

It's heartening to know that Boulder can be at the top of the list for generous community grants. That has been a worthwhile lesson out of this pedestrian pathway UDOT grant.

At this point, however, it seems unnecessary and possibly detrimental to jump into a \$600K+ commitment without a more thorough understanding of the bigger picture.

1. According to an *Insider* report from Torrey's Town Council a couple weeks ago, Torrey is on board to procure a FREE, soft path walkway/bike path along Hwy 24 from UDOT.
2. From the Governor's office to the Garfield County Commission, there is current action toward identifying needs, designing projects, and funding bike/walking paths along Hwy 12, throughout Garfield County. In fact, the public works director, Dave Dodds, at a meeting two weeks ago, put out a notice requesting public input and ideas on their communities "active transportation" needs, in preparation for a finished plan by this summer.

Given these two realities, plus a large swath of Boulder residents unenthusiastic and/or opposed to the current UDOT ped path plan, it seems prudent to back up and reevaluate this particular grant project. Local concerns should be given serious consideration, but there also should be a clearer understanding of the broader picture at play.

How does this project fit in the context of a larger, cross-county plan? What other programs are available, such as UDOT's soft-path In Torrey? What is Boulder's long-range plan for providing safe walkways throughout town for kids and older or disabled people?

Can we table the current plan? Consider it a valuable learning experience and now fine tune a more holistic plan that is in line with the county's goals, as well as Boulder's businesses and residents across the board?

Jacqui Smalley 11/14/2023

Comment on the proposed Park Path

Utah Department of Transportation
Boulder Town Council

There is a clear need for a safe way to travel from the center of Town to. The local Business without the fear you may be run over on Hwy. 12.

This path is a significant part of the safety of the community for many years to come. People are worried what color, what its going to be made from, how are they going to maintain the path.

The path already is not very well maintained the willows are out of control. The image of the Town is not very pleasing as it is. I believe this to be a very positive improvement to Hwy. 12 and the Town.

I have lived here for far more years than most if we could only go back 20 years with no development how many of you would be here today?

Thanks Brenda Catmull

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Brenda Catmull". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed name.

BOULDER, UTAH
A proposed pathway

To Whom it may concern:

Utah Department of Transportation
Boulder Town Council

I have lived in Boulder Utah for 40 plus years, and during that time the community has seen many improvements to the infrastructures to which serve the community now and for many years to follow. We went from dirt roads and mud to pick up your mail to chip seal and gravel and the paving of the Boulder Mountain Hwy. 12.

That improvements are now being enjoyed by many new residents and travelers along with internet, phone service, electric charging station. Chances are they are not willing give any of this but ready to give up a safe walk way. The existing pathway is already seven to 9 feet wide.

This project is crucial for everybody to be safe when traveling throughout our local communities and State. There will not be a need to push a baby stroller on Hwy12 or a Wheelchair to have access to the most unsafe area of travel in our community. This path will also give access to the community park and the core areas of the community

The main issue here is public safety, not that it will disrupt local business for possibility 60 days during their chosen limited hours of operation. These are the same businesses that are also creating the needed for better safety.

This is a needed improvement for all of the Boulder Town Residents and Visitor to enjoy regardless of your age or physical ability. We need a good safe pedestrian pathway place to travel along Hwy. 12 in Boulder.

The intersection of the Burr Trail and Hwy. 12 is still a place waiting for another accident to happen. There is no clear approach entering Hwy. 12 from the Burr Trail. Burr Trail traffic is always in the middle of the road prohibiting you from making a safe turn from either direction . . .

Thank you Randy Catmull



To the Mayor and city council,

I am thrilled with this project of the city sidewalk, even though I would love to see it longer. I'm saddened it won't start sooner & completion sooner.

It not only will be a fun place for kids to ride their bikes & walk. It is a safety issue of keeping children and adults from walking on the shoulder of Hwy. 12 for that short stretch.

Sincerely

Laura DeMay

P.O. Box 1321

Boulder UT

84716

August 19, 2023


Boulder Town,

I am writing this letter to show my support for the pedestrian path. I have lived in this beautiful town of Boulder since 1995 when I moved here at just 5 years old. I grew up in this town; I attended Boulder Elementary and Escalante High School only leaving for a few years to attend University. My husband, Ron LeFevre and I have been Boulder residents ever since and are raising our three young boys here. Growing up and raising young kids in this rural town is such a blessing. Like many kids, riding my bike everywhere I could in this town meant riding out along Highway 12 right with the busy traffic. With the increase in tourism over the years, the traffic has also increased. As a kid, I wanted so badly to have somewhere to ride my bike on concrete or a paved trail that wasn't on the highway. The only place back then and still today is at the LDS church which only has concrete around three sides of the building and a paved parking lot.

