

**HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
May 5, 2026**

APPROVED Minutes

6:00 p.m. Regular Meeting

I. REGULAR MEETING - 6:00 P.M.

City Council Present: Council Member Yvonne Barney
Council Member Aaron Cheatwood - remotely
Council Member Mike Johnston
Council Member Morgan Murdock
Council Member Sid Ostergaard

City Council Absent: Mayor Heidi Franco

Staff Present: City Manager Matt Brower
Assistant City Manager Mark Smedley
Community Development Director Tony Kohler
Planning Manager Jamie Baron
City Engineer Russ Funk
Finance Manager Sara Jane Nagel
City Attorney Jeremy Cook
City Recorder Trina Cooke
Chief of Police Parker Sever
Fleet Manager Preston Hicken

Staff Participating Remotely: J. Mark Smedley, IT Specialist Anthon Beales, Planner Jacob Roberts, Finance Director Sara Nagel, Human Resources Manager Cherie Ashe, and Public Works Director Matthew Kennard.

Also Present: Lindy Reioux, Allison Salisbury, Jason Talley, Michelle Mort, Bryce Mount, McKenzie Manteer, Linda L Middleton, Sandi Brower, Tracy Taylor, Luis Morales, and others who did not sign in or whose handwriting was illegible.

Also Attending Remotely: (names are shown as signed-in online) Louise, Paiulina, CP, Jami Hewlett, AB, Alexandra, Andrew, ATC, B, Cannon Taylor, Dallin, Emily Seang, Grace Doerfler KPCW, Guest, H. Wall, JS, Kylemair, Maren Meibos, Michael, MTN, S, Shorty5, and Tal Adair.

1. Call to Order

Mayor Pro-Tem Aaron Cheatwood called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance (Heidi Franco, Mayor)

Council Member Barney led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Pro-Tem Aaron Cheatwood was participating remotely and asked for one of the Council Members that was physically present to be the Mayor Pro-Tem for the night.

Motion: Council Member Ostergaard nominated Council Member Mike Johnston to be the acting Mayor Pro-Tem for the evening.

Second: Council Member Murdock made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

3. Prayer/Thought by Invitation (Morgan Murdock, Council Member)

Council Member Murdock shared a prayer.

II. AWARDS, RECOGNITION, and PROCLAMATIONS:

1. Proclamation of National Day of Prayer: May 7, 2026

Mayor Pro-Tem Mike Johnston read the Proclamation for a Day of Prayer on May 7, 2026, as included in the meeting materials. He informed everyone that there would be a gathering at 3:00 p.m. on May 7th, at the Main Street Park, for observation of the Day of Prayer.

III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE:

There were no conflicts disclosed.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (Council May Take Action Following Public Comment and Upon Conclusion of the Public Hearing)

1. Public Hearing and Approval of Ordinance 2026-08, vacating a portion of Wasatch Commons Blvd (Jamie Baron, Planning Manager) -

Planning Manager Jamie Baron explained the road realignment that would shift an existing roundabout slightly.

Mayor Pro-Tem Mike Johnston opened the public hearing at 6:14 p.m. With no one from the public coming forward to comment, the public hearing was closed.

Motion: Council Member Ostergaard moved to approve Ordinance 2026-08 to vacate a portion of Wasatch Commons Boulevard.

Second: Council Member Barney made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

V. CONSENT AGENDA:

Assistant City Manager Mark Smedley recommended the Specialized Aviation Service Operator (SASO) agenda item be approved conditionally, upon legal review. He recommended the length of time for the leases be extended from three to five years.

Motion: Council Member Ostergaard moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the condition of legal review for the Elemental Aviation SASO Application outlined in agenda item four and extending the Airport Commercial Agricultural Leases to five years rather than three as stated in agenda item five.

Second: Murdock

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

Council Member Cheatwood was not present for the vote.

