 2011, the team released the alternatives to be considered for detailed study in the EIS via the project website and e-mail updates. A press release discussing the release of the alternatives was also issued on September 8, 2011. The WDC team met with the Stakeholder Working Group and both Resident Working Groups in September 2011 and held an additional South Resident Working Group meeting on December 6, 2011. The WDC team made presentations at city council meetings for each potentially affected municipality and at council of government meetings for Davis and Weber Counties. The team also met with Counties and other stakeholders during this period.

In November 2011, the WDC team released a revised *Technical Memorandum 15* for public and agency comments. The memorandum was placed on the project website, and the public was notified through e-mail and postcard notifications. The WDC Project was the subject of 32 newspaper articles during this time.

Level 2 Screening: Winter 2011 – Fall 2012

From the winter of 2011 through the fall of 2012, the WDC team continued to meet with stakeholder groups, agencies, and municipalities. Refinements to Alternatives A and B continued as the team worked to reduce and minimize impacts.

For example, on January 18, 2012, an additional refinement to Alternative B in Syracuse was made that shifted the alignment from 3000 West farther east, closer to Bluff Road. To help notify the affected Cities and stakeholders of this change, the WDC team made presentations at Syracuse City council meetings and met with other stakeholders along the new alignment in Syracuse. The WDC team made door-to-door visits to inform about 130 residents who

What is a travel demand model?

A travel demand model is a computer model that predicts the number of transportation trips (travel demand) in an area at a given time. This prediction is based on the expected population, employment, household, and land-use conditions in the area. The travel demand model used for the WDC Project is maintained by WFRC.

would be most affected by this additional refinement. The team also mailed 160 postcards to residents in the area to invite them to a community meeting to explain the refinement.

The shift in Alternative B created renewed interest in the EIS and sparked the formation of citizen groups in Syracuse who were opposed to the change. The WDC team received comments on this refinement and added three new members to the North Resident Working Group to provide better representation given the shift in Alternative B. The WDC Project was the subject of 21 newspaper articles during this time.

Following the release of the November 2011 *Technical Memorandum 15*, about 200 comments were received between November 2011 and March 2012. The team received comments in support of and in opposition to the alternatives.

In October 2012, updated wetland information and refinements to Alternatives A and B were posted to the project website. The WDC team made door-to-door visits with property owners who would potentially be affected by these changes to the alternatives' alignments. The WDC Project was the subject of nine newspaper articles during this time.

The public comments during this stage shared many of the same concerns as before, but in different locations. Many people were concerned about property issues and wanted to move the alternatives as far west as possible or to keep the alternatives more central, similar to the alignments that had been identified in previous studies. General concerns were expressed regarding agricultural impacts versus residential impacts, or environmental impacts versus residential impacts, depending on the area.

Of the comments received between the fall of 2011 and the spring of 2012, the largest number concerned the refinement to Alternative B in Syracuse. Many of these comments expressed concern regarding the indirect impacts of noise and air pollution to the surrounding population and to a charter school located adjacent to the proposed Antelope Drive interchange on Alternative B in Syracuse. Comments showing support for Alternative B were also received, since it was closer to the original planned corridor from previous studies and would affect less agricultural land.

The detailed impact analysis for Alternatives A and B continued from the spring of 2012 through the fall of 2012 in preparation for the identification of UDOT's preferred alternative and the release of the Draft EIS. UDOT released a revised version of *Technical Memorandum 15* in November 2012 to the project website detailing the alternative refinements during 2012.

30.4.4 Environmental Justice Outreach

A primary goal of environmental justice is to reach low-income and minority populations that have historically not been able to participate in the transportation decision-making process as readily as other groups. The WDC team made specific efforts to contact all people living in the WDC study area, including any low-income or minority populations. Specific public involvement and outreach efforts included the following:

- **Organizational Contacts.** Over 15 governmental and nongovernmental organizations and community service providers, including low-income and minority providers, were contacted to help identify the locations of environmental justice populations and the resources they might use.
- **Public Meetings.** During the development of the Draft EIS, three different public meeting periods (scoping, alternatives development, and alternatives refinement) were held throughout the WDC study area (a meeting at the south, central, and north end of the WDC study area for each meeting period). Meetings were announced in local media outlets, through city websites and mailers, through mailers to all property owners along the project alternatives, and at other key locations including post offices, libraries, shopping centers, and Hill Air Force Base. Because of the potential to affect residents in Farmington and Kaysville, flyers for the initial public scoping meeting were delivered door to door to ensure that residents were informed about the project.
- **E-mail Update List.** Members of the public who identified a preference for receiving project information by e-mail were sent regular updates about the project. These updates notified recipients of new information on the project website, upcoming events, and major project milestones.
- **Newsletters.** Newsletters were used to provide project information to the public at key decision points and to notify them of public events. Each newsletter included options for communicating with the WDC team and providing input on project choices by postal mail, e-mail, and telephone. These newsletters were distributed at community briefings, placed at community centers, mailed to the project mailing list, posted on the project website, and distributed electronically to the e-mail update list. In addition, all residents who owned property near the project alternatives were identified through county records and were sent direct mailings about upcoming public meetings.

What is environmental justice?

Environmental justice is a term used to describe the fair and equitable treatment of minority and low-income people (environmental justice populations) with regard to federally funded projects and activities. *Fair treatment* means that no minority or low-income population should be forced to bear a disproportionately high share of negative effects from a project.



- **Telephone Comment Line.** A telephone comment line recorded phone messages from people who called in their comments. A record was kept of all comments, and people who requested a response were contacted within a few days of their call. The telephone number was heavily advertised on all communication materials including fact sheets, newsletters, brochures, display advertisements, and information displays.
- **Project Website.** The project website was used to provide public access to timely information about the project and to allow quick, easy interaction with the WDC team. The public was able to read information about the project, including the plans under consideration, and submit their comments online. Although the website was not a primary communication method for those who do not have internet access, it was an important way for those who do have access to become involved in the project. The project website has contact information for Spanish speakers to get project information. The WDC team has also coordinated with local municipalities to post links on their websites that send the public to the WDC Project website if they want more information.
- **Mailing Lists.** The WDC team maintains two mailing lists to which project updates and meeting announcements are sent: an e-mail list and a postal mail list. Local and regional governmental and nongovernmental organizations, community centers, and community groups are included in these lists.

30.4.5 Public Meetings

A series of public meetings were held at key milestones during the EIS process. These included scoping open houses, preliminary alternatives-development open houses, and alternatives-screening and refinement open houses (as described in Section 30.4.1, Scoping, through Section 30.4.3, Alternatives Development). Table 30-6 lists the timeline of these meetings, with their accompanying locations.

Table 30-6. Public Meetings

Public Meeting	Location
Scoping open houses	
February 23, 2010	Syracuse High School, Syracuse
February 24, 2010	Legacy Events Center, Farmington
February 25, 2010	West Weber Elementary School, Ogden
Alternatives-development open houses	
August 3, 2010	Sunset City Hall, Sunset
August 4, 2010	Kanesville Elementary School, West Haven
August 5, 2010	Legacy Events Center, Farmington
Alternatives-refinement open houses	
February 8, 2011	West Point City offices, West Point
February 9, 2011	Legacy Events Center, Farmington
February 10, 2011	West Haven Elementary School, West Haven
Pre-Draft EIS community meetings	
April 18, 2013	Farmington Community Meeting, Farmington Community Center, Farmington
May 1, 2013	Shepard Lane Community Meeting, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Kaysville
Draft EIS open houses and public hearings	
June 11, 2013	Legacy Events Center, Farmington
June 12, 2013	West Point Junior High, Hooper
June 13, 2013	Freedom Elementary School, Hooper
Farmington Ranches Community Meeting	
June 27, 2016	Davis County Library – Farmington Branch, Farmington

Public meetings were held throughout the WDC study area, with a concentration of meetings in areas of potential direct impacts. The stakeholder contact database grew with each set of public meetings, which indicates that the meetings consistently attracted new stakeholders who had not previously been involved with the project. Table 30-7 lists the methods that were used to inform the public of the public meetings.

Table 30-7. Public Meeting Notification Methods

Public Meeting Notification Methods	
Direct mailing	Media releases
E-mail updates	Media print advertising
Door-to-door flyer distribution	City newsletters
Posters/flyers at all cities in WDC study area	Project website
City marquees	

30.4.6 Draft EIS Outreach and Public Hearings

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the WDC Draft EIS was released for public review and comment in May 2013. A hard copy and multiple CD (compact disc) copies of the Draft EIS were distributed to local libraries, municipal buildings, and two local copy centers. Hard copies and CDs of the Draft EIS were also provided to stakeholders on request. Distribution included copies to nongovernmental organizations and media outlets. See Table 30-9 below for a list of distribution locations where the Draft EIS was made available to the public for review. The Draft EIS was also posted on the project website.

