

Appendix B:

Open House Comments

METHOD	COMMENT	NAME	COMMENT DATE
Email	<p>I have used the canyon road on almost a daily bases for over 22 years. My name is Ken Camello and I am a resident of Eden, Utah.</p> <p>Truck Traffic and Speed: Big concern, many narrow escapes as autos/trucks exceed speed limits and drift over the white lines on many occasions. More so in the first mile of the canyon road on the Ogden side. As many of the trucks are engaged in building out the valley loads are too heavy to safely negotiate this section. Biggest concern is their speed. I think the solution is to limit large axle vehicle time in the canyon to after and before rush hours and to install surveillance cameras to monitor their speeds. Exceeding would result in a snap shot of their truck and its speed on radar plus a big fine. The cameras may be used to monitor the speed of all traffic and to help emergency responders manage all incidents better.</p> <p>Bicycles: Suggest developing rail bed road along side the Ogden river. Bikes must be kept off the canyon road especially on the Ogden opening mile. Eminent Domain may be needed to open up this already in use parallel road. I am a biker but stay off the road as it is too dangerous. A bridge could be built to access this road for bikers and pedestrians from the Ogden side. This would be great. Visibility Issues: night driving can be a chore on this road. UDOT needs to maintain all the white lines better. I have seen other states using a reflective paint that seems to hold up better and provide better driving visibility. The plowing has to be widened to expose these lines. Winter usage: UDOT does a good job with frequent plowing and may want to pre-coat the roadway more often to soften up the accumulated snow.</p> <p>County police: I do not see all that many patrol officers on this very dangerous road. Suggest increased patrolling by using a spotter or camera in the canyon to identify the problem drivers. They could then be intercepted by another patrol officer once out of the canyon and issued tickets/warnings. We have had many close calls over the years with irresponsible drivers who take turns to fast and pass on the double white lines.</p> <p>Good luck Ken Camello 5169 Silverado Drive Eden, Utah 84310</p>	Ken Camello	4/7/2016 6:00
Email	<p>1. The interactive map will not load</p> <p>2. The upper valley is a recreation area. We need a route that cyclists and pedestrian can use to reach it. It needs to be separated from the road, due to the narrowness of the road, and the many corners which reduce visibility, and cause vehicles to vary from the center of lane.</p> <p>3. In the winter the lack of sun means that snow doesn't melt and the shoulders are blocked. It also leads to the potential for ice formation from patches that do melt.</p> <p>4. There are persistent problems with rocks falling onto the road in several places, but especially along 158 at the side of the lake north of the dam.</p> <p>thanks</p>	Miranda Menzies	4/14/2016 6:00
Email	<p>My name is Annette Wilson. I share ownership of our family cabin at 449, between Graycliff restaurant and the Alaskan. Both my brother and I are unable to be at the open house on the 27 as we will be out of town. Please hear my concerns.</p> <p>I have both safety issues and concerns about noise should plans be made to widen the road in that area and/or putting a bike path along our narrow lane. Our lots are very small. Our cabins or homes are mere feet from the river in back and the lane in front. Of course, we all realize it is a narrow canyon.</p> <p>Pulling or backing into traffic and bikers as we exit our properties through our gates seems very unsafe to me. Having our narrow lane has allowed a safer merge for cars into canyon traffic. But should bikers be zooming through, that is a danger.</p> <p>The road noise has increased over the years. Anything to abate the growing noise disturbance would be appreciated too.</p> <p>Perhaps if the property between our lane and the road is diminished, the building of berms on that property would help with noise and provide space for a bike trail.</p> <p>Thanks for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Annette Wilson</p>	Annette Wilson	4/24/2016 6:00
Phone	<p>VM Transcription:</p> <p>Hi, I wanted to make a comment because I'm not going to be able to come to the open house on the 28th. And I would like to make a suggestion that if you come through the Canyon and when you get to the damn when you turn to go on 158 __ Eden there should be a black and gold striped reflector put on the guardrail there so that you can have some indications that there is guardrail there, it's pitch dark at night. There are no light at that intersection at all. So, thank you very much. Bye-bye.</p>	Allen Greg	4/27/2016 6:00
Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Keep speed limit at 40-45 mpd * Start building trail even if you don't have agreement from all the landowners * Widen shoulders to allow access for pedestrians and cyclists * Build unpaved trail for mountain bikers and pedestrians at elevation 	Richard Menzies	4/28/2016 6:00

Meeting	<p>I am a cyclist, tho age 74, following the meeting at ATK, I have changed my mind a bit about a hiking/biking trail system. If Donald Trump bought the whole canyon and said I can blast, bulldoze, pave, whatever it takes to build a bike/hike trail in the canyon, would you like me to do it or leave the canyon the way it is? I would say leave it as a scenic byway as it is! I would rather give up the idea of cycling if it mars the beauty of the canyon. So - adding a proposed paved trail in the bottom and widening shoulders 3' - 6' with adequate trail marking, speed limit, and signage through rest of the canyon might work. I have heard the concerns of those living in the canyon and am on their side to a degree described above.</p> <p>Nothing prior to the meeting. But at the meeting howling and gnashing of teeth by canyon residents. As described above I am mostly on their side and if I could use the road shoulder and not eminent domain obtained property - they would be less apt to harm me (tongue in cheek).</p>	Mike Roundy	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	We would love to see a biking trail through the canyon.	Joel Grasmeyer & Debbie Pilkey	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	We like the idea of the trail. -Concerned about how to bike safely so close to the road. -How long will it take to finish if approved, and when will it be started -How will UDOT pay for the work? Will this be a Bond, Taxes, Federally subsidized? No, we have not heard this, prior to a week before the meeting.	John Calin	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	The addition of signage and shoulders are concern #1 for me and fellow cyclists I ride with. Second would be a trail, unpaved is acceptable would love if it was uninterrupted and connected to various existing trail heads / systems. Finally, I don't care for a speed limit reduction necessarily. It won't be enforced easily... Visibility and wider shoulders are more effective for bike safety.	Jake Pantone	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	I support the ideas of paved & unpaved trails. I'm also VERY PLEASED that you are not "piping the river" that would have been a disaster. Glad to see widening the dangerous areas as a safety feature. - some speed bumps (sleeping policeman as they say in New Zealand) may be beneficial too! Thank you!	Beverly Zimmerman	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We NEED a trail AND widened road for road bikes. 2) Get CREATIVE around the bottlenecks. 3) Build the parts we can- NAIL DOWN THE EASY BITS with a definite plan. <p>Some info. mostly accurate.</p>	Miranda Menzies	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>BLM survey sections are the law - all county section plats are off and not lawful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new brass cap. - resolve and honor ancient titles. -TITLE controls - oldest is the most accurate. <p>Jerry's lot has been there since 1892.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fit BLM to titles. <p>Lots of research is needed to prove land boundaries.</p> <p>Occupy the corner and run a new line to Peery Camp but title still.</p> <p>Hermitage has a corner - no other known corners in O.C.</p> <p>Very concerned about Peery Camp - NO TRAIL.</p> <p>Rock has a lot of shale</p> <p>Surface / occupy-</p>	Jerry V. Larson	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>Part of the plan I saw tonight brings up the idea of a mixed use trail - bad idea. Mixed use trails are dangerous to all users as hikers and bikers, with very different speeds, can be hazardous to both.</p> <p>Wider shoulders would help, even with a variable width shoulder, slower speeds in the canyon would be nice, but currently there appears to be no enforcement of the current speed limit. Tailgating is endemic along the entire stretch.</p> <p>I like the proposal on this handout as it appears to be a satisfactory solution.</p> <p>Most of the active sports community in the valley would like a biking/hiking access to the canyon and anyone from the valley realizes the hazards involved driving the canyon.</p>	Dan Norton	4/28/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>Seems like reasonable solutions on all aspects, preserves natural fuel, increases safety and use-ability for biking & hiking.</p> <p>Nice Work</p> <p>-I appreciated the open house format - well done.</p>	Chip Ulrich	4/29/2016 0:00
Meeting	As a long time resident of Ogden Valley and current resident of Ogden and avid cyclist, I agree with the recommended roadway and trail improvement. Having the canyon accessible to cyclists with improved safety is needed. I commute 3 - 5 days a week up and down the canyon to work for a year. I would have felt much safer with only a few extra feet of shoulder. Having the trail / pathway separate from the road would be even better, especially for less experienced cyclists.	Clint Child	4/30/2016 6:00

