

EXECUTIVE TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: Wednesday, April 7, 2010

TIME: 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

PLACE: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
533 West 2600 South, Suite 150
Bountiful, Utah

THOSE PRESENT:

Larry Svoboda, Environmental Protection Agency
Robin Coursen, Environmental Protection Agency
James Christian, Federal Highway Administration
Ed Woolford, Federal Highway Administration
Jason Gipson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Larry Crist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Cheryl Heying, Utah Division of Air Quality
Wilson Martin, Division of State History
Lori Hunsaker, Division of State History
John Njord, Utah Department of Transportation
Carlos Braceras, Utah Department of Transportation
Becky Stromness, Utah Department of Transportation
Tim Rose, Utah Department of Transportation
Brandon Weston, Utah Department of Transportation
Julie Lewis, Utah Department of Transportation

ITEM ONE: CHAIR WELCOME

James Christian called the meeting to order and welcomed those attending. He had everyone introduce themselves.

ITEM TWO: PROVO WESTSIDE PROJECT

Ed Woolford gave a presentation on the Provo Westside Project. He reviewed the initial screening alternatives for the project. Prior to the final draft of the PDEIS being distributed to the public, it was sent to the Resource Agencies for comment. The Resource Agencies responded that the project lacked an avoidance alternative, and this could be cause for denial of the 404 Permit.

The Project Team listened to the agencies. The Team revisited the Transportation Problem. They are in the process of determining whether or not Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land would be involved in the development. The Team clarified the Project Purpose Statement and the Project Need Statement. The Team revisited the Project Screening Criteria. Ed reviewed the Level 1 and Level 2 Screening. The Team revisited the Project Alternatives. They ended up with four alternatives; i.e., the 1860 South Alternative, the I-15 Overpass/Underpass Alternative, the Lake Alignment Alternative, and the No-Build Alternative.

Ed said they held a Resource Agency Update Meeting on March 30, 2010. At this meeting they discussed the Orange Alternative (a new I-15 overpass or underpass at a new location), revised alignments, etc. Ed presented a map of the Provo Commercial District. He outlined where the wetlands are located in this area. He also outlined where there will be general impacts to the businesses in the area.

Ed outlined their next steps. In March 2010, they held a Stakeholder Forum, sent a newsletter, and held a Resource Agency Update Meeting. The Draft EIS should be sent to the public in May 2010. A Public Hearing is scheduled for June 16, 2010.

James thanked Ed for his presentation.

ITEM THREE: LUNCH

ITEM FOUR: BANGERTER AND 600 WEST EIS

Brandon Weston, UDOT Project Manager, gave a presentation on the Bangerter 600 West Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). He outlined what we know on this project as far as safety and capacity, current and future mobility, and resources. Brandon discussed the transportation plans in the area; i.e., the WFRC 2007-2030 RTP, the Draper Transportation Plan, and the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) FrontRunner and Master Plan. Wilson said there is a meeting scheduled today at 1:30 p.m. with UTA to discuss the FrontRunner, and he invited Brandon to attend the meeting.

Brandon discussed the existing and future transportation needs in the area. He outlined the six goals of the study: (1) Conduct a thorough, objective, and technically sound environmental study resulting in a context-sensitive transportation solution; (2) Identify a solution to relieve congestion at the I-15 and Bangerter Interchange; (3) Identify a transportation solution that accommodates Draper City's long-term goals and enhances mobility in the area; (4) Engage all project stakeholders in a proactive and cooperative manner to solicit feedback, resolve concerns, and strive for consensus throughout the process; (5) Provide comprehensive, accurate, and well-organized documentation of the process in a streamlined and concise manner; and (6) Complete the EIS in two years, within budget.

Brandon outlined their study approach. They want this to be an open process. Communication is the key. He outlined their commitment and partnering expectations.

Brandon outlined the EIS schedule. The Notice of Intent will be released in May 2010, the Public Scoping Meetings will be held in June 2010, and the Purpose and Need will be conducted June to September 2010.

James thanked Brandon for his presentation.

ITEM FIVE: CE DELEGATION 18-MONTH REPORT

Becky provided a presentation on the 18-Month Categorical Exclusion (CE) Delegation Report. She gave a background on the SAFETEA-LU process. The challenge is you have to get specific state legislation to carry out the process. Utah, California, and Alaska passed special legislation where they can approve their own CEs with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Becky outlined the CE responsibilities assigned to the states.

Becky outlined the purpose of the monitoring report. She provided graphs outlining CEs completed by month, CEs completed by the UDOT Region Offices, and CEs completed by the 23 CFR 771.117 Category. Becky discussed the 4(f) Determinations. UDOT's CEs were completed by Consultants (34 percent) and UDOT staff (66 percent). UDOT projects were handled mostly by UDOT. Local government projects were handled by Consultants.

Becky discussed areas of improvement for quality control issues for CEs, such as incorrect responses, forms, classifications, etc. Measures to correct these matters included strengthening the review/approval process.

Becky said they have had eight training events/activities for CEs, including quarterly Region Environmental Meetings, Region visits, checklist distribution, and personal instruction. They have also created an Environmental Manual of Instruction. Six Quality Measures were outlined to improve UDOT performance quality and timeliness. Becky outlined two recommendations: (1) Continue with the CE Delegation; and (2) Consider adding all CE Projects on future renewal of the MOU in 2011.

Becky said UDOT has had to pay more attention to quality measures in this process. Lori said they cannot thank UDOT enough for following this process--they are more than likely one of the leaders in the Nation. Wilson said the SHPO Office is there to help the agencies/projects be successful and work through these issues.

Action Item: Larry suggested as a future ETEC agenda item they discuss non-transportation sources of pollution and how they impact UDOT projects. Carlos said AASHTO has established a Climate Change Steering Committee (with about 30 states participating), in which UDOT is a member. Cheryl said it would be helpful to know how EPA determines what they count and what they don't count. More guidance and common understanding among the agencies will be beneficial.

James thanked Becky for her presentation.

ITEM SIX: OPEN AGENCY ISSUES

Action Item: Carlos asked Larry how Fly Ash will be classified. Larry said he is not aware, but he will find out and let UDOT know. Carlos said the use of the material is environmentally sensitive.

ITEM SEVEN: SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

Action Item: The Division of State History will host the next ETEC Meeting. Julie will send the ETEC Members some dates/times to coordinate the next meeting. The following were suggested agenda topics for the next meeting:

- Larry suggested we discuss how we deal with climate change.
- Wilson suggested more information on the Bangerter Project.
- Becky suggested an update on the West Davis Corridor.
- Jason suggested an update on the Tooele Midvalley project.
- Becky suggested they discuss RDCC, the agencies involved, and the types of projects they review and provide comments on.
- Larry said a 15-30 minute presentation from EPA on what Utah looks like through their perspective. He said there seems to be more happening in Utah in a diversity sense.

ADJOURNED AT 1:10 P.M.