

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-24

A RESOLUTION BY LAKE POINT CITY COUNCIL OPPOSING THE PROPOSAL TO CREATE THE OQUIRRH MOUNTAIN EXPRESSWAY

WHEREAS the Utah Department of Transportation and other public and private entities have considered the construction of a public highway referred to as the Oquirrh Mountain Expressway (“Highway”) along property adjacent to or within Lake Point municipal boundaries;

WHEREAS the property on which the Highway is proposed to be constructed consists of open space and conservation areas, including the Green Ravine conservation easement (see Exhibit A), on which private development is not permitted;

WHEREAS the open space and conservation areas were dedicated as such in order for private developers to obtain development rights and density bonuses to increase the density of housing units within Lake Point, which rights and bonuses were not otherwise available to the developers;

WHEREAS the removal and conversion of the open space and conservation areas would remove public benefits that were bargained for in exchange for the private development rights;

WHEREAS the construction of the Highway would decrease the safety, scenic beauty and viewing, and accessibility of the open space and conservation areas and restrict the ability of Lake Point residents to use and access the open space and conservations areas that were dedicated and reserved for their use;

WHEREAS the construction of the Highway could impact the wells, watershed, and aquifer within the open space and conservation areas that provide drinking water to Lake Point residents and the highway would increase the potential for catastrophic fire ignition and would also increase the risk of fires in areas most at risk for fires;

WHEREAS the construction of the Highway would also harm and reduce the accessibility of historic and natural features within the Oquirrh Mountains, including the black rock cave, Lake Point Cave, petroglyphs and other artifacts, and the historic aviation marker,

WHEREAS the construction and use of the Highway would not facilitate access in or to Lake Point, as there is no connection to Lake Point, nor provide transportation or circulation benefits to Lake Point residents, yet would have the most impact on Lake Point residents;

WHEREAS the Highway’s plan to bypass Lake Point would significantly hamper Lake Point’s ability to foster commercial areas;

WHEREAS the Highway would harm the quality of life of Lake Point residents by increasing road and traffic noise, smells, and lights (night sky preservation), which would be all the more damaging because such impacts are located in an area reserved for conservation, natural landscapes, and open spaces;

WHEREAS Lake Point residents already live with the road and traffic impacts of State Road 36 and Interstate 80, and the construction of the Highway would box in Lake Point between major transportation corridors with no benefit to Lake Point residents;

WHEREAS the location of the Highway is in an area of difficult grade, ~~and~~ potential geologic hazard, and crossing multiple fault lines resulting in significant costs to construct and maintain the Highway and the potential for future harm from slope degradation and earthquakes, which costs do not outweigh the damage and impact the Highway would cause,

WHEREAS Lake Point residents (see Exhibit B) and city officers have repeatedly expressed their opposition to construction of any public highway along the foothills of the Oquirrh Mountains near the north/northeast boundary of Lake Point;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Lake Point City Council as follows:

Section 1. The City Council, on behalf of Lake Point residents, finds that the Oquirrh Mountain Expressway or any other similar public highway will harm Lake Point residents for the reasons described in the recitals above, including but not limited to harms related to the removal of, restriction of access to, and damage to open space areas that were intended to be reserved perpetually for the benefit of the public and the significant increase traffic, noise, and safety impacts that will be primarily felt by Lake Point residents without corresponding benefits to those residents.

Section 2. The Lake Point City Council therefore establishes its strong opposition to the Oquirrh Mountain Expressway or any other similar public highway proposed or planned to be constructed along the foothills of the Oquirrh Mountains near the north/northeast boundary of Lake Point.

Section 3. The Lake Point City Council is open to discussions and coming up with solutions on the SR-201 extension that does not interfere with the foothills, meaning generally parallel and near I-80. We look forward to participating in future meetings in relation to transportation needs.

Section 4. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED on the 6th day of September, 2023

Lake Point

By _____
Chair

ATTEST:

City Recorder



Voting:

Daniel Crawford
Doyle Garrard
Jonathan Garrard
Kathleen VonHatten
Ryan Zumwalt

Yea ☒ Nay ☐ Absent ☐
Yea ☒ Nay ☐ Absent ☐
Yea ☒ Nay ☐ Absent ☐
Yea ☒ Nay ☐ Absent ☐
Yea ☒ Nay ☐ Absent ☐

Exhibit A
2023 09.06

E 170013 B 707 P 798
Date 4-OCT-2001 9:25am
Fee: 58.00 Check
CALLEEN PESHELL, Recorder
Filed By JPT
For ASSOCIATED TITLE CO-SLC
TOOELE COUNTY CORPORATION

WHEN RECORDED, MAIL TO:
Utah Open Lands Conservation Association
1790 South 1100 East
Salt Lake City, UT. 84105

D231771

**GREEN RAVINE
CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION EASEMENT
AGREEMENT**

This GRANT OF EASEMENT and DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS, hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement" or the "EASEMENT", made this 30th day of August in the year 2001,

BETWEEN Skull Valley Company, Ltd., a Utah limited partnership, Uintah Land Company, L.C., a Utah limited liability company, and Beaver Creek Investments, L.C., a Utah limited liability company, each having an address of 139 E. South Temple, Suite 310, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111, hereinafter collectively called "GRANTOR",

AND

The Utah Open Lands Conservation Association, Inc. a non profit corporation of the State of Utah, hereinafter "GRANTEE",

Collectively referred to in this AGREEMENT as the "PARTIES",

WITNESSETH;

Whereas, GRANTOR is the owner of a certain tract of PROPERTY located in the Lake Point area of Tooele County, Utah described by the legal descriptions, attached hereto as Exhibit A and by this reference made a part hereof; and

Whereas, GRANTOR desires to leave the PROPERTY in its natural, open condition, to preserve its scenic beauty and quality. Further, GRANTOR proposes to provide an area for studying nature and history, biking, walking and horseback riding and recreation uses; and

Whereas, this PROPERTY is a significant watershed for the Lake Point area; and

Whereas, the Property contains important wildlife habitat for a variety of wildlife, including various bird species and small mammals, and is critical habitat for the wintering of deer and elk; and

Whereas, views of the PROPERTY can be seen from numerous areas in the Tooele Valley, including the major transportation corridors of State Road 36 and Interstate 80; and

Whereas, the natural beauty and open undeveloped character of these views will be preserved by this EASEMENT; and

Whereas, the incorporation of the PROPERTY with this conservation and preservation EASEMENT in place will result in an expanded area of open land adjacent to United States Bureau of Land Management ("BLM") land which will be available to the citizens of Utah in perpetuity; and

Whereas, GRANTOR desires to receive certain development credits with Tooele County allowing density from the PROPERTY to be transferred to other lands owned by GRANTOR; and

Whereas, GRANTOR intends that the Conservation Values of the PROPERTY be preserved and maintained by continuing current land use patterns, including, without limitation, those existing when this EASEMENT is recorded that do not materially impair or interfere with those values; and

Whereas, the PROPERTY possesses natural, watershed, scenic, historic, recreational, ecological, open space and riparian values, collectively referred to herein as "Conservation Values" worthy of conservation protection; and

Whereas, the specific Conservation Values of the PROPERTY are documented in a natural resources inventory, on file at the office of the Grantee to be completed no more than 60 days from the signing of this Agreement. This inventory hereinafter sometimes referred to as "Baseline Documentation" shall consist of reports, maps, photographs and other documentation, intended to provide the PARTIES with an accurate representation of the PROPERTY at the time of this EASEMENT and which will serve as an objective information baseline for monitoring compliance with the terms of this EASEMENT; and

Whereas, GRANTOR, as owner of the PROPERTY, intends to convey to GRANTEE the right to monitor, preserve and protect the Conservation Values of the PROPERTY in perpetuity; and

Whereas, GRANTEE is a community-supported, tax exempt, non-profit organization formed to preserve, protect and enhance, natural areas, agricultural lands, historic sites, ecological lands, open land and areas important to the protection and management of water resources, and is capable of carrying out the responsibilities created for it as identified in this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the recitals above and the covenants, terms, conditions, and restrictions contained herein, which the PARTIES hereby agree are to serve as consideration for this Agreement of adequate value and pursuant to the laws of the State of Utah and in particular Utah Code Ann. §57-18-1, et. seq. (1985), to make an irrevocable EASEMENT in perpetuity, GRANTOR hereby grants and conveys to GRANTEE and its successors in interests a perpetual conservation EASEMENT, as hereinafter defined, "EASEMENT" over and across all of the PROPERTY to preserve and protect the natural, ecological, riparian, historic, watershed, habitat, open space, scenic, and passive recreational values present on the PROPERTY. This EASEMENT shall forever bind GRANTOR and GRANTOR's successors in ownership and/or use of the PROPERTY as well as GRANTEE and any qualified successor of GRANTEE as identified in Paragraph 8 below. This EASEMENT is granted in perpetuity and any mortgage, lien or other encumbrance other than encumbrances of sight or record existing at the time of this instrument's signing, shall be subordinate to the rights and intentions of the this EASEMENT and GRANTEE's ability to enforce the protection of the Conservation Values described herein.