Meeting	<p>Was sad to see that the recommendations for a multi use trail proposed by the residents of the canyon was not taken into consideration of the proposed trail. While the suggested speed limit changes are desirable I am not sure how the speeds will be enforced. There needs to be some means of enforcement.</p> <p>I have read the on-line updates on the webpage.</p>	Walter Tom McCabe	5/2/2016 6:00
Meeting	See attached letter	Craig Peery	5/2/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>Dear Ogden Canyon Study,</p> <p>You've been hearing mine and many others comments over many years concerning the Canyon. I've been traveling this canyon for 60, and know its value and dangers, and I've left my recommendations with the division, and with those who've been working towards some changes.</p> <p>As simply as I can restate it, the lanes should be divided with the river in between them, when possible. The Canyon 'restored', buying up all the property and houses needed for both, but leaving the businesses, and any lanes to homes and subdivisions, in tact. This would be for safety only, not to enable more use and access to the Valley since roads up there couldn't handle the impact of increasing traffic, and since it's been designated a Recreation Area and Destination, it needs to stay looking that way for the public visiting, and the residents living there. It's the 'tourists', unfamiliar with the Canyons dangers that cause most of the problems and accidents.</p> <p>If my recommendations had been taken under consideration during the housing devaluations, it would have saved the State millions to acquire the properties necessary to split the road, and 'clean up' the Canyon of those homes along the river. I've been unable to attend the public meetings because of health issues of myself and others I've been giving care of, and probably couldn't get a word in edgewise with Canyon residents. I live in Huntsville.</p> <p>Thank you for the time and effort you've all spent towards addressing the problems of Ogden Canyon and the roads. I hope somethings done for the sake of everyone using the area. Every year that passes by just means more accidents, and taxpayer dollars, and I think most of us would like to see the Canyon 'restored' to a natural, but safer place as possible.</p> <p>Thank You again, Kathryn Thompson, Huntsville Resident</p>	Kathryn Thompson	5/2/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>It is exciting to hear that there is support for both a shared use path and a roadway widening project so that the canyon can accommodate for walking, running, hiking, family biking, etc. and also allow for serious cyclists to ride on the roadway. Ogden is becoming a major cycling industry hub and this type of progressive thinking will help our city to draw new residents to the area that can help to support our city's financial growth. The number one concern with regards to this project for cyclists and recreational users is safety. It is important that the end result allows motorists and cyclists to exist peacefully in the canyon, so a plan to improve safety and relieve animosity is paramount.</p> <p>What have you been hearing from neighbors, media, etc. about the proposed improvements?</p> <p>I've heard that all of the infrastructure as it relates to safety and access for cyclists is highly at risk.</p>	Joe Wignall	5/2/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>I like that some sections of road will be straightened and the shoulders widened. I believe a shared-use paved trail, for pedestrians and cyclists, will be hugely popular and much used. I'm all for these improvements! GO, shared-use trail through Ogden Canyon, GO! Can't wait to use it! Will the trail provide access to the popular climbing areas? And will there be better parking there? Climbing is a growing sport, so we can expect more traffic in those areas in the future, even without the trail. Will the trail feature trash cans for litter control and doggie waste drop-off? I think it should, but maybe some residents/businesses will adopt portions of the trail.</p> <p>Most of the concerns I've heard have been from residents/businesses inside the canyon, and all those comments have been negative regarding any sort of trail running through the canyon like this, but it sounds like they worry about their safety and the safety of their property, as well as concerns about privacy. However, I'd bet The Oaks would see increased business because of such a trail. Everyone else I've heard talk about the improvements are super-excited to be able to cycle all the way through the canyon without endangering themselves and vehicle drivers.</p>	Tami Martinez	5/3/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Please keep going with this. I am a serious bicyclist and would love to have a safe way to get to Ogen Valley. Both North Ogen pass and Ogden Canyon are too dangerous for me right now. Ogden Canyon is the best option in my case, if a safe path can be established. I am grateful for the work being done and look forward to seeing this happen.</p> <p>I know a number of others who would like to safely bike/run through the canyon.</p>	Jared B Erickson	5/3/2016 0:00

Meeting	<p>Some of my concerns about the meeting on Thursday. First, I am quite pleased with the proposed route for the trail. Our fear was it would be down right next to the houses....putting it up higher along the pipeline is better. Though right now that is kinda like a "private" walking area.</p> <p>Wearing the green shirts was good identification - but I feel like it created a "us vs. them" mentality. Between "those bikers"(outsiders, speedsters, new-comers, youth) and us "locals" (property owners, tax payers, old-timers). When it seems that we all need to come together as "interested parties" who have opinions and ideas and vested interests to create the best possible scenerio - something that can work for the most possible people and for the future and present.</p> <p>I did find some conversations difficult when people were looking at my shirt and me as the "enemy", while I was trying to listen to their concerns, fears, and hopes with compassion and an open mind.</p> <p>As an Idealist, I think that things can work out well.</p> <p>And yes, I still have a dream of some day having the canyon closed to all motorized traffic for recreational and educational enjoyment - for a few hours once or twice a month....."I have a Dream".</p> <p>Thanks Drew for all you do and work for. As a "newbie" you bring much to offer in insight and ideas. As pioneer stock, I sometimes see the past.</p> <p>Peggy Barker</p>	Peggy Barker	5/3/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>From even before the meeting, I am for not seizing property unless there is no alternative. I was also for the trail following what has become the Preferred Alternative. After talking to the residents I believe that other alternatives should be sought. Please consider building this alignment for trail in phases: From Ogden, build on north side of the river, cross it before Perry Camp bridge then stay north of road but cross near Indian Trail Head. Stay south of road until Grey Cliff Lodge where trail will go south of the river. Cross to north of the river and the road before the Hermitage, Follow the pipeline until just before the houses near the ATK Conference Center. The trail will have to cross the river anyway, so why not do so before the ATK CC. From there, just stay south of the road to connect to the Wheeler Creek Trail. The parking there should also be expanded because it is often full.</p> <p>Because of Homeland Security's regulations, they're not going to let the trail go near the dam. I don't know how the Pineview Loop will be completed short of a suspension or floating bridge near the existing string of buoys.</p> <p>After the open house I talked to canyon residents and others. The residents are really concerned about increased crime and other impacts due to the presence of more non-automobile traffic in the canyon. They mostly don't have concerns about widening the roadway. In fact, some said that it is already (legally) too narrow to be used for vehicle traffic so traffic should be severely restricted. I received a well-written proposal from a resident proposing that the trail in the lower canyon be made, but that it should cross to the south side of the river before the Perry Camp bridge then connect to the Indian Trailhead.</p> <p>And leave all existing structures (houses, garages, etc.) untouched.</p>	Val Kartchner	5/3/2016 6:00
Meeting	How do you propose to slow the vehicular traffic? You will need some kind of enforcement?	Edward Macner	5/3/2016 6:00
Email	<p>Thank you for the reply. There have not been a few times that cars pass over the double line because I drive at the speed limit. Often trucks and trucks with trailers especially with multiple axles are unable to stay within the double lines. Often trucks use air brakes to decelerate upon approaching a curve.</p> <p>Those of us who live in the canyon and need to cross on foot SR 39 to the mail box or hike the Indian Trail find it unsafe and uncomfortable.</p> <p>How is design speed determined ? Would electronic speed regulating signs help drivers to become conscious of their driving speed ?</p> <p>Painted crosswalk lines where mailboxes are across from the entrance to a subdivision might help.</p>	Edward Macner	5/3/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>I have the following comments:</p> <p>I generally concur with the recommendations and compliment the UDOT and other participants on a job well done.</p> <p>I am a frequent user of Ogden Canyon and a "serious cyclist", however, I never ride up the canyon and only occasionally will I ride down the canyon (always in the morning when the winds are favorable). I do not think it is practical from an engineering, environmental, or cost view point to consider adding additional road space ie bike lane, shoulder etc above Alaskan Inn, true there are a few places where property, terrain and river would allow it but it would still be at considerable expense and impact to travel.</p> <p>I would strongly urge UDOT and stake holders to utilize existing Pineview Water and Pacific Corp right of ways and easements to construct a paved trail the entire length of the canyon to Wheeler Creek, I have ridden on many paved trails and "serious" cyclists utilize the paved bikeways just as much as "non-serious" cyclists. (RE: Jackson Hole, Glenwood Springs, St George). While not cheap I believe it would be less expensive and certainly less impact than widening HY 39.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Mark Pantone	5/3/2016 6:00
Meeting	The canyon is to narrow for pedestrians and bicyclists it would be a major safety issue.	Kelly Wheat	5/3/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>Please stay out of the groves of homes and use the pipe line as the trail and path.</p> <p>w p melton</p>	Wally Melton	5/4/2016 6:00
Meeting	Thank you it is about time !!!	Donald Noseworthy	5/5/2016 6:00

