INTRODUCTION

There is strong community support for Cache County to plan and work to find ways to expand and enhance the network of trails and active transportation corridors that improve community health, keep our children and ourselves safe while traveling on foot or bicycle, and increase the quality of life for Cache Valley Residents.

The Cache County Trails and Active Transportation master plan represents an inventory of current trails networks and a vision for the future.

Here are some key things to know about this Plan.

This plan addresses a wide range of projects.

From quiet streets that are comfortably shared by cars and joggers, to bike lanes. From painted bike lanes to paved pathways through open spaces. And from sidewalks to strenuous hiking trails, this plan works to tie them all into a seamless network of active transportation and recreation corridors.

This plan is conceptual.

A conceptual plan outlines a vision, preliminary priorities, and strategies for implementation, but leaves details of implementation of any singular project to the many local jurisdictions, agencies and community groups that look after trails and active transportation facilities in Cache County.

This plan respects private property rights.

In the State of Utah, a government cannot condemn land for trails development. As such, any plan elements represented on private land will only be realized through voluntary agreements between land owners or management agencies and local government.

The plan envisions trail development that is of mutual benefit to trail users, adjoining landowners, easement holders and local residents. Trail access will only be acquired through voluntary transactions or agreements, respecting rights of property owners and individual perspectives on the best use of land. In cases where private property owners decline permission to use their lands, alternate routes shall be sought.

This plan is a living document.

As development and growth occur, and other projects, from transit to land use changes occur, the priorities and needs of this trails plan may shift, and can be updated to suit the needs of the public at any time. The recommendations in this plan are meant to be flexible in adapting to changing community priorities and needs.
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AN AMENDMENT TO THE CACHE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN THAT ADOPTS TRAIL AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FINDINGS, OBJECTIVES, AND ASSOCIATED POLICIES AND GUIDELINES LANDS WITHIN CACHE COUNTY.

WHEREAS, on November 2nd at 5:35 p.m., the Planning Commission held a public hearing for said amendment, which meeting was preceded by all required legal notice and at which time all interested parties were given the opportunity to provide written or oral comment concerning the proposed amendment, and;

WHEREAS, on November 2nd, 2017, the Planning Commission recommended the approval of said amendment and forwarded such recommendation to the County Council for final action, and;

WHEREAS, on November 28th, 2017, at 5:30 p.m., the County Council held a public hearing to consider any comments regarding the proposed amendment, which meeting was preceded by all required legal notice and at which time all interested parties were given the opportunity to provide written or oral comment concerning the proposed amendment, and;

WHEREAS, following their review, and after considering all comments, the Cache County Council has determined that it is appropriate for the County to amend and implement this resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Cache County Council hereby adopts this resolution to amend the Cache County Comprehensive Plan to include the County Trails and Active Transportation Plan as identified in this document.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this January 23rd, 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidwell</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CACHE COUNTY COUNCIL

Greg Merrill,
Chair, Cache County Council

ATTEST:

Jill Zollinger,
Cache County Clerk
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If you are reading this document on a pdf reader on a computer, look closely for the hand icon:

This illustrates the ability to directly link from one page to another (just like a website). If you are reading this on a web browser (chrome/firefox/safari/explorer), download the document and open it with Adobe Acrobat Reader or a similar pdf program.
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Thank you for taking the time to read through this document, and we hope you find it helpful. If you have any questions about the content of this plan, please reach out to the Cache County trails planner:

Trails@CacheCounty.org
435.755.1640
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Executive Summary

Cache County residents value their open space, their ability to escape into nature just outside their back door, and a sense of safety that comes from living in small, tightly knit communities. Trails and active transportation improvements are critical to preserving this quality of life that so many treasure here in the valley.

Preserving routes that are safely traveled on foot and bicycle allows everyone to safely reach their destination and ensures that as we age, options remain that allow us safe and comfortable access to our places of worship, public lands, and neighborhoods.

This master plan is the result of a collaborative effort between Cache County, the National Park Service’s Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance Program, and the citizens and municipalities of Cache County.

During the summer of 2017, over 500 community members participated in the planning process through on-line forms and in-person tabling events at local festivals and farmers markets.

The feedback from this public outreach, along with in depth research into existing trails and active transportation planning documents in Cache Valley helped create a plan that does not stand alone, but ties together multiple community plans into a coherent whole, helping prioritize and connect our cities to one another and the public lands surrounding them.

This plan lays the groundwork for making Cache Valley an even better place to live, work and play, and seeks to ensure that no matter how or where you want to get outside, you’ll have a great place to go.
Vision, Goals & Strategies

Clearly stated goals, visions and strategies serve as foundations for the complex work of planning for an entire county. These statements were developed through direct collaboration with the Cache County Trails committee and Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

VISION

Build an interconnected, safe, and beautiful network of trails that will contribute positively to Cache County’s economy, health and quality of life.

GOALS

- Connect population centers to public recreational lands and open space
- Connect residences to services, jobs, recreation and community hubs
- Utilize trails to improve public safety and health
- Design and align trails that highlight Cache County’s unique natural landscape
- Create networks of trails and streets that promote walking and bicycling as transport options
- Provide access to trails within walking distance of valley residents, to reduce the need to drive long distances to trailheads and recreational access.

STRATEGIES

- Focus the plan on high value and achievable projects
- Illustrate the varied implementation tools and steps needed to achieve this plan
- Prioritize projects with a low cost/high value as well as projects that close gaps or route around them, and connect communities
- Prioritize trails, active transportation facilities, and local access points that benefit the most county residents possible
- Identify and prioritize projects that are ‘low hanging fruit’ with willing landowners and/or land managers
- Identify routes both on and off of existing streets that can best develop an all ages and abilities active transportation network
Public Input Process

Overview
Public feedback was key in gathering information across the valley. This feedback played an important role in creating a plan that represents community needs and desires.

Public input was gathered through public events, multiple stakeholder meetings, and on-line maps and surveys.