1. Purpose. The purpose of this EASEMENT is to assure that the PROPERTY will be retained forever in its natural and open space condition, to protect the Conservation Values, thus allowing for recreational use, nature study and scenic viewing, preventing any use of the PROPERTY that will materially impair or interfere with its Conservation Values. GRANTOR intends that this EASEMENT will confine the use of the PROPERTY to such activities, including, without limitation, those involving viewing, education and passive recreational uses as are consistent with the purpose of this EASEMENT and holistic ecosystem management.

2. Rights of GRANTEE. To accomplish the purpose of this EASEMENT the following rights are granted to GRANTEE and its successors in interest by this EASEMENT:

(A) To preserve and protect the Conservation Values of the PROPERTY;

(B) To enter upon the PROPERTY to inspect and enforce the rights herein granted; and

(C) To prevent or enjoin any activity on or use of the PROPERTY, on behalf of itself and the public, that is inconsistent with the purpose of this EASEMENT or which may be reasonably expected to have a significant adverse impact on the Conservation Values associated with the PROPERTY.

3. Permitted Uses. GRANTOR, its successors, assigns, and licensees, shall have the right to and shall be permitted to use the PROPERTY in the following ways:

(A) Unless otherwise prohibited herein, all uses which are consistent with the Pony Express Plan Amendment as prepared by the Salt Lake Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, Decision Record Environmental Assessment No. UT-020-996-36, date of decision November 1997 (the "BLM MANAGEMENT PLAN"). In the event of a conflict between the BLM MANAGEMENT PLAN and this EASEMENT, this EASEMENT shall be the controlling document; and

(B) The construction, maintenance, and operation of a parking lot for use in conjunction with trail access. The parking lot shall not exceed one-half (0.5) acres in size. The parking lot may be made of impervious surfaces such as asphalt or cement or non-impervious surfaces such as gravel; and

(C) The construction, maintenance, and operation of a water storage pond within the PROPERTY below the 4,600 foot msl elevation. This pond is intended to be used in conjunction with a secondary (non-potable) water system to help conserve potable water supplies in the area and the disturbed area for the pond shall not exceed ten (10) acres in size. The right to build this pond shall include the right to install the necessary underground utilities (electricity, water pipelines, etc...), berms, and security fencing for use of the pond for water storage, provided all disturbed areas are reasonably reclaimed. Furthermore, Grantor shall have the right to build an access road as reasonably necessary, provided such road shall be made of a non-impervious surface and shall not exceed twenty (20) feet in surface width.

(D) all uses not otherwise prohibited herein.

4. Prohibited Uses. To accomplish, safeguard, and promote the purposes of the EASEMENT set forth in Paragraph 1, GRANTOR hereby declares and covenants that the following activities are prohibited in perpetuity on the PROPERTY:

(A) Development, pre-sale, division, subdivision, or defacto subdivision (through long-term leasing or otherwise) of the PROPERTY for any type of human occupation;

(B) Construction of buildings, residences, mobile homes, or other structures, or any other improvements constructed or placed in, on, under, or upon the PROPERTY except to the extent provided in Paragraph 3;

(C) To the extent the Grantor, as of the date hereof, owns or controls the mineral estate of the PROPERTY (pursuant to Federal Law), quarrying, mining, excavation, depositing, or removal of rocks, gravel, minerals, sand, or other similar materials from the PROPERTY and exploration, drilling for or production of oil, gas, or other Hydrocarbons from the property, except for archeological or paleontological study of prehistoric and historic sites; and

(D) Any type of motor vehicle (including ORV, motorcycle, and similar uses) access except:

(i) required administrative access for management of the PROPERTY;

(ii) third party administrative access relating to rights-of-way to the PROPERTY or for access to adjacent properties;

(iii) by express consent of GRANTOR and GRANTEE; and

(iv) by emergency vehicles; and

(E) Target shooting of any type.

5. Documentation of Use and Condition of PROPERTY. To establish the present condition of the PROPERTY's natural, scenic, wildlife and water quality resources and the PROPERTY's manmade features, so as to make possible the proper monitoring of future uses of the PROPERTY and to ensure compliance with the terms of the EASEMENT, the PARTIES hereto will have prepared the BASELINE DOCUMENTATION. The PARTIES expressly agree to consider the BASELINE DOCUMENTATION as an accurate representation of the PROPERTY. It shall further constitute the minimum level at which the PROPERTY shall be maintained by GRANTOR. If a controversy arises with respect to the nature and/or extent of the historical, and/or present use of the PROPERTY or physical condition of the PROPERTY, at the time said inventory is recorded, the PARTIES shall not be foreclosed from utilizing all relevant or material documents surveys, reports, and other evidence to assist in the resolution of the controversy.

6. Enforcement of EASEMENT.

(A) GRANTOR shall not take any steps to amend or cause to be amended the BLM MANAGEMENT PLAN as it relates to the PROPERTY without notifying GRANTEE as required in this Paragraph 6 below. In the event GRANTEE reasonably determines that any proposed amendment is consistent with the Conservation Values of this EASEMENT, and the amendment of the BLM MANAGEMENT PLAN is consummated by the BLM, said amendment shall be binding on the PROPERTY. In the event GRANTEE reasonably determines that any proposed

amendment is not consistent with the Conservation Values, said amendment or modification shall not be made without the consent of GRANTEE, or if such amendment or modification is made due to lack of control of the BLM MANAGEMENT PLAN by GRANTOR, it shall not apply to the PROPERTY and the terms of this EASEMENT will supersede said amendment.

(B) GRANTOR of the PROPERTY shall notify GRANTEE in writing before exercising any right reserved by GRANTOR, expressly or impliedly, with respect to the PROPERTY, the exercise of which would not be in compliance with Permitted Uses or Prohibited Uses set forth in Paragraphs 3 and 4 above. Said notice shall inform GRANTEE of all aspects of the proposed activity including, but not limited to, the nature, siting, magnitude, and anticipated effect of the proposed activity or use with respect to the purpose of the EASEMENT. Such notice shall be sent by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to the following:

Utah Open Lands Conservation Association
1790 South 1100 East
Salt Lake City, UT. 84105

or to such other address as GRANTEE may designate.

(C) GRANTEE shall have sixty (60) days from the mailing of such notice to review the proposed activity and notify GRANTOR of any objections thereto. Such objections, if any, shall be based upon GRANTEE's opinion that the proposed activity is inconsistent with this Agreement, and shall inform GRANTOR of the manner, if any, in which the proposed activity can be modified to be consistent with the Agreement. GRANTEE shall have the right to prevent any proposed activity which is incompatible with the authorized uses or prohibitions specified herein. If notice of GRANTEE's objection is not given to GRANTOR, as required by Paragraph 6 (B), within sixty (60) days of GRANTOR's mailing of its notice of a proposed activity, GRANTEE shall have waived its right to object to the proposed activity.

(D) Regardless of receipt of notice, if GRANTEE determines that GRANTOR is in violation of the terms of this EASEMENT, GRANTEE shall give written notice to GRANTOR of such violation and demand corrective action sufficient to cure the violation and where this violation has injured the PROPERTY because of a use or activity inconsistent with this EASEMENT, to restore the portion of this PROPERTY so injured. The PARTIES recognize that GRANTEE may bring an action in law or equity as a court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this EASEMENT, enjoin violations, or require restoration of the PROPERTY, as needed. In the event that any action or court proceeding is brought by a party to enforce the terms of or obligations under this instrument, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorney fees and costs.

(E) In the event of disputes as to any Permitted Use or Prohibited Use of the PROPERTY, GRANTEE or GRANTOR shall have the right to demand arbitration by making such demand in writing upon the other party. Arbitration shall proceed under the rules of the American Arbitration Association. In the event that GRANTEE or GRANTOR exercises this right, if GRANTOR and GRANTEE agree upon selection of one person to serve as arbitrator, there shall be only one (1) arbitrator. If no agreement is reached within fifteen (15) days after the demand for arbitration, there shall be three (3) arbitrators, one named by GRANTEE and one named by GRANTOR. Within thirty (30) days after the demand for arbitration, a third arbitrator shall be chosen by the two designated arbitrators. The decision of the arbitrator (or a majority of the arbitrators, as the case may be) shall be binding. Should GRANTOR or

GRANTEE refuse or neglect to timely appoint an arbitrator, a binding decision shall be rendered solely by the arbitrator named by GRANTEE or GRANTOR.