The availability of the Draft EIS was announced using local media outlets, electronic distribution methods, and printed collateral materials. Fact sheets were also developed that summarized sections of the Draft EIS and were distributed to the media, local government officials, and the public. In addition, the WDC team provided presentations to city and community councils, chambers, and other associations.

The official comment period initially extended from May 24, 2013, to August 23, 2013, but was extended to September 6, 2013, at the request of several Cities and nongovernmental organizations. The total Draft EIS comment period was 106 days. The public had the opportunity to comment using a variety of methods. Official comments were accepted by postal mail, e-mail, comment form, comment postcard, oral testimony to a court reporter, or the project telephone comment line. Posters announcing the public hearings and encouraging public comments were distributed to local libraries and municipal buildings in the project area (see Table 30-8 below). See Table 30-8 below for a complete list of poster distribution locations.

UDOT held three open-house public hearings in June 2013 (see Table 30-10 below). Two were held in Davis County, and one was held in Weber County. A total of 812 attendees came to the public hearings. Attendees had the opportunity to provide official comments using comment forms, by individually speaking to a court reporter, or making verbal comments to a hearing panel which were captured by a court reporter. Comments received at the public hearings are summarized and the responses provided in Chapter 32, Response to Comments on the Draft EIS.

Table 30-8. Draft EIS Open House and Public Hearing Information Poster Locations

Name	Address
Davis County Library Headquarters	133 S. Main Street, Farmington
Davis County Central Branch – Layton	155 N. Wasatch Drive, Layton
Davis County North Branch – Clearfield	562 South 1000 East, Clearfield
Davis County Library Northwest Branch – Syracuse	1875 South 2000 West, Syracuse
Davis County Library South Branch – Bountiful	725 S. Main Street, Bountiful
Centerville City	250 N. Main Street, Centerville
Kaysville City	23 E. Center Street, Kaysville
Layton City	437 N. Wasatch Drive, Layton
Syracuse City	1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse
Clearfield City	55 S. State Street, Clearfield
West Point City	3200 West 300 North, West Point
Clinton City	2267 North 1500 West, Clinton
Sunset City	200 West 1300 North, Sunset
Hooper City	5580 West 4600 South, Hooper
West Haven City	4150 South 3900 West, West Haven
Farmington City	160 S. Main Street, Farmington

Table 30-9. Draft EIS Hard Copy and CD Public Distribution Locations

Name	Address
Davis County Library Headquarters	133 S. Main Street, Farmington
Davis County Central Branch – Layton	155 N. Wasatch Drive, Layton
Davis County North Branch – Clearfield	562 South 1000 East, Clearfield
Davis County Library Northwest Branch – Syracuse	1875 South 2000 West, Syracuse
Davis County Library South Branch – Bountiful	725 S. Main Street, Bountiful
Weber County Library – Ogden	2464 Jefferson Avenue, Ogden
Weber County Library North Branch – Ogden	475 East 2600 North, Ogden
Centerville City; Kaysville City, Layton City; Syracuse City; Clearfield City; West Point City; Clinton City; Sunset City; Roy City; Hooper City; West Haven City; Farmington City	Copies of the EIS were provided to each city for local residents' review.

Table 30-10. WDC Draft EIS Public Hearings

Date and Time	Location
June 11, 2013: 4 to 9 PM	Legacy Event Center 151 South 1100 West, Farmington
June 12, 2013: 4 to 9 PM	West Point Junior High School 2775 West 500 North, West Point
June 13, 2013: 4 to 9 PM	Freedom Elementary School 4555 West 5500 South, Hooper

30.5 Agency Consultation and Coordination

30.5.1 Scoping

Although people who live in the WDC study area understand the issues associated with day-to-day life in this area, it was important to also coordinate with local, state, and federal agencies that oversee the management of resources in the WDC study area. Since these agencies issue permits for their resource areas, it was important to include them in the initial scoping activities. In this way, issues were identified early so that they could be properly considered and, if necessary, avoided, minimized, or mitigated as the project progressed.

Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU addresses environmental streamlining and stewardship. SAFETEA-LU requires transportation agencies to work with federal agencies that oversee the management of natural, cultural, and historic resources to establish realistic timeframes for environmental reviews of transportation projects.

30.5.1.1 Cooperating and Participating Agencies

SAFETEA-LU and NEPA specify that the lead agencies for a federal action should identify potential cooperating and participating agencies early in the EIS process. Concurrent with the development of the Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS, FHWA and UDOT, which are the lead agencies for the WDC Project, identified these potential cooperating and participating agencies for the project.

The regulations that implement NEPA define a *cooperating agency* as “any federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.5). Typically, agencies with a high number of resources in a project area that could be affected by certain actions of the project are contacted early in the scoping process and asked to be involved in the project as cooperating agencies.

The regulations that implement NEPA define *participating agencies* as “any other federal and non-federal agencies that may have an interest in the project” [23 USC 139(d)].

Agency Invitation Letters

In January 2010, the WDC team sent invitation letters to agencies requesting their participation as either a cooperating and participating agency or a participating agency. The letters contained a deadline for response consistent with Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU [23 USC 139(d)(2)]. Letters to federal agencies were sent on FHWA letterhead, and letters to state and local agencies were sent on UDOT letterhead.

Table 30-11 below lists the agencies that were asked to act as cooperating and/or participating agencies and how each agency responded.



Table 30-11. Status of Cooperating and Participating Agencies for the WDC EIS

Agency	Type of Agency Invitation	Response and Status
<i>Federal Agencies</i>		
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Cooperating & participating	Accepted as participating only
Bureau of Indian Affairs	Cooperating & participating	Accepted as participating only
Bureau of Reclamation	Participating	Accepted
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Participating	Accepted
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Participating	Accepted
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cooperating & participating	Accepted
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Cooperating & participating	Accepted
Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission	Cooperating & participating	Accepted
<i>Tribal Governments</i>		
Cedar Band of Paiutes	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe	Cooperating & participating	No response; assume participating
<i>State Agencies</i>		
Governor's Office of Management and Budget, Resource Development Coordinating Committee	Participating	Accepted
Department of Agriculture and Food, Division of Conservation and Resource Management	Participating	No response; assume participating
Department of Community and Culture, Division of State History, State Historic Preservation Officer	Participating	Accepted
Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ), Division of Air Quality	Participating	Accepted
UDEQ, Division of Water Quality	Participating	Accepted
UDEQ, Division of Environmental Response and Remediation	Participating	Accepted
Department of Natural Resources (UDNR), Division of Parks and Recreation	Participating	No response; assume participating
UDNR, Division of Water Resources	Participating	No response; assume participating
UDNR, Division of Water Rights	Participating	No response; assume participating
UDNR, Division of Wildlife Resources	Participating	Accepted
<i>Regional Governments or Agencies</i>		
Utah Transit Authority	Participating	Accepted
Wasatch Front Regional Council	Participating	Accepted

(continued on next page)



Table 30-11. Status of Cooperating and Participating Agencies for the WDC EIS

Agency	Type of Agency Invitation	Response and Status
<i>Local Governments</i>		
Davis County	Participating	Accepted
Weber County	Participating	Accepted
Centerville City	Participating	Accepted
Clearfield City	Participating	Accepted
Clinton City	Participating	Accepted
Farmington City	Participating	Accepted
Farr West City	Participating	No response; assume participating
Hooper City	Participating	Accepted
Kaysville City	Participating	Accepted
Layton City	Participating	Accepted
Marriott-Slaterville City	Participating	Accepted
Ogden City	Participating	Accepted
Plain City	Participating	No response; assume participating
Riverdale City	Participating	No response; assume participating
Roy City	Participating	Accepted
Sunset City	Participating	No response; assume participating
Syracuse City	Participating	Accepted
West Haven City	Participating	Accepted
West Point City	Participating	Accepted

Native American Tribe Consultation

The project area does not include any tribal land, but the Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation, Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe, and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes were expected to have interests regarding cultural resources. Other tribes that have shown interest in other Utah-based projects include Cedar Band of Paiutes, Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Eastern Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, and Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians.

FHWA asked each of these tribes to become cooperating agencies. As shown in Table 30-11 above, none of the tribes responded to the invitation. Because of the government-to-government consultation responsibilities associated with tribes, FHWA has also initiated consultation with these tribes, and tribal representatives were invited to attend the agency scoping meeting on February 17, 2010. No Native American tribal representatives attended this meeting.

Throughout the project, FHWA has consulted with the tribes as required under government-to-government consultation responsibilities regarding potential cultural resource impacts of concern to the tribes. The WDC team provided multiple written updates to the tribes over the course of the WDC Project and informed them of the status and results of archaeological field inventories and the alternatives-screening process. In addition, UDOT attended tribal leaders' meetings in November 2010 and May 2011 and presented an overview of the project and an update on the alternatives being considered. For more information about the tribal consultation process, see Chapter 16, Historic, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources.