Stakeholders
The following groups were consulted regarding the development of this plan:

- Cache County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
- Cache Trails Committee
- Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO)
- Cache County Municipalities
- US Forest Service – Logan Ranger District, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest
- Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT)
- Utah State Department of Natural Resources

Public Outreach
Cache County conducted public outreach through on-line polling and mapping, as well as ten separate public events from May 13 – June 10, 2017.

Feedback was gathered to understand key issues surrounding how people utilize trails and active transportation in the valley, and what improvements they feel are most needed in the future.

Notice of this public input period was announced through traditional and social media, including a community email list-servs, press releases, the Trails Cache website, the Trails Cache newsletter, Facebook, Instagram, and physical posters and flyers. Partner organizations were asked to spread word through their own networks.

Partners organizations included:

- Cache MPO
- Cache County
- Cache County Municipalities
- Logan Downtown Alliance
- Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD)
- Utah State University
- Bear River Land Conservancy
- Cache Clean Air Consortium
- Local Bicycle and Sports Retailers

Along with the on-line survey and map, the trails plan was promoted and refined through informal public conversations at multiple events across the valley. Through spring and summer of 2017, plan representatives were present at the following events:

- May 13 – Smithfield Health Days
- May 15-19 – Bike to Work Week
- May 20 – Cache Valley Gardeners Market
- May 27 – Cache Valley Gardeners Market
- Jun 3 – Hyrum Classic Car Show

In sum, 148 participants took part in the on-line survey, 200 suggestions were made on the map, and over 200 individuals were reached through the in-person tabling events.
Public Open House
Once initial public feedback was collected and analyzed, a public open house was conducted on August 23rd, 2017 to present proposed trail and active transportation improvements. 40 attendees were present, including elected officials and citizens from across the valley. Feedback was overwhelmingly positive, with concerns expressed about funding and private property challenges that could limit future trail development.

Overall Findings
There was strong public support for more trails and active transportation facilities in Cache County. The following pages summarize and illustrate the responses gathered through the on-line surveys. Map input was used in the analysis and creation of final plan recommendations.

As part of the survey, people were also asked what visionary trail or active transportation project they would like to see accomplished over the next decade. The most common responses included:

- Provide better connectivity between other trails and between destinations (corridors running east-west or north-south were frequently mentioned)
- Extend and/or improve Bonneville Shoreline Trail
- Establish and formalize canal trails
- Improve safety, including maintenance and sweeping
- Improve facilities on the Main Street corridor (including 100 E/200 E or 100 W as alternates)
- Create systems of trail loops or bike parks
- Establish long regional trails
- Extend and connect the Logan River Trail
- Improve safety on rural road biking routes
- Extend Blacksmith Fork River Trail
- Create a East-west connection to Mendon (including Mendon Road and alternates)
- Establish a Hyrum to Wellsville connection
- Create a Smithfield to Richmond connection

This public input was used as a factor in the analytical process which ranked and prioritized projects in the final Cache County Trails and Active Transportation Major Recommendations.
**Survey Results**

An on-line survey was distributed through social media, emails, and physical announcements in order to solicit feedback regarding Cache County opinions on trails and active transportation.

The survey garnered 148 responses over the one month period it was live. The following charts illustrate how the public responded.

### How do you primarily use trails in and around Cache County?

- **Hiking**: 76%
- **On road and paved trails cycling**: 63%
- **Off road cycling**: 60%
- **Walking**: 60%
- **Trail running**: 39%
- **Dog walking**: 31%
- **Path and Street Running**: 26%
- **Skateboarding**: 3%
- **Equestrian**: 1%

### Why do you use trails in and around Cache County?

- **Recreation / stress relief**: 91%
- **Exercise / health**: 89%
- **Active transportation**: 50%

### How do you get to the trailhead most often?

- **I ride CVTD**: 41%
- **I drive**: 57%
- **My garage is my trailhead, I walk, run, or ride from there**: 4%
How often do you use active transportation (walking / biking) to get where you’re going in Cache County?

- Never: 12%
- Around 1 or 2x a month: 29%
- Weekly: 24%
- Daily or near daily: 35%

What is the biggest barrier to walking or biking to your destinations in Cache Valley?

- The roads feel dangerous due to traffic: 61%
- The roads feel dangerous due to roadway conditions: 39%
- I don’t have enough time to ride or walk: 26%
- Inclement weather keeps me from walking or biking: 22%
- The distances are just too far: 17%
- The steep hills stop me: 14%
- I carry heavy loads when I travel: 14%
- It’s not my style: 3%

*9 people also cited having children as a reason they don’t walk or bike to destinations.
How applicable is this trail type in Cache County?

**Shared Roadway**

- Not a good fit for our community: 35%
- 23%
- 27%
- 11%
- 6%

Sentiment: Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

**Bike Lanes**

- Not a good fit for our community: 14%
- 11%
- 22%
- 30%
- 34%

Sentiment: Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

**Shared Use Path**

- Not a good fit for our community: 0.7%
- 1%
- 13%
- 20%

Sentiment: Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

**Two Way Cycletrack**

- Not a good fit for our community: 9%
- 19%
- 12%
- 21%
- 39%

Sentiment: Would be amazing. Let’s build it!
On a street with more traffic, how appropriate is this facility?

**Cyclotrack**

- High traffic volume roadway

- 68% Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

- 4% Not a good fit for our community

**Bike Lanes**

- High traffic volume roadway

- 37% Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

- 19% Not a good fit for our community

Now, for off-roadway trails...

**Canal Trail**

- 78% Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

- 12% Not a good fit for our community

**Natural Surface Trail**

- 84% Would be amazing. Let’s build it!

- 1% Not a good fit for our community

**Process & Overview**

- Recommendations
- Implementation Toolbox
Analytical Process

Existing Conditions
In order to plan for Cache County’s future growth and population, it is important to understand where we are now.

Much of Cache County’s population, jobs, services, infrastructure, and traffic are concentrated on the north-south corridor along Hwy 91 on the east side of the valley. Logan and Utah State University, major hubs of activity, are situated in the heart of this corridor.