(F) Failure by any party to exercise its rights under this instrument in the event of any breach shall not be deemed or construed to be a waiver of the PARTIES' rights hereunder as to that breach or any subsequent breach.

7. Payment of Costs, Taxes or Assessments. GRANTOR shall bear all costs and liabilities, if any, of ownership of the PROPERTY. In addition, GRANTOR shall pay all real estate taxes or assessments levied, if any, by competent authorities upon the PROPERTY, and GRANTEE shall have no obligation or responsibility for payment of taxes or assessments levied upon any of the PROPERTY.

8. Transfer of EASEMENT. If GRANTEE determines that it no longer is able to perform its obligations or enforce its rights under this Agreement, or that it no longer desires to enforce said rights, or if GRANTEE ceases to exist or is otherwise prevented from enforcing its rights under this Agreement, or if GRANTEE no longer qualifies as a "qualified organization" under Paragraph 170 (h) (3) of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Code or a comparable provision in any subsequent revision of the IRS Code, GRANTEE shall as soon as practical convey in perpetuity all of its rights under this EASEMENT and deliver a copy of this EASEMENT to an organization designated by GRANTEE and described in or contemplated by Paragraph 170(h)(3) of the IRS Code or the comparable provision in any subsequent revision of the IRS Code, without qualification, to ensure that the EASEMENT is enforced. Notwithstanding the foregoing, GRANTEE is hereby expressly prohibited from transferring the EASEMENT, whether or not for consideration, unless;

(A) GRANTEE, as a condition precedent of the transfer, requires that the Conservation Values which the EASEMENT is intended to advance continue to be carried out;

(B) the transferee is an organization qualifying at the time of the transfer as an eligible donee under Paragraph 170(h)(3) of the IRS Code (or the comparable provision in any subsequent revision of the IRS Code) and regulations promulgated thereunder; and

(C) GRANTOR consents in writing to the transfer, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld.

9. Extinguishment of the EASEMENT. GRANTEE shall not voluntarily or willingly allow the extinguishment of any of the restrictions of this EASEMENT or the taking of any portion of the EASEMENT by the power of eminent domain. If any or all of the restrictions of the EASEMENT are nevertheless extinguished by a judicial or other governmental proceeding or any portion of the EASEMENT taken by the power of eminent domain, any and all compensation received by GRANTEE as a result of the extinguishment or condemnation shall belong solely to GRANTEE and shall be used by GRANTEE in a manner consistent with the conservation Values of the EASEMENT.

10. Subsequent Transfers. GRANTOR shall incorporate the terms of this Agreement and EASEMENT by reference in any deed or other legal instrument by which it divests itself of any interest in all or a portion of the PROPERTY, including, without limitation, a leasehold interest. GRANTOR shall give written notice to GRANTEE of the transfer of any interest at least twenty (20) days prior to the date of such Transfer. The failure of GRANTOR to perform any act

required by this Paragraph shall not impair the validity of this EASEMENT or limit its enforceability in any way.

11. Notices. Any notice, demand, request, consent, approval or communication shall be in writing and served personally or sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

GRANTEE:

Utah Open Lands Conservation Association
P.O. Box 680921
Park City, UT. 84068

GRANTOR:

Skull Valley Company, Ltd.
Uintah Land Company, L.C.
Beaver Creek Investments, L.C.
139 E. South Temple, Suite 310
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

or to such other address as either party from time to time shall designate by written notice to the other.

12. Recordation. GRANTEE shall record this instrument in timely fashion in the official records of Tooele County, Utah, and may re-record it at any time as may be required to preserve its rights in this EASEMENT.

13. Liability. GRANTOR acknowledges that GRANTEE and its members, directors, officers, employees, agents and contractors and the heirs, personal representatives, successors, and the assigns of each of them are not liable or responsible in any way for any of the following:: (1) injury to or the death of any person, or physical damage to any PROPERTY, resulting from any act omission, condition, or other matter related to or occurring on or about the PROPERTY, regardless of cause, unless due solely to the willful or intentional misconduct of GRANTEE; (2) the obligations specified in Paragraph 7; (3) the existence or administration of this EASEMENT; and (4) any hazardous waste, here taken in the broadest context, cleanup resulting from previous landfills, dumping, toxic refuse or other waste for which the Superfund Act may be applied.

14. General Provisions.

(A) Controlling Law. The interpretation and performance of this EASEMENT shall be governed by the laws of the State of Utah.

(B) Construction. Any general rule of construction to the contrary notwithstanding, this Agreement and EASEMENT shall be liberally construed in favor of the EASEMENT and to effect the purpose of this EASEMENT and the policy and purpose of Utah Code Ann. §57-18-1, et seq. (1985) and related provisions.

(C) Severability. If any provision of this EASEMENT, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is found to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this EASEMENT, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is found to be invalid, as the case may be, shall not be affected thereby.

(D) Joint Obligation. The obligations imposed by this EASEMENT upon the GRANTOR, its successors and assigns, shall be joint and several.

(E) Successors. The covenants, terms, conditions, and restriction of this Agreement and this EASEMENT created hereunder shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, GRANTEE, GRANTOR, and their respective personal representatives, heirs, successors and assigns, including subsequent owners of the PROPERTY, and shall continue as a servitude running in perpetuity with the PROPERTY.

(F) Captions. The captions in this instrument have been inserted solely for convenience of reference and are not a part of this instrument and shall have no effect upon construction or interpretation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF GRANTOR and GRANTEE have executed on the day and year first above written.

GRANTOR:

SKULL VALLEY COMPANY, LTD., a Utah limited partnership
By: Christopher F. Robinson
Christopher F. Robinson, a General Partner

UINTAH LAND COMPANY, L.C., a Utah limited liability company
By: Christopher F. Robinson
Christopher F. Robinson, a Manager

BEAVER CREEK INVESTMENTS, L.C., a Utah limited liability company
By: Christopher F. Robinson
Christopher F. Robinson, a Manager

GRANTEE:

UTAH OPEN LANDS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION
By: Steve Gyle, vice chairman

STATE OF UTAH)
) :SS
 COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 31ST day of AUGUST, 2001, by Christopher F. Robinson, a General Partner of Skull Valley Company, Ltd., a Utah limited partnership.

Notary Public
 Residing at Deanna L. Stookey

My Commission Expires:

4-5-02



STATE OF UTAH)
) :SS
 COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 31ST day of AUGUST, 2001, by Christopher F. Robinson, a Manager of Uintah Land Company, L.C., a Utah limited liability company.

Notary Public
 Residing at Deanna L. Stookey

My Commission Expires:

4-5-02



STATE OF UTAH)
) :SS
 COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 31ST day of AUGUST, 2001, by Christopher F. Robinson, a Manager of Beaver Creek Investments, L.C., a Utah limited liability company.

Notary Public
 Residing at Deanna L. Stookey

My Commission Expires:

4-5-02



STATE OF UTAH)

:SS

COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

On the 30 day of August, 2001, personally appeared before me Steven E. Clyde acknowledging before me that he is the Vice-Chairman of Utah Open Lands Conservation Association, and that the within and foregoing Agreement is signed on behalf of said corporation by authority of resolution of its board of directors and duly acknowledges to me that said corporation executed the same.