The **Motion Passed 4-0.**

1. April 7, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes and April 21, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes (Trina Cooke, City Recorder)
2. Approval of Resolution 2026-07 in support of naming HWY40 & SR 32 intersection as Hathcock Junction (Parker Sever, Chief of Police)
3. Contract Award to J. Lyne Roberts & Sons for construction of the Old Mill Village - Project Completion Bond Work (Russ Funk, City Engineer)
4. Elemental Aviation SASO (Specialized Aviation Service Operator) Application (J. Mark Smedley, Asst. City Manager)
5. Airport Commercial Agricultural Leases (J. Mark Smedley, Asst. City Manager)

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3 min per person/20 min max)

Luis Morales read the following statement: hundreds of residents signed a petition and waited more than two hours to speak only to be told that their voices would not be heard. They were told that written comments didn't matter, and the Council would vote how it wanted. Matt Brower's contract was renewed for another three years.

Mr. Morales said that was unacceptable. He told the Council that they were elected to serve the public and not to ignore the public. Now, City Manager Matt Brower was asking to raise taxes by 5% to build a privately run, revenue generating, event center on public park land. Effectively replacing the park that residents currently used and valued. He said that asking taxpayers for more money while dismissing public participation was a breach of public trust. He respectfully asked the Council to, number one, reject any tax increases until there was a transparent public process that generally considered resident input, preserve the park, explore alternative funding options that did not privatize public land, commit to meaningful public engagement, include written comments and deliberations, and allow community members to speak. He said the voters had elected the Council to represent them. He asked the Council to please listen to the people who lived here and protect their public spaces. He appreciated the City's investment in the underground power for the Festival Street, which hadn't been officially named yet, but he felt the continued use of the loud generators by the food trucks undermined the work and harmed the residents' quality of life. He asked that the City please enforce the hookup requirements, noise limits, and require vendors to use the City-provided power. He thought that if enforcement wasn't possible yet, the City should set a clear timetable and communicate it to the residents. He felt the residents deserved quieter streets during all events.

Lindy Reioux, Heber City resident, was present to discuss the proposed tax increase. She read numbers from her tax bill. In 2020, the Heber City portion was \$311.90. In 2025, it was \$438.52, an increase of 40%. Now, the City was asking for another five percent increase. She claimed that the general fund went up 8.9%, Parks and Rec 5.9%, and the library went up 33%. She said the total, including Heber City, went up 20%. She asked why Heber City, at 40%, was asking for more. She said the City had annexed more property and the population had increased. Ms. Reioux said that, in 2020, the population in Heber City was 16,980, according to the U.S. census. In 2025, the estimated population was 19,500. That was using the number from 2024, plus a 2.4% increase. She said, right now, according to the tax rates from filetax.utah.gov, using the 2025 tax rate by area: Hideout Town was at 6.25%, Daniel Town was at 2.9%, Midway was at 6.4%, and Heber was at 7.7%. She said the additional 5% would bring Heber City to 8.085. She asked why Heber residents had to pay 30% more taxes than Hideout, 27% more than Midway, and 173% more than Daniel. She acknowledged that Daniel didn't have the infrastructure and said it was absolutely crazy how much more Heber City residents had to pay to live in Heber City versus her neighbor who lived across the street in Daniel. She said it did not make any sense to her. She said that when she couldn't afford to buy new furniture, she didn't buy new furniture. She felt it was the same with the park and C Street. She wasn't saying they were bad ideas, but felt they needed to be put on hold. The City couldn't afford to do everything all at once. She proposed getting rid of some of the consultants that were needed for these projects, suggested the City sharpen their pencils, and go back to where needed to live within the budget.

Allison Salisbury appreciated the open houses for the different plans for the park. She was disappointed there was not an option to do nothing more than fix the bathrooms. She felt that one person speaking was speaking for the hundreds or thousands of others. She loved the park and said other people did not even know what was happening to the park. She felt it was already a done deal and people were discouraged. She recalled when residents had previously fought against Ranked Choice Voting and the Council had listened to the residents.

Jenna Strom felt the park options only offered drastic options. She agreed with what Ms. Salisbury had said, and Mr. Morales about not being allowed to speak.