I love and frequently use the gravel path through the park and down to the businesses. I love having a place to enjoy a walk while my kids play soccer or roll around in the grass. I have had tiny newborns that I was pushing in a stroller, little toddlers who can make it only a few feet walking before needing to be pushed in some sort of fun car or bike, bigger toddlers who can ride a bike but aren't as stable and wobble back and forth all over the place, to bigger kids now that love being able to ride bikes, scooters, roller blades/skates, wiggle cars and many other things that involve wheels. Up until this year, I worked for Hell's Backbone Grill. The past couple of years, while my kids were in school, it was so nice to have an area off of Highway 12 for them to safely walk from the school down to my work after school. Unfortunately, if they wanted to ride a bike, they could not ride down the pathway because they would be right on Highway 12 with the traffic. Trying to ride something with wheels or push anything with wheels in that gravel is so dang hard, and you will not make it far.

We live in an incredible area between National Parks and National Forests that offers countless areas to get out and about on beautiful walks in nature and many are within a few minutes of Boulder Town. However, there is nowhere to safely walk on a stable surface if you are someone with a disability and may need a walker or wheelchair or someone who may not have a disability but is a little unstable, or just have young kids, like me who have so many things they love to ride. I live close enough to the subdivision that my children can ride their things on that road, and although that is still a public road, thankfully there are a lower number of cars which makes it easier for me to look out for my children's safety. I am grateful to the Town Council for considering this all-inclusive pathway that will benefit many members of our community and visitors alike; my family included! There are so many amazing things about living in Boulder, and there are also many inconveniences living in Boulder. It would be so nice to have something convenient in this Town to enjoy as a family, instead of having to pack up our bikes, roller skates, and push cars to drive to the next town or two towns over just to enjoy a day outside having a stable, clean pathway to ride on.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jessica LeFevre". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jessica LeFevre

September 6, 2023

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to put into writing my desire to have a paved, walking path as it has been proposed in Boulder Town.

I am a permanent Boulder resident. I suffered a devastating stroke in 2010, and because of that I am disabled. Walking on uneven surfaces is just not safe or enjoyable for me. I would very much like to have a paved, outdoor path that I could use. I question the ethics of not having a suitable path. What about strollers, bikes and wheelchairs? There is currently no space for them except at the side of the road. Vehicles travel this highway with a speed limit of 40 mph. This certainly is not safe.

Another important point is that most of the cost is a gift from the State of Utah. Why would we want to pass up an offer for a sidewalk to make our town safer, cleaner, separated from the highway for exercise, and handicap accessible, etc.?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Larry R. Van Quill". The signature is written in a cursive style with some loops and flourishes.

Larry R. Van Quill, a resident and registered voter
583 North 1st West
Boulder, Utah

September 6, 2023

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to put into writing my desire to have a paved, walking path as it has been proposed in Boulder Town. Safety is very important, maybe the most important consideration of all. I recently was driving out of Torrey, Utah and observed their path being used by people of all ages safely away from cars and trucks. This proposed sidewalk in Boulder has a 40 mph speed limit and is used by many different kinds of vehicles on Highway 12. I don't even need to mention distracted drivers or energetic children.

I also think it would be an attractive asset to an already beautiful place.

Another important point is that most of the cost is a gift from the State of Utah. Why would we want to pass up an offer to make our town safer, cleaner, more accessible for exercise, etc.?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Barbara Van Quill".

Barbara Van Quill, a resident and registered voter
583 North 1st West
Boulder, Utah

John Veranth
750 West Highway 12, PO Box 1304
Boulder, Utah 84716

May 3, 2023

To: Boulder Town Council
Sent by email to TC@boulder.utah.gov

Public Comment Regarding Pedestrian Path

I regret not being able to speak in person, but I have a Friday flight out of Salt Lake City. Please accept this written comment.

My professional background was as an engineer and was involved in the design of complex industrial projects that often involved difficult tradeoffs. I believe problems have solutions - you just need to consider alternatives until something acceptable to all stakeholders emerges.

As I previously showed with a diagram, there is sufficient space for both a pedestrian trail and off-pavement parking between the highway and the fence. The Boulder Mountain Lodge and Hells Backbone Grill are important for our local economy and these businesses need to have parking available for large vehicles during peak business hours.

Debi Stout
P.O. Box 1305
Boulder, UT 84716

Tel: (801) 335-7316
Fax: (801) 335-7516

September 1, 2023

Boulder Town Council
Boulder, UT 84716

To Whom It May Concern:

I am in favor of the A.D.A. sidewalk.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Debi Stout". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Sincerely,".

Debi Stout

Sam Stout
P.O. Box 1305
Boulder, UT 84716

Tel: (801) 335-7316
Fax: (801) 335-7516

September 1, 2023

Boulder Town Council
Boulder, UT 84716

To Whom It May Concern:

I am chairman of the Boulder Park Committee, we voted in favor of the A.D.A. sidewalk. This would be a good thing for disabled people and disabled veterans. I can't believe how callous some people in town are against this A.D.A. sidewalk. As it is the trail is gravel and does not support wheelchairs. This is also a safety factor to keep people from walking down the narrow shoulder of Highway 12.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Sc' followed by a long horizontal stroke that ends in a small upward hook.

Chairman Boulder Park Committee
Sam Stout

Josh Ellis
PO Box 1406
Boulder, UT 84716

April 26, 2023

Dear Boulder Town Council:

This letter is a public comment in regards to the Boulder Town Pedestrian Path project. Just to be clear, Jill got a pair of rollerblades last week and is definitely stoked on a big long concrete path.