Email	<p>Stephane, UDOT Chapter 19 says: "The following are the maximum legal vehicle dimensions, loaded or unloaded, that may be operated without special permits on Utah highways. HEIGHT 14' Width 8' 6". " Further down the page it says "Commercial vehicles may operate within the legal width dimension of 8 feet 6 inches."</p> <p>UDOT R912-11-1 is to define oversize and/or overweight permitted vehicle restrictions. R912-11-section 11 says that for State Road 39 between State Route 203 (Harrison Blvd at RP 9) and Pineview Reservoir. "Vehicles or Loads exceeding 10' in width are prohibited."</p> <p>I think the two sections mean your truck must be no more than 8' 6" unless you get a special permit for Highway 39 and than they can be up to 10' in width. Does UDOT issue many special permits for Ogden Canyon ?</p> <p>Am I reading these two sections correctly ? Bill King</p>	Bill King	5/9/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Very Impressed with the direction of the Ideas, I mostly approve on all aspects. I only hope that things move speedily and do not cause years of delays for all residents of Ogden Valley, maybe even a heavy Night construction to ease impact. I also hope we will have a good Sherriff enforcement of posted speeds and uses.</p> <p>Haven't heard much, but I did attend the open houses.</p>	Kyle Frongner	5/10/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Making use of the old trolley fill for bicycles certainly makes sense to me.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	JT Jensen	5/10/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>As Conservation Chair of the Ogden Group of the Sierra Club, I am writing on behalf of our approximately 300 active members in Weber County and 100 members in adjacent counties. We would like the record to show that we are disappointed at not having been invited to participate in any of the focus groups for this study. Early during Phase 1 we were told that we would be able to participate in such a way. We were also disappointed that the recent public event was held at a location that cannot be safely accessed by bicycle from Ogden City.</p> <p>That said, we are very supportive of the general outcome of this study, as represented in the drawings shown on this web page. A safe pathway for cyclists and pedestrians in Ogden Canyon is an absolute necessity and is long overdue. We also recognize the importance of separating high-speed cyclists from pedestrians, so the design should make it feasible for high-speed cyclists to use the shoulder of the highway where there is room, that is, above the narrows. The illustrations on this web page do not adequately depict every detail of the proposed trail and roadway designs, or the impacts to the environment and to private property, or the associated costs, so we do not have enough information to comment on each of these design specifics. At the conceptual level, however, we support the proposal for a paved trail along the old rail right-of-way through the narrows, and an unpaved trail through the rest of the canyon, with a connection that allows high-speed cyclists to transition between the paved trail and the highway (shoulder) at a logically chosen location above the narrows. We believe these improvements will be a tremendous enhancement to the quality of life in Weber County and we urge all policy makers to move toward implementing these improvements as soon as is reasonably possible.</p> <p>Only the usual generalities about cyclists wanting a trail and property owners being afraid of eminent domain.</p>	Dan Schroeder	5/10/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I think efforts to create a bicycle/walking/running path through the canyon is extremely important for our community. Thriving communities across the country have these, and communities without them want them. Such paths are a highly desirable feature for people and companies looking to relocate. Ogden is blessed with a good network and better potential that will help secure Weber County as a desirable place to live, work, & raise a family!</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts to find a way to get this to work while also working with those who may not want anything to change.</p> <p>My active friends & neighbors are very excited about the prospect of extending the Ogden River Parkway up the canyon, both to access the canyon and the trails, and also to provide a route for biking or running all the way up to Pineview Reservoir.</p>	Ed Merrill	5/10/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>The overall plan looks good, but it is very important to get buy-in from certain opinion leaders in the Canyon: Mike Bachman and Kieth Rounkles (Bachman owns the large compound just west of the water treatment plant, and Rounkles owns the Oaks, and a new home that looks to be severely effected by the current route of the path. These 2 men are opinion leaders and very outspoken in the canyon, but if you can get them on board it should really help overall public acceptance by canyon residents. BACHman seems to be very concerned about privacy: if it takes building a higher screening fence, routing the trail further north, adding additional landscaping.....that's what you need to do. Rounkles appeared to be most concerned about losing some of his recently constructed front garden and is feeling "encroached on". Work closely with him on trail routing, screening, landscaping and find a way to make him happy. I also met another man who lives by the beginning of Indian Trail: he said when the trail was upgraded, he saw a big uptick in crime (theft from his yard), because (he claimed) that people could now see into his yard and spot things to steal.... Bottom line: there aren't that many really serious complainers, but their issues need to be heard, and addressed to get buy-in.</p>	Iain Hueton	5/10/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>The on-line graphics are not sufficiently detailed to see where the trail alignments are. I am out of town and unable to attend in person. Could you post more detailed files, perhaps pdf?</p> <p>1) considerable concern over trail alignments - pro and con. 2) concern re: widening or straightening the road to speed traffic - definitely con.</p>	J Hinds	5/10/2016 6:00

Meeting	<p>My family and I strongly support the creation of a walking/biking trail on the canyon to connect to other existing trails, and provide both the option of non motorized canyon travel as well as recreation.</p> <p>All favor the creation of a safe path/trail for pedestrians and cyclists to the Canyon</p>	Manuel Prieto	5/12/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>My concern is a safe bike route up the canyon. I would prefer a designated path by improving and extending the existing trail on the north side of the river. I do not believe the canyon residents will ever sell or give permission to use their property. It is a shame that a few have a "strangle hold" on the whole community. I'm 64 yrs old and have been biking that canyon for 35 yrs and sure I will never see a designated trail.</p> <p>With no trail I would like to see a widening of the road, where possible, and providing a shared use designated bike lane.</p> <p>I will continue to bike the canyon regardless of how safe it is.</p> <p>The information I have read in the newspaper and heard in the meeting indicate the canyon residents don't want anything or anyone to disturb the current condition. They don't care about bicyclist or improving the outdoor experience for all. They are selfish and think they own the canyon.</p>	Brad Garr	5/12/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I think you should leave the canyon alone after the three things are accomplished - the narrows and the two bridges.</p> <p>It has functioned for many years now -</p> <p>I believe the property rights of the folks living in the canyon should be respected.</p> <p>How about a trail going up 21st street and over the mountain. Bikers and hikers can also drive to the valley and go from that destination.</p> <p>Seems like a big deal to please a few.</p> <p>Most not happy. Ogden Valley will never be a Park City and more roads will not make it happen. Have heard some complaints about the enormous amount of money it will take to change a small canyon - they think it is a waste of their tax dollars.</p>	Jody Smith	5/12/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I hope that this gets serious consideration. I know that there are a handful of canyon residents fighting this but there are 100,000 supporters.</p> <p>Everyone I have talked to is excited about the possibility of being able to walk and bike up the canyon.</p>	Kevin Brown	5/12/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Those of us who tow camp trailers, boats, and four wheelers through the canyon know how dangerous it can be. Motorcyclists can also attest to the danger. Add bikes to the mix and you invite disaster, not to mention the traffic slowdown which is unacceptable. There are plenty of other trails for bikers and walkers.</p> <p>My friends & neighbors can't believe this is even being considered. We all use the canyon road for access to recreational activities and believe bike traffic will be a hindrance and lead to fatalities.</p>	Larry Waters	5/12/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Please consider adding a light for night-time illumination at the entrance to the bridge over the dam at Pine View.</p> <p>When dark, it is difficult to judge the turn onto the dam from the highway.</p>	Michael Jensen	5/12/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>I have attended your public meetings. I Mountain Bike & Road Bike the upper canyon highway almost daily from Wildwood to Pineview and beyond. I support highway improvements for wider pavement lanes through the canyon with the least impact to privately owned property. I noticed your research has overlooked and incorrectly published a trail plan that isn't consistent with the factual conditions just west of "The Oaks" in 2 cases.</p> <p>1) About 300 ft west of the oaks heading west on HWY 39, the north side of the road is restricted by 2 large Rock outcroppings situated vertically below the 72" waterline encased overhead. I suspect this outcropping remains due to the waterline, however, you show a 6 ft wide shoulder improvement through this rock? This is the narrowest lane area and is the most dangerous area east of the Narrows. Directly across the highway is the Ogden River and a vertical drop wall eliminating a shoulder improvement area.</p> <p>2) Same area, your map showed "Unpaved Trail" which in theory followed the 72" pipeline. Are you aware that the pipeline west of "The Oaks" leaves the historical route and dives under HWY39 due to a catastrophic landslide that destroyed the stave pipeline (still there)? That area currently is nearly impossible to hike across due to the sharp slope angles and lack of ground. Are you proposing to bridge this unstable area? Site is located across from 882 Ogden canyon above the boulders and group of cut off telephone poles (clearly visible) north side of road.</p> <p>As for the "Narrows" area, the old Transit line works up to Peery Camp where I believe Ogden owns the land, and then crossing the Ogden River to respect property where it would become a shoulder route up to Pineview. CONTINUED....</p>	Jerry Burgess	5/13/2016 0:00

