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Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Wednesday, August 31, 2004

In Attendance:
Jim Villareal, Emigration Canyon Resident
Hilary Silberman, Emigration Canyon Resident
Joe Smolka, Emigration Canyon Resident, Community Council Chair
Andy McNeil, Emigration Canyon Resident
Sarah Bennett Alley, Emigration Canyon Resident
Janet Haskell, Canyon Resident
Tom Roach, Salt Lake County Planning Division
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Emery Crook, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex at 9:00 AM. Lynn Larsen of the Salt Lake County Division of Parks and Recreation provided a brief overview of the purpose of the meeting, and introduced plan consultants Jan Striefel and Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design, who presented the meeting agenda. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING DAYS AND TIMES
It was decided that future meetings would take place at 4:00 PM on the first Thursday of each month through December, beginning on October 7th, 2004. Committee members are urged to mark their calendars accordingly. The October 7th meeting will take place at the Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division Meeting Room, S2100 South State Street, SLC, Room S-4017.

It was noted that the schedule is fairly flexible, allowing for additional meetings and/or modifications to accommodate unforeseen needs and changes.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION
Since the intent of the Steering Committee is to provide critical advice as the plan is produced, it is essential that the composition of the group be diverse and represent as many points of view as possible. Most of those in attendance stated that they believe the current composition of the committee is adequately diverse, representing a broad range of views and concerns.

It was noted that some designated committee members were not in attendance, but should be included. It was suggested that representatives of the County Council and Township Planning Commission be included, in part to confirm the planning process during the plan adoption phase. It was also suggested that representatives of key public agencies such as National Forest Service, SLC Watershed, Fire Department, etc. be included as committee members.

The following is the preliminary composition of the Emigration Canyon Trails Master Plan Advisory Committee:

TBD, Emigration Canyon Township Planning Commission
Jim Villareal, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Rick Spearman, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Finally, it was noted that Advisory Committee meetings are open public meetings and that members of the public are welcome to attend and observe all meetings.

ROLE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
The role of the Advisory Committee is to provide advice as the Emigration Canyon Trails Master Plan is developed. During this process, all members are welcome to address comments or questions directly to Jan Striefel or Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design, or to Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division. A Project website will be linked to the Landmark Design website (www.ldi-ut.com) for dissemination of meeting notes and key information.

REVIEW OF SCOPE AND SCHEDULE
The Preliminary Schedule for completing the Emigration Trail Master Plan was reviewed. To summarize, plan production is earmarked to be completed in approximately five months, during which time the Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet monthly (5 meetings).

A preliminary date of October 12th was set for a Public Open House meeting at Camp Kostopulos to review existing conditions, research data and preliminary trail ideas. Canyon residents will be invited to attend this meeting by the Emigration Canyon Community Council.

Adoption of the Draft Plan is envisioned to begin in January 2005. It was noted that some flexibility is built into the process to provide additional plan production and approval time if necessary.

COUNTY TRAILS
Salt Lake County has four trail priorities: Bonneville Shoreline, Parleys, Jordan River, and Dimple Dell, but there are others as well such as the Mountain View Highway corridor. Each year the County has between $200,000 and $500,000 available to spend on trail related projects, and most of it is leveraged with matching grants.

INITIAL SCOPING OF TRAILS ISSUES
The following is a summary of initial issues and ideas presented by those in attendance:

Key Trail Issues
Access and Private Property are the primary issues. Others include:
Property owner privacy
Property owner protection (from vandalism, etc.)
Parking/access and trailheads
Fire safety
Mode of trail use (hiking, biking, equestrian)

Killyon Canyon
Hiking trails are an OK idea, although mountain bike use is problematic and not desirable (even to local residents who use mountain bikes). One option for accommodating both of these user groups in Killyon Canyon is to improve the existing trail in the drainage for hikers, and to create a new trail on the slopes above for bikers.

Management of Trail Use
One idea is to introduce "Millcreek Canyon" or "City Creek" system for even/odd days to control hike and bike conflicts. However, it was noted that such programs usually only work when the access point is controlled through a gate. In comparison to Millcreek Canyon, it was expressed that Emigration Canyon be maintained as a dog-friendly place.

Emigration Oaks and Other Development Areas
Residents are nervous about public access and use. Land ownership and public/private land use issues are paramount.

Trail Design and Maintenance
Existing trails have been lost or are on the verge of being lost due to poor maintenance and poor design. Maintenance and design are key points to consider in order to assure that the final trail system works. The final system of trails needs to be carefully sited and designed, and existing site conditions and topography carefully addressed to minimize future problems. Salt Lake County stated that once the trail plan is complete, it will assume responsibility for some trail maintenance.

Trail Access and Trailheads
Would like to have a few, well-advertised and highly-visible public parking areas available in order to discourage "informal" access from occurring in the side canyons and private home areas. Key trailheads/parking areas should be developed at the mouth of the canyon and at Little Mountain, with Burr Fork, Killyon Canyon facilities, and the new fire station as other potential sites. Public trailheads should be well-signed and large enough to achieve this goal.

It is thought that most of trail use will be multi-use non-motorized, but some areas of the canyon may be suitable only for foot traffic. Some equestrian use also occurs.
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Hilary Silberman, Emigration Canyon Resident
Joe Smolka, Emigration Canyon Resident, Community Council Chair
Andy McNeil, Emigration Canyon Resident
Sarah Bennett Alley, Emigration Canyon Resident
Christopher Jones
Gary Bowen
Jan Cook
Bruce Cummings
Tom Johnson
Peggy Quinlan
Tracie Kirkham, Salt Lake City Watershed
Rick Spearman
Cheryl Hanzelka
Karen Nichols,
Jim Scott
Mike Watson
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Emery Crook, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design
Lisa Sokol-Benson, Landmark Design
Michael Jones, Alta Planning

Observers in Attendance:
Jim Villareal, Emigration Canyon Resident
Elly Muth, Salt Lake County Council Office
Rick Friedman
Angela Cummings
Jack Christensen
Kathy Christensen
Lisa Neuhof

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Following introductions, Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design presided over the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

Several observers or visitors representing Emigration Oaks and Pine Crest, who are not members of the Advisory Committee, attended the meeting. They signed-in on the attendance sheet indicating they were visitors/observers. Mark indicated that following the meeting, they would be invited to comment if they wished.
ADMISSIONS TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Mark related the circumstances and concerns of the Emigration Canyon Township Community Council that the makeup of the Advisory Committee did not represent both sides of the key issues adequately. Consequently, a meeting was held with Salt Lake County, members of the Township Community Council, and Landmark Design to identify individuals to add to the committee. Members who had already agreed to participate on the committee were retained, and additional members were added at the recommendation of the Community Council. The full membership list was provided at the meeting, with two vacancies, one of which will be filled by Tom Roach, Salt Lake County Planning, who will represent the County Planning Commission; an as yet unidentified representative of Lower Burr Fork will fill the remaining vacancy. Following review of the list, the Community Council agreed to fill the one remaining vacancy and all agreed that the Advisory Committee is now complete. A revised, up-to-date list of members will be provided when the final vacancy has been filled.

A Brief Background on the Salt Lake County Emigration Trails Master Plan was reviewed by the committee and is attached herein. A Draft Mission Statement was presented and approved with no changes. Both are attached herein in the Appendix. Both will be posted on the project website.

ROLE OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
The Committee is advisory to County Staff and the Consultants in the preparation of the Plan. Their role is to provide information, verify information presented, assist in the identification of issues and concerns, act as liaisons with their particular neighborhoods and other residents in the canyon, and provide guidance into the development of the Plan. Once the plan is developed in Draft form, it will be presented to the Township Community Council for public comment, review, and final action.

A question regarding how the planning effort was initiated was answered by Emery Crook, who stated it was the result of a decision by the Salt Lake County Council, which approved and funded the project following a recommendation by the Emigration Canyon Trails Committee.

STATUS OF DATA GATHERING AND DOCUMENTATION OF CURRENT CONDITIONS
Mark presented the status of the mapping and documentation for existing trails conditions in the canyon for review, which will be used for the public open house on October 12, 2004.

Maps presented were:
- The 1999 Emigration Canyon Master Plan map showing existing and proposed trails and trail heads.
- Existing Trails and known trail opportunities maps provided on various base maps including USGS Topography and aerial mapping, with and without property ownership identified.
- A board identifying various trail conditions keyed to photographs.

The maps were reviewed by the Committee. Several inaccuracies were identified and drawn onto the maps either during the meeting or immediately afterwards. Revisions will be shown on updated maps for use at the Public Open House Scoping meeting.

A draft copy of the open house comment form was circulated during the meeting.

A link to the Salt Lake County Emigration Canyon Master Plan chapter on Trail Access will be provided from the project website, along with other pertinent information.
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE COMMITTEE

- Little Mountain Trail Head now has a restroom.
- The term “Existing Trails” needs to be defined – are they recognized by Salt Lake County or informal?
- There is concern that trail access will encourage hunting in the canyons; it is illegal to discharge a rifle in the canyon, although shotgun and bow hunting is apparently allowed.
- Inaccuracies in the map include: Utah Open Lands ownership is not complete, and there are some misaligned trails. (Corrections were noted on the maps by committee members).
- A letter was presented and received from Cheryl Hanselka, representing thoughts and preferences of Kilyon’s Canyon Residents. A digital copy of the letter is provided at the conclusion of these notes in the Appendix.
- Concerns about trailhead parking and its relationship to neighbors and residences.
- Concerns about hunters using the trails – people are seeing hunter walking through their property with bow and rifles, so safety is a concern. Emigration Oaks hires a security officer during hunting season, and local residents have car stickers to identify themselves. Emigration Oaks is a private development.
- What are the rules for hunting in the Canyon? Public Utilities official indicates that no firearms are allowed, only bows; and they cannot be used within 600 feet of a roadway or 800 feet of a residence. There is public information and signing indicating that no firearms are allowed in the canyon, but there is a need for more public information and signing. The current posting does not appear to be working.
- The scar from the pipeline should be noted on the map, and indicated differently than trails.
- Public involvement community-wide will be obtained through the public open houses and the adoption process.
- Crime is a concern, especially in remoter areas of the canyon where drug parties have occurred.
- There should be a continuous trail (east/west) on the south side of the roadway. It was noted that something should on map to indicate an alignment. To clarify, it was stated that the mapping indicates only existing information and that alternative alignments will be explored at a later meeting.
- Motorized access is generally felt to be unacceptable in the canyon, even though there are on-going problems with ATV users.
- Several people expressed the need to consider a trail along the south side of the canyon so that it avoids private property.
- Comment provided after the meeting: There should be no trails without adequate police and fire protection. There is too much vandalism now, and there are concerns about fire.

COMMENTS FROM MICHAEL JONES OF ALTA PLANNING
Mr. Jones introduced himself and provided a brief background of his experience working with trails issues. He followed with a brief summary of his first impressions after visiting the site earlier in the day:

- The canyon is a beautiful place to hike and a great asset to the community
- The General Plan chapter on trails provides good general information and policy direction, but does not get into specifics.
- Emigration Canyon is unique in ownership and use, and different from other canyons along the Wasatch. It is close to the heart of the city and the University.
• The Trail Plan can be an effective means of controlling access and managing people in the canyon.
• Several trail types may be represented in the canyon, and each will attract different users.
  Regional/statewide trails like Great Western, etc.
  City/County trails that receive local use and provide formal facilities.
  Local trails that are informal, not marked or promoted, and primarily used by local residents.
• Mountain bikers want different kinds of trails with more challenges. There appears to be some use in the canyon, but there is the potential for much more.
• Ownership patterns affect implementation, maintenance, and management of trails.
• There appears to be a demand for one or two developed trailheads, which will need to be located sensitively.
• People are in the canyon. Trespassing on private property is a concern and there are resentments.

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM OBSERVERS
• There is concern about dogs in the canyon, specifically related to potential impacts to water quality, local wells and watershed protection in general. Dogs are also harassing wildlife. Dogs are currently allowed in the Canyon and many people who do not live in the Canyon bring them up when hiking.

PROJECT WEBSITE
In order to eliminate confusion and assure that all information that is presented is accurate and up-to-date, a project website will be established on Landmark Design’s website (www.ldi-ut.com). A link on the Township website will make it easy for interested individuals to access the information.

PROJECT MISSION STATEMENT
To create a Trails Master Plan for Emigration Canyon that preserves and secures access to multiple-use, non-motorized trails and open space in Emigration Canyon for the purposes of recreation, community enhancement, and increased fire protection. The master plan should promote the creation of a well-designed and interconnected trail system that serves the Emigration Canyon community and neighborhoods, while minimizing impacts to existing neighborhoods, private properties and the natural environment.
Copy of letter submitted by Cheryl Hanzelka for Kilyon's Canyon Residents

To: Landmark Design Group
   Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation
   Salt Lake County Development Services

From: Residents of Kilyons and Emigration Canyons

The following statements represent thoughts and preferences of the Kilyons Canyon community in regards to a proposed canyon wide trail system in Emigration. These statements are the result of three different meetings over the past two months.

1. Every conceivable route on the south side of Emigration Canyon should be explored. The south side of the canyon has far fewer issues regarding trailheads, parking and disturbing private property owners.

2. We believe that trailheads should be kept out of residential areas. An obvious trail head to access the Kilyons and Afflect areas is the top of Emigration Canyon (aka Little Mountain). A restroom has just recently been provided at this site. The addition of garbage cans and consistent county maintenance makes this an obvious choice. This site would also provide access to a possible hiking/dog trail establishment on the Emigration side of the Emigration/Little Dell Ridge, encouraging dog owners to use this access point and thus remove some of the dog feces impact on Kilyon Creek.

3. We will not support the establishment of new trails in Charlie's or Secret Canyons.

4. Kilyons Canyon should be established as a foot traffic only trail. Bikers and hikers coming from a trail head at the top of Emigration Canyon can access Afflect Park and a number of trails beyond Afflect from the Kilyons Trail saddle, leaving the lower Kilyons as a safe haven for hikers and their dogs.

5. It would be irresponsible of Salt Lake County to begin this project prior to finishing the bike lane on the highway. The addition of a canyon wide trail system will only increase the dangerous encounters between cyclists, hikers and motor vehicles.