A 2003 effort created an eastern corridor North/South on-street bike route with consistent signage. However, that route has become unsafe and difficult to identify due to changes in the roadways which did not take into account walking and biking.

West Cache Valley contains several communities that are somewhat isolated from the population and employment hub of the eastern corridor. Other communities outside of the population center to the east are agricultural communities with rural roads that are popular with long distance cyclists. Though scenic, current rural road conditions pose mixed hazards to those using them by bicycle for recreational or utilitarian purposes.

The middle of the valley is characterized by the Logan, Blacksmith, and Bear River corridors and associated wetlands. These areas are high-value habitat for migratory birds and other animals. These wetlands pose challenges for trail development due to increased costs and potential ecological damage. However, if planned correctly, these lands also provide ideal land for accessible and scenic trails.

On the Shoulders of Giants
This project does not represent the first planning project for trails and active transportation in Cache County.

Existing local and regional plans affecting trails and active transportation were consulted and integrated into the initial draft map that was presented to the public for feedback during the public outreach period. 81% of the trails and active transportation features represented in this document have been sourced from previously adopted plans within Cache County.

Existing Plans consulted include:

- Logan City Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2016)
- North Logan Trails Master Plan (2016)
- Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2015)
- Logan Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (2015)
- Mendon General Plan (2013)
- Richmond City General Plan (2013)
- Smithfield General Plan (2016)
- Northern Bonneville Shoreline Trail Plan (2002)
- Hyrum Trails Master Plan (1999)
- Providence General Plan (2000)
- Millville General Plan (2014)
- N. Bonneville Shoreline Trail Master Plan (2002)
**Local Detail vs. County Overview**

In order to create a clear and concise document, this plan references only trails and active transportation facilities of regional significance. Local plans, particularly Hyde Park, Nibley, and Logan City’s active transportation plans contain high levels of detail and contain many fine-grained projects that compliment the regionally significant facilities outlined in this plan.

**Trail Ranking Criteria**

Which trails are the most valuable and most important? In order to remove personal bias from the process as much as possible, a trail ranking process was developed to score each trail based on three major criteria - location, desire, and feasibility.

Not all contributing factors are weighted evenly. The combination of factors which contributed to Feasibility (sensitive lands, land ownership) were weighted three times the amount of the other two factors.

---

**FEASIBILITY**

Do landownership or geographic/geologic concerns represent excessive cost or barriers to completing the project?

**DESIRE**

Does the public exhibit a strong and clear desire for the trail or active transportation facility?

**LOCATION**

Does a trail or active transportation facility access goods, services and population centers? Does it connect to other trails and facilities in the valley?
**PROCESS & OVERVIEW**

**Criteria Scoring Elements**

In order to develop a unique score representing each trail’s feasibility, desire, and location value, the following elements were mapped in GIS and assigned rank to each trail or active transportation facility within this plan.

**Location Scoring Elements**
- Proximity to community destinations (schools, churches, parks, trailheads)
- Gap completion (connecting areas where no connection currently exists)
- Facility connection (connects to existing or planned trails or facilities)
- Population density
- Employment density
- Cache Valley Transit District routes and stops
- Proximity to Utah State University

**Desire Scoring Criteria**
- Strava data (data collected from smart phones recording ride and run information) quantifying local use.
- Representation in existing master plans
- Public request in this planning process and public outreach.

**Feasibility Scoring Criteria**
- Landowner density (more owners exponentially increases challenge and complexity)
- Sensitive areas (wetlands/floodplains)
- Cost (planning level estimates)

Each trail’s final score, along with common sense judgment from stakeholder groups, called out top projects in each trail category.

Examples of the analytical layers that the trail ranking criteria utilized in order to prioritize the most valuable trail and active transportation projects.
The matrix on this page illustrates the process that assigned scores to each trail and active transportation facility included in this plan. Shared roadways were excluded from this analysis, as they are more roadway improvement projects than stand alone trail or active transportation improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>High Rank</th>
<th>Med Rank</th>
<th>Low Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gap Completion</td>
<td>Facility closes a gap between communities or resources</td>
<td>Connects towns</td>
<td>Connects neighborhoods</td>
<td>Prior connections exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to Facility</td>
<td>Facility connects to an existing or proposed trail/resource</td>
<td>Connect to existing facility</td>
<td>Connects to planned facility</td>
<td>Stand alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Access</td>
<td>Sum of schools, churches &amp; bus stops within 1/4 mile</td>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>Four to nine</td>
<td>Less than four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Access</td>
<td>Sum of parks and trailheads within 1/4 mile</td>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>One to four</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USU Access</td>
<td>Facility within 1/4 mile of main USU campus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Core Access</td>
<td>Facility within core residential districts of valley</td>
<td>High density</td>
<td>Medium density</td>
<td>Low density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Core Access</td>
<td>Facility access to multiple medium or large employers</td>
<td>More than four</td>
<td>One to three</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strava Origin/Destination</td>
<td>Facility accesses major origin/destination regions from Strava data</td>
<td>300 unique users</td>
<td>50-300 unique users</td>
<td>less than 50 unique users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strava Top Route</td>
<td>Facility accesses top-utilized route from Strava data</td>
<td>More than 1000 unique users</td>
<td>500 to 1000 unique users</td>
<td>less than 500 unique users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists in Adopted Plan</td>
<td>Facility is proposed in existing community plan</td>
<td>In existing plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not in existing plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Demand</td>
<td>Facility was a top public input priority</td>
<td>More than eight unique mentions</td>
<td>three to seven unique mentions</td>
<td>less than three mentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Count</td>
<td>Complexity of landownership</td>
<td>Single landowner</td>
<td>two -10 landowners</td>
<td>More than 10 landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Areas</td>
<td>Facility traverses wetlands, high slopes, or other sensitive areas</td>
<td>No sensitive areas</td>
<td>Minor sensitive areas</td>
<td>Major sensitive areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
<td>Cost categorization based on planning estimate</td>
<td>Less than $250k</td>
<td>$250k-$1m</td>
<td>more than $1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Recommendations

## Cache County Trails and Active Transportation Plan
Map and graphic legend detailing proposed projects

## Top Ranked Projects
Details regarding the top 6 trails and active transportation projects developed in this plan.

## Programs and Policies
Overview of proposed policy and programmatic recommendations.
Graphic Key
These pages provide graphic reference to the Trails and Active Transportation Master Plan map. Color bars above images correspond with the same colors on the map.