However, as a member of the small group who spent months rewriting the General Plan during the last major revision, I feel it's important to point out a few inconsistencies in the General Plan with the 8' wide concrete path (including curb and gutters) currently proposed to cut through the core of town.

Within the town ordinances, TITLE XV: LAND USAGE makes it clear that the purpose of Town Council and its appointments/officers is to adopt and implement the General Plan. The introduction to the General Plan states:

The Boulder Town Council adopts this General Plan as an advisory guide for land use decisions and further requires that all land use decisions be found to be consistent with the provisions of the General Plan. As provided by the Act at Section 10-9a-406, "no street, park, or other public way, ground, place, or space, no publicly owned building or structure, and no public utility, whether publicly or privately owned, may be constructed or authorized until and unless it conforms to the General Plan, as adopted."

That said, the proposed project **must** conform to the General Plan. So, what does the General Plan say about the trail?

The trail in its current form is discussed in the General Plan under Chapter 10 (Transportation), subsection 10-3 Trails. It says:

10-3 Trails

Trail access, such as historic cattle trails including Highway 12 and the Burr Trail, should be maintained to facilitate the movement of livestock.

A public trail within the Town Park and along Highway 12 to the Boulder Mountain Lodge was developed in 2013. Plans for continuing the trail system down to Hills and Hollows and up through the Community Center Park to the Anasazi Museum is in consideration. This trail system is intended to provide safe pedestrian access for locals and visitors through the middle of town, as well as providing better exposure to more of Boulder's services and businesses.

It is important to note that the current public trail is discussed alongside historic cattle trails precisely because it has a similar character. It was definitely intended to remain that way. Note that the plans include "continuing the trail system" and not "upgrading the trail system". Note that no mention of a normal concrete sidewalk is made here, let alone an 8' wide one.

The Goals and Policies listed for Transportation (subsection 10-6), which are intended to specifically direct the Town in how to proceed regarding the items discussed in the section, states:

Goal 2: To promote safety for equestrian, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic as viable alternatives to automobile traffic.

Policies:

G2-1 Promote non-motorized trails along major roadways.

It is important to note that under Goal 2, safety for equestrian traffic is listed first and this was intentional on our part. It is not clear how an 8' wide paved path—versus simply continuing the current path—supports the safety of equestrian traffic alongside major roadways.

More important to note is Policy G2-1. These policy statements are explicit directions to the Town based upon the elements and goals discussed in the General Plan. Policy G2-1 explicitly states that Boulder town shall undertake regulations and make decisions that “promote non-motorized trails”.

If we had envisioned that someone would ever propose an 8' wide concrete path instead of the current trail, we would have explicitly listed an additional policy stating that the trail remain in substantially equivalent to its current form. However, this is most definitely implied in the “non-motorized use” policy. An 8' wide concrete path cannot be adequately maintained (i.e., plowed) without regular motorized use.

Moreover, since our last major General Plan revision, there has been an unimaginable and largely unforeseeable proliferation in the electrification and motorization of *everything*. Creating an 8' wide paved path through the middle of town is a clear invitation for motorized use just like taking an old cattle trail and adding an 8' strip of pavement would *inevitably* result in motorized use of the trail. We do not have the enforcement resources required to prevent motorized misuse of a 8' paved path.

Additionally, there is an important statement in Section 12-7 Recreation and Parks that reinforces the points above (emphasis added):

The intent for this public area is to provide an open space within the center of the Town, **with the focus on maintaining a natural setting with a walkway** and integral play features.

The purpose of the Parks and Recreation within the town, according to the General Plan, is to maintain a natural setting *first and foremost* with the walkway clearly secondary. No one can claim that an 8' wide chunk of pavement with curbs and gutters cutting through town “maintains a natural setting with a walkway”.

Additionally, the lack of an 8' wide paved pathway in town is an explicit expectation of living in Boulder as stated in the Overview to Chapter 12 Public Facilities and Services:

A trade-off of living in Boulder is the relative lack of public facilities and services. This does not appear to detract from the overall quality of life for current residents

Indeed, the lack of public facilities and services isn't a problem that needs solved here because it's actually an integral part of the character of our community that the General Plan aims to maintain.

So unfortunately, despite my wife's excitement and new rollerblades, I hope it is abundantly clear that the intent of the General Plan is to develop the trail in a substantially-equivalent form and that paving an 8' wide strip through the middle of town replete with curbs and gutters is most definitely NOT congruent with the General Plan which are you obligated to implement.

Sincerely,



Josh Ellis

To the Boulder Town Clerk Jessica LeFever,

Public Comment from Tina Karlsson, Boulder Resident

Date May 2nd, 2023

Regarding the ADA pathway option brought to the town by Jimmy Catmull:

Thank you Jimmy for bringing this grant option to the communities attention. Grants are really helpful, especially for a small community like ours. We have gotten many grants in the past to help in community projects.

And with community support, we can choose grants that fit our needs and I feel that this one should take a pass.

Here are some questions and my comments:

There is grant money available for an ADA project but is this proposal a needed or desired option for our town?

Is it an appropriate use of town funds?