Meeting	<p>.....CONTINUED. This plan should have a paved trail that would support Road Bike travel (we CAN NOT ride on rocky gravel) Your plan should be considerate of the Road Bikes as primary or I can't re-enter the canyon once I leave downhill with traffic. Mountain Bikes can travel on either type surface.</p> <p>Thank-You, Jerry Burgess (Competitive rider for 40+ years)</p> <p>1) The specific plans you displayed at the open house / online suggested a couple route plans. Our attending canyon residents talked about the failure to see our suggested / presented routes that were a result of the collaboration of some residents who worked out options or solutions to the difficulties related to property access. The talk is that the information is being ignored for sake of official streamlined plans just to get the trails.</p> <p>2) Talk was also about enforcement of proposed speed limits of 30 mph / 35 mph. We laughed because it won't be reality because according to neighbors and the county, the Sheriff doesn't stop violators in the canyon due to "safety reasons" citing that there aren't enough areas to make a safe car stop. Your presentation supported this by saying "Minimum of 35" which could legally mean 55 mph as opposed to presenting "Maximum" safe speeds suggesting a safely restricted speed limits to negotiate turns or safely pass cyclists. We don't expect to see traffic slowing down in this plan. We don't see traffic enforcement at all in the canyon.</p>	Jerry Burgess	5/13/2016 0:00
Email	<p>Stephane, new R909-2 almost makes sense: Maximum legal vehicle dimensions without special permits: height 14 feet, width 8 feet 6 inches, length varies from 45 feet to 97 feet depending on kind of vehicle.</p> <p>Dimensions do not count "appurtenances" such as safety items like rear view mirrors, turn signal lamps and side marker lamps.</p> <p>We have noticed a trend in new rear view mirrors and in replacement mirrors on many old trucks. The mirrors stick way far out, some as much as 12 to 18 inches beyond the cab or body. Have a look at the new UTA bus mirrors. Also some marker lights and turn lights are being mounted on extenders that stick out of the trailers as much as 6 inches.</p> <p>While these safety appurtenances may work well on the the Interstate and reduce accidents they are likely a problem in Ogden Canyon. Big truck drivers may be swerving to the right in order to protect their mirrors when trying to pass another truck or large vehicle in the canyon and in the process may be knocking the cement barriers in the river.</p> <p>Additional signs should be posted in Ogden Canyon: "Narrow Road and Shoulders, all vehicles limited to 8 1/2 feet width without permit"</p> <p>Bill</p>	Bill King	5/14/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>The pipeline route goes through my back yard, I own and pay taxes on it there is an easement for them to maintain the pipe line.</p> <p>Most of the state of Utah is owned by the government. You still want to take more away just so a select few can walk and bike through my back yard. I already do not have a front or side yards. Now you want to take my back yard as well.</p> <p>Go walk on the over 80% of Utah that is available.</p> <p>I like how you have it called improvements. Instead of trying to use eminent domain to take away my property!</p> <p>I AM A VETERAN AND THE THANKS I GET FOR 5 YEARS OF HONORABLE SERVICE, IS YOU WANTING TO TAKE AWAY MY PROPERTY AT A REDUCED VALUE!! I WOULD RATHER YOU JUST SAY THANK YOU, AND LEAVE ME ALONE!!!!!!</p>	Andrew Deckman	5/16/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>1) Very opposed to any bike lines through the Canyon. This is an insane idea that is being pushed by a very few people that will cost a very large sum of money and only cause more problems/accidents/injuries and undoubtedly a few fatalities along the way. The Canyon is simply not wide enough to reconfigure the roadways or to narrow the roadways for the sake a few cyclists. This is being promoted and pushed along by a a minority of people for what cause? What benefit?</p> <p>2) I do support the high mountain trail concept</p> <p>1) Most people do not wanted any widening of the Canyon highway - costs and disruption would be enormous! 2) we do not want increased speed limits or passing lanes 3) Most of my fellow neighbors also feel that bike lanes in the Canyon will be dangerous and are unwarranted. 4) Additional trails would be welcomed</p>	Michael Beddome	5/16/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>It was great to see the paved bike path through the lower part of the canyon, but discouraging not to see it continue further up the canyon. This is a project that UDOT should oversee and not leave it to the County to complete. Without the authority of UDOT it is doubtful that the project will move forward. If it proves to be impossible to put a paved pathway through the top of the canyon, there should be dedicated bike lanes from the pathway to the dam.</p> <p>How important a paved path pathway is for the Ogden Valley and Ogden. This needs to happen.</p>	Alan Wheelwright	5/16/2016 6:00

Meeting	<p>Hi-</p> <p>I attended the open house and am very interested in seeing the canyon trail happen. The future of Ogden as an outdoor hub depends on a safe route for bikes up that canyon. Being a mountain biker, I'd be fine with said trail avoiding the homes altogether and diverting higher up the mountainside! :) That said, I recall the taxpayers having to foot the bill for major sewer and culinary water improvements for Ogden canyon residents a couple years ago. They love to complain about better roads and bike access, but seemed willing to take our money when their water service sucked! Anyway- I'm all for the trail. Keep up the work!</p> <p>Shad Burnham</p>	Shad Burnham	5/16/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>Having been driving through the canyon when a large truck comes barreling around a corner right at me, I'd like to see a ban on vehicles with more than a certain number of axles from the canyon.</p> <p>The road is really too narrow for such traffic and drivers seem to enjoy taking the turns at top speed.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>Rosemary Hoffman</p>	Rosemary Hoffman	5/16/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>Thank you for the recent open house. It was very informative and brought many of the players involved together for discussion. The Ogden Canyon Project is critical to our community. The canyon provides a beautiful pristine experience to those who travel in it. It is the gateway to the OGDEN Valley and needs to have recreational access.</p> <p>Respecting the property rights of these landowners is also important and we should endeavor to find solutions which would ameliorate the land owners' concerns.</p> <p>To our community in Weber county, the OCP would open a vast array of recreational possibilities. It would also make safe the commenting corridor between the two valleys.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and effort in making the OCP happen.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dann C Byck, MD</p>	Dann Byck	5/17/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>I understand and respect the residents living or otherwise owning property in Ogden Canyon. However, everyone should acknowledge and understand that as our population increases, so will traffic demands increase on all roads. I've read several comments that, for example, cyclists should either ride over the North Ogden Divide, or up Weber Canyon. Weber County has pretty much told cyclists to stay off the Divide road (a very poor decision). If I want to ride in Ogden Valley, I either have to drive my bicycle up over the divide road, or ride from North Ogden up Weber Canyon and then over Trapper's Loop. I personally am not concerned with the distance to ride up Weber Canyon and over Trapper's Loop, but I am concerned about riding in the heavy traffic to get to Weber Canyon, and the unsafe ride up the canyon to get to Mountain Green. The canyon roadside shoulder is always littered with debris and there is no shoulder as one rides over the bridges. Being more supportive of cyclists riding over North Ogden Divide, AND making safe accommodations for cyclists to ride up Ogden Canyon would be very acceptable improvements.</p> <p>I personally have heard only positive comments with regard to improving Ogden Canyon to better accommodate cyclists and pedestrians from friends, family, and my neighbors.</p>	Jim Harris	5/17/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>I'm not too sure what the final proposal is. All these slides and maps are confusing! I'm not too clear on what section "the narrows" is and it seems to be key in the proposal. Instead of critiquing the proposal here's what I think is important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * having a footpath that will connect parking to trails; * having a safe, paved route through the canyon for a road bikes (especially the uphill climb direction being safe); and * a safe way for climbers to get to those hugely popular route (which always looks to have super sketch parking and approach). 	Katherine Menzies	5/17/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>I've thought about this a lot for all these months that we've been in committee.</p> <p>The biggest thing that keeps coming to my mind is that we have no second chances, once the canyon is blighted, it will always be blighted! By trying to allow more people the opportunity to enjoy it, we could very easily, almost accidentally, destroy that very thing which we want to enjoy. My suggestions to avoid that are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- keep the speed limit slow; making the canyon safer, modifying it less to keep it safer and that will also automatically encourage folks to use alternate routes which are safe at faster speeds 2- encourage the use of Trappers by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> modifying the intersections at Chris's and at the dam to give the right of way to those using Trappers and forcing those using the canyon and 39 to the north to wait. closing the on/off ramps at I-84 on the west of Mountain Green and creating a new one at the bottom of Trappers; this would also improve the highway through Mountain Green tremendously. placing signage directing traffic to Trappers 3- bike/hike trail in bottom of canyon along roadway when not possible off roadway, no use of eminent domain for trail; if there is not enough room for a separate trail, then widening the shoulder(s) for biking/hiking, possibly with a barrier between trail and traffic 4- If there is not enough room for that, then there isn't and we simply don't get to have a trail; it's not worth destroying the canyon that we wish to enjoy by building a trail; Catch 22 	Rick Kearl	5/17/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>In case a previous comment didn't get included, I would like to say that a hike-bike-ride (equestrian) trail would be a dream-come-true for Ogden. We would become like Jackson, a destination resort, but much closer. Whatever it takes, we should do this!</p>	Roberta Glidden	5/18/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I am in favor of a trail as long it does it does not encroach/or take private property and not cost canyon owners any money.</p> <p>Thank you Marino Toulatos</p>	Marino Toulatos	5/18/2016 6:00