Further design recommendations and details regarding each proposed improvement are located in the Implementation Toolbox chapter of this document. Click on any of the images below to read more regarding design guidelines, cost, and other considerations in the implementation toolbox.

Shared Use Path (railroad corridor example)

Unpaved Pathways (powerline corridor example)
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Singletrack Trails**

- **Proposed**
  - Outsloped to drain water off trail, downhill.
  - 3-5’ natural surface pathway.

**Active Transportation Streets**

- **Proposed**
  - 6-8” paint stripe
  - 4’ minimum rideable surface outside gutter
  - 12’ minimum width 14.5’ preferred
  - 5’ minimum sidewalk width

- **Existing**
RECOMMENDATIONS

Shared Roadway

**Proposed**

**Existing**

4-6' minimum shoulder

Wayfinding Signage

Grade Separated Crossing

Boulder, CO
Improved Crossing

Missoula, MT
Top Ranked Projects
The following pages illustrate six of the top ranked projects in this plan, ranked by feasibility, public desire, and benefit to Cache County.

To review additional project scopes, cost estimates and additional details, visit the implementation toolbox.

Envisioned as Northern Utah’s premier recreational trail, the Bonneville Shoreline Trail has the ability to connect communities along the mountain bench and make a significant positive impact to local quality of life and economic development.

Cache Valley is home to a rail line that carries minimal freight traffic, and connects centrally to nearly every community in the valley. A trail in the Union Pacific ROW would provide safe, accessible, and pleasant recreation and transportation for all.
Millville and Nibley’s schools, parks, and quiet streets make it a family-friendly community. But due to Highways 89 and 165, Nibley is isolated, and no child can access neighboring communities without crossing a busy highway. An underpass at SR165 and the Blacksmith Fork River would resolve that issue and provide safe access to Ridgeline High School and between these adjacent communities.

As the eastern bench of Cache Valley grows, it becomes increasingly important to preserve quiet streets and connect on-street facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, not just to local parks, but to neighboring communities.

The Cache Bikeway would seamlessly connect on-street routes through development of safe and separated facilities from Hyrum to Smithfield, creating an ideal commuting or on-street recreation route.
If active transportation is not prioritized, the communities of Wellsville and Mendon risk being cut off from the rest of the valley by a network of large and busy highways. A trail connecting the east bench to the west bench would provide not only a much needed connection, but a safe and incredibly scenic route for those wishing to leave traffic and busy roads behind.

Windcaves, Right Hand Fork, Card Canyon and Dewit are some of the recreational areas connected by a highway and highway alone. A trail that connects the recreational resources of Logan Canyon would be a fantastic resource in and of itself while reducing impacts upon heavily used trails by dispersing users along an interconnected system, rather than a few isolated loops.
Building and improving programs that promote responsible and sustainable use of trails and active transportation will support the infrastructure recommendations in this plan. These program recommendations will help increase the number of people using active transportation and trails as well as increase public safety. Contact the Cache County Trails Planner for more information on implementing these recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Awareness Campaigns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County-Wide Wayfinding and Signage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambassador Program / Mentorship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commuter Incentive Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Routes to Schools Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Friendly Designation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual or Seasonal User Counts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Parking Inventory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crash Data Collection</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following recommendations outline and link to further information on policies that the County should adopt in order to support a county wide trails system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Friendly Rural Road Standards</td>
<td>Adopt a county-supported road cross section that includes improvements, such as paved shoulders, that can be applied on select routes. Implementation funding for these route improvements could come from active transportation funds, and would improve safety for all road users.</td>
<td>- Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Code Adjustments</td>
<td>Make minor ordinance adjustments that empower this plan and encourage the development of trail and active transportation resources as Cache County Grows and Develops</td>
<td>- Utah Code Reference Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Partnership Funding and Manpower Sources</td>
<td>Work with private organizations, 501c3s and NGOs in the area to develop public/private funding solutions to support trail development.</td>
<td>- Cache County School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Intermountain Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bear River Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Utah Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strong volunteer trail maintenance workforce</td>
<td>Coordinate with non-profit trail stewardship groups and the USFS to help maintain, improve, reroute and build new trails on public lands.</td>
<td>- Cache Trails Alliance 501c3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- USFS Trail Maintenance Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Utah Conservation Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocal Agreement on Trail Development</td>
<td>As trails are developed that cross jurisdictional boundaries, work to establish a standard template to set responsibilities for maintenance, liability, and capitol improvements.</td>
<td>- Contact Trails Planner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Implementation Toolbox

## Implementation Guidelines
Timelines and recommendations to develop, fund and implement projects

## Project Scopes
Details, cost estimates and recommendations for projects, grouped by jurisdiction

## Code Reference Table
Reference of Municipal code from around Utah that facilitates trails and active transportation facilities

## Design Guidelines
Graphic guidelines and national design standards to guide the creation of various facility types

## Cost Estimates
Graphic guidelines and national design standards to guide the creation of various facility types

## Funding Sources
Details regarding grant funding sources specific to trails and active transportation
This document contains reference and guidelines intended to assist the planning, funding, and building of a county wide trail system in Cache County.

This portion of the document is not intended to be read front to back, but rather, referenced as needed to guide city planners, elected officials, and others in the needed steps to promote Cache County’s current and future trail system.

Refer to the table of contents on the following page in order to find details of individual projects that will help prepare budgets, fund-raisers, grant applications, and schematic designs to develop trail and active transportation improvements in Cache Valley.