Agency Scoping Meeting

Representatives from coordinating and participating agencies were invited to attend an agency scoping meeting (which also served as the initial SAFETEA-LU participating agency meeting) and were invited to provide comments regarding possible concerns or considerations for the resource areas under their authority. The agency scoping meeting was held on February 17, 2010, in Farmington. UDOT sent meeting invitations to state and local agencies on January 5, 2010, and FHWA sent invitations to federal agencies on January 14, 2010.

The purposes of the scoping meeting were to introduce attendees to the project and to previously completed corridor studies; to discuss the EIS methodologies considered for the WDC EIS; and to describe the SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 coordination process and the expectations for participating agencies.

In addition to FHWA and UDOT representatives, the following representatives of cooperating and participating agencies attended the meeting:

- W. Russ Findlay – U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- Julia McCarthy – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Robin Coursen – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Tim Witman – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Nathan Darnall – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- John Rice – Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission
- Bill Damery – Utah Department of Environmental Quality
- Pam Kramer – Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
- Mary DeLoretto – Utah Transit Authority
- Ben Wuthrich – WFRC
- John Petroff – Davis County
- Cory Snyder – Centerville City
- Kent Bush – Clearfield City
- Lynn Vinzant – Clinton City
- Scott Harbertson – Farmington City
- Jared Preisler – Hooper City
- Woody Woodruff and Bill Wright – Layton City
- Scott Van Leeuwen – Marriott-Slaterville City
- Daniel Gillies – Ogden City
- Willard Cragun – Roy City
- Rodger Worthen – Syracuse City
- Steve Anderson – West Haven City
- Boyd Davis – West Point City

Resource Agency Coordination Meetings

On January 19, 2010, UDOT sponsored a meeting for federal and state agencies that have specific environmental interests in the WDC study area. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce agency representatives to the project and begin discussions about analysis methodologies prior to the agency scoping meeting. Among the issues discussed at the meeting were a proposed wetland methodology, wildlife survey and analysis methodologies, population and development growth analysis methodology, indirect effects methodology, and alternatives-screening methodology. In addition to FHWA and UDOT representatives, the following agency representatives attended the meeting:

- Robin Coursen – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Jason Gipson and Timothy Witman – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Betsy Herrmann and Nathan Darnall – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Pam Kramer (phone) – Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

The WDC team also met separately with the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer on March 23, 2010, to discuss coordination under the National Historic Preservation Act.

Meeting with the Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission and The Nature Conservancy

On December 17, 2009, UDOT representatives met with representatives of the Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission and The Nature Conservancy to discuss the status of the project and land owned and managed by each entity. In addition to UDOT representatives, the following representatives attended the meeting:

- Mark Holden and John Rice – Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission
- Chris Brown, Kara Butterfield, and Chris Montague – The Nature Conservancy

Meetings with Other Government Agencies and Committees

The WDC team met with a number of other government agencies and committees throughout the scoping process. These meetings were as follows:

- Executive Technical Environmental Council, which is a group of state and federal resource agency representatives that meets on a regular basis, on January 13, 2010
- Utah Governor's Office of Management and Budget, Resource Development Coordinating Committee, which is a group that reviews and coordinates technical and policy actions that can affect the physical resources of the state and facilitates the exchange of information on those actions among federal, state, and local government agencies, on February 9, 2010
- WFRC, the local metropolitan planning organization, on October 27, 2009, and February 11, 2010

30.5.2 Purpose and Need

FHWA and UDOT published a draft of the project purpose and need chapter for review by the SAFETEA-LU cooperating and participating agencies on May 5, 2010. The WDC team gathered comments on the draft chapter through June 7, 2010. Members of the agencies were encouraged to provide comments by e-mail, the project website, and postal mail.

30.5.3 Alternatives Development

The WDC team used several methods to involve agencies during the development and screening of preliminary alternatives as required under NEPA and SAFETEA-LU.

The WDC team requested agency input through meetings, open houses, and reviews of project materials. On August 3, 2010, the WDC team hosted a meeting with the established Stakeholder Working Group (composed of SAFETEA-LU cooperating and participating agencies and representatives from nongovernmental organizations) that presented (1) the proposed alternatives-screening methodology and criteria and (2) a list of preliminary alternatives from previous studies and plans.

At this meeting, the WDC team requested comments on the alternatives-screening methodology and criteria and the preliminary alternatives for the WDC Project. Additionally, the Stakeholder Working Group and the agencies were given a 40-day review and comment period from August 3, 2010, to September 12, 2010. The WDC team received comments from 17 members of the Stakeholder Working Group, which included comments from 11 SAFETEA-LU cooperating and participating agencies.

WDC team members also had focused meetings with individuals, agency representatives, city or county representatives, and representatives of nongovernmental organizations to discuss specific concerns or proposals. These meetings were recorded in meeting minutes, and the minutes were made available to the team as it developed the alternatives.

As part of the SAFETEA-LU process, the WDC team consulted with tribal representatives regarding Native American concerns about potential alternatives and the screening process. FHWA and UDOT also consulted with Native American tribes under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consultation regarding alternatives took place as part of that process as well as through the NEPA/SAFETEA-LU process.

The information gathered during the SAFETEA-LU agency and public involvement process was used to help define the range of preliminary alternatives. In February 2011, the WDC team presented the draft results of the alternatives-screening process to the agencies and the public and provided a 6-week comment period.

During the summer of 2011, the WDC team rescreened the WDC alternatives. On September 8, 2011, the WDC team released updated maps and met with the resource agencies to obtain input on the rescreening process. On November 14, 2011, the WDC team released an updated version of *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report* to the agencies that described the rescreening process and the changes to the screening process between February 2011 and November 2011.

During 2012, the WDC team met frequently with the cooperating agencies to discuss refinements to the alternatives advanced to the Draft EIS and the alternatives-screening process. In November 2012, the WDC team released an updated version of *Technical Memorandum 15* on the project website. This coordination resulted in the cooperating agencies concurring with the range of alternatives carried forward for detailed study in the EIS.

30.5.4 Other Agency Coordination

Throughout the EIS process, the WDC team coordinated with the resource agencies regarding the project's purpose and need, alternatives, methodologies, impact analysis, mitigation, and permitting. Appendix 30A, Agency Coordination, summarizes the coordination process.

30.6 Municipal and County Consultation and Coordination

30.6.1 Scoping

Between November 10, 2009, and February 10, 2010, the WDC team conducted introductory meetings with the mayors of cities in and around the WDC study area. These meetings provided an introduction to the EIS process and determined key points of contact with each City for continued participation in the EIS process. The team also used these meetings to assess key concerns and issues relative to the city leadership and how to best communicate with its residents.

Beginning in January 2010, the WDC team made presentations to city councils at key milestones. These meetings are listed in Table 30-12 below.

During the scoping phase, local government officials and staff were encouraged to provide comments using a variety of tools including the project website, e-mail, and telephone comment line. Municipalities also played a key role in the Stakeholder Working Group and contributed their local knowledge of city planning initiatives and history to benefit the EIS process overall.

Municipal scoping comments revealed that each jurisdiction has unique areas of concern. Municipalities in Weber and Davis Counties strongly supported a previously identified preferred alignment from a 2001 planning study conducted by WFRC. Many Cities had been planning their land uses based on that alignment, and some right-of-way had been preserved or purchased in anticipation of this alignment. In Weber County, there was concern regarding the northern boundary of the WDC study area at 12th South in Weber County, based on fears that 12th South would not be able to handle the traffic from a new highway. Other Cities worried about the alignment splitting the community. Connectivity and east-west movement were considered to be challenges in Weber and Davis Counties and were considered important issues related to economic development and community cohesion.

30.6.2 Purpose and Need Development, Preliminary Alternatives Development, Alternatives Screening and Refinement, and EIS Results

City staff provided input in defining concepts and refining alternatives as part of the public comment process. The WDC team also made numerous presentations to city councils, planning commissions, and other municipal organizations on request and held meetings with individual municipal staff members (see Table 30-12).

The purpose of city council and planning commission presentations was to provide project updates to elected officials. The purpose of municipal staff meetings varied based on project issues related to alternatives development, alternatives refinement, pending residential or commercial developments, and review of data about environmental impacts.

As part of the assessment of indirect impacts in 2012, the WDC team invited city and county planning officials to an indirect impacts analysis meeting on March 14, 2012, to gather information about Alternatives A and B in relation to local planning initiatives. This meeting provided an open setting for representatives from neighboring Cities to discuss the WDC alternatives regionally and to hear different points of view regarding the alternatives and their impacts. The team used this opportunity to gather data regarding the indirect impacts of the alternatives to local development, population, economic development, and future population and development growth on a city-by-city basis.