Meeting	<p>The #1 goal of this should be to not ruin what is Ogden Canyon.. Widening the road to accommodate more traffic would be a horrible idea especially if it meant ruining the river path... Ie. Making it look like Weber canyon above Morgan... Lowering the speed limit is a great idea.. Slow</p> <p>People down and make them enjoy the beauty around them.. If they don't like that they can take trappers... I also think limiting big heavy trucks would be a good idea... Not sure the best way to do this but the increase in big trucks has gone way up in recent years!</p> <p>If there is room and doesn't interfere too</p> <p>Much with canyon residents, a bike/walking/running path would be wonderful! The biggest concern I have heard is the worry of messing up the natural stream bed by expanding the road out over the river!</p>	Chad Booth	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I support the idea of a shared use trail to ease bicycle traffic through the narrows. I would also like to see results from a study on increased bus service during the year.</p>	Christopher Phillion	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>The plan to divert bike traffic from a paved trail to SR-39 in the canyon is insane. There is no legal place in the entire canyon to pass a bike or car. For many of the Valley residents the canyon is the only realistic route to get to work, school, etc. To encourage more bikers in the canyon is just a recipe for disaster. Please don't listen to the vocal minority of bicyclist that think they should be able to ride their bikes anywhere regardless of the danger and inconvenience to residents of the valley and canyon. Unless drastic changes are made to the canyon, bikers will be on the main roadway or so close to it as to impede traffic flow. Especially during the summer months, as I have traveled to work, or appointments, I have had to follow bicyclist as they cruise down the road at 15- 20 MPH. From conversations with friends and family, this is a common problem. I am 100% in favor of a trail that would accommodate bikers and hikers. I understand the problems with property owners in the canyon and hope that something can be worked out for all involved. At the least, where the trail ends, biking should end. Bicyclists should turn around and return down the trail. Do not encourage more bikes in the canyon. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. This has been a huge topic of conversation among my neighbors and friends. Not everyone is willing to put their name on a comment. My neighbors are very upset about the bikes in the canyon. There are so many problems with commuting to Ogden using any of the 3 routes. Why make the canyon more dangerous than it already is?</p>	Marilyn Froerer	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I don't think eminent domain should be used on the property owners in the canyon to accommodate recreational cyclists.</p>	Ashley Carlson	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>When Ogden City repaired the waterline at the mouth of the canyon they merely covered the location of the pipe with concrete. I understand the structural necessity of doing something like this, but they have done nothing to improve the unsightly visual effect they left at the entry of the canyon. If this canyon is such a gem to the city, they need to treat it like one.</p>	Ray Bertoldi	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>My main concern is that Ogden Canyon is our main access to Ogden. North Ogden Divide and Trappers Loop are not feasible for everyday travel to Ogden. They take more than twice as long to get there. They are fine if going to North Ogden or Layton, but Ogden Canyon is our main access and I do not see it as recreational for biking when it is absolutely dangerous to have a biker in front of you who you cannot pass in the canyon and they hold up traffic. It starts to pile up and people get frustrated and start to take chances and can cause serious accidents. Anyone who drives the canyon very often knows this. It is terribly frustrating. Bikers need to have their own place to ride not the roadway in narrow Ogden Canyon and not in just some places. Please don't start a trail and then put them out on the canyon road. The canyon is always busy and getting busier all the time and traffic stacks up quickly if slowed down or stopped. This is our main road to get to and from Ogden. It is also our best emergency access to a hospital. Please don't ruin it. It's bad enough sharing it with large trucks that take your mirrors off because they're so close.</p> <p>My neighborhood feels the same way as our family does including children that live in the Valley. A pathway for walking and biking would be great, but it doesn't look like that is feasible and our canyon road is our access for transportation to Ogden City where we go for work, services, shopping, medical, family and most of the life needs. Please don't stifle it. The beauty is seen very well from a car. Bikers do not pay the vehicle taxes we have to pay and we should have priority.</p>	Bonnie Olson	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>It is certain that there will be accommodations made for bicycles in this canyon project, that being said there should be NO passing what so ever in the canyon also, a bike speed established same as autos to enable the flow of traffic not be restricted. Further if there is a bike lane designated then there should be an established ticket procedure for those bikes that will still ride the road rather than the established bike lanes. Safety is the trump factor with bikes in a narrow canyon, and that means for all not just the bikers. Further, the funding issue for this project should be born for all users as well as the general public. There should be a law that requires bikes to pay a yearly registration and tax the same as all other vehicles, RV's, bikes, boats, campers, trailers, etc. Bikes actually use the roads more than an off road ATV or camp trailer. The bikes should also be required to have current Insurance plans same as all other items listed above, bikers cause accidents and property damage same as vehicles and should be insured. If you are going to make this fair for all then the bikers should have to pay their fair share same as the rest of us. The bikers defense about they pay taxes on their vehicles does not support the fact that we must pay for our off road ATV or other recreational toys, so bikes should not be exempt from this, that is what I call giving special treatment to a select group if they remain exempt. My group of friends, neighbors and family agree fair is fair, but common sense AND SAFETY should be a higher priority than just saying bikers have a right to be in a narrow canyon. If the bikers can keep up the required posted speed and not restrict the flow of traffic there would be less of an issue, however most bikers can not maintain 35/40 mph for the distance of the canyon route. That being said it is common sense that by impeding the flow of traffic to sometimes 15/20 mph drivers will try at every opportunity to pass, causing an extremely hazardous/dangerous situation.</p>	Rick Winn	5/19/2016 0:00