7 Steps to Success
In order for this plan to be as successful as possible, each community in Cache County is encouraged to utilize this appendix as they follow these steps:

1. Adopt this plan as an official municipal document. This action is a first step, both to familiarize staff and elected officials with the content and potential of the plan, and to support step 2.

2. Modify city ordinances to support this plan. Once this plan is adopted, county and city ordinances, particularly subdivision and street ordinances, should be modified to support trail and active transportation projects. Much like a roads master plan, this document can then be referenced in conjunction with development and public works projects.

Note that this plan will take time and property development and/or changes to fully realize some alignments. Trails will be obtained as development and agreements make them possible. Some trail segments may need to be routed onto public rights of way or alternate routes in order to accommodate property owners.

3. Select and pursue priority projects. From the options presented to your community as part of this plan, identify, and select those projects which are the best for your community in the near term. Task staff and/or the regional trails planner with the research, coordination, and preliminary design necessary to identify what funds, agreements, and other steps will be required to implement your high-priority projects.

4. Fund priority projects. Once preliminary design is complete (this is at times a line on a map and a commitment from city council), and appropriate agreements in place, projects can move towards a funding phase. Utilize this appendix to estimate costs and identify potential funding sources. All significant funding sources require matching funds, matching grants with local dollars is crucial.

5. Design and build priority projects. Once funding is secure, the design and build phases can commence. For large projects, these may be two separate rounds of funding, and for smaller projects, the build process could be as simple as regular volunteer days led by experienced trail builders.

6. Celebrate, and repeat steps 3-6.

7. Maintain trails and active transportation infrastructure
Maintenance should include close coordination with city staff (public works or parks and rec) to understand how expanded facilities impact their budgets and needs. Each new mile of trail can require additional resources, so regular inventory of these facilities should consider maintenance requirements to keep them in good condition.
This segment of the document provides basic details on all recommendations created as part of this trails and active transportation plan.

Select any of the headers below to be directed to that table or project page.

### County Wide
- Bonneville Shoreline Trail East
- Bonneville Shoreline Trail West
- Cache Bikeway
- Middle Canal Pathway
- Bridger Rail Trail
- Valley Connector
- Rural Bike Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of County Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Cache National Forest
- Logan Canyon Trail
- Green Canyon Loop
- Maintenance Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of USFS Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Linear Projects by Jurisdiction
- Hyde Park
- Hyrum
- Logan+River Heights
- Mendon
- Millville
- Nibley
- North Logan
- Paradise & South Valley
- Providence
- Richmond
- Smithfield

### County Wide Spot Improvements
- Nibley Underpass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Spot Improvement Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Bonneville Shoreline Trail East

Overview
The top priority of Bonneville Shoreline Expansion is to connect Smithfield Canyon to Logan and southern communities via an uninterrupted mountain trail, nestled between development and preserved landscapes.

Next Steps
Continued dialog with landowners is critical. Small segments between existing canyon access roads that can be built first should be seen as priority segments.

Resources
Many private land owners on this bench either see value in dedicating portions of their properties to public trail access or have already done so. Working with these landowners and the County trail planner, continued outreach to additional landowners should be maintained to gain approval for a future Bonneville Shoreline Trail alignment.

Key Considerations
The current gap between Logan Dry Canyon and Logan Canyon represents a crucial and difficult connection due to limited alignment options and steep mountainside grades. Continued investigation of alternative routes to make a safe and accessible connection is needed.

Along the entire corridor, work with community members familiar with landowners to introduce concept when possible.
Bonneville Shoreline Trail West

Overview
This segment of Bonneville Shoreline would provide residents on the western side of Cache Valley accessible mountain recreation right out their back doors, and provide an outlet for recreational bicycle use that is currently prohibited on the Wellsville mountain wilderness area.

Next Steps
- Work with Wellsville and Mendon community members to approach and gain approval from landowners along the identified corridor
- Pre-approve an alignment corridor for USFS parcels
- Consider revocable and/or flexible easements to encourage private landowner support

Key Considerations
Landowners with functional farms and no plans for development may not immediately see the benefit of allowing trail access on the edge of their property.

Working closely with community members to illustrate the property value and community wide benefits of this type of trail should be prioritized, while identifying methods of protecting working farm ground.
Cache Bikeway

Overview
A series of on-street facilities and separated pathways could connect Smithfield to Hyrum, providing those interested in active transportation and recreational cycling opportunities a clear, safe, and connected route to move north or south.

This route is modeled largely on the CMPO’s existing on-street bikeway. However, the existing alignment of the CMPO route is becoming undesirable due to increased traffic and lack of dedicated facilities.

Next Steps
- Design of each street’s current and future layout that will include at least a painted bicycle lane
- Coordinate with each municipality to ensure painted lines are maintained, and facility is recognized as a cross-county active transportation route
- Locate funding sources to help design and implement first phases of this project

Resources
- Logan Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- CMPO 2040 Transportation Plan

Key Considerations
- Coordination between county and ten distinct municipalities is a complex process, and is crucial to project’s success
- Ongoing maintenance of painted lines on street must be a priority
- Ensure future roadway expansion does not negate quality of bikeway
Middle Canal Pathway

Overview
The middle canal alignment utilizes a publicly owned stormwater channel and privately held canal company easement. The existing pathway alongside the canal utilizes both public and private land.

Should it be completed, the project would offer a tree-lined, road-separate pathway connecting four communities.

Next Steps
- Create an interlocal agreement to govern trail maintenance and improvements between partner cities and County
- Utilize the County’s record of public feedback from spring 2017 to identify areas with low resistance to public trail to gain easements and illustrate positive value of an improved public pathway
- Create an easement offer template for landowners along pathway
- Locate funding to allow purchase of easements

Resources
- Contact Cache County Trails Planner for details on community feedback and potential easement options

Key Considerations
- Canal company and property owners must agree in writing to public trail along canal company easement. Adjacent landowner support is critical.
- There is much debate in the community regarding use of this corridor as a public trail. Strong support for and strong opposition to this trail concept are present among adjacent landowners.
Bridger Rail Trail

Overview
Should approval and funding be sourced, Cache Valley could have a paved, accessible, and continuous trail and bikeway providing a direct connection from Hyrum to Nibley, Logan, North Logan, Smithfield, and Richmond.