Residents of Kilyons Canyon do support continued trail use, well planned new trails and the establishment of well maintained trailheads outside of residential areas. We believe that the restoration of the current Kilyons Stream Trail should be part of the overall plan based on heavy use by Salt Lake County residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hanzelka
Representing Kilyons Canyon Residents
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Wednesday, November 3, 2004

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Andrew McNeil, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Bruce Cummings, Emigration Oaks Home Owner Association
Peggy Quinlivan, Emigration Canyon Resident
Sarah Bennett Alley, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Mary Gibson, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Rick Spearman, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Janet Haskell, Emigration Canyon Resident
Tom Roach, Salt Lake County Planning Division
Joe Smolka, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Jan Cook, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Tom Ward, Salt Lake City Public Utilities Watershed Manager
Steve Scheid, US Forest Service
Christopher Jones, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Ashley Green, Utah State Division of Wildlife Resources
Catherine Harris, Emigration Canyon Community Council & E.C. Trails Association
Karen Nichols, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design
Lisa Sokol, Landmark Design

Observers in Attendance:
Jack Christensen

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Following introductions, Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design presided over the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

One observer residing in Emigration Canyon, who is not a member of the Advisory Committee, attended the meeting. He was invited to comment at the conclusion of the meeting.

STATUS OF DATA GATHERING AND DOCUMENTATION OF CURRENT CONDITIONS
It was explained that work is on schedule, and that documentation and analysis of existing conditions was nearing completion, and that work on preparing preliminary alternatives was just beginning.

The results of the public input have been documented and summarized. Sixty-four comments were submitted, encompassing 38 pages of text. Included in the comment is a letter submitted by a resident of the Kilyon’s Canyon area representing the concerns and ideas of an undefined group of Kilyon’s Canyon residents, and three letters from public agencies, including the SLC Department of Public Utilities, State of Utah DWR, and National Forest Service. Committee members were informed that copies of the full and summarized comments are available for review on the project website.
The summarized comments were reviewed, beginning with the most common or repeated concerns, and concluding with the comments that occurred only once. It was noted that comments are a key tool in helping the planning team to better understand the issues and concerns of local residents. However, they are not considered a "vote" on a particular issue. Multiple comments on a single topic indicate that a particular may be a common viewpoint by a particular group, and should be carefully considered as the planning process unfolds. However, the fact that an issue is mentioned once does not necessarily diminish its importance or significance.

Some of the most common comments addressed the following points:

- Keeping public parking and trailheads away from private property/residential areas;
- Limiting the number of public trailheads;
- Providing feeder trail connections from the road to the trails above;
- Providing a trail on the south side of the canyon;
- Completing a continuous bicycle trail along the length of Emigration Canyon Road;
- Providing no public trail access or trails should be provided in Emigration Oaks subdivision;
- Indication of general support for trails and trails access;
- Indication of a neutral stance for trails and trails access;
- Indication of a negative stance for trails and trails access;
- Providing well-designed and properly managed trail and a trail system;
- Keeping trails out of Charlie’s Canyon and Secret Canyon;
- Providing a regional trail on the south side of the canyon;
- Restoring and converting Kilyon’s Canyon trail into a hiking-only trail;
- Addressing the negative impact of dogs on trails and trail use;
- Protecting critical winter range for elk, moose and deer on the upper ridges of the canyon;
- Protecting trails impact on sensitive riparian areas;
- Providing multi-use rim trails be developed on both sides of canyon;
- Addressing trails and access on hunting and aggressive mountain bike behavior;
- Separating mountain bike trails from hiking trails;
- Addressing the impacts of trails and trail use on fire hazard;
- Protecting important watershed lands surrounding the canyon;
- Protecting potable water sources and wells;
- Revisions to the open house format to include a presentation and a large enough venue to listen and discuss in a calm setting.

A sketch map accompanied the presentation, presenting a preliminary analysis of trails according to the issues and themes expressed by the public and through Advisory Committee comment.

**AN APPROACH TO ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT**

A second map was presented for Advisory Committee review and comment. The map illustrates a concept proposed by the planning team for approaching the next stage of the process, i.e. developing plan alternatives. The concept proposes that a two-prong trail system be looked out for meeting the distinct needs of regional (non-canyon residents) and local (canyon resident) trail users.
Overview of Proposed Approach
A trail plan typically begins with identifying where people are currently using trails, who is using the trails, where they are coming from, how many people are using the trails, and how they are accessing the trails. Based on an initial review of these issues, it is apparent that trails in Emigration Canyon need to (1) serve the dual purposes of local and outside user groups; and (2) serve a combination of hikers, runners, mountain bicyclists and equestrian users. Also, there are currently very limited access points to canyon trails. It has been noted that canyon residents seem to generally support trails, although some are concerned that trail improvements will lead to increases in the general public traversing through their property or infringing on their privacy. This points to the need for two distinct types of facilities:

1) At least one regional connector trail serving the general public and linking to other regional trails in the area, and
2) Local trails for connecting neighborhoods and connecting neighborhoods to the regional trail system, and for providing interior-neighborhood trail connections.

Regional Connector Trail Access
These facilities are intended to serve the trail needs of the general public and provide links to other regional trails in the area. Two locations stand out as potential regional trailhead facilities:

(1) "This is the Place" Trailhead (the mouth of Emigration Canyon), which has available space, good access, and also could serve as a Bonneville Shoreline Trail access point. Specific sites will need to be analyzed, but at present a trailhead could feasibly be located on either side of the road.
(2) Little Mountain Summit Trailhead, which also has available space, and provides connections to existing trails including the Donner Reed, Pony Express and Mormon Trail.

The greatest advantage of these sites is that they do not require or encourage outsiders to drive into Emigration Canyon. With its narrow road and shoulders, inviting significant numbers of new users into the Canyon should probably be avoided. These trailheads could be signed on I-80 and other roads, and be included on trail maps. Each trailhead should provide a restroom, trailhead signage, and if possible, water. The parking areas may need to be paved and re-designed to accommodate horse trailers as well. Parking capacity would be on the order of 30-50 parking spaces per location.

Regional Trails
From the two regional trailheads, a regional trail system can be developed on the north or south sides of the canyon, or both sides.

North Side of Canyon
The proposed mid-slope trail idea that has been proposed by the Emigration Canyon Trails Association offers excellent hiking and mountain biking opportunities. Unfortunately, these routes also offer the best views directly down into local neighborhoods, and may encourage people to park along the roadway and access the trail at other points. The long ascent may also not be especially attractive to users seeking some relief from the grade, and may also have environmental impacts such as erosion.

An alternative trail alignment would have the trail ascend to the north ridgeline in a series of switchbacks as soon as possible from the "This is the Place" Trailhead, tracing the ridge east toward Lookout Peak and concluding at Little Mountain Summit Trailhead. Ridgelines are
popular places to walk or ride because of the views, lower rolling gradients, and enhanced access to other trails. A ridgeline trail would also lessen privacy impacts on local residents, and discourage access from points other than the two regional trailheads.

**South Side of Canyon**
A trail on the south side of the canyon from the mouth of the canyon to the Little Mountain Summit Trailhead would offer obvious attractions to users. Again, a ridgeline trail could ascend up the slope from the canyon floor in a series of switchbacks. The switchbacks would begin directly west of Emigration Place and south of Sunnydale, with the old streetcar right-of-way located along Emigration Canyon Road providing the final connection to "This is the Place" Trailhead at the bottom of the canyon.

By providing both a north and south trail, users could do a loop from the mouth of the canyon entirely around the Canyon without impacting residents.

**East End of Canyon**
A ridgeline trail already exists around the east end of the canyon from Little Mountain Summit to the Old Mine Road. An additional loop system could be created that would be very attractive to mountain bicyclists, hikers, and others in the East End of the Canyon through development of additional trails. A separate portion of this loop could be designed to attract mountain bicyclists, while the other segment would attract equestrians and hikers. This new loop system would require the purchase of trail easements from private property owners.

**Local Trails and Trails Access**
Local trails and trailheads would operate on two levels as described below:

**Neighborhood Trails**
These trails would connect neighborhoods and individual properties to the regional trail system. The trails would be indicated on trail maps, but not signed for the general public. While the trails would occasionally be used by non-locals, they would not attract significant numbers because (a) there is no or limited places to park, and (b) they don’t really go anywhere. Existing local trailheads at Kilyon’s Canyon, Burr Canyon and Pinecrest could be maintained by providing very limited parking, and new local trails added if needed, and located on public land to the greatest degree possible.

**Inner-neighborhood Trail Connections**
A second level of local trails would not be signed for general public use, nor would they be indicated on official trail maps. These facilities would encompass all other trails deemed desirable and necessary to complete the local trail system as desired by canyon residents. Such facilities could be located on public or private land, although location on private land only at the request of the effected private landowner.

While these trails would also occasionally be used by non-locals, they would not be likely to attract significant numbers because (a) there is no or places to park, and (b) they don’t really go anywhere.

**COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE COMMITTEE**
- A comment made by several Advisory Committee members was missing from the notes of then previous Advisory Committee meeting. The missing comment indicated that a
trail along the south side of the canyon should be considered in this process since it avoids much of the privately owned land.

(The notes from the Advisory Committee meeting held on 12 October 2004 will be revised to reflect this oversight.)

- There was a question regarding how many of the people attending the public open house meetings were not residents of the canyon.

(Based on the sign-in sheets, the number of non-canyon resident addresses was low.)

- The protected area in Red Butte Canyon is called the Red Butte Research Natural Area (RNA), not the Red Butte Restricted Natural Area; Forest Service staff can assist the planning team in locating the boundaries of the RNA.

- According to the US Forest Service representative, the definition of “critical” winter range for wildlife basically refers to the south and west facing slopes of Emigration Canyon, where the snow melts first and food/browse is easier to obtain.

- The Utah State Division of Wildlife Resources representative noted that dogs are a problem in general for wildlife, but especially in winter for deer and elk. Because the energy levels of big game are already depleted by the effect of winter conditions, the harassment by dogs stress them further.

- Water quality and conditions of riparian corridors is also an issue, particularly for neotropical birds residing in and migrating through the area.

- In some areas, Forest Service trails are closed to foot and horse traffic from November 30th through April 30th to protect the wildlife that use this critical wildlife range during the winter months.

- The US Forest Service representative noted that the “system” trail indicated in their comments refers to a trail that is given a number in the USFS management system and is built and maintained by the USFS; there are no such trails in Emigration Canyon at present, and the USFS currently has no plans for any “system” trails in Emigration Canyon. When completed, the Emigration Canyon Trails Master Plan may indicate trails that can be considered for evaluation as future “system” trails.

- Any trail constructed on USFS land must go through the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) process, to varying degrees, depending on the site and other factors. This process examines the potential environmental impacts a project might have on a given project site and affected areas. Since NEPA can be a lengthy process, the USFS recommends considering trails through non-forest service lands, particularly if the implementation timeframe is a major consideration.

- The USFS constructed restroom facilities at the Little Mountain Trailhead and these restrooms are maintained by Salt Lake City, though neither the USFS nor SLC maintains any of the trails served by this trailhead. The project was done in the interest of protecting the quality of the water supply.

- If trails are going to go through private areas, such as Emigration Oaks, the County should take over the maintenance for roads, etc. in the area, since the residents are paying for the maintenance of their private community.

- A question was posed whether any cost/benefit analyses have been undertaken for any of the potential trails options indicated on these maps.

(It was noted that a cost analysis has not yet been made, since there are no proposals to analyze. The planning process will include an Opinion of Probable Cost as part of the Master Plan. In addition, the plan will investigate and identify potential funding sources and opportunities.)

- It was asked what happens if the County budget is cut and the trail system isn't funded.

(It was noted that SL County funds are limited, and that alternative funding sources may be available, including partnerships on federal and local level, and will be addressed in the
Master Plan. It was also noted that community groups trails advocacy groups may also assist with obtaining funds for implementing the Master Plan.)

• Salt Lake County has funded this Master Plan process. After this process is complete, the next step will be implementation, which will include looking at the feasibility of specific trail alignments. The master plan will focus on the "big picture", with detailed adjustments to alignments and final designs coming during later stages. For example, implementation of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail has included going out into the field, hiking the potential areas, mapping them with GPS systems, and doing suitability analyses. The implementation process may take years, and may require additional studies related to environmental issues, soils, etc., as it has with the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

• It is difficult to secure funding without a document showing what you are seeking funding for. The Emigration Canyon Trails Master Plan will assist the process of obtaining funding.

• It was felt by some that a trailhead at the lower end of canyon, connecting to a south rim trail, might be difficult to implement due to the steepness of the area near the condos. Also, the trail route would need to cross the stream, which would require a bridge.

• A question was posed whether an analysis been done on soil suitability (It was noted that specific soil studies have not been undertaken as part of this study. General soil conditions, however, are available for planning purposes. Detailed soils and other similar data will be undertaken as necessary during the detail design and implementation phase.)

• There is no logical trail route possible on the south rim as shown, due to the steep nature of the ridge.

• A question was posed whether the Army Corps of Engineers has been involved with anything in the canyon. (It was noted that the Army Corps of Engineers only deal with wetland, waterway and riparian issues.)

• For the south rim trail: go through Sorenson flats, especially since the owner has considered establishing conservation easements for such purposes on this land. (It was noted that this idea will be addressed in at least one of the alternative plans.)

• It was suggested that several alternatives for the lower canyon portion of the south rim trail be investigated.

• One member wondered whether Bonneville Shoreline Trail is paved. (Apparently, only a small portion near the southernmost segment of that trail is hard-surfaced. It was also noted that the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Master Plan was a very general concept, and that detail trail alignment work must follow during the implementation phase.)

• The planning team should consider tying the regional rim trail system with existing activity and recreation sites near the mouth of the canyon, such as Hogle Zoo, Red Butte Gardens, and This is the Place Monument. These are great family-oriented activity nodes that could be linked to the trail system for further recreation opportunities. (It was noted that this idea will be addressed in at least one of the alternative plans.)

• The rim trails that might serve regional trail needs would enable people to connect from the Bonneville Shoreline Trail to other regional trails such as the Great Western Trail.

• Consider a connection along the highway for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, rather than through adjacent private lands.

• A question was posed what the demand for trails in the canyon is, and how many people are likely to use the trails. The USFS representative indicated that the USFS system trails are heavily used, especially the mountain bike trails. Any additional mountain bike trails would be valuable.
• The USFS representative indicated that a possible way to approach the alternatives would be to determine what the issues are, and let them drive the alternatives. For example, alternative plans may be themed as follow: (1) avoiding private property theme, maximizing recreation experience theme, protecting the environment and wildlife theme, etc. Developing alternatives in this manner can help illustrate a wide range of possibilities, and the relative pros/cons of each.