Jami Hewlett said people were moving out of town because they could not afford to live in Heber. She said people who had lived in Heber for generations could not afford to pay the utility bills and taxes. She felt the City should look into spending less money, not more. She wanted the Council to go back to the drawing board and find a way to cut spending. She felt the park should remain the historic park it was, not the circus that was proposed. She said the Council had made a complete disaster of Heber City and property values were decreasing. She asked if anyone on the Council had looked into cutting costs in the budget. She felt the Council shouldn't be thinking about spending millions more for a park to turn it into a circus. She claimed that the City's founding fathers had created the park when Heber became a City.

Alexandra Folmer claimed that Matt Brower had, once again, illegally, failed to disclose he was on the CAMS Board. She said the park would cost an astounding \$23 million, as budgeted, for a resident population of about 19,000 full-time residents. She said 2024 saw a net migration into Heber Valley of only 110 people. She added that there were thousands and thousands of new homes being built in the valley, and there was not going to be the demand. She said the data was showing that the demand had crested and was starting to go down. She felt there was about to be an economic recession. She felt a \$23 million expenditure when families were about to lose their jobs, go bankrupt, have to sell their secondary vacation homes, their third vacation homes, their fourth vacation homes, was high risk in the valley. She added that the real estate in the valley was currently 40% overpriced according to what the average person could afford to pay. She said any increase in taxes further put the people that loved the valley, and had their hearts and souls in the valley, at risk of bankruptcy on their homes, having to move out, and having to leave their community. The valley was on the verge of a real estate bubble crisis with oversupply of thousands of houses in the pipeline for construction. Ms. Folmer felt the tax base was astronomical and called the park plan fiscally irresponsible and reckless.

Catherine Moore was against the 5% tax increase. She said the electricity was going up as well as gas, and property tax. She felt that everything was going up and did not support a 5% tax increase for pet projects like the park. She lived across the street from the park and loved watching the kids at the park. She felt the survey did not allow for no improvements at the park. She felt the park was being crammed down their throats.

Ms. Moore felt the kids weren't going to have a place to run around, a place to have fun, to play catch with their dad or run around and play tag. The kids were going to have to pay money to go skating and bring in a bunch of vendors to sell a bunch of stuff that nobody wanted. She felt the survey didn't have an option to say that you wanted nothing done at the park except new bathrooms and to update a few things. Ms. Moore said they didn't want the park and had yet to talk to one person that wanted it unless they were on the City Council, Matt Brower, or Rachel Kahler. She felt the City should do a better job of getting the word out about the proposed park updates. She had met the woman who grew up in her house in the 30s. Ms. Moore said she was not from here, but she was learning about it and volunteered to learn about the history, not destroy it like the City Council was doing and Matt Brower.

Linda Middleton, Heber City resident, was glad the City had banned cryptocurrency. She treasured the view the Valley offered, and the open space. She had to deal with constant construction with the dust and the noise. She had to breathe dust when it was windy. The brand new sewers were filling with silt. There was either mud or dust. She did not think the City should be competing with local business. She asked for one year with no construction on Southfield Road. She asked the City to slow down on projects. She appreciated the infrastructure and new bathrooms. She wanted a break from the constant construction. She did not feel like Heber should be competing with the Main Street businesses for parking.

VII. GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:

1. Finance Director Intends to State that the Tentative Budget Includes a Proposed Property Tax Rate Increase. (Sara Nagel, Finance Manager) - 10 min

Finance Director Sara Nagel explained the new requirements established in the State Code for the budget process. She clarified the Council was not adopting a tax increase that evening but was complying with State guidelines. She said she would be providing a brief precursor for the Budget Workshop meetings scheduled for that week. Ms. Nagel showed everyone how to access the tentative budget online. She explained that the State was seeking better transparency. Mayor Pro-Tem Johnston clarified that the City was required to declare the possibility of consideration of a tax increase in order to be allowed to impose a tax increase if so decided.

This agenda item was specifically providing notice that there was a proposed tax increase in the City's Tentative Budget.