A rail trail would provide increased connectivity along the west side of these communities, and would have fewer road crossings than any similar alignment.

Next Steps
- Establish contact with Union Pacific representatives
- Study precedents of other rails with trails in the western United States and elsewhere
- Identify segments that could be established as small phases of this county-wide project
- Identify contacts at Rails to Trails Conservancy who can help create a strategic approach to Union Pacific Railroad.

Resources
- Railstotrails.org
- Ownership of corridor is largely, if not wholly owned by Union Pacific, reducing complexity of permitting to a single organization

Key Considerations
- Logan City has previously led approaches on this project.
- Safety concerns likely dictate a fence to be established along any future alignment, increasing construction costs significantly
Valley Connector

Overview
A pathway connecting communities on the east side of Cache Valley to those on the west would provide a critical active transportation link within the valley. In addition, it would have strong potential to attract additional tourism revenue as cycling and running events could take advantage of a beautiful, comfortable and safe route.

Three unique options exist - all with advantages and drawbacks.
- The CMPO has planned for a route parallel to SR30 along an expanded highway.
- Mendon Road would require significant ROW purchase as part of any road improvement, but would provide the most direct and most desirable connection.
- 2200 South would require only a small portion of trail built to link two existing rural roadways. If this connection were built to accommodate non-motorized vehicles, the existing roadways would still remain quiet streets. However, it is the least direct route of these three options.

Next Steps
- Work with UDOT and elected officials to pursue funding for SR30 paved pathway improvements
- Explore private landowner interest in 2200 S option
- Include paved pathway as part of future conversations on Mendon Road expansion

Key Considerations
Wetlands and high costs associated with building in the valley exist for all options
- Private land acquisition required
Rural Routes

Overview
Cache County, UDOT, and rural municipalities operate some of the most beautiful roadways in Cache County. For generations, these roads have served both as transportation corridors for farmers and recreational treasures for cyclists and runners.

By identifying key routes preferred and utilized for recreation, a network of shared rural routes should be developed that provides basic safety and wayfinding improvements such as shoulders and signage.

Next Steps
- Work with UDOT, County, and local communities to identify feasible improvements
- Identify key corridors to prioritize among those identified in this plan
- Develop active transportation funding sources that can also be used for shoulder improvements on rural roads
- Develop and adopt county road standards that allow for shoulder improvements on certain routes

Key Considerations
- Rural roads are often only public by use, and acquiring additional ROW can be costly
- Involvement and discussion with rural community leaders is critical to the success of these projects
- Once established and signed, a careful eye must be kept on Average Annual Daily Traffic counts (AADT) to ensure that if traffic increases beyond a low-traffic rural standard, increased measures are pursued for cyclist, pedestrian, and motorist safety
The following pages contain tables which provide basic information regarding all linear and spot recommendations developed as part of this plan.

Each municipality’s relevant projects are split out to their individual pages, and Cache County wide and USFS specific projects receive their own table listings.

Projects are listed in alphabetical order for each community.

### Table of County Wide Linear Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Cost Est.</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200E Shared Use Pathway</td>
<td>Pathway connecting Smithfield to Hyde Park, along future road construction</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalga to Smithfield Trail</td>
<td>Paved pathway along SR243 providing rural road access from Smithfield</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Fork East River Trail</td>
<td>A shared use pathway on the eastern bank of the Blacksmith Fork River</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline Trail (BST) Elevated</td>
<td>An improved Bonneville Shoreline Trail increasing this popular trail’s capacity and avoiding development conflicts</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Private/USFS</td>
<td>42.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST Green to Birch Canyon</td>
<td>New Bonneville Shoreline Trail, see pg. 31</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST Hyrum to Paradise</td>
<td>Future Bonneville Shoreline Trail linking southern Cache Communities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST Mendon to Wellsville</td>
<td>Future Bonneville Shoreline Trail see pg.32</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private/USFS</td>
<td>30.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST Richmond to ID</td>
<td>Future Bonneville Shoreline Trail to state line</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>35.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST Smithfield to Richmond</td>
<td>Future Bonneville Shoreline Trail linking northern Cache communities</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>33.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length (mi)</td>
<td>Cost Est.</td>
<td>ROW?</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridger Rail Trail</td>
<td>Large scale rail with trail project connecting multiple communities. See pg. 33</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway (200W Prov, Main Street Millville)</td>
<td>On street bike lane and sidewalk improvements between Providence and Millville</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>County/City</td>
<td>56.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway</td>
<td>On street bike lane &amp; improved shoulders between Smithfield and Hyrum</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>County/City</td>
<td>50.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 89 Pathway</td>
<td>Paved pathway providing a safe recreational route along HWY 89/91 to Sardine Canyon</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>43.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum to Paradise Route</td>
<td>Preserved and signed quiet street route for bike/ped access between communities</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>45.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum Slough Trail</td>
<td>A low lying pathway connecting Nibley to Hyrum</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>16.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendon Road Trail</td>
<td>Off-street pathway to be included as part of future Mendon Road improvements</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>24.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendon to Wellsville Canal Trail</td>
<td>A federally owned, locally operated canal from Mendon to Wellsville</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>US Dept. of Reclamation</td>
<td>16.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Canal</td>
<td>Middle canal improvements between Smithfield and Hyde Park</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>County/Private</td>
<td>44.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milky Way Connector</td>
<td>Designated and signed quiet street connecting multiple N/S routes</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>40.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise to Hyrum Connector</td>
<td>Paved pathway alongside SR 165</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>23.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural On Street Routes (NW County)</td>
<td>Bicycle boulevard / quiet streets throughout county</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>County/Private</td>
<td>39.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length (mi)</td>
<td>Cost Est.</td>
<td>ROW?</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Trail</td>
<td>Gravel Surfaced pathway utilizing powerline easements above Hyde Park and North Logan</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>33.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Pathway</td>
<td>Paved pathway connecting Logan to Mendon see pg.36</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>UDOT/Private</td>
<td>32.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield to Richmond Hwy Connector</td>
<td>Shared use pathway connecting northern communities along Hwy 91</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Connector Trail</td>
<td>Short trail segment to link southern quiet streets across valley</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellsville to Hyrum Canal Trail</td>
<td>Federally owned, locally operated canal from Wellsville to Hyrum</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>US Dept. of Reclamation</td>
<td>28.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logan Canyon Trail