Meeting	<p>We are not in favor of a trail in the canyon unless it is on the highway. Of course we don't want it going through our back yard where it is proposed. How do you propose going through a tunnel (above Perry Camp and Fairmont) and the sheer cliffs above it; concrete covering the pipeline is exposed from Cobbles to the Hermitage (Ogden River Water Users say "no" because "traffic" will deteriorate it); the pipeline right of way from Hermitage to the reservoir has been claimed by property owners and they own it -- it's private property (Rocky Mt Power and Ogden River Water Users don't own it ; slide area across from ValHalla that can't be used; there can't be a trail any where the pipe is exposed, same reason as above; there cannot be a trail on the repair access points on the pipeline throughout the canyon (there are at least 6 of these, maybe more).</p> <p>Another thought: go through the bottom of North Ogden Canyon. It's a shorter route to the valley and makes more sense. No residents would be impacted through that canyon. We haven't talked to anyone in the Canyon who want a trail anywhere but on the highway. Concerns as it is proposed include trash, vandalism, maintainance, security, fencing, parking, access to and from the trail across private property.</p>	Paul & Lois Fifield	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Since banning trucks is not a viable suggestion, but widening shoulders and flattening curves is, please consider building a sound barrier through the canyon. Truck traffic takes away enjoyment of living in the canyon and undermines the Scenic Byway designation. "Good plan. A lot of work went into this." "It will never happen." "Are they going to dynamite canyon walls?" "It will cost too much money." "Who will maintain the trails?" "There are three residents at the east end of the canyon who are very, very unhappy. The bicycle trail cuts right into their property."</p>	Judy Macner	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Didn't see much regarding biking lanes in plan. Maybe I missed it but the UDOT individual talking made it sound like it is something to consider in next 20 years. Not what I was hoping for. WOULD love to see the canyon bike assessible much like some of the canyons are in SLC. Please consider options for allowing bikes and hikers/walkers/joggers access to commute through canyon. Also, there are places to rock climb but not much room to park or access. Anyway to make it more user friendly? That groups have wanted a bike lane for over 20 years and nothing ever gets done. Just a lot of wishful thinking. "The old TIMERS at UDOT will never change and until they retire and move on nothing will get done."</p>	Mark Geddes	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I am grateful the higher speed limits of 40 mph and 45 mph were eliminated. I would not have minded if the speed limits were reduced to 25 and 30 mph instead of 30 and 35 mph if it would have preserved more of the imposing cliffs. I drive the canyon nearly everyday and would have been happy to have the slower speed. The removal areas look pretty substantial (around the Narrows and Wildwood), and would definitely change the feel of the canyon in those areas. While safety is cited as the main reason, almost all incidents appear to be just property damage (colored dots) and not serious injury-if people would slow down, the incidents would be further reduced, and the canyon could be left alone. I guess we should consider ourselves lucky not to have had even further impacts. Thank heavens for the environmental group concerns.</p>	Carol Campbell	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>The plans look great. I have commuted to snowbasin by bike before via weber canyon and a bike path in Ogden Canyon would be much better and i would do it more if it existed. I know of other employees who would bike to work in the summer if a bike path in Ogden canyon existed.</p>	Eric Ahern	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I am very much in support of adding a bike lane, up and down, on SR-39. This will greatly improve Weber County's recreation opportunities and also improve the driving conditions on this roadway. I my neighborhood I've heard many people in support of the secondary trail going up Ogden Canyon. It seems like there is much support for a walking, running, family biking, etc. path. This would be a very nice recreation feature that compliments Ogden's vision and marketing.</p>	Weston Woodward	5/19/2016 6:00
Email	<p>See attached letter</p>	Bill King	5/19/2016 0:00
Email	<p>See attached letter</p>	Benjamin D. Quick/ Pineview Water	5/19/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>I am a valley resident and a buisness owner in Ogden Valley and feel strongly that the current speed limits should be left in place. A reduction to those speed limits will greatly impact both my family and business in a negative way. Please do not reduce the speed limits in the canyon. Respectfully Jason Peterson</p>	Jason Peterson	5/20/2016 0:00
Meeting	<p>Thanks for the efforts you have put into this. Good job! My main input would be to find a way to keep bikers off the lower part of the canyon (possibly find a way to divert them to the bike trail) . It is extremely dangerous for them as well as cars coming both directions!</p> <p>I really like the idea of a walking/bike path if possible. The main objection seems to be from a few residents who think it will increase crime - this has been shown to be absolutely false. In fact crime has actually decreased in areas with active, well-maintained walking paths. People like the idea of a walking path!</p>	Steve Songer	5/20/2016 0:00

Meeting	<p>The study is very well done and takes into account essentially every detail that could be a factor in improving transportation through the canyon. What is obvious is that canyon usage was poorly planned a century ago and that we are still paying a price for that. We talk about the beauty of the canyon, but there are no real parking areas for observing the canyon, you can only do so on the move. I know there are places where fishermen stop, but these are just dirt areas that are not well placed and that have no amenities.</p> <p>It is also very bothersome that the biking "community" has so much power these days. It seems that if you buy a bike, then suddenly you are a "stake holder" who has a say about a trail that you think should go through someone's back yard. Sure, the canyon would be a beautiful place to bike, but why not Weber Canyon? I am a low-end recreational biker, but diverting large sums of money to make the city biker friendly and redesigning the canyon for it seems excessive. The Grant Avenue "bike blocks" around the 21st street area are a complete fiasco, and I have never seen a single bike on that street, and now they want to expand it! A walking trail, a rail line and bike lanes in the canyon would be great, but to put them through people's back yards would be wrong, especially since there are so many other places for biking and hiking. Some have argued that the bike path is necessary as an alternative route through the canyon, but the truth is that Trappers Loop does that, and it does it much better than a trail would.</p> <p>I hope reason will prevail.</p> <p>Thanks for all your work on this important project and for all your attention to the details and for your willingness to involve the public.</p> <p>Gary</p>	Gary Godfrey	5/20/2016 0:00
Meeting	I don't like the proposals of utilizing my private properties for a trail system. I oppose the trails on my properties and don't think it is legal, fair, or right. I am seeking legal council on the matter.	John Falls	5/20/2016 0:00
Meeting	Looks like nothing much is going to change except for a possible trail. The trail would be a good thing since bicycles are a big hazard. Another suggestion I would have to help improve traffic flow would be to have more turnouts and pass a law that if you have more than 5 cars built up behind you that you must pullover and let them pass.	Brent Openshaw	5/20/2016 6:00
Meeting	<p>We attended your open house at the ATK Center. Were very surprised to find you had printed a map for everyone showing a bike path right through our back yard. The Pineview water pipeline runs through our property, they have an easement to maintain this pipeline. They do not have an easement to use it for a bike and hiking trail. We have private roads to and from our home, which we maintain. We will never give permission for this use. If there is to be a trail, it should be along the road, not through anyone's private property. Ogden Canyon is a scenic byway. It is a beautiful drive. It is not meant to be a freeway, please do not ruin it by making it a more straight road so that cars are able to drive faster.</p> <p>We enjoy the trails Ogden has established. However walking on these trails at the Parkway just last week we see 2 Walmart shopping carts, one in the river. Many bottles, cans and lots of dog poop just thrown anywhere. The general public is not very good at taking care of these public places. Why would we want them in our yards? We have had to place no trespassing signs as we get some bikers, hikers, and walkers. They leave a mess we have to pick up after.</p> <p>Bikers are a small group of our population. Why should they have more rights than those of us who own this property. Maybe there just isn't room for a bike path everywhere.</p> <p>Thank you for asking for our input, Nick and Gail Breeze</p>	Nick and Gail Breeze	5/23/2016 0:00
Meeting	I am against bike riders as well as pedestrians in the canyon. The road is not large enough to safely get around them. They are going to get hit when u can't stop and some one is coming the other way. So who do u hit the car coming the other direction or the bike rider. Keep them out of the canyon. Can u take your bike down the freeway. No	Lance Olson	5/23/2016 0:00

CRAIL PEERY

Owners of Peery Camp are unalterably and permanently opposed to government seizing private property for recreational use using eminent domain.

QUESTIONS (some of the questions) the current proposal leaves unanswered:

*Why is UDOT funding a study for a bike/hiking path which is clearly out of it's jurisdiction? Is this yet another covert plot by the unelected bureaucrats in the League of Cities. If not why is the Ogden City Mayor (both previous, and current) lobbying for the path (without the knowledge or support of the City Council-see appendix) when it is clearly outside his jurisdiction? Why does this proposal keep coming up year after year, when it is clear there is unalterable opposition to it from most residents of Ogden Canyon?

- HOW MANY CYCLISTS? HOW MANY HIKERS? It is claimed that, "thousands" of people are in favor of a bike and hiking paths in the canyon. It is ALSO apparent that tens of thousands of college students in Utah agree with Senator Sanders that college education and health care should be free, but isn't this pie in the sky? Can we get more specific please.

For example, the planning document implies that 4 bicyclists every six seconds will use the Canyon (around 250,000 per year.) Currently there may be 4 bicyclists per day.

The plan states that bicyclists want to commute. Really? How many people from Huntsville want to commute daily (summer only, remember) through Ogden Canyon?? Currently are there 2?

What is the current annual usage of the Indian Trail?

-WHAT IS THE COST? First the legal war between Canyon residents and their County Government to seize homes and property, to expand rights of way beyond legal boundaries, to pay for seized property, etc etc (Conservative estimate over \$10,000,000.00)--plus possible permanent animus between County Commission and private property owners in the Canyon, and the larger County. Then comes construction (dynamiting canyon rock formations, cantilevered paths over the river, and around tunnels (see appendix for possible costs and troubles with exotic engineering), viaducts, reconfiguring highway, etc etc

Estimated total monetary costs in excess of \$50,000,000.00. Does the County Commission have this kind of spare change? The partly completed ring path around Ogden Valley is currently soliciting \$200,000.00 for completion of a small portion of their project. Doesn't seem like money for trails is that easy to come by...