2. Finance Director Statement of Proposed Property Tax Increase and Presentation of the Proposed Property Tax Impact Schedule (Sara Nagel, Finance Manager) - 10 min

Finance Director Sara Nagel read the prepared Fiscal Impact Statement as included in the meeting materials. Mayor Pro-Tem Johnston clarified that the amount of property tax increase proposed was to cover the City's inflationary costs. He noted that only 6% of the City's budget came from property taxes.

VIII. ACTION ITEMS: (Council can discuss; table; continue; or approve items)

1. Resolution 2026-08 to Tentatively Adopt the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027, to Adopt the Proposed Property Tax Impact Schedule and to Establish a Public Hearing Date to Consider the Tentative Budget. (Sara Nagel, Finance Manager, Matt Brower, City Manager) - *30 min*

Finance Director Sara Nagel reviewed the dates and times for the three upcoming Budget Workshops. She reviewed the purpose of the proposed resolutions. She stated there were 27 funds within the City budget and provided a graph reflecting the City-wide budget fund allocations.

Mayor Pro-Tem Johnston opened the discussion for public comment.

Alexandra Folmer stated that the public sector and State Employees might be getting higher wages and cost of living (COLA) wage increases but that was not the case with most of the private sector.

Catherine Moore asked if she could get a copy of the Tentative Budget. Mayor Pro-Tem Mike Johnston informed her how to access all the budget documents from the City website. City Manager Matt Brower added that there was also a PowerPoint presentation that could be found with the budget document, attached in the meeting materials, that acted as a guide for understanding the budget document.

Jenna Strom asked what time the budget meeting would begin the following day. Mayor Pro-Tem Mike Johnston informed her the meeting would begin at six p.m. and go until at least nine o'clock.

Jami Hewlett inquired why the Council would pass a resolution if the City needed State and County approval. She said that was not accurate. She then shared that she had purchased her home for \$115,000.00 and it was now probably worth over a million dollars. She said she was paying tax on that amount. She said the taxes had gone up with the price of her house. She said Council was incorrect because her house value had gone up a hundred or thousand percent. She said she was not getting any younger and she was making less money, getting a lot older, and her tax rate was going up. She said that she purchased her home when she was 20-years old and was paying more for it now, due to the cost of taxes and utilities, than she originally had for just her mortgage. She claimed the City had raised her taxes because it had raised the value of her home. She asked for an explanation for why the City was passing resolutions that night if it was just a friendly discussion.

Mayor Pro-Tem Mike Johnston explained the process was strictly mandated by the State, and the proposed resolutions were to keep the City compliant with the State regulations. The budget would not be adopted that night. Finance Director Sara Nagel explained that the budget adoption code was different from the truth in taxation code. City Attorney Jeremy Cook informed that the Tentative Budget Code could be found in Titles ten, six, and 11 of the State Code, and Truth in Taxation was in Title 59, Chapter two. Mayor Pro-Tem Johnston provided an explanation of how inflation affected home values and property tax increases. He reiterated the amount of property taxes that went to the School District, Fire Department, Library, and other services, noting that Heber City received only 8.3% of the property taxes collected. The proposed tax increase was \$18.00 a year for the average household in Heber City.

Linda Middleton felt like majority of the taxes were falling on the residents of Heber City. She said there was Daniels, Midway, and all the rest of Wasatch County, and then there was the School District. She felt like Heber was dealing with all the infrastructure improvements. She said the rest of the County and State were benefiting from the infrastructure that was paid for by Heber City residents tax dollars. She said the infrastructure work was causing all the dust and the mud and ruining the view. She said the Valley was being destroyed and a bisect was going to be put through it, and dealing with all of the mess and construction and noise and disruption of lives. She proposed taking a picture of the rock pile and dust storm along US 189 by the Airport to advertise for the Valley.

Allison Salisbury asked who was going to pay for the parking.

With no one further coming forward to comment, the public comment period was closed.

Motion: Council Member Ostergaard moved to approve Resolution 2026-08, as presented by staff, and to set the Tentative Budget Public Hearing date for June 2, 2026.