Overview
This four mile trail would connect a myriad of campsites, recreational trails, picnic, and wildlife viewing areas. By connecting lower Logan Canyon, this trail would disperse forest impact across a connected network, rather than concentrate use at isolated sites.

Next Steps
This project is purely conceptual at this stage, and due diligence must be done to identify potential alignments, feasibility on USFS lands as well as potential impacts to a pair of small private parcels further up canyon.

Resources
- Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan
- USFS Trail Planning Handbook

Key Considerations
This is not a short term project. Simply identifying a suitable alignment, and undergoing requisite permitting procedures with the USFS will take several years. However, should the project be approved, relative to other paved pathways of similar lengths, this project could be relatively cost-effective.
Green Canyon Loop

Overview
Green Canyon is one of the most popular recreation areas of Cache Valley's public lands. Trail counts in 2017 show peak use of nearly 300 users in a 10 hour period.

This use pattern coupled with a one way out and back trail results in user conflicts and safety hazards. A loop trail would reduce user conflict and improve safety while providing a greater sense of solitude for all.

Next Steps
- Work with USFS to refine potential alignment on northern slopes of Green Canyon
- Create proposal for USFS consideration
- Seek funding for trail construction, including Utah Conservation Corps and volunteer maintenance

Resources
- Utah Conservation Corps
- Wasatch–Cache National Forest Plan

Key Considerations
Permitting will take time for this project, and feasibility of trail building on the northern side of the canyon varies based on soils and slopes.
Maintenance Priorities

**Overview**
As Cache County grows, and more people chose to call this place home, use patterns will disproportionately favor trails close to the populated valley floor. Already, land managers note the severe wear that trails like Windcaves, Green Canyon, and Providence Canyon receive.

Because of these wear patterns, trails in the front country, both on the western and eastern sides of the valley floor should be prioritized as high-maintenance trails.

Partnerships with non-profits such as Cache Trails Alliance, and organizations such as the Utah Conservation Corps should be pursued in order to facilitate regular maintenance and improvement on these local trails and resources as use grows.

**Resources**
- Utah Conservation Corps
- Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Fork to Left Hand Fork</td>
<td>Route a trail on one side or another of SR101 to connect Hyrum to Left Hand Fork.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private/ USFS/ County</td>
<td>34.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline Trail Elevated</td>
<td>Alternate alignment between Logan Dry Canyon and Providence Canyon to avoid development conflicts and provide a more sustainable alignment</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline Trail West</td>
<td>Lower bench trail linking Mendon’s Deep Canyon to Wellsville’s Narrow and Wide Canyons.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Canyon North</td>
<td>Create a loop trail system by building one or more trails on the northern side of Green Canyon</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>41.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Canyon Trail</td>
<td>Connect trail systems at mouth of canyon to Wind Caves Trail and Right Hand Fork</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>USFS/ Private</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hollow Loop</td>
<td>Provide additional trail connecting Mill Hollow to a re-routed Spring Hollow Trail</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>40.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millville Canyon Trail</td>
<td>Recreational out and back trail up Millville Canyon</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>33.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow Canyon</td>
<td>Recreational trail looping the southern Wellsvilles - connects to Wide Canyon</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Canyon</td>
<td>Recreational trail looping the southern Wellsvilles, connects to Narrow Canyon</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*due to time and budget restraints, these trails were added after the analytical process and were not calculated for relative score.*
### Implementation Toolbox

#### Linear Projects by Jurisdiction

**Hyde Park Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100W Bike Lane</td>
<td>Cache Bikeway segment, linking western schools and parks.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>50.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200S Route</td>
<td>Signed, quiet streets that connect planned and existing facilities within Hyde Park</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>45.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200E Pathway</td>
<td>Pathway constructed along w/ 200E roadway expansion</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>37.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100N Bike Lane</td>
<td>Primary E/W bikeroute</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# IMPLEMENTATION TOOLBOX