The permeable pathway we have was chosen as an appropriate option for the intended use and it is also very maintainable by the town.

An 8-foot wide cement/concrete pathway would not be so easily maintainable by the town, and I don't think it is appropriate to replace what we already have.

I suggest the priority for ADA needs in town should start with the front door of our community center.

Public infrastructure needs public input and general consensus. The first step in securing grants should start at the community level with a set of priorities that the community is willing to support and fund.

I encourage the town council to start to solicit projects the community is interested in funding, prioritize the project, and then look for grant money to help if needed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Tina Karlsson

Town Council Members

I am writing this letter in response to information provided at the Work Meeting on November 14th. I signed the petition mentioned and found it to be very simple to read and understand. There was no misinformation given in the introduction. It was simple and straightforward (*Boulder Town Council may vote at their September 7 meeting to accept a grant to build a ½ mile, \$683,000, 8-foot wide concrete path through the Town Park to the Burr Trail*). There were concerns listed and petition signees were asked if they shared these and other concerns. Over 130 people read these concerns and signed the petition. I would suggest the Town Council recognize they owe these constituents answers, not a dismissal of their concerns.

One of my greatest concerns is the long term maintenance of a ½ mile concrete path. Using the rough numbers of the length of the path and assuming each individual section is 8' x 8', there will be a total of around 330 sections. Each of these sections is subject to tilting, spalling, cracking, etc. Cost to repair or replace a section could cost \$200-\$600. If you look at the sidewalk from the old Escalante Elementary to Escalante High School, numerous sections have been replaced and repaired. I suggested the Town Council have someone contact Escalante City to find out what their cost has been to keep it safe. I never got a response. In addition to these costs, what will it take in extra maintenance labor and supplies to keep weeds out of the expansion joints, edges trimmed, debris from erosion and cattle drives swept off, and sections deiced?

Another concern raised in the petition is the coordination of the path with other future State and County projects. The UDOT Active Transportation Plan shows a parallel bike path along Highway 12 planned in the future. It will be part of a bike path system across the county. The proposed Pedestrian Path would be unnecessary when this occurs. There was also a recent grant application to modify the Burr Trail/Highway 12 intersection. It wasn't funded but could be in the future. Coordination with these projects have not been adequately addressed by the Town Council.

The idea that the path has to be 8' wide assumes moderate use by touring bicyclists passing through town. No cyclist I know would ride 1 minute, get off their bike to open and close a gate, and then ride 2 minutes to the pavilion where they then would reroute back to Highway 12. The bicycle, scooter, skateboard use would be by locals and that doesn't require 8' of concrete. Another misconception being pushed is this will be an ADA path requiring it be concrete or asphalt. This is false. I think town residents would overwhelmingly be in favor of resurfacing the current path to make it ADA accessible using fine gravel or another suitable substrate.

The petition lists Alignment with the Boulder Town General Plan as a concern. I think the letter by Josh Ellis accurately addresses this but hasn't been discussed by the Town Council.

My final concern is the Town spending Class B and C Road money on the path. This money could be better spent upgrading, improving, chip sealing roads in town such as 100 North (Rice), 200 North (Wilson), 100 West (Brems), 100 East (Ahlstrom) and the Lower Boulder Road. The current council should not encumber future councils with this project.

Thank You,

Steve Cox

Boulder Town Council


As one of the 130+ Boulder residents who signed the petition against the current plan for the Pedestrian Path, I was very disappointed when the will of this many people was totally discounted. Therefore, I'm writing the letter as support for my decision to sign that petition. It wasn't confusing or misleading, but it did point out six questions, most that still have yet to be addressed.

My biggest concern is the project does not add anything to the current trail except for maintenance costs in the future and with an 8 foot cement trail that long, there will be a lot of future costs to keep it from becoming a hazard. In the work meeting, there was some discussion about sealing the sidewalk. We currently have a sidewalk in front of the community center I doubt has ever been sealed and is cracking and crumbling. Why would the park sidewalk be any better? The costs will just be greater to maintain it and then to pay when it begins to fail.

This project does not add anything to the need to get bicycle traffic off the highway. No one is going to use that stretch for bicycle traffic. It also doesn't add anything for kids coming and going to school.

Finally, there is no rush in making this decision since it doesn't have to be made until next Fall. The decision should be made by the new town council since they will be the ones in office when the project begins and throughout the process.

Cheryl Cox

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Cheryl Cox', with a stylized, cursive flourish extending from the end.

Jennifer Bach
360 N 100 E
Boulder, Utah 84716

December 5, 2023

Re: Pedestrian Path concerns

Boulder Town Council,

I have some reservations about the Town Council's plan for "upgrading" the pedestrian path running through the town park. While it can be helpful to receive grant money to fund important projects, the existence of grant money should not influence the nature of said projects or be the reason a project is pursued in the first place. While I agree with others' opinions that an ADA compliant path might be a welcomed addition for residents with physical limitations, I remain unconvinced this particular plan, as proposed, is the correct "solution" to the "problem(?)."