• One member of the committee believes that an assumption that there is great demand for trails in the canyon underpins the logic for preparing the plan, without any data to back it up.

(It was noted by others that use of trails in the canyon is ongoing, and a trails plan will provide a long-term, comprehensive approach for managing existing and future use in a way that is beneficial to all. If the planning process were halted and no further action taken, you would still have users on the trails and the canyon would still be experiencing trail use and some undesirable impacts. There is extreme pressure for access to regional trails and other public recreation facilities throughout the Wasatch Front, and this will increase as population continues to grow.)

• Another member asked whether a survey of canyon residents regarding trails is appropriate, and whether or not the Emigration Canyon Community Council could conduct a survey and submit it in the form of a comment letter to the planning consultant.

(It was noted that the council can conduct a survey if it wishes. If they decide to undertake a survey, it should be carefully crafted and thoughtfully designed and implemented. Also, it should be clear what information is sought with the survey, and how it will be analyzed. It was also noted that residents of Emigration Canyon are not the only users of trails in the area, and that a survey limited to canyon residents would not represent their opinions, needs or desires.)

• One member noted that trails have become a divisive issue in the canyon. There are people who want a lot of trails, and people who want no trails at all. If posting signs is the only way to keep people out of private property that is an unworkable, unacceptable solution. Signs that are already in place are ignored.

• It was asked whether the planning team disregards comments made by people, and whether more input and consideration from canyon residents is necessary.

• Another member questioned the logic of Salt Lake County spending money on the trails planning process.

• It was asked whether planning for potential impacts should take place at all. Another member questioned the logic of attacking the need for planning, noting that the original plan was completed in 1999, and an update that reflects today's conditions and needs is necessary.

• The north side is not practical as a regional trail, particularly for mountain bikes. Another comment was made questioning whether regional trails must accommodate bikes on all potential routes.

(It was noted that not all trails would necessarily accommodate all potential user groups.)

• According to one comment, Troy Duffin, a trail builder, has investigated the feasibility of placing a trail along the south rim from the trailhead at the entrance of the canyon, concluding that the idea was not very feasible. It was noted by another member that one would be surprised where you can build a trail. Some areas of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail were surprising, but successful.

• The NEPA process includes a no-build option as a baseline for evaluating other alternatives. A similar approach could be used here. However, since not all of the trail alternatives will necessarily be limited to across USFS land, the NEPA process is probably not a necessary process, particularly at this broad planning stage.
Several members reiterated that they disagree with the idea of a trail going through Secret Canyon or Charlie's Canyon, and that these ideas should be removed from further consideration. They questioned why such alignments are illustrated in the concept sketch, even though many residents have expressed their opposition to such ideas. (It was noted by members of the planning team that opposition to these and other points of conflict have been noted, and will be addressed as the planning process unfolds. However, since there are opposite points of view, no options should be ruled out at stage of the process.)

- Keep trails off private property.
- The local level of trails gets difficult because many trail facilities are likely to be located on private land.
- Trails through and around Kilyon’s Canyon are hot issues.
- Hard surface versus soft surface trails are funded by different sources, and it’s hard to lump them together in the same category, especially during implementation.
- Kilyon’s Canyon is currently criss-crossed with numerous trails, which are heavily used by various user groups. Introducing more trails into this area the area is not a good idea.

CONCLUSION

- Members in general agreed with the concept of utilizing a two-tier approach to trails (Regional and Local trails), as alternatives are developed and refined in the upcoming weeks. There was also general agreement on avoiding private land when locating regional trails and Neighborhood Local Trails. There was less agreement on Inner-neighborhood Trail Connections, especially in areas where the trails cross through or near private land.
- Representatives of Kilyon’s Canyon requested that any trails passing through Charlie’s Canyon and Secret Canyon be removed from consideration as potential alternatives.

COMMENTS FROM OBSERVERS

- The planning team should consider designating the existing bike lane along Emigration Canyon Road as part of the regional trail system, and don’t do anything along the rims of the canyon.

OTHER ITEMS

Future Meetings

- The Advisory Committee will meet on Thursday, December 2nd at 4:00 PM at the Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division Meeting Room, 2100 South State Street, SLC, Room S-4017. The purpose of the meeting is to review plan alternatives and help determine what will be presented to the public at the next public review meeting.
- An additional public meeting will be added to the schedule, and is tentatively scheduled for mid-January. A determination and announcement of the specific venue, date and time will be determined at a later date.
- The next public meeting format will be modified, beginning with a presentation of the alternatives, followed by a question and answer period, and concluding with an open house period to review plan drawings and make comment. In addition, the meeting will be held at a larger venue, possibly the Salt Lake County Council Chamber.
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #4

Thursday, December 2, 2004

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Andrew McNeil, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Bruce Cummings, Emigration Oaks Home Owner Association
Peggy Quinlivan, Emigration Canyon Resident
Sarah Bennett Alley, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Bill Arthur - representing Mary Gibson, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Molly A. O’Gourman-Picot, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Rick Spearman, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Cheryl Hanzelka, Emigration Canyon Resident - Kilyon's
Janet Haskell, Emigration Canyon Resident
Joe Smolka, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Hilary Silberman, Emigration Canyon Community Council - Emigration Oaks
Tom Johnson, Emigration Canyon Resident - Pinecrest
Michelle Turpin, Emigration Place Home Owner's Association
Tracy Kirkham, Salt Lake City Public Utilities
Steve Scheid, US Forest Service
Karen Nichols, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design

Observers in Attendance:
Rick Reese, Bonneville Shoreline Trail
Jack Christensen
Kathy Christensen
Tim Alley
Brian Doubek
Alison Beddard
Gayle Weyher
Matt Knotts
Robert Warburton
Fred Swanson
Bessann Swanson
Betsy Wolf

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks led the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

Lynn explained there are sensitive issues and concerns about the planning process and assured everyone that this is an open process, with no hidden agendas or preconceived notions. He feels the process may be moving too quickly and that it needs to slow down in order to give people more time and a better understanding. When he asked committee members how the process could be improved, the following comments were made:
Tom Johnson – create a mailing to all canyon residents. The maps are causing people to be distrustful, so communicate more. There is probably broad support for the plan, but people are suspicious and better communications might help.

Sarah Bennett Alley – The Anderson Library is willing to let an exhibit be set up. There is not a lot of room, but they seem willing. There may be another public place that would work too.

Janet Haskell – the process needs to acknowledge the feedback it has received. Address the feedback and show it in the alternatives.

Bruce Cummings – stamp out misapprehensions by stating that no trail will go through private property.

Sarah Bennett Alley – meet with smaller groups. The problem with this is there is too much misunderstanding; its better if everyone hears the same things. Specific areas should get together and discuss things and the steering committee representatives should bring the information back to the group.

Several members noted that the public open house scoping meeting gathered a lot of information and was successful in that regard, even though there was a lot of confusion and misunderstanding. Lynn Larsen noted that future public meetings will include a presentation to help people better understand the drawings.

Tom Johnson noted that the process of gathering information and input from residents is not over. Information can continue to be gotten through meetings and other means.

Janet Haskell requested that once alternatives are developed, a survey of residents should take place. The survey should gauge interest in trails too.

Andy McNeil – Favors a south-side, mid-slope alternative. Wondered whether we have to eliminate private property from consideration for trails, particularly since there is a good opportunity to incorporate a trail, trailhead and access point on the Sorensen property?

Lynn Larsen re-stated that what we do here represents the neighborhood desires. The fact that Kilyon’s Canyon has presented a united front behind a strong idea is a good example that the committee works.

Sarah Bennett Alley – Canyon Road people want to meet.

Karen Nichols – Concerned about the survey, what the intent is, and how people outside of the canyon who use the trails will be represented.

Janet Haskell – The trail plan is not just for neighbors because it includes a regional aspect as well, connecting the Bonneville Shoreline Trail with trail beyond Emigration Canyon.

Lynn summarized the general ideas presented as follows:

- Provide periodic mailings to residents.
- Display exhibits at a library or other public location.
- Make sure the planning team understands what the committee is saying, and that and it acknowledges that you are being heard.
- Clarify and stamp out misunderstandings.
- Solicit and gather additional input and information, from groups and/or individuals.
- Consider a survey – be specific what it should do and how it would be developed.

Lynn then asked about what the next steps in this process might be. The group responded they want to see alternatives. The misunderstandings that have occurred in the past will be cleared.
up with trail locations on a map. A question was posed whether the trails plan is for all users. Lynn and Jan Striefel then explained that one logical approach would be to develop a hierarchy of trails, which could include regional trails that make the connection between the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and those above Emigration Canyon, and local trails that connect neighborhoods to the broader regional trails. The neighbors involved would address local trails within their neighborhoods.

Mark Vlasic then read the mission statement previously generated by the committee, and Lynn summarized it to Committee Members as follows:

- Secure access to trails for non-motorized trails, recreation, community enhancement and fire protection.
- Serve Canyon and its neighborhoods.
- Promote a trail system that serves neighborhoods, but minimizes impacts to neighborhoods.
- Limit impacts to private property.
- Protect and limit impacts to the natural environment.

Molly O’Gorman-Picot – if canyon residents said they wanted no new trails then the existing ones in Freeze Creek and Kilyon’s would not be maintained and there would be no money for trails development. Lynn responded that if the majority of canyon residents favor closing the door at the mouth of the canyon and believe the status quo in the canyon is preferred, then that would be OK.

- Bruce Cummings – concerned about the firehouse at Pioneer Park Road, and wants more information on the bicycle lane along Canyon Road. Joe has the information and will share it with Bruce.
- Tom Johnson – The process is going forward as it should. People who do not have a lot of understanding about the process will continue to have misunderstandings. People assume that lines on a map mean things are a done deal and it’s hard for them to understanding what’s going on.
- Hillary Silberman – is OK with the planning process and wants it to continue. The Steering Committee should come up with a plan and take it to the Township Planning Commission.

Lynn Larsen then asked the committee if they want to proceed with the plan. We are assuming that most people do. A show of hands indicated that almost 100 percent of the steering committee wants to see the process proceed. He then asked if an approach to trails that includes the regional trails and local trails described earlier is OK. The committee indicated that the two main trails designations are acceptable. The committee feels most people in the canyon support the concept of a trails plan, but there may be a need to have a place for a minority position statement. They also asked that the local trails element include no parking.

The topic of private property was once more discussed. Earlier in the meeting it was stated that if private property owners do not want trails on their property, no trails would be investigated or shown. After much discussion, it was determined that there is private property that may be up for sale, such as the Sorenson property, that could be acquired. Also, there may be people who have property but do not mind having a trail across it.

Rick Reese (Bonneville Shoreline Trail Committee) – their policy has been that trails do not pass through private property unless the property owner agrees to an easement or the property
is purchased from a willing seller. But trail connections may still be shown through private property, which can be negotiated or acquired in the future when conditions and property owners may change.

- Janet Haskell - asked how the plan would address sensitive lands like wetlands. It was explained that if a trail is shown in what is thought to be a sensitive area, that aspect would be addressed at a next step during the design process.
- Steve Scheid – Now is the time to look at options. Decisions have not been made yet. There is no preferred option yet. We need to look at alternatives, the full range of alternatives that may make some people unhappy.
- Joe Smolka - suggested getting a copy of the map to committee members and have them bring them back with suggestions. It was commented though that many people may not be able to accurately read a map and may continue to be confused.
- Steve Scheid – Landmark Design has some ideas, they should put them out for review.

Lynn Larsen then asked the Committee what they would like Landmark Design to have at the next meeting. The committee asked Landmark Design to come up with options and get them out for review.

- Michelle Turpin has heard the LDS church wants to buy the Sorensen property for a church, with parking on the other side of the roadway.

A summary of additional discussion on trails plan elements includes the following:

- Show no trails through Emigration Oaks.
- Show no trails on private property in Kilyon’s Canyon.
- There is a public easement through Kilyon’s Canyon.
- There should be a mid-mountain and a ridge trail on either the north or south side, or both.

Comments from observers at the meeting:

- Frequent trail user is concerned about the condition of trails. Some are in poor condition and need to be maintained. A trails plan would help manage trail users.
- Wants trail information and favors the process.
- Planners are making the assumption that people in the canyon want trails. A survey should be conducted first, because if the majority of people don’t want trails, then this process is a waste of time.
- Supports the process and wants to protect the existing informal trail system in the canyon even though it has property rights issues.
- There are three wells in the area and residents are concerned about dogs and water quality. Joe Smolka will provide Landmark Design information on where the wells are located.
- Wants a trail from Emigration Creek to Lookout Point.
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #5

Thursday, February 3, 2005

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Andrew McNeil, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Peggy Quinlivan, Emigration Canyon Resident
Sarah Bennett Alley, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Molly A. O’Gourman-Picot, Emigration Canyon Trails Association
Cheryl Hanzelka, Emigration Canyon Resident - Kilyon
Janet Haskell, Emigration Canyon Resident
Joe Smolka, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Jan Cook, Emigration Canyon Community Council, Emigration Oaks resident
Tom Johnson, Emigration Canyon Resident - Pinecrest
Michelle Turpin, Emigration Place Home Owner's Association
Chris Jones, Emigration Canyon Resident - Sunnydale resident
Mary Gibson, Emigration Canyon Trails Association - Emigration Oaks resident
Tom Ward, Salt Lake City Public Utilities
Ray Loken, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Scott White, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design
Lisa Sokol, Landmark Design

Observers in Attendance:
Brook Richardson, Trout Unlimited
Jason Berry
Alison Beddard
Robert Warburton
Jack Christensen
Kathy Christensen

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks led the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

Lynn Larsen started the meeting by reviewing the project mission statement. He then explained that the main purpose of the meeting was to review some preliminary trail alignments and trail ideas, and to get feedback and ideas from the committee members.

Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design next presented three plans for consideration. The following is a description of each drawing:

Alternative One - South Ridge Trail System

Regional Trail Component
Regional Trailheads at the mouth of the Canyon and Little Mountain link mid-slope and ridgeline trail alignments on the south slope of the canyon. These trails provide access to adjacent
regional trail systems, including the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the Salt Lake Valley; and the Donner Reed Trail, Mormon Trail, Pony Express Route and Great Western Trail to the north and east. A third trailhead, located on a vacant site just east of Emigration Place Subdivision known as the "Sorenson Property", serves as the western (lower) terminus of the mid-slope trail.