How much of the Canyon are we willing to dynamite? How much river are we willing to cover over?

How much loss of wildlife (see appendix) and Canyon ecosystem are we willing to lose?

How much loss of water quality though public urination and defecation can we accept? Note: Since the introduction of the Indian Trail, e-coli and giardia (from public defecation into the watershed) have made Warm Water Canyon Creek water unsafe for human consumption.

How much loss of quiet, privacy, safety and security (personal and property) can be inflicted on (the few remaining) private property owners?

-WHO WILL PAY? Assume there are a thousand bicyclists who would use the canyon...Cost would be over \$50,000.00 per bicyclist. If there are 50,000 bicyclists then each could pay a \$1000 fee to cover the costs.

-WHY SET UP A HIKING PATH THAT IS DISCONNECTED FROM THE INDIAN TRAIL AND SO ISOLATED THAT IT IS A FIVE MILE HIKE OR NOTHING-WITH NO RESTROOM FACILITIES?

-HOW MUCH BIKING/HIKING TRAIL MILEAGE DO WE REALLY NEED?

There are existing trails through Ogden, the Bonnaville Shoreline trail, a planned 19 mile biking hiking trail in Ogden Valley, and numerous other trails throughout the County and vicinity. Do we really NEED that much more when the costs are so high?

OBSERVATIONS and SUGGESTIONS.

Proceed in steps.

* If the County Commission is serious about increasing biking/hiking use and safety in the canyon they should lobby the state to return jurisdiction of SR-39 to the County. Then the roadway could be modified in the following ways:

- It could be made a toll road—like East Millcreek Canyon in Salt Lake County.
- Speed could be limited to 20 mph via speed bumps.
- in the narrow parts of the canyon up to half the road could be turned over to biker/hikers.
- One way traffic, regulated by traffic lights-- in the particularly narrow areas--could accommodate cars and biker/hikers, without jeopardizing emergency access.
- Those who want to access the Canyon Road would do it because they wanted to slow down and enjoy its natural scenic beauty (it is designated as a State Scenic Byway).

We already lived through some of this when the new water system was put in. Canyon noise was reduced, traffic declined, traffic use over Trappers Loop increased

* As a state road:

- Bicycles have and will always have legal access to the road.
- Trucks (including semi-trucks with their obnoxious engine brakes) will always have access to the road
- Bicycles and trucks and cars have to obey current laws and continue to work together.

By the way, use of Ogden Canyon Road is declining year by year currently. Trappers Loop use is increasing.

* If more hiking in the Canyon's scenic beauty is needed, why not develop the Cold Water Canyon Creek fork of the Indian Trail. There was once a WPA camp (for the workers who built the wall along the Canyon road) in this area. The story of this camp, the great depression, the WPA is of great historic interest, and is being lost—at least as evidenced in the Canyon. Restore some of that camp area. It would be a wonderful hike, the story of the camp is of great historic interest. There is already a trail head, etc.

* One of the suggestions in the planning document is to run a trail from the mouth of the canyon part way up. Large corporations own much of the land on the north side of the river for the first mile into the canyon. For around \$2,000,000.00 it is likely that that trail could be developed for a mile up the canyon, and connected to the Ogden river parkway downstream. That would add two mile hike into the canyon (up and back) to the exiting several miles of parkway, and shoreline trail hiking.

* If after doing the above the County budget and appetite for biker/hiker trails continues to be insatiable, run a bridge across the river (below the Peery property) back to the road and make necessary adjustments on the road shoulders to connected with the current Indian Trail trailhead. That would make a loop of about 8 or 9 miles for canyon/scenic hiking without having to destroy private property in the canyon.

We have miles and miles and miles and miles of biker/hiker trails in the county. How much is enough?

Ogden City Recreation Planning Meeting
Ben Lomand High School
2012 March 29

Appendix 1

JCP: Ogden city is a part of the league of cities, is that correct?

OCRCP: Yes.

JCP: This spring the League of Cities apparently sponsored, sub rosa – under the table, a bill to condemn private property for trails and recreational purposes. Is that favored in the city? Is the city Council pushing that?

OCRCP: I'm not aware of that. I don't think that's our plan. I know we have some city Council members here who might be able to speak to that. I'm not familiar with it.

City Council Member: I feel like there are a lot of restrictions on that, it's not some kind of blanket thing. They have to have 70% to 80% of the property owners agree.

JCP: That wasn't in the Bill (HR 429).

City Council Member: so 70% have to agree before they can condemn the property.

JCP: That wasn't in the bill.

City Council Member: as far as I know it was in the bill.

JCP: Believe me, I know the bill. The plan had to be 80% complete, the master plan.

City Council Member: it has to conform to the plan.

JCP: Right. So I'm wondering if it's Ogden city's policy to confiscate property for dog walking.

OCRCP: No

City Council Member. No... No, No.

JCP: So you're not going to do that. And in some sense then you don't agree with the house bill HB 429?

OCRCP: As far as I knew it didn't pass.

JCP: It didn't pass, but it will be back, because it's the League of Cities that's pushing it.

Attendee: I'm not sure this is the right forum to discuss that. The city Council would probably be a better forum. Because we have a lot to do tonight.

JCP: I thought I was asking questions about policy and recreation. My last question is I know that the mayor of Ogden last November was lobbying for, and asking for personal meetings with property owners in the county to give up property rights for "recreational" use. And I was wondering about that. I know that for a fact. But that's news to the city?

City Council Member: The city Council doesn't know about it? We are not aware.

JCP: So the issues I'm raising are not imminent?

City Council Member: No.

JCP: Okay

OCRCP: unintelligible... We've had a lot of input countywide... We need the trails... Countywide .And of course. How Ogden City sees that is something to take to the City Council... And see how that goes over...

Unintelligible

JCP: But there's no particular "eminent domain" enthusiasm, if I'm hearing you right.

City Council Member: No not at all.

JCP: Okay. Thank you.

WILDLIFE IN PEERY CAMP

Appendix Z



Following the game path from mountain to river for water.



Bald Eagle leaves as soon as he spots people!!



Red Breasted Merganser not previously known to breed in Utah

Year round Mallard ducks.

Additional animals seen but too tricky to photograph:

Cougar, Bobcat, Mountain Goat, Cormorant, Flicker, Downy Woodpecker, Barn Owl, Redtailed Hawk, Sparrow Hawk, Lazuli Bunting, Dipper, other varieties of duck, plus many other more common birds, and animals, racoon, squirrels, skunks etc.

The Animals pictured along with these others described will immediately disappear and leave the area if 10's to 100's of biker hikers pass through.

We have been working hard to encourage a supportive environment for wildlife. These animals get no vote, but we would like to speak for them in opposing loss of their homes and habitat.

Two Dead in Brazil After Bike Path Collapses - Newsweek

Photos shared on social media show a large section of the bike path missing; it is believed to have been swept into the sea. It's not immediately clear how or why the path collapsed. The path ran for several miles through southern sections of Rio. **This exotic engineering is expensive and can be dangerous**

<http://www.newsweek.com/brazil-bike-path-collapses-rio-olympic-games-450806>



LA TIMES Photo

A bike lane is missing a section after it collapsed onto the beach below in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Thursday, April 21, 2016. The bike lane built ahead of the Olympic Games collapsed, killing at least two people who were on it when cement gave way. (AP Photo/Felipe Dana)



<http://bigstory.ap.org/article/c6782f6aeee84005a1b2d8ac621e596a/bike-lane-brazil-built-ahead-olympics-collapses>

Notice public recreation continues as the dead bodies lie on the beach!

May 19, 2016

William H. King
Vice President, Operations
Rainbow Gardens Corporation
1851 Valley Drive
Ogden, Utah 84401
mzzzyt@aol.com
801-621-0150

Ogden Canyon Transportation Use Study
% Horrocks Engineering
4905 S. 1500 West #100
Riverdale, UTah 84405
ogdencanyonstudy@utah.gov

cc: Horrocks Engineering
2162 W. Grove Parkway Ste. 400
Pleasant Grove, UT 84062

Re: Comments on Ogden Canyon Use Study

Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Environmental Focus group for the Ogden Canyon Transportation Use Study. The Study has collected a lot of information, much of which might prove to be useful for future generations. Perhaps the greatest achievement of the study is an aerial map which identifies the current transportation status in Ogden Canyon along with potential changes.