Per Mayor Drain and Councilman Catmull, the Town's plan was awarded the grant money specifically due to the details and design of the proposal being in alignment with ADA accessibility *and* Governor Cox's plan to link all towns in Utah via multi use Pedestrian and Bike paths. The proposed 8' width is what meets the requirements for bicycle use. When I asked about the minimum required width for ADA accessibility at an informational meeting, I was told that 6' is compliant with ADA standards. I also asked about the "least-concrete-like" material that could be used for ADA compliance, and I was told that would be asphalt. This leads me to conclude that the path, while also covering requirements for ADA compliance, is actually being intended for use primarily as a bike path.

A bike path linking the area around the businesses near the Burr Trail and the town park will certainly be marketed toward and used frequently by people with E-bikes (Electric bikes), which are becoming increasingly popular with tourists (see Springdale, Bryce Canyon, Moab, etc). The more motorized use by electric bikes, the less pedestrian-friendly the path becomes. Even with regular bikes, the pedestrian use of the path can become dangerous. I lived in Cedar City for many years, and I utilized the park path that went along Coal Creek to walk my dog. When people would come by on bikes, we pedestrians always had to make way for the bicyclists to pass, and the riders, often teenagers, were often going much faster than necessary. Now, imagine someone with mobility issues—it is much more difficult to clear the way for the bicyclists. There are locals advocating for the path who want a place for their kids to use to ride bikes, roller blades, and/or scooters. Is that really pedestrian or ADA *friendly*? How does that keep in alignment with the intended peaceful nature of the town park?

If the town truly wants a safe way for bicyclists and pedestrians to get from the Burr Trail to the town park (or even all the way to the museum), why would this bike path not run alongside the highway? Why does it need to cut through the town park? The last thing we need, as a community, is to draw more visitors to peaceful areas *off* the main thoroughfare.

The initial announcement of the plan was made during a public Town Council meeting—that it had already been approved and granted funds from the state government. Nobody I know of had heard about it until the mention in Department Reports by Councilman Catmull.

Subsequently, when many local residents voiced concerns (in more than one meeting) regarding the path and the plan for 8 feet of concrete with curb and gutter ripping its way through the town park, the Town Council, rather than holding meetings that truly listened and considered other points of view, proceeded to host a series of “informational” meetings. These meetings were an attempt to explain away the concerns of the townspeople with research and numbers, all in support of the Town’s plan. What Mayor Drain, among others, failed to recognize is that all of those figures were irrelevant to the conversation. We were concerned that we had zero input to the design of the proposed path, the necessity of the “upgrades,” and whether or not that was where the priority should be placed in pursuing projects for Boulder.

Instead of modifying or withdrawing the application, Mayor Drain (et al) pushed forward with renewed vigor, even going so far as to request the Governor write a letter in favor of the project (of COURSE he did, this proposal supports his plan to link all the towns in Utah via multi use paths—but does it really address the specific needs of Boulder?). Town Clerk, Jessica LeFevre, at the request of Mayor Drain, hosted a special meeting that addressed some specific questions and concerns that had come up (the color of the path, where the funds were being drawn from for maintenance, etc) and reiterated the Council’s justification for the plan, all the while completely ignoring the actual issue being pointed out by dozens of people. Meanwhile, some members of the Town Council suggested putting together a committee to research alternatives more thoroughly, but they were essentially shut down. The deadline for modifying the original application has come and gone. The Town is now faced with a decision to proceed as planned or to back out and turn down the money.

In conclusion, Boulder Town Council, you are supposed to represent the residents of Boulder Town. How can that be achieved by completely ignoring or dismissing a large percentage of its population, especially when they have vehemently voiced their concerns? The vote for pursuing the pedestrian path is upon you this week. It is my suggestion that you drop this project as proposed. “Free” money is rarely given without conditions or support of a larger agenda. It is ill advised to pursue grant money for upgrading the pedestrian path by crafting the plan in a way that fits the grant’s conditions rather than addresses the actual needs or preferences of the town. Dollar signs in eyes can cloud the vision. Please vote NO to the pursuit of this particular pedestrian path plan. We can discuss an alternative afterward.

Thank you for your consideration,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jennifer Bach". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jennifer Bach

To: Mayor Drain, the Boulder Town Council, Clerk Lefevre and Boulder Planning Commission

From: Lisa Varga

Date: 12-4-2023

RE: Proposed Jones and DeMille pathway through Boulder Town Park and beyond

Key Points:

1. Accept and appreciate 'the Petition'. It reflects the will of the people that elected you to represent them.
2. Form a working group of interested citizens to create a modified plan that better fits the needs and desires of Boulder residents.

I would like to ask the town to please consider the input of your constituents regarding the town pathway, including those who signed the petition asking the Town to reconsider the current plan presented by Jones and DeMille.

pe·ti·tion

/pəˈtiʃən/

noun

1. a formal written request, typically one signed by many people, appealing to authority with respect to a particular cause.

Although the petition recently presented to the Town Council is not a 'legal' document, it is a respectful way for a group of like-minded people to state their shared opinion to the Town Council. Many Boulder residents simply want to have input on a pathway plan that is a significant addition to our town infrastructure. How wonderful that so many people are interested in this timely topic!