Table 30-12. City Council and Planning Commission Presentations and Municipal Coordination Meetings

Municipality	Number of City Council or Planning Commission Presentations Attended	Number of Municipal Coordination Meetings with Staff or Elected Officials
Davis County	9	12
Farmington	8	12
Kaysville	8	10
Layton	4	7
Clearfield	2	1
West Point	5	8
Clinton	3	2
Sunset	2	2
Syracuse	5	11
Davis Chamber of Commerce	0	4
Weber County	6	9
Ogden	1	0
Roy	2	1
Hooper	4	3
West Haven	3	4
Marriott-Slaterville	2	1
Uintah	0	1
Weber Chamber of Commerce	0	3

30.6.3 Draft EIS Outreach and Public Hearings

The WDC team provided each municipality with a hard copy of the Draft EIS. In addition, a copy of the Draft EIS and/or a CD copy of the Draft EIS was sent to each current member of the Stakeholder Working Group (see Table 30-13 below). The WDC team also met with city and county councils and presented a summary of findings from the Draft EIS.

Table 30-13. Distribution of Draft EIS Hard Copies and CDs to Local Governments

Name	Organization
The Honorable Gary Herbert	Governor of Utah
The Honorable Greg Bell	Lieutenant Governor of Utah
Senator Scott Jenkins	Utah State Senate District 20
Senator Jerry Stevenson	Utah State Senate District 21
Senator Stuart Adams	Utah State Senate District 22
Senator Todd Weiler	Utah State Senate District 23
Representative Jacob Anderegg	Utah House District 6
Representative Richard Greenwood	Utah House District 12
Representative Paul Ray	Utah House District 13
Representative Curtis Oda	Utah House District 14
Representative Brad Wilson	Utah House District 15
Representative Stewart Barlow	Utah House District 17
Representative Roger Barrus	Utah House District 18
Commissioner Louenda H. Downs	Davis County Commissioner
Commissioner P. Brett Millburn	Davis County Commissioner
Commissioner John Petroff, Jr.	Davis County Commissioner
Commissioner Matthew G. Bell	Weber County Commissioner
Commissioner Kerry W. Gibson	Weber County Commissioner
Commissioner Jan M. Zogmaister	Weber County Commissioner
Mayor Ronald Russell	Centerville City
Mayor Don Wood	Clearfield City
Mayor Mitch Adams	Clinton City
Mayor Scott Harbertson	Farmington City
Mayor Korry Green	Hooper City
Mayor Steve Hiatt	Kaysville City
Mayor Steve Curtis	Layton City
Mayor Joe Ritchie	Roy City
Mayor Chad Bangerter	Sunset City
Mayor Jamie Nagle	Syracuse City
Mayor Brian Melaney	West Haven
Mayor Erik Craythorne	West Point City

30.7 Nongovernmental Organization Coordination

30.7.1 General Coordination

As part of the environmental process, meetings were held with nongovernmental organizations to address specific issues related to the project need, alternatives, and impacts to the environment. These meetings included representatives from The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club, Utahns for Better Transportation, Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment, and Breathe Utah.

The main focus of the meetings with The Nature Conservancy was to address the Conservancy's concerns about impacts from the WDC to properties it owns or manages as part of the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve. These meetings focused on avoidance of the property, potential impacts on the management of the preserve, and ways to mitigate the impacts. Meetings were held throughout the EIS process and included site tours of the project area and field visits to the preserve. The meetings with The Conservancy gave the WDC team important information about the importance of the preserve and the infrastructure that is in place. The WDC team agreed that this infrastructure, which is critical to the successful management of the property, should be considered in the alternatives-development and impact-evaluation processes.

The meetings with the Sierra Club, Utahns for Better Transportation, Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment, and Breathe Utah focused primarily on potential transit options that could be implemented as part of the WDC Project to provide a multimodal solution. Meetings were held starting in 2010 and continued throughout the environmental process. The meetings included site tours of the WDC Project area and detailed discussions of WDC transit options. The WDC team provided the nongovernmental organizations with an overview of the WDC screening process, detailed transit studies, and a copy of the WFRC travel demand model and input files used in the alternatives-screening process. The meetings also provided important feedback to the WDC team regarding various transits and pedestrian options that should be evaluated as potential alternatives. This input was included in the alternatives-screening process.

30.7.2 Shared Solution Alternative

During the Draft EIS public comment period, several nongovernmental organizations suggested to the WDC team a concept referred to as the "Shared Solution" to be studied as part of the EIS. The EIS process requires UDOT to evaluate alternatives brought forward by the public to determine whether such alternatives meet the transportation need and can be reasonably implemented. In June 2014, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was signed between UDOT and these stakeholders, collectively called the Shared Solution Coalition. The MOA describes the alternative-development and evaluation process that would be followed for this effort. This process followed the same screening and evaluation process established by the WDC team to evaluate all other alternatives.

30.7.2.1 Shared Solution Alternative Development

As part of the MOA, six workshops were conducted to help develop the Shared Solution Alternative. These workshops included representatives from Cities in the WDC study area as well as representatives from the Coalition as identified in the MOA. City representatives were specifically invited to participate and provide their input on ideas regarding roadway design, transit elements, and land use specific to their cities. In addition to the six workshops, 18 technical meetings with the Coalition were conducted. This collaboration provided valuable feedback on the needs and interests of these communities and directly influenced the details of the Shared Solution Alternative.

In addition to the six workshops and technical meetings, the WDC team and the Coalition met individually with each City for the Coalition to present the ideology behind the Shared Solution Alternative and to receive additional input on the alternative. Cities were also requested to provide, in writing, their support level for the land-use modifications included in the Shared Solution Alternative. A total of 12 city meetings were held during this time.

30.7.2.2 Shared Solution Alternative Level 1 Screening

The Shared Solution Alternative Level 1 screening results were shared with the public on May 20, 2016. An e-mail update was sent out to the stakeholder e-mail list that included a link to *Development and Evaluation of the Shared Solution* (West Davis Corridor Team 2016), the *Summary of the Shared Solution Alternative Development and Evaluation Process*, and a UDOT Story Map, which is a visual slideshow that walks viewers through the Shared Solution Alternative development process and screening results. Meetings with the Stakeholder Working Group and Resident Working Groups were held just after the public release to walk those representatives through the process and screening results and answer any questions. An informational flyer was also created to distribute to Stakeholder Working Group representatives, Resident Working Group representatives, and elected officials. It was also posted to the project website.

Because the Shared Solution Alternative did not meet the Level 1 screening criteria, it was not carried forward for further Level 2 screening and was dismissed. Table 30-14 and Table 30-15 below list the Shared Solution Coalition members and workshops, respectively.

Table 30-14. Shared Solution Coalition Members

Organization	
Breathe Utah	Utah Birders
Citizens for a Better Syracuse	Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club
Clean Air Now!	Utah Mud Motor Association
Friends of the Great Salt Lake	Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment
Great Salt Lake Audubon	Utah Rivers Council
National Audubon Society	Utah Waterfowl Association
The Nature Conservancy of Utah	Utahns for Better Transportation
Utah Airboat Association	Wasatch Clean Air Coalition
Utah Audubon Council	Western Wildlife Conservancy
Utah Audubon Society	

Table 30-15. Shared Solution Alternative Development Workshops

Date	Location	Topic
June 18, 2014	West Point City Hall	Concepts and methodology
July 2, 2014	Sunset City Hall	Roadway elements
July 28, 2014	Clearfield City Hall	Transit
September 4, 2014	Syracuse Community Center	Land use
September 25, 2014	Kaysville City Hall	Alternative finalization
December 18, 2014	West Point City	Screening results

Table 30-16 lists the city and county participants in the Shared Solution Alternative development workshops.

Table 30-16. Shared Solution Alternative Development City and County Participants

Cities	Counties
Clearfield	Davis County
Layton	Weber County
Kaysville	
Farmington	
Sunset	
Syracuse	
Roy	
Clinton	
West Point	
Hooper	
West Haven	

30.8 Consultation and Coordination Tools

30.8.1 Printed Publications and Collateral Materials

Printed materials were used throughout the WDC EIS process to inform stakeholders about the project and to request comments. Several newsletters, information sheets, and project updates were published during the EIS process (see Table 30-17). These were distributed at drop-off points throughout the WDC study area such as city halls and public libraries and as portable document format (PDF) files on the project website. These materials were also made available as part of the public open-house materials and were distributed at the sign-in table or in the comment area. Comment forms were also made available at the open houses and were given a return address so that the forms could be mailed to the project address if needed.