Second: Council Member Murdock made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

2. Resolution 2026-09 Acknowledging that the Finance Director stated as a separate item from the budget and in a public meeting that the tentative budget includes a proposed property tax increase and presented a property tax impact schedule. (Sara Nagel, Finance Manager, Matt Brower, City Manager) - *15 min*

Council Member Barney wished to commend Ms. Nagel and her department for the hard work and time invested putting together the budget.

Council Member Barney said she recognized that it was fairly difficult and wanted the citizens to understand Council and Staff had to adhere to the State Code, especially with all of the code changes that were constantly passed down from the State. She felt it was very confusing at times, very frustrating, and trying to make sure that the City complied with everything that the State was requiring could be tedious at best. Council Member Barney wanted to make a statement that she would not vote for this particular resolution to allow the Council to consider a potential tax increase.

Council Member Cheatwood confirmed appreciation for the Budget Staff. He wished to clarify that this particular resolution merely confirmed that the budget officer complied with State Code.

Motion: Council Member Ostergaard moved to approve Resolution 2026-09 acknowledging that the Finance Director had stated, as a separate item from the budget and in a public meeting, that the Tentative Budget included a proposed property tax increase.

Second: Council Member Cheatwood made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: Council Member Barney.

The **Motion Passed 4-1.**

3. Resolution 2026-10 Acknowledging the City's Intent to Increase Property Tax Revenue and Setting a Hearing Date for the August Truth in Taxation Hearing. (Sara Nagel, Finance Manager, Matt Brower, City Manager) - 15 min

Motion: Council Member Johnston to adopt Resolution 2026-10 acknowledging that the City could potentially have a property tax revenue increase and, if so, there would be a public hearing for truth in taxation in August.

Second: Council Member Cheatwood

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

4. Main Street Park (aka Trailhead Plaza) Survey Results and Design Tenets for Preferred Master Plan for the Plaza (Lars Erickson)

Terracon Design Team, Lars Erickson, Dave Harris, and Ryan Wallace shared the goals and objectives of their presentation regarding the proposed park design project as included in the meeting materials. They provided park project details and the potential for C Street connecting the park and tabernacle block plaza. Mr. Wallace explained the survey process and results. The representatives detailed the community feedback regarding amenity preferences for the park design. Council provided feedback and expressed appreciation for the work done by Terracon. Discussion continued.

Council asked for two weeks to better review the presentation and proposed design options before offering detailed feedback or making a decision.

Allison Salisbury was thrilled with the community feedback for majestic trees and lawn in the park. She did not feel the design presented offered enough lawn and questioned what several of the symbols were. She felt the City was losing its population of young children because they couldn't afford to live here. She questioned that people wanted change in the community. She claimed that four or five out of every ten people she spoke with did not want change in the park. She said the feedback she received was for better bathrooms and an improved playground. She felt there was not enough parking to support the proposed events at the park.

Alexandra Folmer expressed gratitude for the presentation and appreciated that the designers had scaled back from the original model. She shared that she was also a consultant and designer. It looked to her that the proposed design would eliminate approximately two thirds of the old growth trees and she suggested an old growth tree overlay. She encouraged the designers to incorporate modular space usage, increase the overall green footprint, and reduce the impact of removing old growth trees. She felt it would be risky to rely on volunteers to run the park and unlikely that the City could get 40 of them as implied. She thought better data was necessary to project the vendor space needed. She felt there would be too much competition brought in with the Slope development offering commerce, restaurants, and social space, and proposed the City let the Slope development have it as the City couldn't afford it. She felt it was too warm for an ice rink and noted there was a rink in Midway.

Lindy Reioux asked why the option of no changes had not been offered. She felt the data results were warped and she did not want the proposed park upgrades. She wanted bathrooms upgraded and the pavilion. She wanted the Council to not change the Main Street Park.