A small portion of the upper ridgeline trail currently exists in the vicinity of Little Mountain; otherwise both alignments require new trail construction.

A key element of the Emigration Canyon Regional Trail System is completion of identified bicycle lanes on both sides of Emigration Road. When these lanes are completed, they will facilitate roadside bicycle travel through the canyon and provide a canyon-bottom opportunity for accessing the proposed trailheads by bicycles.

**Local Trail Component**

Local trails provide limited local access to the regional trail system at two existing trailheads. The local trailheads include an existing trailhead currently located midway up Burr Fork on the west side of the road, which provides local access to the Old Mine Trail and Lookout Peak to the north, and Little Mountain Regional Trailhead to the east. A second existing local trailhead (b) is located at the top of Kilyon’s Canyon developed area. This trailhead provides access to Affleck Park, Big Mountain and the Great Western Trail and other regional trails to the east; and to the North Fork of Kilyon’s Canyon via upper Kilyon’s Canyon.

The local trails and trailheads are intended to serve the needs of canyon residents. While the trails may also occasionally be used by non-locals, they are not likely to attract significant numbers of non-canyon residents because (a) there is no parking or limited places to park, and (b) they don’t serve as primary trailheads.

The local trail system utilizes existing facilities and routes that avoid passage through private land. Substantial adjustments and modifications are necessary to bring the trails up to acceptable standard, to avoid sensitive conditions, and to accommodate the specific needs of potential trail users.

No local trails are proposed for the south side of the canyon, where there is little or no need for local trails or access points.

Accessing the various local trails will require most users to walk, bike or drive along the paved road system. Furthermore, it may be necessary to limit some routes to single modes (hiking-only, biking only, equestrian only, for example) and/or require the establishment of dual trails to accommodate non-compatible uses (hiking and equestrian, for example).

**Alternative Two - North Ridge Trail System**

**Regional Trail Component**

Two Regional Trailheads, one located at the mouth of Emigration Canyon, and the other at Little Mountain summit, provide access to mid-slope and ridgeline trails on the north slope of the canyon. These trails and trailheads provide access to other regional trail systems, most notably the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the Salt Lake Valley; and the Donner Reed Trail, Mormon Trail, Pony Express Route and Great Western Trail north and east of the canyon.

A small portion of the upper ridgeline trail currently exists, from Mount Wire east for about two miles. The segment from Little Mountain Trailhead to Freeze Creek via Lookout Peak also
exists, although some segments are marginally traversable by foot. The illustrated alignment between Little Mountain summit and Lookout Peak has been slightly modified to maintain the trail wholly within the Emigration Canyon watershed, thus avoiding conflicts with adjacent protected watershed areas.

A key element of the Emigration Canyon Regional Trail System is completion of identified bicycle lanes on both sides of Emigration Road. When these lanes are completed, they will facilitate roadside bicycle travel through the canyon and provide a canyon-bottom opportunity for accessing the proposed trailheads by bicycles.

**Local Trail Component**

Local trails are intended to provide limited local access to the regional trail system, primarily for canyon residents. While non-locals would occasionally use the trails, they would not attract significant numbers of non-canyon residents because (a) there is no parking or limited places to park, and (b) they don’t serve as primary trailheads.

The local trail system focuses on existing facilities and routes located on the north slope of the canyon that avoids passage through private land. Particular care has been taken to avoid access to and through sensitive private land, including Emigration Oaks and Kilyon's Canyon. No local trails are proposed for the south side of the canyon.

Two local trailheads provide access to the local trail system. These include the existing trailhead currently located midway up Burr Fork on the west side of the road, which provides local access to the Old Mine Trail and Lookout Peak to the north, and eventually to Little Mountain Regional Trailhead to the east. A second existing local trailhead is located on public land at the top of Kilyon's Canyon developed area. This trailhead will continue to provide access to Affleck Park, Big Mountain and the Great Western Trail and other regional trails to the east; and to the North Fork of Kilyon's Canyon via upper Kilyon's Canyon.

Accessing the various local trails will require most users to walk, bike or drive paved roads for part of their experience. Sensitive conditions in some areas (Kilyon's Canyon, for example) may necessitate limiting some routes to single modes of use (hiking-only, biking only, equestrian only, for example) and/or require the construction of dual trails to accommodate non-compatible uses.

All segments of the proposed local trail system currently exist, although substantial adjustments and modifications will be required to bring the trails up to acceptable standard, to avoid sensitive conditions, and to accommodate the specific needs of the potential trail users.

**Alternative Three - North and South Ridge Trail System**

**Regional Trail Component**

This alternative merges the trail concepts contained in Alternatives One and Two.

Regional Trailheads at the mouth of the Canyon and Little Mountain are linked with mid-slope and ridgeline trails on both sides of the canyon. The trails and trailheads provide access to other regional trail systems, including the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the Salt Lake Valley; and the Donner Reed Trail, Mormon Trail, Pony Express Route and Great Western Trail north and east of the canyon. A third trailhead, located the south side of the canyon bottom on a vacant site just east of Emigration Place Subdivision (the Sorensen Property) serves as the western access point for the mid-slope trail on the south side of the canyon.
On the south side of the canyon, a small segment of the upper ridgeline trail already exists in the vicinity of Little Mountain. On the north slope, a small portion of the upper ridgeline trail exists in the vicinity of Mount Wire, as is a segment between Lookout Peak to Freeze Creek. The proposed alignment has been shifted slightly in places to keep the trail within Emigration Canyon, thus discouraging trail activities that conflict with adjacent protected watershed areas.

The remaining alignments will require new trail construction.

A key element of the Emigration Canyon Regional Trail System is completion of identified bicycle lanes on both sides of Emigration Road. When these lanes are completed, they will facilitate roadside bicycle travel through the canyon and provide a canyon-bottom opportunity for accessing the proposed trailheads by bicycles.

Local Trail Component
The system of local trails is similar to those illustrated in Alternatives 2 and 3, with the inclusion of a few additional alignments. The local trails are intended to provide limited local access to the regional trail system, primarily for canyon residents. While non-locals would occasionally use the trails, they would not attract significant numbers of non-canyon residents because (a) there is no parking or limited places to park, and (b) they don’t serve as primary trailheads.

The local trail system represented in this alternative focuses on existing facilities and routes on the north slope of the canyon that avoid passage through private land. No local trails are proposed for the south side of the canyon, where there is little or no need for local trails or access points. Particular care has been taken to link the local trails to the North Ridge and South Ridge Regional Trail System, and avoid access to and through identified sensitized private land areas, including Emigration Oaks and Kilyon's Canyon.

Two local trailheads provide access to the local outlined trail system. These include (a) the existing trailhead currently located midway up Burr Fork on the west side of the road, which provides local access to the Old Mine Trail and Lookout Peak to the north, and eventually to Little Mountain Regional Trailhead to the east. A second existing local trailhead (b) is located in on public land at the top of Kilyon's Canyon developed area. This trailhead can continue to provide access to Affleck Park, Big Mountain and the Great Western Trail and other regional trails to the east; and to the North Fork of Kilyon's Canyon via upper Kilyon's Canyon.

Accessing the various local trails will require most users to walk, bike or drive along the paved road system. Sensitive conditions in areas such as Kilyon's Canyon may necessitate limiting some routes to single modes of use (hiking-only, biking only, equestrian only, for example) and/or require the construction of dual trails to accommodate non-compatible uses.

All segments of the proposed local trail system currently exist, although substantial adjustments and modifications will be required to bring the trails up to acceptable standard, to avoid sensitive conditions, and to accommodate specific needs of the potential trail users.

Once the three alternative plans were presented, a drawing illustrating two cross sections through the canyon was reviewed. The cross sections illustrate the distances between existing homes in Emigration Oaks and elsewhere in the canyon, and the horizontal and vertical relationships to potential trail alignments on the adjacent slopes.

Comments and Questions
- The Old Sheep Trail alignment doesn't serve much of a purpose, and the private property owners at the west terminus do not want it. Perhaps another access point along the canyon
road can be located, particularly in the vicinity of Maple Grove subdivision. There is a
dedicated public right-of-way at Maple Grove, and it was indicated as a local trailhead site in
the existing Trails Element of the Emigration Canyon Master Plan. The Old Sheep Trail
could be modified and contoured around the current alignment, and perhaps utilize the
adjacent pipeline corridor. This trail should have access to the lower canyon to serve the
local neighborhoods, perhaps using the condemned property where a pipeline easement is
located (Molly will illustrate the idea on the plan later in the meeting).

- The ridgeline trails on the north slope of the canyon, which are illustrated in Alternatives 2
  and 3, may be problematic from the perspective of maintaining the protected status of the
  adjacent Red Butte Research Natural Area (RNA).
- Ridgeline trails are not practical for mountain bike use.
- Ridgeline trails make great hiking trails.
- Separating user groups on some trails makes good sense.
- Mid-slope trails serve as firebreaks and provide access for fighting fires. This could be a
great benefit to canyon residents.
- The cross sections tell a good story and are very helpful for understanding the actual
  relationships between existing homes and possible trails. They clearly illustrate the
distances and sightlines. We would like to see a couple of more sections in key areas.
- What about the potential link between Burr Fork and Kilyon’s Canyon over public land?

Lynn next asked committee members if they had any other trail ideas, and whether or not we
could reach some agreement on some of the ideas proposed. The following are comments and
ideas suggested:

- Old Mine road - change the name to Quarry Trail
- Ira Sachs owns land around old quarry, and may be amenable to trail use through his
  property.
- Old Mine Trailhead - a better location is found on the opposite side of the road.
- Don’t lose public right-of-ways through private property at the top of Pinecrest.
- We need to secure some of the local trails not illustrated on the three alternatives, including
  Freeze Creek and other trails that are commonly used today.
- Local trails not indicated on the alternatives can be part of a lower-hierarchy trail designation
  that are not indicated on official plans, and which will serve the local residents. It would be
  up to Emigration Township decision-makers to determine how these trails would be used,
  and whether or not they will be closed.
- The three alternatives illustrate Regional and Local trail alignments, which will potentially be
  included for official designation in the Salt Lake County Plan (not smaller local trails which
  already exist or existed in the past). The goal for the Advisory Committee is to reach some
  sort of agreement on whether or not additional trails are to be included, or if some
  alignments should be removed.
- If we add more alignments we are just going back to where we were, and back to the
  discomfort and high level of disagreement. A Composite Plan should be taken to the public
  for review and comment, as is or with fewer alignments, but certainly not with the
  controversial alignments which have been removed already.
- Some viewpoints, and particularly those which desire more extensive trail alignments, are
  not adequately reflected in the alternatives. The lack of a trail connecting Old Mine Road
  with Kilyon’s Canyon does not recognize the needs of trail advocates.
- Salt Lake City Public Utilities objects strongly to the creation of a new trail on the Dell
  Watershed side of Little Mountain-to-Lookout Peak ridge. From a policy standpoint, the
development of a new trail in this protected watershed is very difficult to defend. Recreation
is a secondary resource in protected watershed. This alignment could be a fatal flaw to any of the alternatives. The group should strongly consider other alternatives for an out-and-back loop, perhaps utilizing the existing trail toward Affleck Park and back along East Canyon Road, or a new trail within the Secret Canyon area west of the proposed alignment.

- Utah Division of Wildlife representatives noted that all of the alternatives will impact wildlife, especially the mid-slope alignments. These will draw wildlife closer to homes, thereby increasing conflict with existing and future development in the canyon. That said, none of the alternatives represent a fatal flaw from a wildlife viewpoint, as long as the trails are implemented carefully.
- Tom Johnson sketched a better connection between the east and west portions of the North Ridge upper alignment.

After further discussion focusing on the Dell alignment, Kilyon’s Canyon and the use of Charlie’s Canyon and Secret Canyon areas, committee members reached the following general agreement:

- Alternative 3 is the preferred concept, with modifications as follow
  - The new trail illustrated on the Dell Watershed side of Little Mountain-to-lookout Peak ridge should be eliminated, and the existing trail toward Affleck Park and back along East Canyon Road should be included and designated as a mountain bike loop trail.
  - Kilyon’s Canyon Trail should be designated as HIKING ONLY.
  - Rename Old Mine Road to Quarry Trail; relocate Quarry Trail Trailhead to the opposite side of Burr Fork Road (exact location indicated by committee members).
  - Trail from Quarry Trail Trailhead to Lookout Peak via Pinecrest should be designated as HIKING ONLY.
  - Revise north side upper ridge alignment as illustrated by Tom Johnson.
  - Revise Sheep Trail, linking it to Maple Grove neighborhood. Investigate the existing Trails chapter of the Emigration Canyon Township plan to confirm that a trailhead is proposed at Maple Grove, and include in the revised Alternative 3 plan.

- An Open House meeting should be scheduled for early April, in a venue of adequate size (preferably the large meeting room at the County Complex; Lynn will investigate dates and scheduling). The Open House should begin with a PowerPoint presentation, followed by small “breakout” areas where the plans and sections can be reviewed, where project staff will be available to explain or clarify, and where draft copies and/or highlights of the associated text will be available for review.
- Once all of the modifications have been made to Alternative 3, the map should be renamed TRAIL ALTERNATIVES. Color copies should be forwarded to Advisory Committee members by mid-February for their review and comment. Committee members are expected to mark up the maps to indicate their concerns or modifications, and bring them to the next meeting in March, at which time we will finalize changes prior to holding the public Open House meeting and presentation.