Table 30-17. Newsletters and Information Sheets

Publication Date	Title	Topic
February 2010	Newsletter #1	Scoping overview and open-house schedule
February 2010	Public Fact Sheet	Gave study overview and goals, public process description, and open-house schedule
May 2010	WDC Purpose and Need	Purpose and need summary and results
July 2010	Newsletter #2 Alternatives Open Houses	Preliminary alternatives-development and open-house schedule
August 2010	Alternatives-Development Process	Overview of alternatives-development and Level 1 and 2 screening processes
November 2010	Alternatives Development and Screening	Level 1 screening results
February 2011	Right-of-Way FAQs (February 2011)	WDC right-of-way questions
February 2011	Transportation Alternative Screening Results	Level 2 screening results
February 2011	Environmental Fact Sheet	Summary of federal and state laws requiring environmental protection
March 2011	Right-of-Way FAQs (March 2011)	Updated WDC right-of-way questions
May 2011	Wetlands Fact Sheet	Summary of wetland classifications
September 2011	Refined Alternatives (September 2011)	Summary and maps of Alternatives A and B
January 2012	Environmental Study Update	2012 Syracuse public update on EIS
October 2012	Environmental Study Update – Fall 2012	Updates to wetland information and refinements to alternatives advanced to EIS
May 2013	Environmental Study Update – Spring 2013	Draft EIS information – public comment period and preferred alternative
January 2015	Environmental Study Update – 2015 Legislature	Overview and update on study process and schedule
January 2016	Environmental Study Update – 2016 Legislature	Overview and update on EIS process and schedule
May 2016	Shared Solution Info Fact Sheet	Shared Solution process information
January 2017	Environmental Study Update – 2017 Legislature	Overview and update on EIS process and schedule

Other documents such as frequently asked questions (FAQs), technical memoranda, city master plans, alternatives cost estimates, and impact comparison tables were distributed at public meetings and were made available on the project website. Conceptual drawings for preliminary interchanges in Farmington and Syracuse and typical cross-sections of the WDC roadway were also posted on the project website and were made available at public meetings.

In addition to the collateral EIS materials listed in Table 30-17 above, the WDC team coordinated regularly with the Cities in the WDC study area to distribute information through their city newsletters. Updates were sent depending on how frequently they published a city newsletter and when new information was available. These newsletters directed the public to the project website for more information and were another resource for advertising the public open houses throughout the EIS process.

30.8.2 Electronic Communication Tools

Several electronic communication tools were used to provide information and receive comments. Tools for distributing project information included the project website (www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis) and monthly e-mail updates sent to stakeholders who requested to receive project information. Tools for receiving comments included an online comment form as part of the project website, a project e-mail address (westdavis@utah.gov), and a toll-free telephone comment line (877-298-1991). The website also provided Spanish-language instructions for contacting the comment line and project e-mail.

At the scoping, preliminary alternatives-development, and alternatives-screening refinement open houses, and during the Draft EIS comment period, electronic comment forms were also provided on individual laptops so people could type their comments rather than write them on comment cards. This streamlined the collection of comments and eliminated transcription errors, since comments on comment cards would need to be entered into the EIS database later.

As mentioned in Section 30.4.3.2, Alternatives Screening and Refinement, the February 2011 online open house provided an innovative approach to involve the public remotely in the open houses and comment period. The online event included a narrated review of the open-house displays (prerecorded and posted on the project website) and a live chat room to ask the WDC team questions and comment on the alternatives. Comments from the online event were included in the *Alternatives Screening and Refinement Comment Report* (West Davis Corridor Team 2011a) as part of the official comment record.

An online, narrated version of the Draft EIS open houses was available on the project website for those who preferred to learn about the project online or were unable to attend the open houses in person. The online open-house presentation contained the same information that was displayed at the live open houses.

Video communication was incorporated at the release of the Draft EIS in May 2013. A video instructing viewers how to make a formal public comment on the Draft EIS was embedded on the project website, as were videos explaining the EIS process to date and the preferred alternative.

The WDC team also implemented the use of a UDOT Story Map during the release of the Shared Solution Alternative screening results, which visually walks viewers through the Shared Solution Alternative development process and screening results. A link to this story map was provided in the e-mail update sent May 20, 2016, and was added to the project website.

30.8.2.1 Project Website

The WDC team launched a project website as soon as public scoping began in February 2010. The site, www.udot.utah.gov/westdavis, provides a forum for gathering public comments as well as disseminating project information (see Table 30-18 below). Other public communications directed residents in the WDC study area and other stakeholders to the website for detailed project information. For each phase of the EIS, members of the public were invited to comment using the website. The WDC team posted comment reports at key milestones to demonstrate how the comments were being used to develop the EIS. Site content was updated as new information became available. Website visitor sessions and comments received on the site remained constant, with short increases in website use during public outreach related to specific project milestones.

Throughout the EIS, key project documents were posted on the website, and the public was encouraged to review these materials and provide comments during each phase of the EIS. The draft purpose and need chapter was published on the project website for public review in May 2010. *Technical Memorandum 13: Alternatives-Development and Screening Process* and detailed maps showing the conceptual alignments on aerial photographs were posted on the website in August 2010. These maps were updated in November 2010 to show the results of the Level 1 screening process. They were updated again in February 2011 to show the results of the Level 2 screening process and the alignments carried forward for detailed study in the EIS. *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report, Technical Memorandum 8: Wetland Assessment Methodology* (West Davis Corridor Team 2013), and *Preliminary Wetland Study Results* (West Davis Corridor Team 2010b) were posted in late February 2011. Updated maps of the three alternatives were again posted in late February and in March based on initial refinements from the February 2011 comment period.

After the rescreening process, Alternatives A and B and the corresponding maps and updated Level 2 screening data were posted on the website on September 8, 2011. In November 2011, an updated *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report*, which described the rescreening process and refinements to the alternatives, was posted to the website.

In January 2012, a refinement was made to Alternative B in Syracuse that shifted the alternative from 3000 West closer to Bluff Road. The corresponding updated maps were posted on the website to reflect this change.

In October 2012, updated wetland information and refinements to the alternatives advanced for detailed study in the EIS were posted on the website.

All project maps were posted on the website, including an archive of past maps from throughout the EIS process. Other project information on the website included an EIS timeline; a series of frequently asked questions (FAQs) and answers; a copy of the monthly e-mail update; a schedule of upcoming and past events; an archive of past open-house materials; an archive of key study presentations (to municipal representatives, the Stakeholder Working Group, the Resident Working Groups, and chambers of commerce); a roster of Stakeholder Working Group representatives; and a copy of the SAFETEA-LU Coordination Plan. Press releases and updated study information were also made available to the media, as well as the appropriate contact for all media inquiries.



On May 16, 2013, the Draft EIS document was added to the Documentation page of the project website. A public comment button was also added to the home page to allow direct access to an online comment form, with which stakeholders could submit their comments electronically. Updated maps were also added to the Maps page of the website, as well as a new interactive map viewer, which allows users to visualize the various alternatives throughout the WDC study area, zoom in and out, and measure distances. Videos were also added to the project website, including directions on how to make a public comment, a walkthrough of the EIS process to date, and an explanation of the preferred alternative.

After the Draft EIS public comment period, a public comment report was added to the project website on September 20, 2013. This report is a compilation of all the public comments received during the public comment period. An alphabetized index was added as well to help readers locate their particular comments in the report.

The project website was again updated on November 11, 2014, with the completed Shared Solution Alternative map. An accompanying land-use designation table was also added for reference.

In May 2016, the project website was updated with documentation related to the Shared Solution Alternative screening results. This include a Shared Solution Alternative market analysis, *Technical Memorandum 16: Level 2 Screening Alternatives Cost Estimate* and accompanying exhibits, the *Technical Memorandum 16 Executive Summary*, and the Shared Solution Alternative Story Map. Updates at this time also included FAQs, city master plans, the addition of WFRC's 2015–2040 Regional Transportation Plan, and the EIS schedule and various website design graphics.

Table 30-18 below summarizes all project documents and illustrations made available on the project website.