Since the Town Clerk informed us that we have a bit of time, we can create a plan that better fits the needs of the community. I suggest you revisit Council member Elizabeth Julian's suggestion of creating an advisory citizen's working group (Active Transportation Plan Development Committee – ATPDC) that can quickly explore and propose alternative plans to our current conundrum. This group will make recommendations to the Town Council for their approval and vote. Creating a working group has the added benefit of taking some of the burden off the Clerk who has had to do all the work up to this point.

I believe that a better alternative is possible rather than the ABC plans we've come up with so far. Perhaps we can agree that ADA sidewalks connecting the pavilion and bathrooms make sense. We have a designated ADA parking place at the park. Maybe we could improve the safety along our core roads in the center of town by extending the sidewalk in front of the church to the park, so kids do not have to walk along the road. We could create a crosswalk for safety. A sidewalk to the Town Hall would connect all 'downtown Boulder' without walking in the roads. Maybe an ADA sidewalk could make a loop along the cleared upper pathway of the Park (where the terrain is level) that would return via the bathrooms (a modified Plan B).

These are just examples and suggestions, but it makes sense to me to upgrade the Town Center before going off to the Government yards with a dead-end cement sidewalk.

I think many people support the idea of Pathways linking businesses in town. Once the working group produces the best use of our current grant funding it can continue to envision a townwide pathway system and develop a master plan for future grants. We need a comprehensive plan for all pathway improvements and extensions along highway 12 so we can continue to build a safe highway corridor for pedestrians that is continuous and integrated.

Let's get busy and use this time to make the Jones and DeMille plan a better fit for Boulder with citizen input. This is an excellent opportunity to make the best use of our current funding that includes the good ideas of the people that live here and understand the needs of the community.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this topic once again.

Sincerely,
Lisa Varga

Mark Nelson
360 N 100 E
Boulder, Utah 84716

December 7, 2023

Boulder Town Council,

The Pedestrian Path that has been proposed (an 8-foot wide concrete sidewalk with curb and gutter) is unwarranted and unnecessary. Not only is it completely incompatible with the Park Plan, the Town Survey, and the General Plan, it is not wanted and too expensive.

I have examined your three options (Plans A, B, and C). All three funnel traffic off Highway 12 and through the town park. Bad idea! You have completely ignored the most logical alternative which was conceived in the original park plan and endorsed by the Park Committee, UDOT, and the Town Board. The most logical alternative for an all purpose trail follows the Highway 12 corridor and branches off to the town park/school/church at 300 North and at the Anasazi State Park. Logical, right?!

The pursuit of the current plan seems to be based more on grant money issues rather than a good plan. Let's start over on this one.

Sincerely,
Mark Nelson

Katie Coleman 1135 E Black Ledge Road Boulder, Utah 84716

Boulder Town Council

Boulder, Utah

December 7th, 2023

Dear Boulder Town Council,

I have concerns about you voting today on the concrete pedestrian path.

I feel strongly that you do not have all the information needed to make an informed decision for all of us.

You are planning on spending \$46,000 of our road funds on the proposed concrete pedestrian path? That would be approximately 300% or 3 years' worth of funding for our roads! Our roads need repairs and upgrading more than we need a concrete path. If you were to spend the money on the concrete path, how do you plan on fixing the town's damaged roads? What are your plans for the future road budget factoring in also the maintenance of the concrete path? Is there an emergency fund for road wash outs and such?

Do you have any numbers at this point that reflect an estimated maintenance expense of the concrete ped path? Including removal and replacement or upgrade in 20 to 30 years?

The General Plan serves as a foundation and guideline document, and it states that the town planning needs to meet the needs of the community.

Is it an option that you have your constituents vote if they want the concrete ped path or if they want their roads maintained instead? Obviously, there isn't enough money in the budget for both. There is also plenty of controversy if the ped path is what our tax money should be used for.

3 of the 4 Town Council Members' terms are terminating at the end of the month. Let's give the newly elected Town Council Members a chance to take a fresh view at this topic and consider the wishes and needs of their constituents and review their limited budget.

The existing pedestrian path is very cute and suits Boulder well.

After all this is for all of us.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Katie Coleman

Boulder Town Pathways Overview and Recommendations (by Keith Watts)

Overview:

Boulder Town was awarded a UDOT grant for its “Boulder Town Pedestrian Path Project”. All five other towns that applied for the TAP Non-urban grant proposals were fully funded as well.

Although having the proposed path ADA-accessible ($\geq 5'$ wide) would be an attribute, it did not seem to be required to win our grant. Boulder’s proposal made no mention of this being a bicycle path, so the 8’-wide path shown in the proposal seems excessive. The proposed concrete pathway (plan A) is not located in the best place for a bike/pedestrian path.

Boulder Town is responsible for 6.77% (up to \$46,239) in matching funds that would be taken from the Road B&C money. It is unclear if this money might be better utilized on other transportation-related projects, such as Boulder King Estate road upgrades, Lower Boulder Road repairs, cutting of weeds along Boulder’s roads to reduce fire hazards, or other pathways. Some UDOT grants do not require matching funds (eg. UDOT/JHC Safe Routes to School grants).