Notary Public

Residing at:

Rita Hulet

My Commission Expires:

9-27-04

EXHIBIT "A"
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

That certain parcel of real property situated in Tooele County, State of Utah and more particularly described as follows:

PARCEL A:

(Parcel 6E)

5-16-1 Lots 2 and 5 of Section 1, Township 2 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

(Parcel 6H)

5-16-1 Lots 1 and 6 of Section 1, Township 2 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

(Parcel 7A)

-2-1 Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, and the Southwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 South, Range 3 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

PARCEL B:

(Parcel 7B)

5-2-2 Lots 11 and 12, Section 6, Township 2 South, Range 3 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

PARCEL C:

(Parcel 6M)

5-16-12 Lot 8, Section 1, Township 2 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

PARCEL F:

A parcel of land located in the Sections 25 and 36, Township 1 South, Range 4 West and Section 1 Township 2 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Tooele County, State of Utah, more fully described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point the North Quarter Corner of Section 1, Township 2 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, thence South 00°23'14" West 2588.06 feet to the Southwest Corner of Lot 5 of said Section 1; thence South 00°23'14" West 1353.03 feet to the Southwest Corner of Lot 8 of said Section 1; thence South 89°46'33" West 1170.56 feet to a point of non-tangency of a 2175.00 foot radius curve to the left, of which the radius point bears South 83°24'22" West; thence Northwesterly 682.16 feet along said curve through a central angle of 17°58'12" to a point on the easterly line of the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way; thence following said easterly line the following seven courses: North 29°48'37" East 339.23 feet to a point of tangency of a 3869.83 foot radius curve to the left, Northeasterly 2111.79 feet along said curve through a central angle of 31°16'00", North 01°27'23" West 982.72 feet, South 89°24'10" East 50.03 feet, North 01°27'23" West 1246.78 feet to a point of tangency of a 3919.83 foot radius curve to the left, Northwesterly 758.25 feet along said curve through a central angle of 11°05'00", North 12°32'23" West 2322.30 feet to the east line of the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 36, Township 1 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence North 00°16'05" East 204.46; thence North 89°43'36" West 72.12 feet to said easterly line of the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way; thence following said easterly line North 12°32'23" West 2211.21 feet to a point on the north line of the South Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 25, Township 1 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence following said north line South 89°45'19" East 1899.36 feet to the North-South Quarter Line of said Section 25; thence South 00°23'14" West 1320.00 feet to the North Quarter Corner of Section 36, Township 1 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence along the north line of said Section 36 North 89°45'19" West 660.00 feet; thence South 00°23'14" West 1320.00 feet; thence South 89°45'19" East 660.00 feet to the North-South Quarter Line of said Section 36; thence along said North-South Quarter Line of said Section 36 South 00°23'14" West 3987.22 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

LESS AND EXCEPTING THEREFROM:

That portion conveyed to Kennecott Copper Corporation, as recorded September 29, 1978 as Entry No. 327106, in Book 165, at Page 364, Tooele County Recorder's Office and being more particularly described as follows:

The following 10 foot strip of land located in Sections 25 and 36, Township 1 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian:

The East 10 feet of the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 25 and that portion of the North 10 feet of Section 36 in the West half of the Northeast quarter of the Northwest quarter and extending 10 feet West into the Northwest quarter of the Northwest quarter.

Exhibit B.
2023 09.06

Comment ID	Interactive Map Comments	Street/Route	From	To
4	This road negatively and unnecessarily impacts the quality of life for homeowners, the town of lake point and other historical areas next to it. It also impacts mule deer, elk herds and other animals living here. It also impacts preservation of the foothill area, open space and views and access to BLM lands for public use remaining safe for residents. It also should not be done as it will be too close to native American petroglyphs that could be damaged but the very least impacted by this negatively. In addition there are better routes for a North to South Corridor in Tooele Valley that do not have these impacts and this corridor should not be done where it is unless it is further east up the mountains. I will be doing all I can to oppose this Oquirrh Expressway.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
5	This road negatively and unnecessarily impacts the quality of life for homeowners, the town of lake point and other historical areas next to it. It also impacts mule deer, elk herds and other animals living here. It also impacts preservation of the foothill area, open space and views and access to BLM lands for public use remaining safe for residents. It also should not be done as it will be too close to native American petroglyphs that could be damaged but the very least impacted by this negatively. In addition there are better routes for a North to South Corridor in Tooele Valley that do not have these impacts and this corridor should not be done where it is unless it is further east up the mountains. I will be doing all I can to oppose this in this area and trying to have it done in another ar	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
7	I question the need of this road with the widening and development of Droubay. Though I suppose development up into the benches in the next 30 years is inevitable.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
36	This is not the fix for 201 congestions it cuts through Lake point unnecessarily. The road can be fixed without impacting current residents or wildlife areas. There should be a different i80 fix that swings towards the lake instead of impacting people it should impact the unusable area around the great salt lake. This road is asinine, why consider ruining lives when you have an entire dust bowl of a lake you can mess with?	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
37	This is not the fix for congestion of lake point. The road should extend out away from the homeowners and wildlife areas. A better fix would use the worthless land around the great salt lake to avoid cutting into the residential areas with consequences.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
38	I agree we need to have something but with absolutely nothing to the west of the main exit why is it not being placed there? You have so much open space to work with rather then impacting the homes in the community	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension

39	This is so close to the community right along the railroad. It's going to cause more traffic in neighborhoods that have little kids playing and it will be so dangerous. We need to not put it so close there. I agree that we do need an alternative to exit 99, but this is just moving the problem. I TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH THE PLAN!!! IT DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE TO DISRUPT THE ENTIRE ECOSYSTEM OF LAKE POINT IN ORDER FOR A FEW IMPATIENT INDIVIDUALS TO GET HOME 5 OR 10 MINUTES FASTER!!! THE SENSIBLE THING TO DO WOULD BE TO JUST ADD A FEW MORE EXITS ALONG AN ALREADY EXISTING I80 EXAMPLE: EXIT 94 TO STANSBURY/GRANTSVILLE, EXIT 90 ERDA, EXIT 88 TOOEELE ARMY DEPOT, ETC... ALLOWS INDIVIDUALS THAT LIVE FURTHER INTO TOOEELE COUNTY TO ACCESS MORE QUICKLY BYPASSING EXIT 99 ALL TOGETHER!!!! I KNOW I AM A GENIUS!!!! THANK ME LATER!!!! PLEASE CONSIDER THIS SENSIBLE AND LESS COSTLY AND LESS CONTROVERSIAL PROPOSAL!!!!	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
42		Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
43	This idea won't even fix the issue. Without an alternative road connecting straight into 201 the issues won't go away. We need an alternative path to 201 without getting on I-80. Also the current route would be hard on the environment because of the hillside not to mention it will be extremely close to the neighborhood. We have an entire open area west of SR-36 that would be perfectly utilized to make this route. But again it would need to connect directly into 201 to actually make a difference.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
44	This option of placing 201 right there will completely decimate the desirability of the houses that are being built and have just been built up near there.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
45	Good concept but wrong location. Why are we running it against the mountain when we have so much open space west of SR-36	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
46	I highly disagree with this plan. This would be devastating to the city of Lake Point and hinder the overall growth of Tooeele making new construction less desirable in this area. The road should come from the west, using the land that will most likely never be used for anything. This proposed road would unnecessarily deface the beautiful mountain side and deter growth. This would be very disappointing and devastating.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
49	I agree we need one but there are alternate routes for this on the West side of 36 that udot already has mapped out and had plans for. This location is unnecessary and will impact the community negatively when there are other options and have already been looked at as feasible and mapped out. Those other locations provide a situation like I15/Legacy away from most homes but this plan makes our community like I15/215 in a smaller area near all the homes.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension

50	this alternative location would be more costly to the taxpayers and be a more extensive project than going on the westside of 36 that's more flat and doesn't require the stabilization of the mountainside the digging construction and all those various aspects why are you doing here versus the west side as previously shown to residence of this County	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
51	Please don't build a highway in my backyard. Why would this road be an option? A major road through this area will negatively impact traffic on the east side of the dwellings, and wildlife. Why would you put a road above the congested area? When the prior roads have sufficient right of way to expand without effecting wildlife? The traffic that will be forced to go east of the major impacted areas. As the previous would allow both east and west residents to move more efficiently throughout the bottleneck. This would be a huge waste of tax money. If the motorist are forced to go to the most eastern boundary. The neighborhood that exists will be greatly impacted with safety as these areas were not designed to have the amount of traffic that would go through these neighborhoods. There would also be a great negative impact on the wildlife through this area, that would increase the number of accidents involving wildlife. The only option to improve traffic flow with the safety for your citizens should be to utilize existing road	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
52		Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
53	There are plenty of other areas to expand rather than stomping on a beautiful mountain side and the Lake point community. Expand on the roads in place.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
63	My major concern is has the environmental impact been studied? How will the affect the wildlife in the area? Will this location be safe for both people and animals? Has the cost to shore up the mountain been considered compared to a route on the west side of SR36? This cost	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
64	should include both cost to build and cost for long term maintenance. We desperately need an alternate route with all the new growth that a few individuals are excited over. My small town of Lake Point isn't small anymore and now they want to add a freeway. Please consider using the land west of 36 so you don't inturpt our town anymore than you already have.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
65	If this plan is really looking out to 2040, the widening needs to be 4 lanes in each direction.	I-80	SR-36	SR-201
66	There is much more empty space to the West. Shoring up the mountainside and displacing all of the wildlife seems more costly and less environmentally friendly. I think the original plan would be better further West.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension

67	The area to the east of Lake Point is full of wildlife, what plans does UDOT have to keep the deer, elk, coyotes off the road? The designated open/natural space will be adjoining the proposed road, this was not the proposed plan when the space was designated as open space and could negatively impact our wildlife.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
68	The area to the east of Lake Point is full of wildlife, what plans does UDOT have to keep the deer, elk, coyotes off the road? The designated open/natural space will be adjoining the proposed road, this was not the proposed plan when the space was designated as open space and could negatively impact our wildlife.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
69	Fix the existing road ways before paving more. Fix the off ramps. Going through rural area is not going to do anything other than cause litter and noise pollution.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
70	I think this is a horrible idea and seems like a dangerous road considering all the animals that are constantly by the mountains, being next to the train that are constantly coming by. Also seems like it would cost and very alot more to build on that side. They should look into the west side of sr36 Its already flat, not as much wildlife Udot already had a plan drawn out for it	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
71	Please don't build this road. Not only will it limits access to BLM land for recreation purposes such as hunting, horseback riding, hiking, it will cause a major disturbance to the residents of Lake point. Many of us already dislike the amount of houses going in but to have a road right next to the mountain is just not something many want to see. Go out the other way...build up the area next to the current I-80 and 36 for more traffic means.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
73	It appears to me that tax money would go a lot further if we did not dig up the mountainside and used the area west of I-80. Financially this seems to make more sense to me. I am also concerned about access to BLM land and the danger with all of the wildlife in the area.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
74	Please don't build a highway behind my house. My family and I enjoy hikes and walks on that trails behind the house. It will create noise and pollution. Can't we extend the road that already exists on S 36?	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
80	Seems like this stretch just drops all traffic right at the 180 entrance so all it's going to do is make an already bottleneck situation even worse.	SR-201 extension	SR-36	SR-201
81	There are a number of Indian artifacts and stone carvings in this area - and early pioneer markings on the boulders. This history needs to be preserved before any construction destroys it.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd

84	Building this road is a waste of taxpayer dollars. The traffic coming in and out of Tooele County comes from the west side of 36. Building on the east side of 36 is ridiculous. I will destroy the natural landscape and limit access to public lands. Additionally it will increase traffic through the town of Lake Point, who's roads and infrastructure are not capable of supporting any additional traffic. There is plenty of land west of 36 to either add an exit for Stansbury Park residents to use.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
85	This is an odd location for a road. It appears to be more aligned with a couple of property owner's interests than an alternative North/South route. It dead ends at Droubay by the railroad tracks in between Erda and Pine Canyon. Not a high population area and no easy east/west connection to alleviate any considerable amount of traffic off of SR-36. Population growth will happen more towards the center of the Valley. Need North/South routes there.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
86	A road to nowhere is a good description, but think about it... You have a higher density area with the potential of high traffic running straight into a highly populated area... all to funnel people through to I-80. Poor choice... especially since you will most likely have issues acquiring some of that land that could be costly.	400 West	Village Blvd	2000 North
87	This doesn't make any sense... they just barely finished extending Saddleback Blvd curving a little to the south with a roundabout. I also don't see how this road would help lessen any congestion. The connection at Saddleback and 36 is already bad.	Saddleback Blvd	SR-36	Oquirrh Expressway
88	This is one large property owner's solution to increase the value of his property. It has very little to do with providing an alternative outlet out of the valley as much as padding his pocket.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
89	A better option that would effect fewer homes and population would be to run the road down 1200 West as planned rather than run a main artery through Cochrane Lane and Tom's Lane. Cochrane is currently a country road with many children getting on and off school buses and where children ride bikes. This would make it very dangerous.	400 West	Village Blvd	2000 North
90	I highly oppose the location of the Oquirrh Expressway. It looks to benefit developers. The wildlife that lives on the bench will be impacted. You will forever change the look of the mountains that everyone in the Tooele Valley loves. This should go on the west side of the valley so it can benefit more communities with the amount of money it will cost. It is a very odd location to drop the road off on... right by the tracks on Droubay. One of the lowest populations in the area and the tracks already have malfunctioned on times where people have to turn around.. this will make this much worse. You will also take away the use of the trailheads already located in these areas.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
91	The location where this proposed expressway ties into Droubay Rd. is a bad plan in my opinion. The railroad track at this location is a very busy track and to drop a expressway off at that location would cause frequent traffic backups on a daily basis.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd

	The train quite frequently stops on the tracks at that location.				
95	Here is the map with the original plan for the 201 extension and separate exits. As you can see it does not go through the foothills, wildlife areas, hiking and equestrian activities, native American petroglyphs and more currently there. This is the better plan already evaluated and proposed and it is where the best place to put it is so the impact would be limited. This is what we want for the 201 extension. It connects all the area without the huge impact. I'm addition, why not place it and plan for it in an area that is away from homes while we can and development can plan around it not drop it in areas of huge impact including conservation areas. The west side of 36 would work well like legacy and I15.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension	
102	Having the lane from 201 go straight past the rest area and extend the lane to exit 99 without having to merge into the i80 lane would eliminate a huge bottle neck	I-80	SR-36	SR-201	
103	More exits to/from i80 are a great idea, BUT THEY DO NOTHING IF THE BOTTLE NECK AROUND THE MOUNTAIN ISN'T FIXED! If i80 isn't widened with something to stop the people who take exit 99 from blocking people who continue further westbound then is does nothing. Also if 201 isn't extended around the mountain and connected to droubay to relieve some of the traffic as well as provide another route if something happened to i80 this does nothing. Both of those projects need to be done before this one.	Midvalley Highway	I-80	SR-138	
107	I didn't believe the person who told me about this proposed project, because it doesn't make any sense and benefits only one developer and not the Tooele Valley. The day that road goes in is the day I'll be moving out of Tooele. With so many worthy and important projects, please don't waste money on this one, just so one developer can ruin the foothills with homes.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd	
110	What do we have against open space and wildlife? This area is the winter range for mule deer. Building a road in this area is asking for fatalities (human and wildlife). The benefits are minimal unless you are the developer to the north and the costs would be high. Surely we can come up with something better	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd	
112	Absolute and utter waste! Helps with economic growth but does nothing to address the real issue which is on I-80 between SR36 and SR201. Stop this project and focus on fixing the real problem that plagues commuters frequently!	Midvalley Highway	I-80	SR-138	
113	Tooele does need an alternate route out of the valley but this road is NOT THE ANSWER. It will disrupt that natural habitat of the wildlife there. It would put travelers in danger of hitting wildlife and getting hurt. It would ruin hiking and horseback riding in the area. It would destroy the beautiful Oquirrh Range that we love. Build the road farther west which would save us taxpayers money.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension	

114	This is the wrong place for this road. Yes we need alternate routes to ease congestion but the east side of the valley is not the problem. Plus it will destroy wildlife. Put in more exits off I80 to help with Stansbury and Grantsville communities.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
116	It would be great to have a bridge or connecting highway between SR-36 to I-80 prior to the lake point McDonald's. Avoiding the slow down area yet still having use of the Flying J exit to get to fuel and food.	SR-201 extension	SR-36	SR-201
117	I don't think a five mile road will help anything. You would have to leave a highway, drive thru a neighborhood, then get onto a new highway that hooks onto the original one you were already on! There's plenty of flat ground west of sr36.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
118	Drying it out is cheaper than trying to bulldoze a hillside Bad idea. There are lots of us who live along droubay with our small hobby farms and young families. This is the road we bike down, ride horses down, and take walks along. With this it will be very busy and unsafe. Whave our property right up agaist droubay. This will ruin every reason we moved to Erda. Find another route. Keep our rural area out of this.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
141	The cost of building a long stretch of road like this is too high. It would be a better use of money to improve existing roads and fix existing problems.	(quirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
142	This road will have to cross train tracks. People use SR36 instead of droubay because droubay crosses tracks. Nobody wants to get stopped by a train when they are rushing to work in the morning.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
146	Easily the worst idea of the projected "improvements". The road would open up too much development in an area that many people use for hiking, biking, running, ATV-ing, etc. Looking at the map here the road also appears not to have much purpose unless the area is built up all the way to the mountains. There is plenty of other space to create the Tooele- Stansbury-Grantsville Tri-opolis. Please leave this one section alone. A note on the build up of the entire valley... is there going to be enough water to support this mega growth? Some people I know in Erda have already had to drill their wells deeper for water which isn't cheap and it is not going to get any better no matter how many heavy winters you hope for.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
147	This is almost as bad as the Oquirrh Expressway. Anything east of the tracks should be off limits. Open spaces are a necessity not just for wildlife, but people as well. There is plenty of space from Droubay west.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
169	This proposed road will not help with any traffic problems it will only help the land owners in Erda and Lakepoint. They will sell their property to a developer and they will build more houses and create more traffic. There is already a north and south road going to Lakepoint it is Droubay road. This road could eliminate most of the traffic on	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd

	the east side of Tooele. All that would be needed is to extend it from Bates canyon Rd. to S.R.201 Then the Lake point developers can Be happy. Horrible idea. The money from this should be used to build the Midvalley Highway, and upgrades to the existing roads. Many of the longer routed roads through the county, are in dire need of resurfacing, and many need widening. Horrible idea. The money from this should be used to build the Midvalley Highway, and upgrades to the existing roads. Many of the longer routed roads through the county, are in dire need of resurfacing, and many need widening.				
184		Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
185		Droubay Rd	Center St	Center St	SR-201 extension
187	I'll join the others by saying that this project needs to happen YESTERDAY. From a design standpoint, Maybe design the whole Mid-Valley Highway, similar to the Legacy Corridor in Davis County. Dual use highway with plenty of pedestrian paths. Money from other nonsensical projects like your Droubay Expressways to the east, could be put into jump starting both ends of the highway project, completing it earlier. This makes more sense for residents as it serves EVERYONE in the Tooele Valley due to its central location. This project at both ends, needs to be started ASAP, ahead of other considerations for any other bypass routes. The only exception to this, would be the SR201 to SR36 bypass route, since it would also help fix the traffic problem.	Midvalley Highway	I-80		SR-138
209	I apologize but I think everyone is kind of missing the point. The published information is almost meaningless, with no technical support information. Where is a population/transport study recommending a highway on the extreme East side of the valley? It would be relatively costly construction especially near the northern turn to the east due to relatively steep mountain slope. People in Tooele and Stansbury would be much better served with access to a significant midvalley highway. In addition, the presented planning map is not even up to date with existing changes already being made to roads in the Lake Point area. Where are the preliminary studies? I am not in favor of submitting an extremely early draft idea out for public opinion without any basis provided. This stirs up emotion without solving any identified problems. I believe this is highly detrimental to the committee's true intent to help. Let's work hard and determine the needs and then we can discuss solutions.	Droubay Rd	Center St		SR-201 extension
219	Yes, I hope this road is the counties first priority time-wise and also financially. This road is so needed here in this county. It will benefit us all.	Midvalley Highway	I-80		SR-138

236	This is a horrible proposal. Expensive to build and HUGE negative impact to Tooele Valley future as a "So Much. So Close" tourism destination - that is why we are spending all this money to promote Tooele - RIGHT? Roads already exist to support North/South traffic. SR36 already has the footprint that can expand ... AND is already heavily designated as commercial land. Think of how Park City protected habitat, residential appeal and area desirability with the Swaner Preserve and the Rail Trail for tourism. This could be mirrored for the betterment of all of Tooele Valley. Do not negatively impact the natural beauty of Tooele Valley with an duplicative north/south route. Expand and improve what we have. The entire valley does not need to be a freeway!	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
239	This is an expressway to no-where! It will just dead end! Concentrate efforts on getting traffic THROUGH the valley (North and South)... Midvalley Highway does this with a plan for appropriate East and West parkways to support local traffic.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
245	Bad idea. That can't dump off anywhere near the train tracks. So much bottle neck would occur. 1.. money better spent on other projects, 2.. If that is ever considered in the very distant future it needs to connect further south and traverse the benches closer so it doesn't impact rural living. Better growth opportunities elsewhere in the valley.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
269	I'm oppose to this recommendation, wildlife cannot survive in this area if this road is created. What do you plan for wildlife preservation? Reduced food and migration, which this road creates, will be their downfall, stop this madness. What will be in place so they can migrate, feed and survive during harsh winters. This will also disrupt the feel of the rural environment, which is why I moved here. When will we stop letting growth and money kill our wildlife? We need better transportation and better planning that works for all living things. Utilize the rail system that already exists on the mountain. Think out of the box, the last thing we need is to support more vehicles, the pollution is already unbearable out here.	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
271	Money would be better spent on the midvalley highway along with extending village blvd. This would reduce traffic on SR36 giving commuters on the east and north end of Tooele a smother commute on SR36. Maybe SR36 is the road needing improved? Also, Droubay Rd is a rural RESIDENTIAL area, so desperate commuters should be using SR36 where they belong. Commuting may be their biggest priority in life, but families along Droubay Rd are trying to live their life! please show a little courtesy and stop endangering our families and friends.	Droubay Rd	Bates Canyon Rd	Center St

272	This is way too close to the railroad tracks and will need a way over the railroad tracks and will also ruin the BLM trail that so many use that gives walking and horse access up the canyon and it infringes on people's existing backyards and properties. The space is just too tight. Why not utilize a road that is already made? Like Bates Canyon and Smelter Road as access points? This would serve both Erda and Tooele residents. Why create a new road? Why have it be right next to railroad tracks? This probably wouldn't give the proper easement and we should always, always strive to not impede on existing homes and land with homes on it. That should be the last option ALWAYS!	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
273	We attended the meeting on Jan 31st and concluded there needs to be far more consideration, feasibility planning, and research done before moving forward. We live on Green Meadows Court and would be greatly affected by this roadway. Before moving forward we request further consideration of other options that would not so greatly affect the untouched habitat and environment behind our home. The train tracks that cross Droubay Road seem like a large barrier to such a major roadway entrance as well. Thank you for your time and consideration with this matter, ShayLyn Peterson	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
274	This proposal needs another ramp added between Exit 99 and the Midvalley Highway. I suggest the UDOT haul road, Beaman Way. Make Beaman Way the east I-80 access point. Replace the east I-80 on ramp at mile 99 with only the SR-201 extension entrance and remove the current SR-201 exit. This accomplishes many positive things. Those traveling West on I-80 wanting to take SR-201 would exit at Lake Point and use the new extension as access, or they could use SR-202. By separating I-80 and SR-201, the dangerous lane changes to exit at freeway speeds are eliminated. A stoplight could then be added by Hardy Road/Clinton Landing Road to improve safety of Semi's exiting Travel America truck-stop. For Semi's to obtain east I-80 access, they would need to utilize the Beaman Way entrance, or take SR-201 to SR-202. With this extension, SR-201 should be widened to 2 lanes in both directions from Lake Point to Kennecott's main entrance. Additional TC new east roads could also connect to SR-201 Ext.	SR-201 extension	SR-36	SR-201

275	Placement of the SR-201 extension is critical. The Oquirrh Mountains support a large Herd of Elk, that winter and forage between Lake Point and SR-201 exit. The greater space you leave between I-80 and this extension, the greater the damage to their winter range and the potential accidents caused by them crossing the road for food and fresh water from the springs all along this corridor. Also consider the high cross winds that are experienced frequently in this section. The higher the elevation, the greater cost for building and maintaining of this stretch, since lake effect storms hit this section during most winter storms. Near the Lake Bonneville Bench line there are also caves and other natural formations that may be damaged from placing this extension to high in elevation. Keep the speed on this section significantly lower than I-80 to accommodate the wildlife visiting the fresh water springs.	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
277	I feel like the negative impacts of this road far outweigh any benefits. It would be incredibly expensive, would negatively impact wildlife, and would adversely affect the rural feel of the area, all while benefiting a very small percentage of the Tooele valley. That small percentage will already benefit from the widening and potential extension of Droubay, and so it seems redundant and unnecessary to also add 8+ miles of brand new expressway running parallel that will benefit far fewer people, while having such a huge negative impact on so many others. I agree with many others that because the bulk of the population lies west of Highway 36, transportation efforts would be more wisely allocated to projects that ease congestion over there. I do not believe this expressway is a wise use of funds, or a positive change for the valley as a whole. Please reconsider building this road!	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
279	Stop making lake point and erda he dumping ground for all pet projects of the county commissioners and developers. These roads would be better served on the west side of 36 where most of the population is	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd
280	Stop making lake point and erda the dumping ground for all pet projects of the county commissioners and developers. These roads would be better served on the west side of 36 where most of the population is	Droubay Rd	Center St	SR-201 extension
281	The location of this expressway would be money spent on a road in the wrong location. This particular area of Tooele Valley has fewer residents because of zoning (usually 5 acre lot sizes), septic systems, and the limiting factor of actual available Water. According to a study done in the early 2000's, this area is over appropriated for the amount of water rights issued on paper. The actual water rights being used currently for this area have not yet reached that limiting factor, although with the concentrated development that is being proposed by developers, it will quickly reach the maximum. Why build a main road in an area that has limited growth potential?	Oquirrh Expressway	Droubay Rd	Droubay Rd