Table 30-18. Documents Available on the Project Website

Available Documents and Illustrations	
<p><u>Scoping</u> Scoping Summary Report and Comments</p> <p><u>Purpose and Need</u> Purpose and Need Chapter Purpose and Need 2-Page Summary</p> <p><u>Alternatives Development and Screening</u> Technical Memorandum 13: Alternatives-Development and Screening Process Level 1 Screening 2-Page Summary Level 2 Screening 2-Page Summary Level 2 Screening Alternatives Cost Estimate <i>Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report</i> (October 2012) Environmental Fact Sheet Bluff Road Impact Table Comparison Western Kaysville Impact Table Weber County Impact Table</p> <p><u>Shared Solution</u> Shared Solution Memorandum of Agreement Shared Solution Handout Shared Solution Alternative Map Shared Solution Land Use Designations Shared Solution Market Analysis Shared Solution Technical Memo Executive Summary Shared Solution Technical Memo Shared Solution Alternative Story Map</p> <p><u>Conceptual Drawings</u> Shepard Lane Preliminary Interchange Concepts (March 2011, December 2011, October 2012) Glovers Lane Preliminary Interchange Concepts (March 2011, December 2011, October 2012) Proposed Typical Cross-Sections Antelope Drive Preliminary Interchange Concept (January 2012; refined October 2012) Glovers Lane Engineering Plot and Profile (October 2012)</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u> Alternatives-Development Comment Report (August–September 2010) February–April 2011 Public Comment Report Draft EIS Public Comments – September 2013 Draft EIS Public Comment Index – September 2013</p>	<p><u>Property Acquisition/Right-of-Way</u> Right-of-Way FAQs</p> <p><u>General Illustrations</u> EIS Process and Schedule WDC Study Logo</p> <p><u>Refined Alternatives</u> Refined Alternatives 2-Page Summary (Fall 2011; Fall 2012) Alternatives Refinement Summary (Fall 2011; Fall 2012) Level 2 Screening Impact Table (November 2010; revised November 2011) <i>Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report</i> (November 2011) Farmington Interchange Cost Comparison Alternative B Comparison Map (3000 West vs. Bluff Road) Alternative B Comparison Map (Jan. 2012 vs. Oct. 2012) Alternative B Cost Comparison (3000 West vs. Bluff Road) Alternative A West Point Comparison Map (Jan. 2012 vs. Oct. 2012) <i>Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report</i> (November 2012)</p> <p><u>Draft EIS</u> May 2013 Draft EIS (by chapter) Technical Memoranda 1–27</p> <p><u>Maps</u> WDC Study Area Map WDC Study Area Aerial Map August 2010 Alternatives-Development Maps September 2010 Alternatives-Development Maps (Refined) November 2010 Level 1 Screening Results Maps February 2011 Level 2 Screening Results Maps (Alternatives A, B, and C) September 2011 Refined Alternatives Maps (Alternatives A and B) January 2012 Refined Alternative B Maps October 2012 Refined Alternative Maps (Alternatives A and B) May 2013 Draft EIS Alternatives Maps</p> <p><u>Local Master Plans</u> Centerville City Clearfield City Clinton City Farmington City Kaysville City Layton City Ogden City Riverdale City Roy City Syracuse City West Haven City West Point City</p>

(continued on next page)



Table 30-18. Documents Available on the Project Website

Available Documents and Illustrations	
<p><u>Wetlands</u> Wetland Assessment Methodology Preliminary Wetland Study Results Wetlands Field Work Reference Map Wetlands Field Work Maps and Data Sheets (May 2010) Wetlands Fact Sheet Wetlands Field Work Maps (May 2011) 2012 Wetland Maps 2012 Wetland Data Sheets</p>	<p><u>Previous Studies and Transportation Plans</u> 2001 <i>North Legacy Transportation Corridor Study</i> 2009 <i>North Legacy Transportation Corridor Supplemental Study</i> 2007 <i>Farmington City Evaluation Study</i> WFRC Regional Transportation Plan 2011–2040 <i>Wasatch Choices 2040: A Four County Land-Use and Transportation Vision</i> <i>Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis</i> WFRC Regional Transportation Plan 2015–2040</p>

30.8.2.2 E-mail Update List

The e-mail update list was established as a method to communicate with stakeholders who had participated in the public involvement process and/or had requested to be added to the update list. E-mail updates were sent as part of key milestone outreach efforts. The updates were also used to encourage continued participation and to follow up with stakeholders after a public event (see Table 30-19 below). The initial e-mail update list consisted of about 700 stakeholders. The e-mail update list grew to over 5,600 stakeholders during the course of public outreach in preparation for the release of the Draft EIS.

Table 30-19. E-mail Updates

Date	Topic	E-mails Sent
March 2010	Open-house summary, encourage public to submit comments	700+
April 2010	Scoping comment period closed, public input used to draft purpose and need chapter	800+
May 2010	Invite public to make comments on the draft purpose and need chapter	800+
June 2010	Thank public for comments on the draft purpose and need chapter	900+
July 2010	Invite public to add ideas to alternative maps at open houses	900+
August 2010	Open-house announcement, initial alternative maps posted to website	900+
September 2010	Open-house summary and public thank you, still accepting comments through September 12, 2010	1,100+
October 2010	Comment period closed, comment report posted to website	1,200+
November 2010	Maps showing 14 alternatives from Level 1 screening posted to website	1,200+
December 2010	WDC team evaluating and working to narrow down 14 alternatives using Level 2 screening	1,300+
January 2011	Open houses announcement, Level 2 screening results almost ready	1,400+
February 2011	Open-house summary, thank public for attending open houses, continue submitting comments on Level 2 screening results	3,600+
March 18, 2011	More comments coming in, one week left for submitting comments on Level 2 screening results	4,200+
March 24, 2011	Deadline for submitting comments is March 25, 2011	4,500+
March 28, 2011	Comment period now closed, thank public for comments	4,500+
June 2011	WDC team reviewing comments and refining alternatives	4,800+
September 2, 2011	Refined alternatives will be posted on website on September 8, 2011	5,000+
September 8, 2011	Refined alternatives posted on website	5,100+
October 2011	WDC team meeting with stakeholders and gathering feedback to improve alternatives	5,100+
November 2011	Updated Alternatives Screening Report and Level 2 Screening Impact Table posted to website	5,100+
December 3, 2011	Updated Shepard and Glovers Lane interchange design concepts and Farmington/Kaysville area map posted on website	5,100+
December 16, 2011	Updated Shepard and Glovers Lane interchange design concepts and cost comparison posted on website	5,100+
January 2012	Further refined Alternative B (Syracuse) posted on website	5,100+
March 2012	Old versus new Alternative B cost and impact comparison table posted on website	5,200+
May 2012	Schedule update	5,200+
July 2012	Notice for Shepard Lane and Glovers Lane interchange animations on website	5,200+
September 2012	Notice that there will be updated wetland data and alternatives refinements in October; notice of schedule change for Draft EIS to spring of 2013	5,200+
October 2012	Updated wetland data, alternatives-refinement information, interchange figures posted on the website; provided a list of upcoming city meetings	5,200+
November 2012	New dates for city council meetings	5,200+
February 2013	Update on Draft EIS progress; explanation of upcoming public comment period and open houses/public hearings	5,200+

(continued on next page)



Table 30-19. E-mail Updates

Date	Topic	E-mails Sent
May 2013	What to expect in the Draft EIS; how to make a public comment video	5,200+
May 2013	Release of the Draft EIS; links to website documentation; recap of EIS process video; preferred alternative video; public open house/public hearing dates and times	5,200+
June 2013	Reminder of Draft EIS open houses/public hearing dates and times	5,200+
August 2013	Extension of Draft EIS public comment period	5,400+
September 2013	Close of Draft EIS public comment period; number of comments received	5,600+
October 2013	EIS schedule update	5,600+
January 2014	Comments being reviewed; website updates	5,600+
April 2014	Comments and new ideas being reviewed; next steps in EIS process	5,600+
August 2014	Working with Shared Solution group on news ideas; EIS schedule	5,600+
November 2014	Shared Solution process update; links to Shared Solution map and land use designation table on website	5,600+
June 2015	Shared Solution Process update	5,600+
September 2015	Shared Solution Process update; WFRC Regional Transportation Plan update	5,600+
December 2015	Shared Solution Process update	5,600+
May 2016	Shared Solution Alternative Screening Results	5,600+
September 2016	Update on EIS process; agency coordination; further wetland/wildlife assessments, mitigation; EIS schedule update	5,600+

30.8.3 Media Relations

The WDC team used local and statewide media to tell project stakeholders where they could obtain information about the EIS. One-on-one briefings with reporters were scheduled during major milestones of the EIS process, including scoping, purpose and need development, preliminary alternatives development, alternatives screening and refinement, and the release of the Draft EIS. The WDC team made project spokespeople available for interviews on request.

Press kits were distributed to reporters and editors at the one-on-one briefings and at public meetings. The contents of the press kits included press releases, EIS background information, fact sheets, maps, and public meeting handouts. Press releases (see Table 30-20) were distributed to media outlets statewide (see Table 30-21 below), typically to announce an upcoming public meeting (see Table 30-20). More than 495 news stories were published or broadcasted in local and statewide media during the EIS process (see Table 30-22 below).