The meeting was concluded with a reminder that the next meeting will take place as regularly scheduled on Thursday, March 3, 2004 at 4:00 PM at the Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division Meeting Room, 2100 South State Street, SLC, Room S-4017. Committee members are requested to bring their maps.
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #6

Thursday, March 3, 2005

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Andrew McNeil, Emigration Canyon Community Council, Kilyon’s Canyon resident
Peggy Quinlivan, Emigration Canyon Resident
Sarah Bennett Alley, Emigration Canyon Trails Association, Emigration Canyon resident
Molly A. O’Gourman, Emigration Canyon Trails Association, Maple Grove Resident
Janet Haskell, Emigration Canyon Resident
Jan Cook, Emigration Canyon Community Council, Emigration Oaks resident
Tom Johnson, Emigration Canyon Resident - Pinecrest resident
Bruce Cummings, Emigration Oaks Home Owner Association
Mary Gibson, Emigration Canyon Trails Association - Emigration Oaks resident
Hilary Silberman, Emigration Canyon Community Council - Emigration Oaks
Jim Scott, Salt Lake City Watershed
Ray Loken, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Scott White, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Steve Scheid, US Forest Service
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design
Lisa Sokol, Landmark Design

Observers in Attendance:
Troy Duffin, Alpine Trails
Don Bloswick
Kathy Christensen, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Fred Silvester
Margo Silvester
Robert Warburton
Jim Villareal
Fred Swanson
Lisa Neuhof
David Ream

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks led the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

1. Questions About Funding
Lynn began with a clarification regarding funding for trails in Emigration Canyon. He explained that the trails master plan identifies overall concept and ideas, and that the search for funding follows. Likewise, specific details are addressed once the plan has been approved, typically in conjunction with specific implementation proposals, but even on a much broader basis such as part of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study, if required. Once the planning commission has adopted a plan, it can be modified or even abolished, although only by a decision of the planning commission.
It was also explained that during the master planning process, cost of construction is taken into consideration, but good ideas are not necessarily excluded simply based on cost. An important part of the plan will be to determine priorities and develop phasing concepts.

Typical funding sources for trails run the gamut of possibilities, including county, state, federal and private sources. It was also clarified that the County Mayor’s office signed-off on the initial planning process, as did the County Council.

2. Review of Alternative Trail Plan
Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design presented the Alternative Trails Map, focusing on the changes agreed to at the previous committee meeting. To summarize:

- The Old Mine Road has been renamed Quarry Trail.
- The previous three Trail Alternatives maps have been synthesized into a single Trails Alternatives map, which illustrates potential trails and trailheads agreed to at the previous meeting. The Trail Alternatives map incorporates mid-slope and ridgeline regional trails on both sides of the canyon, with regional trailheads located at the Canyon Mouth, Mountain Dell and the Sorensen Property. Local Trails are relatively limited, with trailheads located on the east side of Burr Fork Road (across the road and slightly south of the existing Quarry Trailhead.) A second local trailhead is located at the top of Kilyon’s Canyon.
- No trails are indicated through Emigration Oaks subdivision or Kilyon’s Canyon private properties.
- An existing out-and back trail connecting Little Mountain Trailhead with Affleck Park has been noted on the map.
- Kilyon’s Canyon Trail has been designated as a HIKING ONLY trail.
- A trail from Quarry Trailhead north to Lookout Peak via Burr Fork Road has been designated as a HIKING ONLY trail.
- A small local trail has been added in the vicinity of Maple Grove, and linked to the Sheep Trail via Little Mountain Trailhead.
- A local loop trail has been included in the vicinity of the Sorensen property.

3. Discussion and Questions
Following the presentation of plan revisions, questions and comments were made by committee members, as summarized below:

HUNTING
- It was noted by several committee members that hunting in the canyon is a significant issue, particularly on the north slope in the vicinity of Emigration Oaks. Even though hunting is not allowed in most parts of the canyon, hunters can legally access adjacent hunting lands through public land.
- It was noted that private security guards have been hired by Emigration Oaks, in part to ensure hunting violations do not go unchecked. Some committee members asked if hunting can be outlawed in the canyon; others noted that they feel hunting is not a danger, particularly archery hunting.
- Input from State Department of Wildlife Resources (DWR) representatives noted that further limitations on hunting, including an outright ban, would be met with resistance by the hunting public. The Department of Wildlife Resources (DWR) has not received complaints from Emigration residents that would indicate a problem to the extent being expressed. It was noted that most hunters gain access to hunting trails at recognized public access points, and that additional signage would help minimize violations. It was also indicated that
educating the hunting public about the concerns and sensitivities in Emigration was important, and could possibly be incorporated into the licensing process, for example.

- Some residents expressed their concern that additional signage will have little effect, and that financial support is necessary to ensure adequate enforcement.

MID-SLOPE TRAIL ALIGNMENT ON THE NORTH SLOPE OF THE CANYON

- Some members feel that the mid-slope trail alignment on the north slope is not well thought out. Even though the trail is at least 1/3 mile from the nearest homes and separated by a significant vertical difference, it is felt that the alignment is too close to Emigration Oaks. There is concern that the trail will be visible to-and-from the homes. Also, it was felt that the alignment encourages contact between people and wild animals, disrupting important range and forage for numerous species such as elk and moose, but also including smaller animals such as coyotes.
- The response from Emigration Oaks Homeowners Association leadership is that they are against the mid-slope alignment on the north side of the canyon; other committee members from Emigration Oaks voiced concern that the Home Owner's Association board does not fairly represent all residents.
- Some suggested that there is broad support for the mid-slope trail.
- One member stated that the trail system is great and makes a lot of sense. The ridge trail is primarily for hikers and non-resident use, while the mid-slope alignments would primarily serve local residents. Maintaining the elk and moose range will be a challenge, although coyotes are not much of a concern.
- Steve Scheid, National Forest Service representative, noted that there is substantial concern with the ridge trails, especially the one proposed for the north slope. He noted that the mid-ridge options could possibly be merged with portions of the ridgeline options on the north slope to avoid sensitive lands while avoiding increased public access to Red Butte Canyon RNA. He noted that despite their concern, he supports taking the plan to the public for their input and ideas. He stated that the details would be sorted out in the design/implementation stage, and as always, compromises will be made.

NUMBER OF MAPS

- It was felt that distilling the three maps presented at the previous meeting into a single map may not allow the public to form their own opinions and see really understand the range of options still available.
- It was noted that committee members at the previous meeting in February agreed to the single map and other changes currently illustrated.

At this point it was suggested that the committee attempt to reach a consensus on what to present to the public for review at the upcoming open house meeting. It was noted by some that members of the public may assume the map constitutes a final product, rather than a range of possible solutions. Another member felt it was irresponsible not to have implementation costs provided for consideration. It was explained that the open house meeting will begin with a presentation that will "set the stage" and try to explain the various alignments, the planning process, and implications of the plan.

Further discussion followed, as summarized below:

TRAIL USE

- Ridgeline trails are probably too steep and rugged for mountain biking, since they are so steep. They will primarily serve the needs of avid hikers.
• There is already a lot of trail activity occurring in the area; a good plan needs to be developed if future use is going to be managed and controlled.
• It was noted that the mid-slope trails would be primarily for use by canyon residents, not the general public.

PLAN PRESENTATION
• It was suggested that in order to minimize confusion, the various alignments be color-coded and named.

PUBLIC PROCESS
• In response to a question regarding when the public gets the chance to be heard, it was clarified that the public will be given the opportunity to make official comments to the Planning Commission when the plan is being considered for adoption. Also, comments and input received at the upcoming public open house will be used to help gauge the level of support for various plan ideas prior to submitting a preferred plan for approval.

FIRE CONCERN
• According to some members, there are serious reservations regarding the north slope mid-ridge alignment, particularly by residents of Emigration Oaks. These reservations go beyond private property issues, reflecting concerns that trails may acerbate the risk of brush fire.
• Others noted that trails may help in the fight of fight fires when they occur, acting as fire breaks and providing better access to fire zones by personnel and equipment.

SURVEY OF EMMISSION OAKS RESIDENTS
• The results of an informal survey conducted by residents of Emigration Oaks Subdivision were presented. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the level of support by residents of Emigration Oaks for various trail alternatives, ranging from no trails at all to multiple trail alignments through public and private land. To summarize, the majority of responses favored a relatively extensive trail system, including mid-slope and ridgeline regional trails on both sides of the canyon. However, it should be noted that the survey was not carried out in a scientific manner, and not all residents of the subdivision participated.
It was noted by some committee members that there might have been some misunderstanding about the way the survey was phrased or presented.

It was also confirmed that the current planning contract does not include funding for a comprehensive canyon-wide survey.

After much discussion about the relative merits and science of conducting surveys, it was generally agreed that the upcoming open house would provide a good avenue to gauge opinions and feelings regarding the various options. At that time a formal presentation will be made, followed by "breakout" areas where residents will be given an opportunity to review the map and sections up-close, ask questions, and submit comment. Response forms will be available, and will also be accepted through email, standard post and the project website.

KILYON’S CANYON AREA/HIKING ONLY TRAILS
• Some members expressed concern that inadequate parking at Kilon’s Canyon needs to be resolved.
• There was some concern that mountain bikers might not comply with HIKING ONLY trails.
• Steve Scheid, representing the National Forest Service, noted that HIKING ONLY trails have been tried in the past, with marginal results. Existing trails and trail use patterns are very difficult to change, although use restrictions are more successful on new trails. His feeling is that if Kilyon’s Canyon is closed to bikes, a loop will be necessary somewhere in the vicinity.

• It was noted that the public lands portion of Kilyon’s Canyon is currently designated “non-motorized”, which makes the restriction of bicycles and other non-motorized traffic very difficult.

4. Reaching Consensus: Committee Decisions
The members of the board were asked to decide on what should be shown at the public open house. The following is a synopsis of the results, which were based on majority vote by committee members:

1) Maintain the single Trails Alternative map, illustrating all of the various trail options as currently laid out;
2) Add a Regional Trail connection to Kingdom Lakes/City Creek Canyon near the junction with Lookout Peak;
3) Add modified bicycle loop-trail between Little Mountain Summit and lower Kilyon’s Canyon, avoiding Secret Canyon (Andy’s version);
4) Provide link between South Slope Ridgeline Trail and Sorensen Property;
5) Change the name of Trailhead #4 to Pinecrest Trailhead;
6) Modify sections through canyon to indicate that they extend into Mountain Dell Drainage (indicated as East Canyon on the existing sections)

The meeting was concluded with a reminder that the Public Open House will take place in April; this has now been modified. The Public Open House will be held on Monday, May 9, 2005 from 6PM to 9PM. The first hour of the open house will consist of a formal presentation by Salt Lake County and Landmark Design, explaining the planning process, trail alternatives, and answering general questions. The last two hours will allow members of the public to visit "break out" stations, where they can review the trail alternatives map and sections up close, discuss any concerns, ask questions, and provide written comment, which may be submitted that evening or in the following days. This input will be summarized and presented to Advisory Committee members at the June meeting.

In the interim, members of the advisory committee will meet at the regular-scheduled day and time (the First Thursday of the month, April 7, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division Meeting Room, 2100 South State Street, SLC, Room S-4017.) The purpose of Meeting #7 is to finalize preparations for the open house, as described in the agenda below:

Agenda - Steering Committee Meeting #7
1) Review Map Changes;
2) Review Open House format;
3) Confirm meeting advertisement;
   – Direct Mail invitation to all canyon residents
   – Newspaper Ad
4) Consider request by some committee members to include Q&A sheets with direct mail invitation.

Due to the concise nature of the April 7th committee meeting, it is expected that an hour will be sufficient.
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #7

Thursday, April 7, 2005

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Peggy Quinlivan, Emigration Canyon Resident
Molly A. O’Gourman, Emigration Canyon Trails Association, Emigration Oaks Resident
Janet Haskell, Emigration Canyon Resident
Jan Cook, Emigration Canyon Community Council, Emigration Oaks resident
Tom Johnson, Emigration Canyon Resident - Pinecrest resident
Mary Gibson, Emigration Canyon Trails Association - Emigration Oaks resident
Rick Reese, (representing Sarah Bennett-Alley) – Emigration Trails
Ray Loken, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Scott White, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Chris Jones, Emigration Canyon Resident, Emigration Canyon Resident
Karen Nichols, Emigration Community Council, Emigration Canyon Resident
Catherine Harris, Emigration Canyon Community Council
Steve Scheid, US Forest Service
Tracey Kirkham, Salt Lake Public Utilities
Rick Spearman, Emigration Community Council, Emigration Canyon Resident
Joe Smolka, Emigration Community Council, Emigration Canyon Resident
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design
Lisa Sokol, Landmark Design

Observers in Attendance:
Milt Shipp, representing Butcher family
Dennis Conroy
Brian Doubek

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks led the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

Lynn Larsen reminded everyone that the Open House is scheduled for Monday, May 9th, from 6 to 9 pm, and will be held in the North Building of the Salt Lake County Complex, in the Council Chambers and Atrium.

1. Review of Map Changes from Previous Meeting
Mark Vlasic summarized the map changes that were agreed upon at the previous Advisory Committee Meeting:

- A single map showing trail alternatives as currently prepared will be presented at the Open House Meeting;
- The Quarry Trailhead (#4) has been renamed Pinecrest Trailhead;
- An existing Regional Trail connection to Kingdom Lakes/City Creek Canyon near the junction with Lookout Peak was added to the map;
- A modified bicycle loop-trail between Little Mountain Summit and lower Kilyon’s Canyon (Andy’s version) was added. The route avoids lands associated with Secret Canyon;
• A regional trail link was provided between South Slope Ridgeline Trail and the trail beginning at the proposed Sorensen Property trailhead; and
• Section drawings through were modified to indicate that they extend into Mountain Dell Canyon (not East Canyon as previously described).

The advisory committee then asked questions about the trail alternatives, with comments summarized below:

• One member asked about the connection from the main road to the North Mid-Slope trail alignment that was mentioned at the previous meeting. It was noted that this trail addition was brought up at the very end of the meeting and there was not sufficient time to allow discussion by the committee. Therefore, the trail connection was not added to the map.
• A question was raised regarding Andy’s bike loop alignment and the amount of parking provided. It was noted that this trail segment would only have access from the main road, and that no parking or trailhead was included.
• Some members expressed concern about the trailhead proposed for Kilyon’s Canyon. In particular, they felt that this site, too, might best be served as an access point only, with no parking or other trailhead amenities provided. It was noted that feedback from the public open house would be important in determining what happens at this local trailhead, and that for the present time the trailhead would remain on the map.