The Ogden Canyon Transportation Use Study seems to be a study in search for problems to be solved within the Ogden Canyon corridor, rather than a study to propose solutions to problems that already clearly exist. A good example of this are the exaggerated projections of growth in the study of the average daily traffic counts in the canyon. Traffic counts have remained slightly under 8,000 cars per day and have been stable over the period of the past fifteen years. Rather than growing in numbers, they are in reality flat. While the accidents and fatalities in Ogden Canyon are elevated in comparison to a straight 24 foot rural highway, they compare favorably to roads of a similar size and nature such as Logan Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, Millcreek Canyon and Emigration Canyon. Ogden Canyon has a better track record than nearby connecting roads, such as Hwy. 39 and Harrison Boulevard, 20th Street and Harrison Boulevard, Valley Drive, and Hwy. 39/158 in the Ogden Valley next to Pineview Dam. The rebuilding of the road through Ogden Canyon is a much lower priority than re-building the above-mentioned intersections on Harrison Boulevard. Rather than re-building Hwy. 39

through Ogden Canyon, UDOT should make many needed minor improvements on the road as suggested below.

The King/Peery family has supported a new trail system in Ogden Canyon since the 1930's, when Ogden Mayor Harman W. Peery attempted to build an equestrian trail up the canyon, but was thwarted by canyon property owners, which might still prove to be a roadblock in 2016. The King family/Rainbow Gardens continues to support a trail going up the canyon, but we view it differently than the the Transportation Study. It is, to us, a five mile linear parkway and not a form of alternative transportation between Ogden City and the Ogden Valley.

Rainbow Gardens Corporation currently has four major trails adjacent to or crossing our property of nearly 200 acres at the Mouth of Ogden Canyon. These include the Bonneville Shoreline Trail southbound, the Bird Song Trail, the Ogden River Parkway, and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail north towards North Ogden. Additionally, there are segments of other adjacent trails on our property. We have dedicated, in cooperation with Ogden City, the southwest portion of our parking lot for use by trail users. This area contains 68 parking stalls. We regularly count the number of cars utilizing these spaces.

On a prime holiday or weekend day in the springtime, when the temperature is 60-80 degrees and the trails are dry and the sun is shining we estimate that 220 people cross the trails on our property. This of course, does not include those on the Ogden Marathon Day or those using the Ogden Ski Bus operation in our parking lot. In the winter, from late November to mid-March, only about 11 people a day use the trail system. On an average day during the year, we believe that about 104 people use the trails per day, or about 38,000 total people per year. We have frequent conversations with the trail users, as many of them use our restroom facilities inside the building of our business. The primary reason they use the trails systems is for recreation. Rarely do we encounter someone who is using the trail system to travel from one part of Ogden to another on their way to work or for other shopping errands.

Once the Ogden Canyon Trail System is connected to the trails at the Mouth of Ogden Canyon, we estimate that 20-40% of the people (or 7,600 to 15,200 per year) that are traveling through our property will explore the newly opened trail system going up the canyon for recreational activities. These numbers pale in comparison to the overly robust estimates of the Alta Planning Group which believes that 220,000 will visit the proposed new trail system in Ogden Canyon. The number of people using the new Ogden Canyon Trail as an alternative form of transportation would be very small indeed, if at all. Also, the number of people in Ogden Valley who might use the trail for alternative transportation from the upper to the lower valley, might only be a couple a day at best. We are in favor of building a separate trail system on the north side of the Ogden River and believe it is a reasonable proposal. However, building an additional bicycle trail next to the canyon road on the pretense of building alternative transportation routes would be costly and dangerous to both the bicycle riders and vehicle drivers.

In the conclusions presented for Phase II of the study, it was suggested that Weber County should be in charge of managing and policing the new trail system going up Ogden Canyon on the north side of the Ogden River because it falls into their jurisdiction. Since it is apparent that the new trail system will be used almost exclusively for recreation and not for transportation, we think that it would be appropriate to turn the entire trail project over to Weber County. This trail is beyond the purview of UDOT, because it is recreational and not a form of alternative transportation.

One of the big concerns on the Ogden Canyon Road are serious accidents involving drivers going off the road or crossing the middle lane. Actions that could be taken to address these problems would include but are by no means limited to:

- repainting the double yellow lines at least every year and posting "No Passing Signs"
- painting a yellow fluorescent stripe on the concrete barriers and regularly replace the damaged reflectors on top of the barriers
- removing all tree limbs hanging over the road and deadwood from the sides of the road
- installing street lights at every cross-traffic location
- installing caution signs encouraging the use of daytime headlights
- sweeping loose, fallen rocks and other road hazards off the road daily
- utilization of the new fiber optics system going up the canyon for a weather station, traffic cameras and traffic counters
- installing new signage stating "Narrow Road and Shoulder, Vehicles over 8 1/2 feet wide Prohibited Without Permit"
- paved turn-outs. Build small parking lots at regular intervals and then prohibit any other parking directly on the canyon road
- prohibit triple-trailers in the canyon because they waiver, drift and have great difficulty stopping quickly
- UDOT should purchase the right of the way for all the road shoulder that it doesn't already own so that they can be regularly and properly maintained
- Utah Highway Patrol should assist the Weber County Sheriff's office enforcing the traffic laws in Ogden Canyon on a regular basis, especially infractions involving crossing the middle line and over-sized loads
- variable speed limits like those being used in Parley's Canyon

One of the big disappointments of the Ogden Canyon Transportation Use Study is its reliance on conclusions drawn from an internet survey conducted during Phase I. Internet surveys are subject to sampling errors, bias and manipulation by interested parties and are notoriously unreliable. See for example: "The Fallacy of Online Surveys: No Data Are Better Than Bad Data" (http://www.responsivemanagement.com/news_from/2010-05-04.htm). We call for a scientific survey conducted by the likes of Dan Jones & Associates, Brigham Young University, or Utah State University. The survey should include a scientific sample of all of the people of

Weber County. Additionally, the taxpayers of Weber County should be asked in a ballot initiative whether they are willing to pay their share of the costs for any proposed changes to Ogden Canyon, whether that be \$10 million, \$50 million or even \$100 million or more.

Ogden Canyon has a long and important history because of its peculiar and rugged beauty that has attracted many visitors including Presidents of the United States, Governors, Mayors and foreign dignitaries. It is vital to preserve and protect this historical legacy and geological treasure for future generations and there is definitely a Federal nexus. We therefore call for a full Environmental Impact Statement and public comment for any new project that would impact Ogden Canyon, especially anything that would cut into the mountains or building into or on the Ogden River.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'W.H. King', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

William H. King

OFFICERS

Mark G. Hodson
President
Robert E. Lindquist
1st Vice President
William G. Holt
2nd Vice President
Benjamin D. Quick
General Manager
Tamera Marlinson
Secretary-Treasurer
Michael V. Houtz
Legal Counsel



TRUSTEES
Mark G. Hodson
Robert E. Lindquist
Paul W. Nelson
William G. Holt
John P. Valcarce
Rick Hancock
Kenton Moffett
Dolph Woods
David S. Humphreys

May 19, 2016

Ogden River Water Users' Association would like to present its concerns about a proposal to use a significant portion of the Ogden Canyon Pipeline corridor as a recreational trail.

The Ogden Canyon Pipeline is an irrigation and power generating pipeline that begins at the Pineview Reservoir dam and travels the full length of Ogden Canyon. The pipeline is owned by the Bureau of Reclamation and Pacificorp. The land that encompasses the pipeline is owned by the Bureau of Reclamation. Ogden River Water Users Association, herein after referred to as the Association, is responsible for the maintenance and operation of the land and the pipeline.

The Association has agreed to consider the possibility of allowing a trail along the pipeline corridor but has a number of concerns and reservations. Among the concerns are:

- Dam and pipeline security
- Public parking at base of dam
- Fall protection along the corridor
- Rock, land, & debris fall protection
- Injury & death liability
- Maintenance responsibility
- Access around tunnels that contain the pipeline
- Low overhead powerlines
- Infrastructure vandalism
- Inadvertent damage to the pipeline and bridge structures
- Proximity of proposed trail to Ogden Canyon residents' homes and property
- Ingress & egress of the corridor

The preceding list is some and may not be all of the Association's concerns. Until all of the Association's concerns are sufficiently addressed to the satisfaction of the Association, a trail along the corridor will not be granted.

Sincerely,

Benjamin D. Quick
General Manager
Ogden River Water Users' Association