Table 30-20. Press Releases

Date	Title
February 11, 2010	Meetings on future transportation options in west Davis, Weber Counties to be held Feb. 23–25
May 6, 2010	Transportation Needs Identified for Potential West Davis Corridor: Public invited to provide feedback on study's draft Purpose and Need through June 7
July 21, 2010	Alternatives Open Houses Planned for West Davis Corridor: Public invited to provide feedback on study's initial transportation concepts
February 1, 2011	Three West Davis Corridor Alternatives Advancing for Detailed Study: Public invited to provide feedback on study's alternatives at open houses
September 8, 2011	West Davis Corridor Alternatives Updated: UDOT Releases Refined Alternatives Following Detailed Study and Review of Public Feedback
May 16, 2013	UDOT Releases West Davis Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Public Review: West Davis Corridor Study Team to Host Three Public Hearings as Part of 90-Day Comment Period

Table 30-21. Press Release Distribution

Source	Location
<i>Print</i>	
Associated Press	Salt Lake City, Utah
<i>Box Elder News Journal</i>	Brigham City, Utah
<i>Davis County Clipper</i>	Bountiful, Utah
<i>Deseret News</i>	Salt Lake City, Utah
<i>The Herald Journal</i>	Logan, Utah
<i>Hilltop Times</i>	Hill Air Force Base, Utah
<i>Morgan County News</i>	Morgan, Utah
<i>Ogden Valley News</i>	Ogden, Utah
<i>Salt Lake Tribune</i>	Salt Lake City, Utah
<i>Standard-Examiner</i>	Ogden, Utah
<i>Syracuse Islander</i>	Syracuse, Utah
<i>Tremonton Leader</i>	Tremonton, Utah
<i>Uintah County Journal</i>	Vernal, Utah
<i>Utah Statesman</i>	Utah State University, Logan, Utah
<i>Broadcast – TV</i>	
KUTV 2News	Salt Lake City, Utah
KTVX ABC 4	Salt Lake City, Utah
KSL 5	Salt Lake City, Utah
KSTU Fox 13	Salt Lake City, Utah
<i>Broadcast – Radio</i>	
Air Watch Traffic Network	Salt Lake City, Utah
Cache Valley Radio Group	Logan, Utah
Clear Channel's Total Traffic Network	Salt Lake City, Utah
KLO 1430 AM	Ogden, Utah
KSL 1160 AM / 102.7 FM	Salt Lake City, Utah
KUER 90.1 FM	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
KUTR 820 AM	Taylorsville, Utah
Utah Public Radio	Utah State University, Logan, Utah

Table 30-22. Media Coverage

Source	Number of Stories
<i>Print</i>	
<i>The Daily Herald</i>	2
<i>Davis County Clipper</i>	82
<i>Deseret News</i>	42
<i>The Enterprise</i>	1
<i>Hilltop Times</i>	1
<i>Salt Lake Tribune</i>	72
<i>Standard-Examiner</i>	186
<i>Syracuse Islander</i>	2
<i>Broadcast – On-Air</i>	
KTVX ABC 4	5
KSL 5	6
KSTU Fox 13	9
KSL 1160 AM / 102.7 FM	42
KTVX ABC 4	5
KUTV	4
<i>Broadcast – Online</i>	
ABC4.com	14
Connect2Utah.com	5
Fox13now.com	27
KSL.com	20

30.9 Comments Received

All correspondence received from the general public, resource agencies, municipalities, and other stakeholder groups was documented in a comment database. Monthly comment reports were generated for the WDC team to review (sometimes weekly reports depending on the volume of comments). About 6,700 public comments were received prior to the release of the Draft EIS.

During the project, the number of incoming comments generally increased when the WDC team provided new public information and conducted public outreach in the form of public meetings, e-mail updates, or other public outreach methods. Figure 30-1a, Public Involvement Timeline, through Figure 30-1d, Public Involvement Tools and Study Results, in Volume IV show the major stages of public outreach and the spike in comments received as a result of public outreach.

The comments reflected a wide range of issues and concerns including the natural and built environments, the property-acquisition process, the alternatives-identification and refinement process, community cohesion, and transportation needs. Public and agency input shaped the definition of the project's purpose and need statement, the definition of alternatives, and the development of public information materials and outreach methods.

For example, public scoping comments in 2010 about a possible alternative in Farmington near Shepard Lane prompted the WDC team to analyze additional interchange concepts for the Shepard Lane alignment. Public and agency comments in 2011 were used to further refine the results of the Level 2 screening process from three alternatives to two and directly affected the alternatives studied in detail in the EIS.

Questions and comments about the environmental process and regulations led the WDC team to post information describing the NEPA process, wetland survey data, and fact sheets regarding wetland protections. Comments regarding the design of interchanges in Farmington and Syracuse prompted the team to provide preliminary interchange concept designs on the project website. Questions regarding the costs associated with the alternatives in Farmington and Alternative B in Syracuse led the team to provide cost estimate tables on the website.

Concerns about right-of-way acquisition and the impacts associated with the alternatives led the team to provide responses to frequently asked questions about right-of-way issues. Tables were also provided that compared the impacts of each alternative and helped the public analyze the data used by the team.

Table 30-23 below summarizes the general disposition of comments from each phase of the project prior to the release of the Draft EIS.

The Draft EIS was released for public review and comment on May 16, 2013. The official comment period ended on September 6, 2013. A total of 1,618 comment submissions were received during that period. A summary of official comments and responses to those comments is presented in Chapter 32, Response to Comments. An index of the original comments and responses are provided in Appendix 32A, Commenter and Response Matrix.

Comments received after September 6, 2013, were entered into the project database and reviewed by the WDC team on a regular basis. Most comments received after the official comment period were regarding UDOT's property acquisition process, potential property impacts, the Shared Solution Alternative, the Shepard Lane and Farmington interchanges, and the WDC's construction schedule. A total of 196 additional comments were received between the end of the Draft EIS public comment period and January 2017 (see Table 30-24 on page 30-49).

Table 30-23. Pre-Draft EIS Summary of Comments Received

Public and Agency Comments – Scoping

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations that the WDC team consider or use previously adopted plans for a corridor route through the WDC study area. • General concerns about effects on air quality. • Concern about dividing existing communities and affecting the quality of life. • Concern about specific routes, especially in and near Farmington. • Effects on community facilities, particularly the Legacy Events Center. • Need to recognize the importance of farmland. • Preservation of open space. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise in the area. • Effects on property values. • Direct property impacts (acquisitions and/or relocations and the equity of property impacts). • Impact to or loss of wetlands. • Impact to wildlife and wildlife habitat, especially formal and informal refuges along the shore of the Great Salt Lake. • Need to seriously consider residents’ concerns, including those expressed during other recent studies. |
|---|---|
-

Public and Agency Comments – Purpose and Need

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General agreement or disagreement that the project is needed. • Opinion that project goals should consider both transportation and environmental values. • Accuracy of assumptions about the future transportation system. • Accuracy of population and employment forecasts and associated assumptions. • Accuracy of land-use assumptions. • Transit and other needs for alternate transportation choices. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrections regarding the project history. • Local growth objectives. • Accuracy of the traffic modeling results. • Air quality. • Comments on the project alternatives (incorporated as the WDC team began developing the preliminary alternative concepts). |
|---|---|
-

Public and Agency Comments – Preliminary Alternatives Development

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build facility as close as possible to the 2001 WFRC preferred alternative (Bluff Road). • Support for specific alternatives. • Disapproval of specific alternatives. • Concern over impacts to specific cities, neighborhoods, and communities. • Build a future facility as far west as possible. • Concern over loss of open space. • Interest in getting involved in the EIS process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve agricultural land and farming community. • Concerns over impacts to home values. • Concern about environmental impacts of a new highway. • Transit and trails should be part of the WDC. • Concerns over noise, air quality, and visual impacts. • Choose alignment that affects the fewest number of homes. • Individual home impact concerns. • Support for a new facility. • Do not build. |
|---|--|
-

(continued on next page)

Table 30-23. Pre-Draft EIS Summary of Comments Received

New or Modified Alternatives Suggested by the Public during the Preliminary Alternatives-Development Process:

- Two new preliminary alignments in the north part of the WDC study area: one on Midland Drive and one along the Hooper Canal between 2300 North and 12th South.
- An alignment that follows Gentile Street west from the Gentile Street/A-2^a intersection to 3000 West and then follows 3000 West north to intersect the A-3 alignment.^a
- An alignment that connects the G-3 alignment^a from Antelope Drive to the A-3^a/300 North intersection in West Point.
- Modifications to the A-1 and A-2 alignments^a as suggested by The Nature Conservancy and the Utah Reclamation, Mitigation, and Conservation Commission.
- A modification to the C-1 alignment^a through Farmington that connects the WDC with Interstate 15 (I-15) and Legacy Parkway near Shepard Lane (C-1 Modified^a).
- A shift to the west in the 2001 alignment^a to about 4500 West between Antelope Drive (1700 South in Syracuse) and 300 North in West Point.
- Specific maps showing new developments to avoid.
- Specific interchange locations.