2. Review of Open House Format
Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design provided an overview of the general format of the open house.
• A formal presentation will be given from 6 to 7 PM. This will consist of a PowerPoint slide presentation that will describe the purpose of the plan, review the trail alternatives, and provide an overview of the planning process to date.
• Once the presentation is made, agency representatives (police, fire, SLC Watershed, National Forest Service, and Utah State Wildlife) will present their views of the plan.
• The goal will be to gather as many comments as possible at the meeting; a full week will be allowed for submitting comments.
• Landmark Design and the agency representatives will head the presentation in the SL County Council Chambers. Once the presentation is complete, attendees will be asked to disperse to three “stations” where copies of the trail alternatives map and the illustrative sections can be reviewed up close, and where staff will be available to answer questions and assist attendees submit comments.
• Concerns were raised about how verbal comments would be incorporated into the plan process. It was proposed that verbal comments will not be allowed, and that all comments must be written down, whether on a comment sheet, as a letter, or by email.
• Several members expressed concern that there should be a short period for the public to ask questions at the end of the formal presentation, prior to dispersing to stations. It was agreed that up to 15 minutes will be allowed for asking general questions about the plan, but that rules will be established to keep people from editorializing.
• It was mentioned that the map and sections should be available for review at a public venue for a week after the meeting; this is important for those people who are unable to come to the Open House meeting so they may review the map at their convenience as needed. Camp Kostopoulos was suggested as a location, but it was pointed out that their hours may not coincide with people’s needs. Another suggestion was made that the information should be located at a public venue, like the Anderson-Foothill library. Lynn Larsen will contact the library about displaying the information.
• The maps will be posted on the project website after the meeting.
• The question was raised about how the comments will be included in the plan and the process. It was explained that every comment received will be incorporated verbatim, and then grouped according to issue, and summarized. This process will assist the advisory committee as well as the public to review the comments received, and help them understand the general concerns and ideas expressed. It was noted by one member that it is important to the planning process that opinions of the general public as well as canyon residents are incorporated into the document and process.
• Comments and summaries will be presented to the advisory committee at the next advisory committee meeting scheduled for June 2nd, at 4:00pm.
• People need to get their comments down in written form, whether they do it at the meeting, or later. Consultants can assist those members who are unable to record comments.
• It would help people to direct their comments more specifically and avoid confusion if each trail segment was given a specific designation, whether it’s numbers or letters.
• Tables will be located near each station to allow people a place to sit down and record their comments. A large map will be located at each station. Smaller maps (11x17 color, approximately 300 copies) will also be available for attendees to reference.
• A concern was raised about the comment forms, that maybe they shouldn’t be so open ended. It was noted that the comment forms should not lead attendees in any way.
• It was mentioned that it would be better for crowd dispersal and noise control, one of the stations should be located in the chambers, and the other two could be spaced as far apart as possible in the atrium.

3. Meeting Advertisement
Lynn Larsen summarized the plan for advertising the Open House. To summarize, canyon residents will receive a direct mail invitation, and the public will be notified through newspaper notices and public postings.
• The mailing list for canyon resident distribution will be obtained from the County Recorder’s Office.
• A question was raised about why only canyon residents are being directly notified about the meeting. It was noted that the project most directly impacts canyon residents, but that other county residents would be notified through newspaper ads. Another committee member pointed out that local public radio stations might assist with broadcasting the notice as well.
• A committee member noted that some organizations would be happy to distribute meeting notices at their own cost, and that advisory committee members should be forwarding this information through their own networks, and encouraging the people they distribute it to do the same.

4. Q&A/Fact Sheet Distribution
• Some committee members expressed interest in sending out a question and answer sheet along with the meeting notice. It was noted that this should be more along the lines of a fact sheet, answering basic questions about the plan and the planning process, so as not to bias comments in any way. The fact sheet should state why it is important for people to attend this meeting, let them know who is hosting this meeting, what the meeting format will be, and where they can get information and send comments if they are unable to attend. It should also mention who has been involved in the process and what everyone’s role has been.
• One member suggested that the meeting should be titled “Presentation and Open House”, so that people know that a formal presentation will take place, and that it’s more than just an Open House.
• The Fact Sheet needs to make clear the future process, including approval and funding.
• Notice should be distributed at least 2 weeks prior to the meeting, and announcements in papers should be repeated more than once.

5. Law Enforcement Representative on Committee
Currently there is no representative for law enforcement on the committee, and it was felt by several members that it is important to have a representative, especially regarding the enforcement side of issues. Lynn Larsen will contact the appropriate County Sheriff official.

6. Additional Items
Concern was expressed about how the committee functions, whether decisions are made based on consensus, by vote, and whether comments by canyon residents or the general public would have equal “weight” on the final decisions made in the plan. Some felt that there is not good representation for all groups on the committee. Lynn Larsen clarified that the group is an advisory board, and not a voting body. The only reason a vote was taken last time was to get past a sticking point that was holding up the process. A vote to approve the plan comes at the planning commission level. It was suggested that advisory board members have a responsibility to attend all meetings in order to ensure that their views are expressed and noted. If committee members are unable to attend a meeting, they should arrange to have a representative attend in their place. The purpose of the Advisory Board is to help develop a reasonable plan that can be presented to the planning commission. The Master Plan is intended to guide future trail development in the canyon.

Other comments follow:
• It was pointed out that the trails are not just for canyon residents, and that people outside the canyon have concerns as well, which need to be incorporated into the planning process.
• We need to be sure that accurate terminology is being used.
• The question was raised whether law enforcement would be providing figures on law enforcement issues in the canyon concerning trail use. It was noted that the sheriff’s representative should be able to provide a summary of their concerns at the public open house.
• The issue of trail prioritization was raised. It was noted that past experience gained from the implementation of Bonneville Shoreline Trail, Jordan River Trail and other trails in Salt Lake County illustrate that prioritization tends to be a fairly benign tool, since the long-term nature of the implementation process can’t adequately account for unforeseen changes and emerging opportunities before they arise. Based on this knowledge, the final Master Plan is not likely to suggest a prescriptive prioritization process.
• Emigration Community Council will distribute a general e-mail, notifying citizens on their mailing list about the Open House.

The next advisory committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 2, 2005, at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Comments and summaries from the Open House will be presented at this time.
Notes from Advisory Committee Meeting #8

Thursday, July 7, 2005

Advisory Committee Members In Attendance:
Janet Haskell, Emigration Canyon Resident
Jan Cook, Emigration Canyon Community Council, Emigration Oaks resident
Tom Johnson, Emigration Canyon Resident - Pinecrest resident
Chris Jones, Emigration Canyon Resident
Andy McNeil, Emigration Canyon Resident
Steve Scheid, US Forest Service
Sarah Bennett-Alley, Friends of Emigration Canyon Trails, Canyon Resident
Tracey Kirkham, Salt Lake Public Utilities
Rick Spearman, Emigration Community Council, Emigration Canyon Resident
Joe Smolka, Emigration Community Council, Emigration Canyon Resident
Lynn Larsen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Division
Jan Striefel, Landmark Design
Mark Vlasic, Landmark Design
Lisa Sokol, Landmark Design

Observers in Attendance:

The meeting was convened at the Salt Lake County Complex, Room 4017 at 4:00 PM. Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks led the meeting. The following is a summary of the discussions that took place.

Lynn Larsen thanked everyone for their participation on the advisory committee and for their input, and then reviewed the purpose of trail master plans and what the future steps would be in the planning process. To summarize:

- The master plan is a conceptual plan document representing what the County and its residents would like to see happen sometime in the future. The County and the planning consultants understand that there is a wide range of opinions and feelings about the plan, and have tried to be as objective as possible in the planning process.
- Routes depicted are purely conceptual – the master plan document is a planning tool that can be used in the future to help obtain funding for trails projects as opportunities arise.
- When a development of a particular trail is desired, funding must be obtained for the planning and/or construction phases. This is the time that exact routes will be determined using GPS, and detailed analysis will take place to determine feasibility and effects on wildlife and the environment. If the project crosses federal land, it must go through the NEPA process. All agencies involved with a particular trail route must give their approval before construction can move forward, including utility companies with rights of way, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake Public Utilities, National Forest Service, and the Emigration Township planning commission.
- The goal is to complete this master plan, including a revised trails map and a detailed report, in approximately two months. It will then go before the Emigration Township Planning Commission for approval, further discussion, rejection, or approval with required changes. Canyon residents and the general public will have this opportunity to
comment at a public hearing before the planning commission regarding their opinions of the plan and the planning process.

- The master plan document will include detailed information such as:
  - A Summary of existing conditions, mapping, and analysis
  - Description of the planning process and decision-making process
  - Documentation of Public involvement
  - Alternatives developed during the planning process
  - Descriptions and justifications of the proposed trail alignments
  - Important issues raised during the planning process
  - Design and management guidelines
  - Potential funding sources and opportunities

- Committee members expressed concern about the lack of information about funding, and detailed analysis of various trail routes.

- The question was raised whether local neighborhood trails should be shown on the maps to help the planning commission see important connections to the proposed trail system.

- The proposed trails map that will be submitted to the planning commission will be based on all of the feedback received during the planning process, and modifications will be made to the previous map. The extent of those changes are not known yet, but the County and planning consultants will be as objective as possible in determining the most appropriate options.

Mark Vlasic then reviewed the summary results from the public open house meeting. These are available in a separate summary document, as well as verbatim comment documents which will be available on the project website.

- Concerns were raised about the newspaper article that came out shortly before the end of the comment period, and whether this might have skewed the results, or whether groups providing talking points may have skewed results as well.

- Lynn reminded the committee that the comment process was not a voting process, and that they would be taking all the feedback under advisement, and the planning consultants would do their best to complete a professional and objective planning document.

Lynn Larsen then asked whether the committee should meet again in two months to review the draft plan, or to proceed to the planning commission with the draft plan and allow the citizens to give their comments. Some committee members felt there should be another meeting, and others felt that the committee has already fulfilled its role, and that it would be more appropriate to take the plan directly to the commission when completed. It was proposed that the project website remain operational through the approval process, so that citizens may view and obtain copies of the draft plan prior to the planning commission hearing. It was agreed that the website would remain on-line, and SL County Parks and Recreation would determine whether the committee would meet again.
Notes from Public Open House Meeting #1

Tuesday, October 12, 2004

1) Background

A public open house meeting was held on the evening of October 12, 2004 at Camp Kostopulos for the residents of Emigration Canyon. The intent of the meeting was to (1) introduce the Emigration Canyon Trails Master Plan process to the public, (2) present existing information and what the planning team understands about existing trails and trails issues in the canyon, and (3) solicit public comment on the ideas, concerns and issues of Emigration Canyon residents regarding trails in their community.

Attendance at the open house was high, with 129 people signing in. Sixty-four comments were submitted during the intervening weeks, most within days of the meeting. Of the total comments received, 33 were submitted on comment forms distributed during the meeting, or written on maps and note pads provided at the meeting. One comment was provided via telephone conversation, 26 additional comments were received via e-mail, and four in the mail.

A letter was submitted by a resident of the Kilyon’s Canyon area representing the concerns and ideas of an undefined group of Kilyon’s Canyon residents, and three letters were received from the following public agencies:

- SLC Department of Public Utilities
- State of Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife Resources
- National Forest Service - Wasatch Cache, SL Ranger District

Comments ranged from a single sentence to seven pages in length, and encompassed 38 pages of text, scanned letters and scanned images. A copy of this summary document, and a full transcript of verbatim comments, will be posted on the project website.

2) Summary of Public Comment

The following is a general summary of the public input received. Since many of the comments addressed similar themes or areas of concern, the summary is presented in descending order, beginning with the most prevalent issues and ending with singular issues and ideas.

MOST COMMON COMMENTS, CONCERNS AND ISSUES (5-19)

1) The most common stated desire is to keep public parking and trailheads away from private property/residential areas. This includes limiting the number of public trailheads, preferably with one trailhead at the top of the Canyon at Little Mountain, and another at the mouth of canyon adjacent to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. There were several requests to provide feeder trail connections from the road to the trails above according to a well-thought out system of feeder trails.

2) Providing a trail on the south side of the canyon also received support from a number of respondents, as did a request that efforts continue to focus on completing a continuous bicycle trail along the length of Emigration Canyon Road, especially before resources are used for implementing non-motorized, off-road trails.

3) Several respondents stated a desire that no public trail access or trails should be provided in Emigration Oaks subdivision, most noting that Emigration Oaks is a private development. It was also noted that Emigration Oaks subdivision has specific restrictive
covenants that limit trails access and trail use to residents and their guests, and that allowing public access will compromise the covenants and potentially place the association in a difficult legal position.

4) **General support for trails and trails access** was stated by several respondents, and a well-designed and properly managed trail and a trail system in particular. Several respondents stated a neutral feeling toward trails and trails use.

5) Several Kilyon’s Canyon residents provided comment supporting a letter presented at Advisory Committee Meeting 2, which supports the following:

- No trails in Charlie’s Canyon;
- No trails in Secret Canyon;
- Provide a regional trail on the south side of the canyon;
- Keep parking/trailheads away from private property/residential areas; and
- Restore and convert Kilyon’s Canyon into a hiking-only trail.

6) Several respondents believe that dogs present a serious safety, pollution and wildlife problem. Concern was also stated for critical winter range for elk, moose and deer on the upper ridges of the canyon; several felt that trails should be kept away from these areas at all costs. It was also noted that riparian areas are extremely sensitive and cannot handle additional impacts. On a related issue, it was stated that the Bonneville Cutthroat, an endangered species of trout, is present in Emigration Creek, and that erosion and other potential trail impacts may further the decline the condition of this water body as viable trout habitat.

7) Several respondents requested that non-motorized, multi-use rim trails be developed on both sides of canyon for hiking, biking, horse riding. Several stated concern that new and additional trailheads and trails will increase public interest in canyon trail use that are unsustainable. Some indicated their fear and concern for hunting, while others are fearful of “gonzo” mountain bike riders when hiking on the trails.

8) Some respondents requested that mountain bike trails be separated from hiking trails. Several comments expressed concern that trails increase fire hazard, while others noted that properly designed trails might improve fire hazard by providing firebreaks and increasing access for fire fighting efforts.

9) Several comments noted that important watershed lands surround the area, and that protecting water quality is critical for wildlife and people. It was also noted that protection of potable water sources and wells is a very important concern.

10) Several respondents were concerned with the open house format, which was felt to be confusing and did not encourage discussion and understanding. It was requested that future public meetings include a presentation of key issues and ideas, with an opportunity to listen and discuss in a calm environment. It was also felt that future venues should be of sufficient size to accommodate a large crowd.