The proposed concrete pathway through the Boulder Town Park and onward to the Government Yard is not supported by many of Boulder’s citizens (125 signed the petition against this plan). A major concern is that this plan did not have any public input; it appears to have been solely designed by Jim Catmul and Jones and DeMille Engineering.

Jones and DeMille Engineering stands to make over \$100,000 on this project, so cannot be expected to serve as an unbiased source of advice. However, they might be willing to help us come up with an alternative plan.

An “original” plan called for a pathway connecting Boulder Town Park to Anasazi State Park, via the Boulder Town Hall property. This might be a more appropriate pedestrian path.

Three plans were presented at the Boulder Town Council (BTC) November 2023 Work Meeting:

- Plan A is the original proposed Boulder Pedestrian Path Project, with a concrete sidewalk going through the Boulder Town Park and continuing to the Government Yard, southwest of the Burr Trail.
- Plan B shows the paved concrete sidewalk ending at the south entrance gate of the Boulder Town Park with addition of ADA accessible sidewalks in the Park (see below).
- Plan C has the paved concrete sidewalk ending near the fire hydrant on the Boulder Mountain Lodge with addition of same ADA accessible sidewalks in the Park (see below).
- Other options certainly exist but have not been considered (see next page).

By eliminating the ill-conceived pathway across the Burr Trail to the Government Yard (southernmost dogleg shown in Plan A) and possibly the controversial sidewalks leading from the south entrance of the park toward the Burr Trail where a gravel pathway already exists, the money saved might instead be spent on additional ADA-compliant pathways in the Boulder Town Park, leading from the ADA parking space to the Pavilion and Bathroom (see Plans B&C).

Any substantive changes to the proposal will have to be approved by the Joint Highway Committee (JHC). It seems logical to propose a revised plan that better suits Boulder’s needs and is also likely to get approval. I just discovered that UDOT needs to get a revised proposal by January 12, 2024 to submit to the JHC. This is a very short timeline.

In the future, more grant money will probably be available for additional active (non-motorized) pathways. UDOT presently seems to support separate grants for State Park access (to Anasazi State Park) and off-system bridges (for pathway bridge crossing Boulder Creek).

The next meeting for the JHC is in February 2024 and the final meeting before grants are awarded is September 2024. Planning and construction would be authorized at the September 2024 meeting.

Recommendations:

With the January 12th deadline for submitting a revised proposal, we need to come up with a revised plan by the January BTC meeting.

BTC should establish an "Active Transportation Plan Development Committee" (making necessary revisions to the proposal made by Elizabeth Julian, Boulder Town Councilmember in July 2023) to consider the overall pathway needs for Boulder Town. This advisory committee should be authorized ASAP, hopefully by resolution at the December 2023 BTC meeting.

Possible short and long-term goals for an active/non-motorized pathway system might include:

1. ADA sidewalks to Pavilion and Bathroom at the Boulder Town Park.
2. ADA sidewalk to LDS Church and Boulder Elementary.
3. ADA sidewalks to Post Office, Boulder Town Hall and possibly Anasazi State Park.
4. Non-motorized path to Hills and Hollows
5. Non-motorized path to Anasazi State Park
6. Non-motorized path to Boulder Town cemetery, perhaps continuing to the GarKane Powerplant road.
7. Non-motorized path down the Burr Trail to Boulder Town limits.

It would be very worthwhile to have public meetings to get input on what our community would like to see in our pathway system. The committee should try to come up with preliminary recommendations and map(s) before the January 2024 BTC meeting.

Given the time limitations, I would prefer that the BTC give up the grant and return to the drawing board with an opportunity to have community input on this important active transportation plan. If the BTC chooses to keep the grant money, then I would prefer Plan B. For public safety, I suggest adding connector paths (ADA sidewalks) and designated pedestrian crosswalks connecting to the Boulder Elementary School and perhaps the Boulder Town Hall and Post Office.

Thanks for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Keith Watts
PO Box 1426
Boulder, Utah 84716

Phone: 435-335-7545
Cell: 307-733-4261
keith@earth-tours.com

I am writing regarding the proposed concrete pedestrian pathway in Boulder.

I feel a paved path is not something the town needs. Boulder has never been a “sidewalks and curbs and gutters” sort of place and I don’t think most people think it fits into the character of the community. There is no place for it in the adopted general plan for Boulder.

The way this was proposed didn’t originate with community members asking for something. It was apparently first proposed by someone from Jones and DeMille or maybe UDOT. If it was Jones and DeMille then it looks a lot like a sale for some easy work for them. If so, I am saddened that a council member was so easily sold on such an obvious pork barrel project. If there were strong community consensus to support such a project and there was little or no opposition to it then the town should consider it, but this clearly has some vehement opposition. In some ways this feels like something maybe intended to split the town.

It sounds like the town will get a lot for its money if they only have to spend something like \$40,000 for a project that would normally cost over \$600,000, but It still relies on \$40,000 of the town’s funds. I have heard that it is not a problem because we can use the roads budget for this. I don’t know if that is a legitimate use of road funds. Even if it is legitimate that is no justification because it is still \$40,000 that we cannot spend on actual road maintenance that is sorely needed around town.