Public and Agency Comments – Alternatives Screening and Refinement

- Quit talking about a future facility, choose an alignment, and build something. A new corridor has been discussed for many years.
- Desire for a facility to be built but want it located as closely as possible to the 2001 WFRC preferred alternative (Bluff Road). Antelope Drive interchange will be too impactful to Syracuse Arts Academy.
- Antelope Drive interchange is too complex.
- Indirect impacts to residents are important and should be considered.
- Concern over why an alternative close to the Bluff Road was put back into consideration with the 2012 refinement to Alternative B.
- Go west of power lines in Kaysville.
- Go as far west as possible.
- Concern over interchanges creating more traffic on smaller, local streets.
- Shepard Lane alternative will create a bottleneck on I-15.
- Concern for the safety of children playing and walking to school.
- Glovers Lane connector will separate Farmington communities.
- Shepard Lane connector will split a single neighborhood in half.
- Agricultural areas will be developed anyway and shouldn't have priority over existing homes.
- Homes adjacent to the future facility will decrease in value or might become difficult to sell.
- Concerns over changes to cost estimates.
- Directly and indirectly affected property owners are stuck until a decision is made.
- Mass transit should be part of the WDC.
- Do not build.
- Avoid impacts to golf courses.
- Concerns over air quality, noise, and visual impacts.
- Individual home impact concerns.
- Homes versus wetlands.
- Impacts to agricultural land will affect the livelihood of farmers and the local economy.
- Project has not been thoroughly thought out.
- Animals and environment should not be considered more important than human beings.
- Humans and homes should receive equal representation or rights as wetlands and wildlife.
- UDOT should be listening to the wants and needs of the taxpayers.
- The process has been fair and transparent.
- More attention and consideration are being given to a particular alternative.
- Encouraged by the refinements.
- A decision should be made as quickly as possible.

(continued on next page)

Table 30-23. Pre-Draft EIS Summary of Comments Received

New or Modified Alternatives Suggested by the Public during the Alternatives-Screening and Refinement Process:

- Connect to I-15 at 200 North exit and go west through Kaysville to connect with WDC alignment west of Kaysville near Schick Lane.
- Connect to I-15 near the Kaysville rest stop and go west through Kaysville to connect with WDC alignment west of Kaysville near Angel Street.
- Connect to I-15 and Legacy Parkway near Station Park and go west through the Farmington Meadows subdivision south of Burke Lane.
- Shift alternative farther west and farther south by building structures over wetlands.
- Expand and make better use of existing roads, including U.S. Highway 89, State Route 193, Antelope Drive, and 300 North rather than build new highway.
- Move Kaysville alignment west of power corridor.
- Share right-of-way with power lines or relocate them.
- Split WDC on either side of Rocky Mountain Power corridor.
- Expand right-of-way from 250 feet to 450 feet for Shepard Lane connection.
- Construct bridge at 2000 West in Farmington.
- Depress the roadway under 2000 West in Farmington.
- Shift Glovers Lane connection farther south and west.
- Different roads should be used for the West Haven alternatives.
- Public transit should be expanded instead of investing in a new highway.
- Go as far west as possible.
- Create button-hook interchange at Antelope Drive.
- Move alignment to the west of the power corridor near Equestrian Estates.
- Move Antelope Drive interchange farther east or west.
- Extend and realign Angel Street to create frontage road in Kaysville.
- Move 2000 West/Gentile Street interchange to 1000 West close to Bluff Road. Dead-end 2000 West.

^a This alignment is described in *Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report* (West Davis Corridor Team 2012).

Table 30-24. Post-Draft EIS Summary of Comments Received

Public and Agency Comments – Post-Draft EIS

-
- Need to develop story map for entire EIS process.
 - Concern about increasing number of bird strikes at Salt Lake City International Airport.
 - Concern about economic impact to Station Park.
 - Concern about high winds and impacts to semi-trucks.
 - Negative impacts to air quality and pollution near schools.
 - General concerns for access near Clark Lane.
 - Concern about increased traffic around schools.
 - Support for specific alternatives.
 - Support for public transportation.
 - Build road as far west as possible.
 - Disappointed with EIS process.
 - Frustration with delays in EIS process.
 - Inform landowners of study intentions.
 - Supplemental Draft EIS is necessary.
 - Land use.
 - Include the Dual-Mode Advanced Vehicular Endeavor (DAVE) alternative.
 - The Shepard Lane option would cause bottleneck on I-15.
 - EIS process is wasting taxpayers' dollars.
 - Concerns about highway elevation.
 - Support for truck, speed, and billboard restrictions similar to Legacy Parkway.
 - UDOT should adhere to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers policy.
 - UDOT should reconnect the WDC with I-15 in the north.
 - No need for on ramps at Glovers Lane/I-15; motorists can get on Legacy Parkway in Centerville at the Parrish Lane/Legacy Parkway on ramp.
 - General concerns about the performance of the Shepard Lane Option in Farmington and Kaysville.
 - Effects on property values.
 - Direct property impacts (acquisitions and/or relocations and the equity of property impacts).
 - Impact to or loss of wetlands.
 - Impact to wildlife and wildlife habitat, especially formal and informal refuges along the shore of the Great Salt Lake.
 - Need to seriously consider residents' concerns, including those expressed during other recent studies.
 - Concern about length of Draft EIS comment period.
 - Concerns about cost.
 - Build along Bluff Road in Syracuse.
 - Concerns over noise, air quality, and visual impacts.
 - Supportive of a build alternative because it will cause economic growth.
 - Concerns about impacts to new housing developments.
 - Impact of access to businesses near Glovers Lane.
 - Impacts to community cohesion.
 - Final alternative should be voted on.
 - Opposition to the Shared Solution Alternative.
 - Supportive of trail components.
 - Concerns about the advanced acquisition of Buffalo Ranch.
 - Support for hunting access on west side of all alternatives.
 - Increase of asthma rates and impaired lung development near alternatives.
-

30.10 Use of Public and Agency Comments in the Study Process Prior to the Release of the Draft EIS

30.10.1 Scoping

During the scoping period, the WDC team received more than 189 comments. The WDC team reviewed all comments and incorporated them into the range of initial alternatives. Public and agency input during scoping enabled the WDC team to compile a comprehensive list of potential transportation solutions and understand issues of concern. After scoping was complete, the WDC team continued to accept and address comments from the public, agencies, and municipalities.

30.10.2 Purpose and Need, Preliminary Alternatives Development, and Alternatives Screening and Refinement

The WDC team solicited additional input from relevant federal, state, and local government agencies and the public after the formal scoping period. Information about the project's purpose and need and the alternatives was disseminated through meetings, the project website, and local libraries and in other high-traffic areas in the WDC study area. Opportunities to submit comments were provided through meetings, the project website, comment drop boxes, a telephone comment line, an e-mail address, a fax number, and a mailing address. Comments helped refine alternatives and identified areas of concern as the WDC team worked to minimize potential impacts.

30.10.3 Responding to Questions and Anticipating Issues

All public, agency, and local government input received during the EIS process was reviewed and recorded in the project stakeholder database. Hard copies of comments were archived in the project file. If a comment included a specific question or a request for personal contact, the team responded to that stakeholder by e-mail or phone call. As a rule, the team also responded to those who submitted comments to at least confirm receipt of that comment. About 6,700 comments were received prior to the release of the Draft EIS.

Comments were also reviewed in order to identify current issues that were important to the public and potential issues or questions that could arise in the future. The WDC team developed public information materials based on key issues identified in public feedback.

30.11 Summary and Conclusion

The WDC team made a commitment at the beginning of the project to encourage and solicit public participation and feedback throughout the project. The WDC team selected communication tools that best addressed the public's need for information and provided a variety of methods for public comment. The implementation of both wide-reaching and targeted public and agency consultation strategies produced important information for the WDC team to consider during the EIS process to support the NEPA decision-making process.

Public and agency participation has been an important part of the WDC EIS process. This process helped identify important issues related to wetlands, wildlife, farmland, and community impacts, and this identification helped the WDC team develop alternatives and focus the EIS analysis. The process also helped stakeholders be informed about the different interests in the project area and understand how different stakeholders consider different issues to be the most important issue when making a decision.

When preparing the EIS, the WDC team worked to address each issue that was identified. When issues were identified by the resource agencies, the farming community, local governments, residents, or nongovernmental organizations, the WDC team held multiple meetings with each group to better understand the issue so that it could be considered when developing alternatives or evaluating impacts. The process was not intended to resolve every issue but to ensure that the decision-makers have the appropriate information when making a decision about how to proceed with the project.

Finally, the process was comprehensive in nature and used the media, mailers, websites, and meetings to ensure that all stakeholders who could be affected were aware of the project and understood the methods for providing input.

30.12 References

West Davis Corridor Team

- 2010a West Davis Corridor Summary Scoping Report.
- 2010b Preliminary Wetland Study Results.
- 2011a Alternatives Screening and Refinement Comment Report.
- 2011b Technical Memorandum 13: Alternatives-Development and Screening Process.
- 2012 Technical Memorandum 15: Alternatives Screening Report.
- 2013 Technical Memorandum 8: Wetland Assessment Methodology.
- 2016 Development and Evaluation of the Shared Solution Alternative.



This page is intentionally blank.