**LESS COMMON COMMENTS, CONCERNS AND ISSUES**

1) Some respondents felt that efforts should focus on protecting and maintaining existing trailheads and trails instead of constructing new trails. It was also requested that Kilyon’s Canyon trailhead be improved, maintained and plowed, although it was noted that the existing road and informal trailhead are privately controlled. Some felt that improvements might encourage unsustainable use in Kilyon’s, impacting the already impacted surroundings.

2) Some respondents expressed their concern that illegal and inappropriate behavior takes place on the trails, and is likely to increase with if more trailheads and trails are
constructed. Noted behaviors include allowing aggressive dogs to wander off-leash, illegal camping, littering, hunting, and parties.

3) It was noted that **many existing trails have erosion problems**. More than one respondent suggested that **hiking and mountain bike use could be controlled** with odd/even date limits, similar to the system used in Millcreek Canyon. It was also suggested that an **Emigration Canyon Resident sticker program** might be considered, allowing canyon residents access to limited parking and trailheads on private land.

4) Some felt that **trails increase crime**, while others requested data on safety, fire, property value and other similar trail use issues. Finally, some felt that public safety may be compromised by the inability of police to adequately monitor trail use and behavior.

**SINGULAR COMMENTS, CONCERNS AND ISSUES (1)**
The following is a list of individual comments made and ideas suggested by respondents, and organized according to the categories described.

**Planning Process Issues and Ideas**
1) Hold small neighborhood meetings to discuss alternatives and discourage spread of misinformation.
2) Inform canyon residents that this is an **interactive process** and that no decisions have been made.
3) Provide a clear description of public comments, including a description of how they were compiled, analyzed and will be incorporated into the planning process.
4) Hold **additional public meetings** to review and comment on alternatives as well as preferred designs.
5) Mail a newsletter to each household explaining the planning process and the various alternatives and proposals as they emerge.

**Environmental Issues and Ideas**
1) **Protect and maintain integrity of the Red Butte Restricted Natural Area (RNA)**. This is a unique and sensitive environment; if trails on the upper ridges emerge as an element of the plan, methods and signage should be instituted to prevent public access into the area.
2) Improve, reroute or close the many existing trails near riparian areas.
3) Document and address important **cultural resources**.
4) **Keep mountain bikes and horses away from sensitive environmental areas**, including riparian areas, areas with easily eroded soils, steep slopes, etc.
5) Ensure that the National Forest Service, Division of Wildlife Resources and other agencies **adequately participate** in the planning process and review proposals to ensure that sensitive canyon environmental conditions are not compromised.
6) Investigate the development of a **Mid-south slope trail**, which is less disruptive to wildlife and private properties.
7) Clarify how new and expanded trails will “enhance the beauty of the fragile environment”, as stated in the vision statement.
8) Avoid constructing new trails on **slopes that are too steep** and are likely to increase erosion.
9) Investigate the need for implementing an Emigration Canyon noise ordinance.

**Location, Siting and Design Issues and Ideas**
1) **Review all alternatives** before determining the need for additional trails.
2) **Improve trail access** near the mouth of canyon and Bonneville Shoreline Trail, near Affleck Park, and at Little Mountain.
3) Provide access to North Slope trail system in vicinity of future fire station/ Santa Fe restaurant.
4) Address the problematic checkerboard ownership pattern.
5) Determine the potential and need for negotiated easements and rights-of-way through private land.
6) Logical land trades between the National Forest Service and Salt Lake City is generally not possible due to the 1918 SLC Watershed Protection Act, which forbids such exchanges. Any exchanges of this type will require an act of congress.
7) Avoid locating a public trailhead and/or trails in Kilyon’s Canyon.
8) Maintain and/or re-establish public access through Freeze Creek to the upper north reaches of canyon.
9) Develop a canyon wide multi-use trail system.
10) Link rim trails on both sides of the canyon with feeder trails to bottom and road.
11) No trailheads in the interior areas of the canyon.
12) Provide additional, better trails and preserve existing trails and access areas.
13) Connect existing and new trails as part of a logical trail system.
14) Provide adequate trailheads at the mouth of canyon and at Little Mountain, summit, including adequate parking, turnouts, restrooms, etc.
15) Provide a comprehensive trail system throughout Emigration Canyon, including Emigration Oaks.
16) Create a comprehensive north-slope trail system.
17) Develop a trailhead at the proposed fire station site.
18) Investigate the potential for developing a public trailhead near main entrance to Emigration Oaks.
19) Do not provide or encourage trails use in Emigration Canyon.
20) Take no steps that will increase traffic in Burr’s Fork or Kilyon’s Canyons. This includes improving the informal trailhead to Old Mine Road, and improved public access and/or parking at the top of Pinecrest.
21) Negotiate easements with landowners and Emigration Oaks Association to ensure existing tails and trails access is maintained.
22) Re-establish public access to Lookout Peak trails via upper Pinecrest Canyon.
23) Provide no public access over private land on the Middle Fork of Kilyon’s Canyon without compensation to the landowner, and/or without maintaining traditional motorized vehicle access rights.
24) Provide alternative access from Pinecrest to Middle Fork Traverse on public land – do not cross private property to provide this link.

**Trail Use/Operation Issues and Ideas**

1) Enforce the ban on Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use.
2) Allow and support multi-use trail activity, as long as bikers are well behaved.
3) Do not publicize trailhead location in the canyon interior, which will help minimize traffic and other negative impacts.
4) Provide horse trails wherever possible.
5) Do not allow mountain bikes on Emigration Canyon trails.
6) Maintain the existing trail system “as it is”.

**Property/Privacy Issues and Ideas**

1) Do not allow canyon top-to-bottom, regional trails, since this will impact private property in the canyon.
2) Do not promote the development or formalization of trailheads or parking in Emigration Oaks, since there is no room for such uses.
3) Existing trails and trail access points leading to Freeze Creek have already been lost through lot development.
4) Do not allow any trails to be developed or improved on the north side of the canyon.

**Maintenance/Enforcement Issues and Ideas**
1) Dogs are appropriate to have on trails only when leashed and under control.
2) More trails for dogs

**General/Miscellaneous Issues and Ideas**
1) Need to define what a “non-motorized” trail is.

2) **Summary of Agency Comment**

As summarized below, three agencies, all members of the Advisory Committee, submitted comments.

**SLC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES**
Emigration Canyon borders SLC Protected Watershed Areas in City Creek and Parley’s and Dell Canyon, which are primary drinking water sources for the SL Valley. In addition, SLC owns significant parcels of land in Emigration Canyon, which are managed for conservation purposes. Formal trail development on SLC-owned Emigration Canyon lands will be low-impact, non-motorized recreational use, and meet a list of specific requirements, including a right of access agreement, signage, use of proper construction techniques, etc.

**STATE OF UTAH DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES**
The main concern is protection of critical big game winter range, and the impact an extensive trail system has on this objective. Dogs are a particular concern in this regard.

Degradation of water quality in Emigration Creek as a result of trails and trails use is also of concern, particularly since the Bonneville Cutthroat trout is found here. The narrow riparian corridor is important for nesting and foraging and is easily impacted by trails and trail use.

**NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE - WASATCH CACHE, SL RANGER DISTRICT**
Notes from October 2003 were received concerning ideas for trails on the north side of Emigration Canyon as proposed by the Emigration Canyon Trails Association (ECTA). The notes include an extensive list of issues, potential impacts and concerns. Some of the key points include:
- The routes proposed by the Emigration Trails Association for the north slope of the canyon are not a trail priority in the National Forest Service Long-Range Master Plan. It is pointed out that alternative ideas need to be considered before a determination of need can be made.
- There are no National Forest Service “system” trails in Emigration Canyon.
- There are no trails or routes in Emigration Canyon that allow motorized access.
- New trails can either reduce or increase illegal motorized use in area, depending on many factors, including enforcement.
- No National Forest Service funding is earmarked for trails development or maintenance in Emigration Canyon.
### Table 1

Summarized Comments According to General Issue Category, Including the Number of Times Each Comment was Made or Supported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Process Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold small neighborhood meetings to discuss alternatives and discourage spread of misinformation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents need to be informed that this is an interactive process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open house process is confusing. Would like a presentation of the issues with discussion and calm environment. Increase size of venue accordingly.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear description of public comments, and how they were compiled and analyzed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need additional public meetings to review and comment on alternatives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail newsletter to each household explaining planning process and alts/proposals as they emerge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many existing trails have erosion problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many existing trails near riparian areas must either be upgraded, rerouted or closed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important winter range for deer, elk and moose; trails on upper south slope are particularly sensitive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs are major threat to large game and other wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area is important watershed; protection of water quality is critical for wildlife and potable water sources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource survey necessary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of riparian areas is important; additional impacts are unacceptable. Bonneville Cutthroat trout is present in Emigration Creek (endangered species)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area has high fire hazard; trails may increase problem or provide better firefighting access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mountain bikes or horses in sensitive environmental areas (riparian areas, easily eroded soils, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure NFS and DWR adequately review proposals to ensure sensitive environmental conditions (wildlife, erosion, etc.) are not compromised</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-south slope trail is less disruptive to wildlife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will trails “enhance the beauty of the fragile environment”, as stated in the vision statement?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New trails may be too steep, increase erosion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and maintain integrity of Red Butte RNA; sign upper ride if part of trail system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration Canyon needs noise ordinance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect potable water sources and wells</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location, Siting and Design Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to review alternatives before determination of need for additional trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing access at mouth of canyon, near Affleck Park, Little Mountain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed access near Santa Fe restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkerboard ownership is major problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easements and rights-of-way necessary through private land</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area is protected by 1918 Watershed protection Act, which forbids exchanging land</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimize number of trailheads (1 at Little Mountain, 1 at mouth of canyon), link with feeder/historic trails from slopes to main road</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carefully consider any trailhead or trails in Kilyon’s canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No public trails, trailheads or parking areas on private land</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain/re-establish continued public access up Freeze Creek to upper reaches of canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop multi-use rim trails on both sides of canyon (hiking, biking, horses)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide multi-use trail system</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link rim trails with feeder trails to bottom of canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No improved trailheads in canyon interior</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide additional, better trails</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preserve existing trails and access</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logically connect existing and new trails</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide regional trail connection for length of canyon, preferably on public land</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide adequate trailhead with parking, bathrooms, etc. at mouth of canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide comprehensive trail system throughout Emigration Canyon, including Emigration Oaks</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create north-slope trail system</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create trailhead at fire station site</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect and maintain existing trailheads and trails instead of constructing new trails</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigate possible public trailhead near main entrance to Emigration Oaks</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No trails in canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do nothing to increase traffic in Burr’s Fork or Kilyon’s Canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiate easements with landowners and Emigration Oaks Association to ensure access is maintained</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re-establish public trails access to Lookout Peak via upper Pinecrest Canyon</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No public access over private land on Middle Fork of Kilyon’s canyon without compensation and/or maintaining traditional motorized vehicle access</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide alternative access from Pinecrest to Middle Fork Travers – do not cross private property</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trail Use/Operation Issues**

<p>| <strong>Prohibit all OHV use</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>No NFS “system” trails in Emigration Canyon</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>No trails/routes in canyon currently allow motorized access</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>New trails can either reduce or increase illegal motorized use in area</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>No funding earmarked</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>Not listed as trail priority in NFS Long-Range Master Plan</strong> | 1 |
| <strong>Focus on completing continuous bike trail along length of Emigration</strong> | 9 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property/Privacy Issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cross canyon, regional trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration Oaks is private property</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No public access or trail use in Emigration Oaks</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not attempt to compromise Emigration Oaks CC&amp;R’s by allowing public access</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No room for trailheads or parking in Emigration Oaks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public trails and access in Emigration Oaks increases liability of association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trails in Charlie’s Canyon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trails in Secret Canyon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide trail on the south side of the canyon</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep parking/trailheads away from private residences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore and convert Kilyon’s Canyon into a hiking trail only</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide trail link between Kilyon’s and Burr Fork Canyons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not acquire private land for trails use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide link on public land which avoids private land and maintains privacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-south slope trail diminishes privacy of adjacent landowners and decreases visual quality of view (exposed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and understand the CC&amp;R’s for all subdivisions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No north side trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications to Emigration Oaks CC&amp;R’s require 2/3 member vote</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance/Enforcement Issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New trails are not NFS maintenance priority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control illegal/inappropriate behavior (dogs, camping, littering, hunting, parties)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need better trails maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs are a problem: safety, pollution, wildlife</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs appropriate if on leash only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trails for dogs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General/Miscellaneous Issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General support for trails/trail system in Emigration Canyon that is well-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neutral stand on trails/trail system in Emigration Canyon
Need to define “non-motorized” trail

Notes from Public Open House Meeting #2

Thursday, May 9, 2005

1) Background

A public open house and presentation was held from 6:00 to 9:00 PM, May 9, 2005 at the Salt Lake County Council Chambers. The intent of the meeting was to provide relevant information and solicit public comment on Trail Alternatives. One-hundred-six (106) people signed attendance sheets for the meeting; based on the addresses provided, approximately half were Emigration Canyon residents.

The meeting began with introductions by Jan Cook, Chair of the Emigration Canyon Community Council, and was followed by introductory comments by Lynn Larsen of Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation. Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design next presented a PowerPoint slideshow, which discussed the planning process to date, key issues that have emerged during the planning process, and Trail Alternatives ideas. Following the presentation five representatives of stakeholder public agencies provided their input and response to the Trail Alternatives. These included Salt Lake County Unified Fire Services, Salt Lake County Sheriff’s Office, Utah State Department of Wildlife Resources, the National Forest Service, and Salt Lake City Public Utilities – Watershed. The formal presentation was concluded with a thirty-minute Q&A session conducted by Lynn Larsen.

At the conclusion of the presentation, those in attendance were invited to review large-format copies of the Alternative Trails Map and related materials, which were on display at three stations manned by project staff. Smaller color copies of the maps were available for distribution, as were comment sheets for submitting written comments.

2) Public Comment Received

Opportunities for providing comments were varied. In addition to comment sheets provided at the Open House, attendees were provided with a Project Website and e-mail information for submitting comments electronically, and were also provided a physical address for mailing comments. Following the meeting, copies of the large format maps and other project information were displayed at the Anderson-Foothill Library for review through the end of May. In response to requests by members of the public, the deadline for submitting comments was extended from one week to three weeks, resulting in a revised submittal closure date of May 31, 2005.