Tracy Taylor wished to reiterate the comments she had heard from many citizens that had given up on trying to complete the survey. She did not care for the survey format and felt it took too long. She wanted to know what the survey process had cost the City. She said she had forwarded approximately 400 Facebook comments to the Council for free. She claimed that the Midway ice rink lost money every year. Ms. Taylor said there were parks in the community that needed repairs, and noted there were weeds on the eastern bypass. She felt the City should build a new park on the east side of town rather than spend 25 million to redesign the Main Street Park. She felt the City should be more frugal. Ms. Taylor expressed concern with the proposed vendors competing with the Main Street business owners that were already struggling to pay their leases or mortgages.

Catherine Moore did not think Heber City should be compared to Midway. She felt there was an identity issue as everything was referred to as Heber Valley. She reminded Council that they worked for the Heber City residents and not the rest of the Valley.

Linda Middleton said she had spoken to the business owners that had trees depicted on their property in the proposed park design and said it needed to stop. She said Olson Design had gone out of business and sold to Kora, whose building had been flooded due to the plaza construction. She felt the City was competing with the existing businesses for internet, parking, sunlight, and snow. She said it was already an ice rink when trying to enter north facing buildings.

Jami Hewlett expressed surprise that Council Members Johnston and Ostergaard had not declared a conflict of interest at the beginning of the meeting. She felt the City did not need another splash pad and asked that the return on investment to be considered.

5. Ordinance 2026-09 to Temporarily Suspend City Restrictions for Dogs at the Main Street Park (J. Mark Smedley, Asst. City Manager) - 15 min

Assistant City Manager Mark Smedley explained there was an event planned for dogs in the parks scheduled for May 23, 2026. The current City Code prohibited dogs in parks. The proposed ordinance would provide an exception to allow dogs in the park for the two-hour event that day. Council Member Murdock provided an update on the progress of the ad-hoc committee to rewrite the City Code regarding dogs in parks. The committee was considering the proposal of additional off-leash areas at certain parks and designating some parks to allow dogs and others to prohibit dogs.

Motion: Council Member Barney moved to approve Ordinance 2026-09, to temporarily suspend City restrictions for dogs at the Main Street Park on May 23, 2026, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Second: Council Member Ostergaard made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

6. Recommendation to Nominate two Residents to Serve on the Airport Advisory Bylaws Review Committee (Matt Brower, City Manager) - 10 min

Council Member Murdock read two emails from residents interested in serving on the Airport Advisory Board (AAB) Bylaw review ad-hoc committee as included in the meeting materials.

Motion: Council Member Murdock to nominate the two residents that submitted emails

Second: Council Member Barney made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

IX. COMMUNICATION:

City Manager Matt Brower reminded everyone of the dates and times for the coming Budget Workshops:

- Wednesday, May 6 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
- Friday, May 8 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. and
- Saturday, May 9 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, if needed.

Mr. Brower said the focus would be on the PowerPoint slides that would provide a more detailed view of the budget. He recalled the Council's requests to focus on certain initiatives.

Council Member Ostergaard provided an update on the efforts to obtain the necessary bids to install a backdrop for the stage at the Main Street Park before the summer events began. He added that the team was struggling to get the three bids due to the unique design, but had obtained two.

X. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion: Council Member Ostergaard made the motion to adjourn.

Second: Council Member Johnston made the second.

Voting Yes: Council Members Ostergaard, Johnston, Barney, Cheatwood, and Murdock.

Voting No: None.

The **Motion Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.




Trina Cooke, City Recorder

XI. PUBLIC COMMENTS: received by email

From: Annette McRae

Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2026 1:39 AM

To: City Council <citycouncil@heberut.gov>; CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>; publiccomment@wasatch.utah.gov <publiccomment@wasatch.utah.gov>; info@wasatch.utah.gov <info@wasatch.utah.gov>

Cc: Heidi Franco <hfranco@Heberut.gov>; Aaron Cheatwood <acheatwood@heberut.gov>; Yvonne Barney <ybarney@heberut.gov>; Scott Phillips <sphillips@heberut.gov>; Sid Ostergaard <sostergaard@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Request for local parallel letter: US-40 through-hazmat watershed-risk analysis before Final EIS/ROD

Dear Heber City and Wasatch County officials,

I am asking Heber City and Wasatch County to submit parallel written requests to UDOT before the Heber Valley Corridor Final EIS/Record of Decision is finalized.