Thank you
Peter Benson

Dear Council members,

I am opposed to the pathway, having already signed the petition presented to you last month. In short, I feel that the proposed sidewalk is unnecessary, unsightly, unwanted by a sizable segment of Boulder, and outside the spirit of the General Plan.

And, as a side note, dismissing over 125 citizens' petition signatures as invalid indicates you are either missing the point or simply do not care. I don't understand why you choose to ignore so many of your constituents.

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,

Dan Pence

To: all Town Council member,
From: Tina Karlsson

As someone who has been involved with the plans for the park since the ground was under BLM management, there was never a discussion about the need for a concrete path through the park. In fact, it seemed appropriate that the path was permeable. I realize that change is inevitable but when it comes to public spaces, plans need to be made with an understanding of the need and public support first. This plan for a public concrete pathway came about with no public input or any general planning and ultimately some very clear outcry from the public. Including a petition with concerned citizens' signatures.

At this point in the controversy over the need to accept the Grant money and the bid/estimated cost from Jones and DeMille 683K, The town is again addressing this pathway at the final meeting of the Year before 3 newly elected council members will be sworn in. I feel that I need to say that this project seems to me to be a Boondoggle.

Boondoggle: work or activity that is [wasteful](#) or [pointless](#) but gives the appearance of having value.

Here are my reasons why. There was no public plan or discussion about putting in a concrete pathway through the park before we had a grant to do so.

It seemed to be planned by Jones and Demille a private engineering firm and councilman Jim Catmull at a meeting with UDOT who had federal funds to spread around the state. Free money as it was defined to help support transportation needs. The town will be responsible for at least 40 K and more if the cost of the project goes over the estimate.

Where would these funds come from? Our road funds were the first place that the town council suggested. We have town roads that need attention. Do we have plans for them? Is the pathway the best way to use those funds? No public discussion by the town council on that.

The Path is now on the agenda for the December meeting. I ask that all council members review the petition that was presented to the town before making a vote. Plus all comments made by the general public. And that the town council members consider, as this is the last meeting before the three newly elected members of the council are sworn in, that this decision be postponed until January 2024.

Thank You for your Consideration.
Kristina Karlsson aka Tina
Happy to chat with council members.
335-7312 home or cell (406) 207-7201

Members of the Town Council:

Please add my name to the list of those in opposition to the pedestrian path.

thank you,

Dear Boulder Town Council:

It is a startling experience to have your Town Council completely dismiss, ignore, and blatantly mischaracterize the concerns of more than 130 citizens who signed a petition about the proposed concrete pedestrian path project; but that is precisely what the TC did on September 7, 2023, as part of their "work meeting" about the pedestrian path. Therefore, as one of the many residents who signed the petition, I write this letter to restate my opposition to the concrete pedestrian path.

Many of my concerns have been thoughtfully addressed by other letter writers also in opposition: the lack of alignment with the General Plan, the inadequate or incomplete assessment of maintenance costs, a project that should be coordinated with the State's Active Transportation Plan but isn't, road funds being diverted from higher priority projects, a casual and cavalier attitude towards the spending of taxpayer monies, and a project that did not include adequate community input.

Most disheartening, however, is that so many citizens respectfully came forward, through a clear and concise petition, requesting the TC pause and/or to stop the project, and were dismissed and ignored. The TC has also rejected the reasonable idea to form a citizen committee to gather input and make a recommendation to the TC.

Why is this TC adamantly and aggressively pursuing this project in the face of so much opposition from their own citizenry? I don't know, but it doesn't ring true, and the TC can and should do better.

Jennifer Geerlings
Boulder resident

To the Planning Commission

There has been a lot of discussion and rumor mill about the proposed pathway and we wanted to take this opportunity to explain our reason for signing the petition and our disagreement with the proposed path.

We completely support the existing pathway and see it as a real benefit to both residents and visitors. Our disagreement with the upgraded concrete walk is that it does not seem compatible with our very rural community whereas the existing gravel path fits the Town "feel" well. I understand that the concrete path would make wheelchair access easier but debate there will be any real time use by wheelchair users in this place. This is an urban design proposed for a rural community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tom and Caroline Hoyt

Sent from my iPhone

Hoytcamp@gmail.com

720 226 1041

Sent from my iPhone

Hoytcamp@gmail.com

720 226 1041

To Town Council,

In the absence of the opportunity for more concerted study, evaluation and discussion of the plan for the pedestrian walkway, I will have to register my opposition to the pedestrian path for the following reasons:

- 1) I do not believe the path as it is currently designed, adds value to the town.
- 2) It is grossly out of scale with community size, population, use and need. An eight foot wide path is more appropriate for an large urban or suburban community, which we are not.
- 3) During the construction of the path, there will be an impact on local businesses, which depend on easy accessibility from route 12, some of which may not survive multiple months of decreased customer base.
- 4) The Town Council has not honored the community consensus, as evidenced by the number of citizens either opposing or requesting further study on this matter.

Susan Kelly

Sent from my iPhone

Hi Jessica.

I want to go on record, that I oppose the pedestrian path as is.

The town needs to have meetings and get more public input to alternatives, pros and cons of this project.

Thank- you