	TOOELE COUNTY GOVERNMENT WOULD BE WISE TO PLAN FOR AN EXPRESSWAY WHERE GROWTH IS NOT AS LIMITED. THEY WOULD ALSO BE WISE IN FOCUSING MORE ON BUILDING COMMERCIAL TYPE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT WOULD ALLOW MORE RESIDENTS TO BE EMPLOYED IN TOOELE VALLEY, RATHER THAN COMMUTING TO THE WASATCH FRONT.			
286	WIDENING THIS STRETCH WILL HELP TRAFFIC FLOW. THREE LANES WILL ACTUALLY GIVE THE ABILITY FOR GOVERNED SEMI'S TO PASS SLOWER VEHICLES WITHOUT SLOWING DOWN THE ENTIRE FLOW OF TRAFFIC WHILE THEY PASS. I AM SURE MANY COLLISIONS HAPPEN ALONG THIS STRETCH BECAUSE OF THE SUDDEN DECREASE IN SPEED WHEN GOVERNED SEMI'S PASS SLOWER TRAFFIC AND IMPEDE THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC. THIS WOULD BE AN EXCELLENT STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. THINKING FORWARD, THIS WIDENING WOULD ALSO BE BENEFICIAL TO CONTINUE ON TO 5600 WEST IN SALT LAKE COUNTY, ESPECIALLY WITH THE COMING OF THE "INLAND PORT" IN THAT AREA.	I-80	SR-36	SR-201

Here are Comments I saved from last time a survey was done by the WFRC on placing anything on the East Side of Highway 36, many opposed.

To SR-201 extension

Phase 1

Project Type New Construction

Lanes

Length (miles) 5.1

Notes

Leave Comment

Public Comments (39)Hide

Comment This is almost as bad as the Oquirrh Expressway. Anything east of the tracks should be off limits. Open spaces are a necessity not just for wildlife, but people as well. There is plenty of space from Droubay west.

Date 1/24/2019, 3:26:54 PM

Comment I don't think a five mile road will help anything. You would have to leave a highway, drive thru a neighborhood, then get onto a new highway that hooks onto the original one you were already on! There's plenty of flat ground west of sr36. Drying it out is cheaper than trying to bulldoze a hillside

Date 1/17/2019, 7:44:18 PM

Comment Tooele does need an alternate route out of the valley but this road is NOT THE ANSWER. It will disrupt that natural habitat of the wildlife there. It would put travelers in danger of hitting wildlife and getting hurt. It would ruin hiking and horseback riding in the area. It would destroy the beautiful Oquirrh Range that we love. Build the road farther west which would save us taxpayers money.

Date 1/16/2019, 9:09:15 PM

Comment Here is the map with the original plan for the 201 extension and separate exits. As you can see it does not go through the foothills, wildlife areas, hiking and equestrian activities, native American petroglyphs and more currently there. This is the better plan already evaluated and proposed and it is where the best place to put it is so the impact would be limited. This is what we want for the 201 extension. It connects all the area without the huge impact. I'm addition, why not place it and plan for it in an area that is away from homes while we can and development can plan around it not drop it in areas of huge impact including conservation areas. The west side of 36 would work well like legacy and I15.

[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=http://maps.udot.utah.gov/wadocuments/apps/ProgramBriefing/2/16380.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi-](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=http://maps.udot.utah.gov/wadocuments/apps/ProgramBriefing/2/16380.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi-ievv2_LfAhUc8YMKHRnkBRkQFjAAegQIBhAB&usg=AOvVaw1WzSJc8bwrksQcgUBg1E4k)

[ievv2_LfAhUc8YMKHRnkBRkQFjAAegQIBhAB&usg=AOvVaw1WzSJc8bwrksQcgUBg1E4k](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=http://maps.udot.utah.gov/wadocuments/apps/ProgramBriefing/2/16380.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi-ievv2_LfAhUc8YMKHRnkBRkQFjAAegQIBhAB&usg=AOvVaw1WzSJc8bwrksQcgUBg1E4k)

Date 1/16/2019, 9:56:41 AM

Comment Building this road is a waste of taxpayer dollars. The traffic coming in and out of Tooele County comes from the west side of 36. Building on the east side of 36 is ridiculous, I will destroy the natural landscape and limit access to public lands. Additionally it will increase traffic though the

town of Lake Point, who's roads and infrastructure are not capable of supporting any additional traffic. There is plenty of land west of 36 to either add an exit for Stansbury Park residents to use.

Date 1/15/2019, 9:12:50 PM

Comment Please don't build a highway behind my house. My family and I enjoy hikes and walks on that trail behind the house. It will create noise and pollution. Can't we extend the road that already exists on S 36?

Date 1/15/2019, 6:14:17 PM

Comment It appears to me that tax money would go a lot further if we did not dig up the mountainside and use the area west of I-80. Financially this seems to make more sense to me. I am also concerned about access to BLM land and the danger with all of the wildlife in the area.

Date 1/15/2019, 5:32:57 PM

Comment Please don't build this road. Not only will it limit access to BLM land for recreation purposes such as hunting, horseback riding, hiking, it will cause a major disturbance to the residents of Lake Point. Many of us already dislike the amount of houses going in but to have a road right next to the mountain is just not something many want to see. Go out the other way...build up the area next to the current I-80 and 36 for more traffic means.

Date 1/15/2019, 3:28:03 PM

Comment I think this is a horrible idea and seems like a dangerous road considering all the animals that are constantly by the mountains, being next to the train that are constantly coming by. Also seems like it would cost a very lot more to build on that side. They should look into the west side of SR 36. It's already flat, not as much wildlife. UDOT already had a plan drawn out for it.

Date 1/15/2019, 3:08:31 PM

Comment The area to the east of Lake Point is full of wildlife, what plans does UDOT have to keep the deer, elk, coyotes off the road? The designated open/natural space will be adjoining the proposed road, this was not the proposed plan when the space was designated as open space and could negatively impact our wildlife.

Date 1/15/2019, 2:25:27 PM

Comment The area to the east of Lake Point is full of wildlife, what plans does UDOT have to keep the deer, elk, coyotes off the road? The designated open/natural space will be adjoining the proposed road, this was not the proposed plan when the space was designated as open space and could negatively impact our wildlife.

Date 1/15/2019, 2:25:27 PM

Comment There is much more empty space to the West. Shoring up the mountainside and displacing all of the wildlife seems more costly and less environmentally friendly. I think the original plan would be better further West.

Date 1/15/2019, 1:27:59 PM

Comment We desperately need an alternate route with all the new growth that a few individuals are excited over. My small town of Lake Point isn't small anymore and now they want to add a freeway. Please consider using the land west of 36 so you don't interrupt our town anymore than you already have.

Date 1/15/2019, 12:40:16 PM

Comment My major concern is has the environmental impact been studied? How will the affect the wildlife in the area? Will this location be safe for both people and animals? Has the cost to shore up the mountain been considered compared to a route on the west side of SR36? This cost should include both cost to build and cost for long term maintenance.

Date 1/15/2019, 11:13:46 AM

Comment There are plenty of other areas to expand rather than stomping on a beautiful mountain side and the Lake point community. Expand on the roads in place.

Date 1/15/2019, 8:23:48 AM

Comment Why would this road be an option? A major road through this area will negatively impact traffic on the east side of the dwellings, and wildlife. Why would you put a road above the congested area? When the prior roads have sufficient right of way to expand without effecting wildlife? The traffic that will be forced to go east of the major impacted areas. As the previous would allow both east and west residents to move more efficiently throughout the bottleneck. This would be a huge waste of tax money. If the motorist are forced to go to the most eastern boundary. The neighborhood that exists will be greatly impacted with safety as these areas were not designed to have the amount of traffic that would go through these neighborhoods. There would also be a great negative impact on the wildlife through this area, that would increase the number of accidents involving wildlife. The only option to improve traffic flow with the safety for your citizens should be to utilize existing road

Date 1/15/2019, 7:17:07 AM

Comment Please don't build a highway in my backyard.

Date 1/15/2019, 7:05:00 AM

Comment this alternative location would be more costly to the taxpayers and be a more extensive project than going on the westside of 36 that's more flat and doesn't require the stabilization of the mountainside the digging construction and all those various aspects why are you doing here versus the west side as previously shown to residence of this County

Date 1/15/2019, 5:57:42 AM

Comment I agree we need one but there are alternate routes for this on the West side of 36 that udot already has mapped out and had plans for. This location is unnecessary and will impact the community negatively when there are other options and have already been looked at as feasible and mapped out. Those other locations provide a situation like I15/Legacy away from most homes but this plan makes our community like I15/215 in a smaller area near all the homes.

Date 1/15/2019, 5:56:35 AM

Comment I highly disagree with this plan. This would be devistating to the city of Lake Point and hinder the overall growth of Tooele making new construction less desirable in this area. The road should come from the west, using the land that will most likely never be used for anything. This proposed road would unnecessarily deface the beautiful mountain side and deter growth. This would be very disappointing and devistating.