As illustrated in Table 1, Two-hundred-thirty-nine (239) comments were received during the comment period, representing 269 individuals1. Seventy-eight comments (29%) were received from persons with Emigration Canyon addresses or zip codes. One-hundred-ninety-one (191) comments (71%) were received from persons residing outside of the canyon, or from persons who did not indicate their residence. One comment was from out-of-state. Three comments were received after the submittal deadline, and were not included in the analysis.

---

1 Several comments were signed by more than one person.
Letters representing the following groups were received:

- National Society of the Sons of Utah Pioneers
- Wasatch Mountain Club
- Save Our Canyons
- Emigration Oaks Property Owners Association

Comments ranged from a single sentence to nine pages in length, encompassing 132 pages of text.

3) General Summary of Public Comment

The following is a general summary of the public comments that were received. Some were direct and simple, stating support or opposition to the Preferred Trails Map or the process. Others were complex and detailed, addressing multiple issues and ideas, and posing detailed questions. A good faith effort has been applied to account for all comments, summarizing them in a manner that reflects the time, effort and thought behind each.

The comments are presented in three categories which follow.

**CATEGORY 1 - General Support or Opposition to the Alternative Trails Map/Planning Process**

Comments were reviewed to determine general support or opposition to the Alternative Trails Map, and the planning process in general. As illustrated in Table 2, two-hundred-twelve (212) or 79% of the comments indicate general support, and thirty-one (12%) generally oppose the map or planning process. Twenty-six (26) comments, or 9% of the total, do not indicate clear support or opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Comments Received</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emigration Canyon</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Emigration Canyon</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A total of 239 comment forms or letters were received, representing 269 individuals.

As illustrated in Table 3, all 31 comments generally opposed to the map were submitted by canyon residents (Table 3). This represents approximately 40% of comments received from
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canyon residents. The remaining comments submitted by canyon residents indicate general support (47%), or do not indicate support or opposition (13%).

Table 3
Canyon Residents: General Support or Opposition to the Alternative Trails Map/Planning Process

| Comments in General Support | 37 | 47 |
| Comments in General Opposition | 31 | 40 |
| Comments Indicating Neither General Support or Opposition | 10 | 13 |
| **TOTAL** | **78** | **100** |

CATEGORY 2 - Comments Related to Planning Process, Procedures and Public Input

Twenty-seven (27) comments focused on the planning process, procedures and public input. These tended to be thoughtful yet critical of the work completed to date, and were somewhat challenging to summarize.

As illustrated in Table 4, comments of this type focused on the perception that the general public has been poorly represented in the planning process, and the belief that the plan has been prepared for the local neighborhood instead of a broader constituency. There was concern that no criteria or rationale has been provided for the various alignments and trailheads, that general information is lacking, and that the analysis of potential impacts is weak or missing. Other comments address the concern that public comments will be placed in a “black box” with no answers or responses provided; the belief that “secret agreements” have been struck between Emigration Canyon residents; and the perception that no purpose or need has been established for trails.

Table 4
Comments Related to Planning Process, Procedures and Public Input

| Comment | # |
| No rationale or criteria for the proposed alignments/general lack of information/ critical impact analysis weak or missing/ no expert input. | 7 |
| General Public not adequately involved in the planning process. | 6 |
| “Black Box” comment analysis/ need to answer comments so respondents know they have been heard/ use NEPA-style procedures. | 2 |
| Secret agreements have been struck between neighborhoods. | 2 |
| Purpose and need not established. | 2 |
| Map/Plan does not reflect the large canyon population, sensitive environmental and natural conditions | 2 |
| Analysis lacking rigorous approach. | 1 |
| Plan needs to be completed in order to provide meaningful comments. | 1 |
| Plan needs to reflect the needs of Salt Lake County, not just Emigration Canyon. | 1 |
| No descriptions of trail alignments and trailheads. | 1 |
| Presentations made at Open House were often contradictory. | 1 |
| Map/plan does not reflect the desires of canyon residents. | 1 |
| **TOTAL** | **27** |
CATEGORY 3 - Comments Related to Specific Trails and Details

As illustrated in Table 5, three-hundred-forty-two (342)² comments were received that address specific trail details. Two-hundred-fifty-three (253) were generally supportive, most suggesting additions or alterations that might enhance the Alternative Trails Map. Eighty-nine (89) were generally non-supportive, suggesting the deletion of specific trail alignments and elements, or pointing out the negative impacts of the Alternative Trails map and planning process in general.

Table 5
Comments Related to Specific Trail Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone or Tenor of Comments</th>
<th># of Comments Received</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally Supportive</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally Unsupportive</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 illustrates 60 categories of specific comments which emerged, beginning with the most prevalent and ending with singular comments. The number of comments within each category ranges from one to twenty-six. For purposes of aiding analysis, generally supportive comments are indicated in italic type style, while comments that are generally unsupportive are indicated in bold.

The most prevalent comments focus on maintaining public access to trails located on public land; re-establishing the public trail connection from Burr Fork to Lookout Peak; providing a public trail across public land between Burr Fork and the top of Kilyon’s Canyon (Charlie’s Canyon area); and establishing Trail Alignment R3 as the primary Emigration Canyon trail.

Frequently-occurring comments also suggest that Kilyon’s Canyon not be closed to mountain bike use without providing a reasonable alternative loop trail (such as expanding the current loop to Burnt Flats); that existing trails in the canyon be secured and rehabilitated; that a trail on the south side of the canyon be developed as a complement to R3 Trail alignment on the north side; that a Regional trail link be developed from the bottom of the canyon to Little Mountain Trailhead and beyond; and that equestrian access and trailer parking be maintained, especially at Little Mountain Summit Trailhead.

Eliminating the R4 Trail Alignment received substantial support. Several comments suggested that increased trails and trails activity will increase fire hazard. There was some support for making Kilyon’s Canyon a hiking-only trail, and similar numbers against the creation of new trails on the north slope of the canyon, in the vicinity of Emigration Oaks subdivision (trail alignment R3 in particular), and within the canyon.

Table 6
Comments Related to Specific Trail Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Maintain and obtain public access to trails located on public land.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Re-establish and maintain public trail connection from Burr Fork to</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² In order to assist the complex accounting of the numerous and varied Specific Comments, each comment submitted was tallied as a single comment, whether representing a group, organization or multiple signatories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provide a public trail across public land between Burr Fork and top of Kilyon’s Canyon (Charlie’s Canyon Area).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establish Trail Alignment R3 as the primary Emigration Canyon trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do not close Kilyon’s Canyon to mountain bikes without providing a reasonable alternative loop trail (Secret Canyon loop would be OK).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Secure and rehabilitate existing trails in the canyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Establish trail on the south side of the canyon as a complement to R3 Trail Alignment on the north side of the canyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provide a Regional trail link from the bottom of the canyon to Little Mountain Trailhead and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maintain equestrian access and trailer parking, especially from Little Mountain Summit Trailhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eliminate R4 Trail Alignment (too sensitive/ threatens Red Butte RNA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increased trail activity will increase fire hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Establish ridge trails on both sides of the canyon as a long-term goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Provide mid-canyon link from roadway to R3 Trail (reduces trail length, discourages shortcuts through private property).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Convert Kilyon’s canyon to hiking-only trail/ place barrier at the top of canyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Increased trail activity will increase hunter activity/ conflicts with residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>No new trails on the north side of the canyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No new trails in the canyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No R3 Trail Alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>No new trail; use existing trails instead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>No new trails or trailheads in Emigration Oaks subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Extend lower portion of Old Mine Road to Burr Fork Road, following original route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Support all aspects of the Alternative Trails Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provide better parking solutions/ no parking on streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>delineate areas and trails where dogs are allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Establish, improve and maintain Emigration Canyon Main Road as the primary trail connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>No trailhead at Kilyon’s Canyon (designate as a trail access point only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Establish all regional trail indicated on Trails Alternative Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Concede that Freeze Creek will become defacto access trail from R3 trail alignment (private land conflict).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Top-to-bottom regional trails do not respect or respond to unique terrain and vegetative regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Increased trail activity will increase soil erosion and habitat destruction/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>No R1 Trail Alignment (too steep).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Increased trail activity does not adequately assess impacts to wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Connect and maintain Sheep Trail from Little Mountain Summit Trailhead to Main canyon Road near monument (historic route of Mormon Pioneer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34) Link Perkin’s Hollow trail into R2 alignment.
35) Provide trailheads with adequate restroom facilities.
36) Provide addition trails use education/ sign hunting and other rules.
37) Trails reduce fire hazard by providing fire breaks and access to fires.
38) Control mountain bike use.
39) Reduce scope of plan/ focus on establishing R2 Trail Alignment and trailheads 1 and 3/ do not put trailheads 2 and 3 on official map.
40) No parking or trailheads at Perkin’s flats (Sorensen Property)
41) Limit or ban horse use from trails in canyon.
42) No top-to-bottom regional trail connection.
43) No trails of any type through Kilyon’s Canyon (allow to heal).
44) Include historic trail monuments with trails development.
45) Design trails and trailheads well to provide good resource and minimize impacts.
46) Provide Trail Access points, not trailheads.
47) Avoid steep trail alignments.
48) Include a variety of skill levels in the design of new trails.
49) Harden steep trail alignments.
50) No trails along Main Canyon Road (unsafe).
51) Focus on developing south side R2 trail alignment.
52) Provide a trailhead in Emigration Oaks subdivision to access historic trails.
53) R4 trail alignment would make a great hiking trail.
54) Establish one main trail on each side of the canyon, connecting at the top and bottom of the canyon, with side access points in canyon.
55) Clarify whether horses will be allowed in Kilyon’s Canyon.
56) No R3-B Trail (too steep/snow avalanche risk in winter).
57) Maintain limited vehicular paring in the upper reaches of Pinecrest Canyon to accommodate hike to the north.
58) R3 Trail threatens private property rights of Emigration Oaks subdivision.
59) trails in vicinity of Emigration Oaks subdivision reduce property values.
60) No trailheads anywhere in the canyon.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>338</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Alternative Trails – Summary Map and Illustrative Sections
3.2 Preliminary Trail Alignments

Numerous trail alternatives were investigated as part of the planning process. Of these, three main alternatives were eventually presented to the Advisory Committee for consideration:

- **Alternative One** proposed a South Ridge Regional Trail system with Limited Local Trails;
- **Alternative Two** illustrated a North Ridge Regional Trails with Limited Local Trails; and
- **Alternative Three** represented Regional Trails on Both Ridges with Limited Local Trails.

Each of the three alternatives were designed to meet the needs of canyon residents and non-local trail users, and to accommodate the various needs of hikers, mountain bicyclists, and equestrians, although not necessarily uniformly in each alternative. Other common goals included:

- Maximizing connectivity between Emigration Canyon Neighborhoods and Regional Trails;
- Avoiding private land for trails and trail facilities;
- Maintaining public easements and access to Kilyon’s Canyon; and
- Providing both mid-slope and ridgeline alignments to meet the needs of various user groups.

These goals served as the primary screening criteria for evaluating the alternatives.

3.2.1 Trail Alternatives Map

The three Alternatives were presented to the Advisory Committee for their input and advice. After discussing the merits and shortcomings of each, it was agreed that Alternative Three should be modified as an Alternative Trails map and be presented to the public at Open House Meeting #2. A copy of this Plan is illustrated on the following page.

To summarize, the Alternative Trails map illustrates mid-slope and ridgeline regional trails on both sides of the canyon, a limited system of local trails, and a series of regional and local trailheads and trail access points. The development of new trails and the incorporation of existing trails located on private land were avoided wherever possible.

As Detailed in Appendix B, public comments received following Open House # 2 were generally supportive of the Trail Alternatives map, although there was some polarization between canyon residents and other members of the public, the latter tending to support a more extensive trail system and calling for the inclusion of additional trail alignments across public and private land. Canyon residents also tended to support the Trails Alternatives map, although some residents expressed concerns with key alignments and the planning process in general.

As documented in Appendix D, the Trails Alternative Map was later modified by the Emigration Canyon Township Planning Commission and later by the Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Department for consideration by the Salt Lake County Council.
EMIGRATION CANYON TRAILS MASTER PLAN

FOR CONSIDERATION ONLY

ALTERNATIVE TRAILS

EMIGRATION CANYON WATER RESERVOIR PROJECT LIMITS
RED BUTTE RESEARCH NATURAL AREA (RBRA) BOUNDARY
RED BUTTE RESEARCH VIRTUAL AREA (RBRA)
END OF PRIVATE LAND/ATCHMENTS
GREAT MODERN TRAIL
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PRIVATE
PUBLIC/PRIVATE (SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION, STATE OF UTAH, GOVERNMENT, AND UTAH ORGANIZATIONS)

TRAIL SYSTEM
REGIONAL TRAIL HEAD
1. CAMPOSSOUTH
2. SUGARMASS PROPERTY
3. LITTLE MOUNTAIN SUMMIT
EXISTING CONNECTION TO REGIONAL TRAIL SYSTEM
SOUTH SLOPE MODELLING TRAIL
SOUTH MOREN TRAIL
NORTH SLOPE MODELING TRAIL
NORTH MOREN TRAIL
EXISTING ROADWAY BIKE LANES
FUTURE RESIDENCE BIKE LANES

LOCAL TRAIL HEAD
4. COUNTRY TRAIL
5. KATY CANYON
LOCAL TRAIL
LOCAL TRAIL - LIFING ONLY
TRAIL CLOSED AT BEGINNING

NOTE:
The Emigration-Canyon Trail Advisory Committee has been working on the development of a comprehensive plan since August 2015. The ideas presented in the map represent a broad general consensus by committee members, but are preliminary only. Following public input and stippling, the final plan will be refined and presented to the Emigration-Canyon Trail Advisory Committee and the public for consideration. An open public meeting will be scheduled for public input and discussion. The public meeting will be the last opportunity for public comments on the final Emigration-Canyon Trail Master Plan. The final plan will only be adopted if the public consensus is reached. The final plan will be submitted to the City of Salt Lake for approval.
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TWO SECTIONS THROUGH EMIGRATION OAKS SUBDIVISION ILLUSTRATING TRAIL ALIGNMENTS IN RELATION TO PRIVATE HOMES AND PROPERTIES.
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Section B
APPENDIX D

Alternative Trails Maps Prepared by Emigration Township Planning Commission and Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Department
PROPOSED TRAIL ALIGNMENT
REVISED AUGUST 2, 2006
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