Earlier tonight, I submitted the attached supplemental request to the UDOT Heber Valley Corridor EIS team and UDOT Motor Carrier Division. The request asks UDOT to specifically analyze through-hazmat and crude-oil tanker watershed risk before the Final EIS/ROD becomes final, and to identify the correct process owner for a federally compliant non-radioactive hazardous materials routing study for US-40 watershed-sensitive segments.

This is not a request for a local truck ban. It is a request for a defensible route-risk study, source-water protection, emergency preparedness, and route certainty.

The core issue is simple: if Alternative B moves crude-oil tanker and other through-hazmat traffic away from Main Street, the Final EIS/ROD should disclose where that traffic goes, what watershed risk remains, and whether a safer designated industrial route, rail/transload option, pipeline option, or conditional restriction would reduce total public-safety and source-water risk.

UDOT's own record already identifies several facts that justify local government follow-up:

1. Crude oil from the Uintah Basin is frequently hauled on US-40 through Heber City to Salt Lake City-area refineries.
2. Uintah Basin black waxy crude oil is classified as a hazardous material because it is a flammable liquid with health hazards and risks.
3. About 600 to 700 oil tanker trucks per day were observed in 2020.
4. The Provo River, Snake Creek, and Heber Valley Aquifer are relevant receiving waters/resources.

5. The Heber Valley Aquifer is classified as Class 1A Pristine, and all project elements are within its contributing area.

6. The Provo River has beneficial uses that include domestic/drinking water with prior treatment, recreation, cold-water fishery/aquatic life, and agricultural uses.

I respectfully ask Heber City and Wasatch County to consider submitting a short parallel letter to UDOT asking that the Final EIS/ROD include a specific response item on through-hazmat and crude-oil tanker watershed risk under Alternative B, Alternative A, and the No-action Alternative.

The local-government ask could be as simple as:

Before the Heber Valley Corridor Final EIS/Record of Decision is finalized, UDOT should disclose how Alternative B affects through-hazmat and crude-oil tanker routing, whether watershed risk to the Provo River and Heber Valley Aquifer is preserved, increased, or reduced, and whether UDOT will scope a federally compliant NRHM routing study for US-40 watershed-sensitive segments.

The attached packet includes the supporting record facts, legal/process frame, talking points, requested follow-up sequence, and disclosure.

Please confirm receipt and let me know whether this can be routed to the appropriate city/county elected officials, staff, and public-record process.

From: Sheila Siggard

Sent: Monday, May 4, 2026 11:33 AM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>; City Council <citycouncil@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Heber City Park

Here is ANOTHER vote to put these park expenditures on the ballot! Let us Citizens vote about spending funds!!

Thank you!

Kerry & Sheila Siggard

Midway

From: allison larsen

Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2026 9:14 AM

To: CC Public Comments <ccpublic@heberut.gov>

Subject: (EXTERNAL) Park

Council members,

Normally, I would write each one of you individually, and I have in the past, but I just found out about this and I know the meeting is tonight!

I believe it is outrageous to even be considering the destruction of our beloved Park and turning it into "Disneyland". I talk to a lot of people and have seen so many comments on so many different pages, and have yet to see or hear anyone who is defending what is going on here!

Number one there is not an out cry and need for any of the three different options that were presented! And it begs the question why was there not an option four. That option would be don't do anything except improve the bathrooms and maybe the playground!

To turn this beautiful gathering place into an Olympic venue, which is what I consider being done here, goes against the small town feeling that most people live here.

I don't know the exact figure, but I do know that for one person who vocally speaks out or comes to meetings, they represent hundreds, and maybe even thousands of people. These people are either unaware of what is going on, busy, or have given up on our government representing them!

I will always have faith that government can change its mind given enough pressure from the citizens they represent! This was seen when rank choice voting was eliminated!

I will see you tonight!

Regards,
Allison Salisbury
Sent from my iPad