Date 1/14/2019, 11:39:30 PM

Comment Good concept but wrong location. Why are we running it against the mountain when we have so much open space west of SR-36

Date 1/14/2019, 11:29:02 PM

Comment This option of placing 201 right there will completely decimate the desirability of the houses that are being built and have just been built up near there.

Date 1/14/2019, 11:15:02 PM

Comment This idea won't even fix the issue. Without an alternative road connecting straight into 201 the issues won't go away. We need an alternative path to 201 without getting on I-80. Also the current route would be hard on the environment because of the hillside not to mention it will be extremely close to the neighborhood. We have an entire open area west of SR-36 that would be perfectly utilized to make this route. But again it would need to connect directly into 201 to actually make a difference.

Date 1/14/2019, 11:14:42 PM

Comment I TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH THE PLAN!!! IT DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE TO DISRUPT THE ENTIRE ECOSYSTEM OF LAKE POINT IN ORDER FOR A FEW IMPATIENT INDIVIDUALS TO GET HOME 5 OR 10 MINUTES FASTER!!! THE SENSIBLE THING TO DO WOULD BE TO JUST ADD A FEW MORE EXITS ALONG AN ALREADY EXISTING I80 EXAMPLE: EXIT 94 TO STANSBURY/GRANTSVILLE, EXIT EXIT 90 ERDA, EXIT 88 TOOELE ARMY DEPOT, ETC... ALLOWS INDIVIDUALS THAT LIVE FURTHER INTO TOOELE COUNTY TO ACCESS MORE QUICKLY BYPASSING EXIT 99 ALL TOGETHER!!!! I KNOW I AM A GENIUS!!!! THANK ME LATER!!!! PLEASE CONSIDER THIS SENSIBLE AND LESS COSTLY AND LESS CONTROVERSIAL PROPOSAL!!!!

Date 1/14/2019, 11:11:18 PM

Comment This is so close to the community right along the railroad. It's going to cause more traffic in neighborhoods that have little kids playing and it will be so dangerous. We need to not put it so close there. I agree that we do need an alternative to exit 99, but this is just moving the problem.

Date 1/14/2019, 11:02:18 PM

Comment I agree we need to have something but with absolutely nothing to the west of the main exit why is it not being placed there? You have so much open space to work with rather than impacting the homes in the community

Date 1/14/2019, 10:51:29 PM

Comment This is not the fix for 201 congestions it cuts through Lake point unnecessarily. The road can be fixed without impacting current residents or wildlife areas. There should be a different i80 fix that swings towards the lake instead of impacting people it should impact the unusable area around the great salt lake. This road is asinine, why consider ruining lives when you have an entire dust bowl of a lake you can mess with?

Date 1/14/2019, 10:35:08 PM

Comment This road negatively and unnecessarily impacts the quality of life for homeowners, the town of lake point and other historical areas next to it. It also impacts mule deer, elk herds and other animals living here. It also impacts preservation of the foothill area, open space and views and access to BLM lands for public use remaining safe for residents. It also should not be done as it will be too close to native American petroglyphs that could be damaged but the very least impacted by this negatively. In addition there are better routes for a North to South Corridor in Tooele Valley that do not have these impacts and this corridor should not be done where it is unless it is further east up the mountains. I will be doing all I can to oppose this in this area and trying to have it done in another area

Date 1/14/2019, 11:24:20 AM

Oquirrh Expressway

From Droubay Rd

To Droubay Rd

Phase 1

Project Type New Construction

Lanes

Length (miles) 8.2

Notes

Leave Comment

Public Comments (22)Hide

Comment This proposed road will not help with any traffic problems it will only help the land owners in Erda and Lakepoint. They will sell their property to a developer and they will build more houses and create more traffic. There is already a north and south road going to Lakepoint it is Droubay road. This road could eliminate most of the traffic on the east side of Tooele. All that would be needed is to extend it from Bates canyon Rd. to S.R.201 Then the Lake point developers can Be happy.

Date 1/25/2019, 12:17:39 PM

Comment Easily the worst idea of the projected "improvements". The road would open up too much development in an area that many people use for hiking, biking, running, ATV-ing, etc. Looking at the map here the road also appears not to have much purpose unless the area is built up all the way to the mountains. There is plenty of other space to create the Tooele-Stansbury-Grantsville Tri-opolis. Please leave this one section alone. A note on the build up of the entire valley... is there going to be enough water to support this mega growth? Some people I know in Erda have already had to drill their wells deeper for water which isn't cheap and it is not going to get any better no matter how many heavy winters you hope for.

Date 1/24/2019, 1:55:58 PM

Comment The cost of building a long stretch of road like this is too high. It would be a better use of money to improve existing roads and fix existing problems.

Date 1/22/2019, 10:26:33 PM

Comment Bad idea. There are lots of us who live along droubay with our small hobby farms and young families. This is the road we bike down, ride horses down, and take walks along. With this it will be very busy and unsafe. Whave our property right up agaist droubay. This will ruin every reason we moved to Erda. Find another route. Keep our rural area out of this.

Date 1/17/2019, 10:16:21 PM

Comment This is the wrong place for this road. Yes we need alternate routes to ease congestion but the east side of the valley is not the problem. Plus it will destroy wildlife. Put in more exits off I80 to help with Stansbury and Grantsville communities.

Date 1/16/2019, 9:17:10 PM

Comment What do we have against open space and wildlife? This area is the winter range for mule deer. Building a road in this area is asking for fatalities (human and wildlife). The benefits are

minimal unless you are the developer to the north and the costs would be high. Surely we can come up with something better

Date 1/16/2019, 8:26:11 PM

Comment I didn't believe the person who told me about this proposed project, because it doesn't make any sense and benefits only one developer and not the Tooele Valley. The day that road goes in is the day I'll be moving out of Tooele. With so many worthy and important projects, please don't waste money on this one, just so one developer can ruin the foothills with homes.

Date 1/16/2019, 3:35:48 PM

Comment The location where this proposed expressway ties into Droubay Rd. is a bad plan in my opinion. The railroad track at this location is a very busy track and to drop a expressway off at that location would cause frequent traffic backups on a daily basis. The train quite frequently stops on the tracks at that location.

Date 1/16/2019, 8:41:54 AM

Comment I highly oppose the location of the Oquirrh Expressway. It looks to benefit developers. The wildlife that lives on the bench will be impacted. You will forever change the look of the mountains that everyone in the Tooele valley love. This should go on the west side of the valley so it can benefit more communities with the amount of money it will cost. It is a very odd location to drop the road off on.. right by the tracks on Droubay. One of the lowest populations in the area and the tracks already have malfunctioned on times where people have to turn around.. this will make this much worse. You will also take away the use of the trailheads already located in these areas.

Date 1/16/2019, 7:15:31 AM

Comment This is one large property owners solution to increase the value of his property. It has very little to do with providing an alternative outlet out of the valley as much as padding his pocket.

Date 1/15/2019, 9:51:41 PM

Comment This is an odd location for a road. It appears to be more aligned with a couple of property owner's interests than an alternative North/South route. It dead ends at Droubay by the railroad tracks in between Erda and Pine Canyon. Not a high population area and no easy east/west connection to alleviate any considerable amount of traffic off of SR-36. Population growth will happen more towards the center of the Valley. Need North/South routes there.

Date 1/15/2019, 9:28:20 PM

Comment There are a number of Indian artifacts and stone carvings in this area - and early pioneer markings on the boulders. This history needs to be preserved before any construction destroys it.

Date 1/15/2019, 8:39:04 PM

Comment Fix the existing road ways before paving more. Fix the off ramps. Going through rural area is not going to do anything other than cause litter and noise pollution.

Date 1/15/2019, 2:27:36 PM

Comment This is not the fix for congestion of lake point. The road should extend out away from the homeowners and wildlife areas. A better fix would use the worthless land around the great salt lake to avoid cutting into the residential areas with consequences.

Date 1/14/2019, 10:45:54 PM

Comment This road negatively and unnecessarily impacts the quality of life for homeowners, the town of lake point and other historical areas next to it. It also impacts mule deer, elk herds and other animals living here. It also impacts preservation of the foothill area, open space and views and access to BLM lands for public use remaining safe for residents. It also should not be done as it will be too close to native American petroglyphs that could be damaged but the very least impacted by this negatively. In addition there are better routes for a North to South Corridor in Tooele Valley that do not have these impacts and this corridor should not be done where it is unless it is further east up the mountains. I will be doing all I can to oppose this Oquirrh Expressway.

Date 1/14/2019, 11:21:18 AM