## Hyde Park Facilities, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Basic description of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100N/600 S Pathway</td>
<td>Shared use pathway to be included as part of future road expansion</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Private / Hyde Park</td>
<td>44.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Road Canal Connector</td>
<td>Connects Canyon Road trail to Upper Canal</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>34.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Road Trail</td>
<td>Mountain trail on ridge above Canyon Road</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Street Bike Lane</td>
<td>Central bike lane through Hyde Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Cemetery Connector</td>
<td>Gravel surfaced shared use pathway</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Hyde Park / Private</td>
<td>41.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Center St. Pathway</td>
<td>Paved pathway to future recreation area and 200E trail</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Hyde Park / Private</td>
<td>46.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Lower Canal</td>
<td>Potential for trail when canal is piped, pending local support</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>45.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Middle Canal</td>
<td>Historic and scenic natural pathway</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Cache County / Private</td>
<td>34.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Neighborhood Connector</td>
<td>Gravel surfaced shared use pathway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Upper Canal</td>
<td>Historic and scenic natural pathway</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>34.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle to Lower Canal Link</td>
<td>Linkage between Middle and Lower canal pathways</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Cache County / Private</td>
<td>50.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Access Trail</td>
<td>Extension of North Logan’s existing powerline trail</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Pacificorp/ Private</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Canal Access</td>
<td>Link through farm property to upper canal pathway</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>47.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Boundary Trail</td>
<td>Ridgeline trail along USFS wilderness</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hyrum Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Fork Connector Trail</td>
<td>Connects eastern Hyrum to existing trails in Blacksmith Fork Canyon</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>20.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway - Hyrum</td>
<td>Bike lane connecting Cache Bikeway route north to Nibley</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>33.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum Active Transportation Route</td>
<td>Bike lane and sidewalks providing east-west active transportation route.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>23.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum Reservoir Trail</td>
<td>Recreational trail circling Hyrum Reservoir</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Utah State Parks</td>
<td>14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR101 Pathway</td>
<td>Protected Bike Lane improving safety for all users along SR101</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>UDOT / Private</td>
<td>25.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Logan+River Heights Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100W Active Trans. Street</td>
<td>Protected bike lane to downtown and south on new road project</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>56.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 E Pathway</td>
<td>Connection north of USU, utilizing buffered bike lanes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>USU/Logan</td>
<td>49.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400N Bike Lane</td>
<td>Buffered bike lane / beyond simple bike lane</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>52.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200W Canal Pathway</td>
<td>Pathway along canal alignment</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>35.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400W Active Trans. Street</td>
<td>Bike lanes accessing west side residential core and schools</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>56.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600E Active Trans. Streets</td>
<td>Bike lane connecting existing trails with USU and northern canal path</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>57.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementation Toolbox

**Process & Overview**

**Recommendations**

**Implementation Toolbox**

[Plan analysis](#)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700N Aggie Trail</td>
<td>USU active transportation corridor</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>USU / Logan</td>
<td>49.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800W Regional Trail</td>
<td>Paved trail connection between Nibley and Logan parks</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Logan/Private</td>
<td>39.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Road Shared Use Pathway</td>
<td>Separated pathway improving recreational safety access rural valley roads</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>44.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST Logan to Dry Canyon</td>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline Trail connecting First Dam - Dry Canyon</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>47.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridger Rail Trail - Logan</td>
<td>Paved pathway along lightly utilized rail line</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Union Pacific</td>
<td>31.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway - Logan</td>
<td>Bike lane accessing downtown Logan and other communities</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>60.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal-Boulevard Connector</td>
<td>Minor connection between major trail systems</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>53.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan River Trail - Far west</td>
<td>Paved pathway between 6th south park and SR30 pathway</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Private / Pacificorp</td>
<td>15.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan River Trail - Main Street</td>
<td>Riverwoods pathway to future Logan River Trail</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>51.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan River Trail West</td>
<td>Logan River Trail west of Main Street</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundstrom to Highline Pathway</td>
<td>Future connection through golf course property</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>USU/Cache Highline</td>
<td>42.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Streets</td>
<td>Improvements to surfacing, wayfinding, and bike/ped access on street to connect with existing and planned facilities</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>50.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Heights Bike Lane</td>
<td>Bike lane connecting River Heights to surrounding communities</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>River Heights</td>
<td>47.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapper to 6th South Park</td>
<td>Future extension of Logan River Trail system</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>37.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USU BST Connector</td>
<td>Connection between USU and mountain trail network</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>40.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mendon Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendon BST Connector</td>
<td>Mountain trail connecting to future Bonneville Shoreline Trail</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>31.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendon Canal Access</td>
<td>Quiet street and signage to provide wayfinding to Mendon Canal Pathway</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Private/Mendon</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Access</td>
<td>Walk in access points to Bonneville Shoreline from neighborhoods</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Millville Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith Fork River Trail North</td>
<td>River trail connecting to Logan trails</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway 100N Millville</td>
<td>New bike route to be utilized in conjunction w/ underpass on SR165</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Millville</td>
<td>45.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway - Main St.</td>
<td>Bike lanes and sidewalks to promote active transportation through town</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Millville/County</td>
<td>55.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millville Canyon Connector</td>
<td>Side path connecting Millville to canyon</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Millville/Private</td>
<td>34.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Access</td>
<td>Walk in access points to Bonneville Shoreline from neighborhoods</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*due to time and budget restraints, these trails were added after the analytical process and were not calculated for relative score.
# Nibley Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3200 S Bike Lane Extension</td>
<td>Bike lane E/W across Nibley</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>48.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800W Nibley</td>
<td>Extension of regional trail to Logan</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Nibley/Private</td>
<td>34.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway - Bridger Rail Trail</td>
<td>Multi-use pathway along UP railroad &amp; Cache Bikeway corridor</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Union Pacific RR</td>
<td>36.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum Slough Connector</td>
<td>Gravel surfaced shared use pathway</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Way Trail</td>
<td>Pathway connecting high school, underpass, and Stokes Nature Center</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nibley Quiet Streets (250W south)</td>
<td>Quiet streets to be signed and traffic calmed</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>40.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## North Logan Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200E Pathway</td>
<td>Regional connectivity provided through future road projects</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>34.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200E Bike Lane</td>
<td>Bike lane</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>54.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 E Pathway</td>
<td>Recreational access route</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>North Logan / Private</td>
<td>33.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 N Bike lane</td>
<td>Bike lane</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### North Logan Facilities (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Basic description of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 N Pathway</td>
<td>Shared use pathway</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>40.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 N Bike Lane</td>
<td>Bike lane</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>48.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 N Route</td>
<td>Preserve quiet street route</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>34.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway</td>
<td>400E Bike lane serving as core N/S Cache Bikeway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Gates BST Connector</td>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline Trail access</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>35.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Ridge BST Connector</td>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline Trail access</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Canal</td>
<td>Piped canal and unpaved pathway</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>46.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Canal - North Logan</td>
<td>Core N/S route connecting multiple communities</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Private/Cache County</td>
<td>29.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green Canyon, Cache National Forest*
### Paradise and South Valley Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paradise to Hyrum Connector</td>
<td>Paved pathway along SR 165 to connect the two communities</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Valley Bike Route</td>
<td>Shared and signed roadway south to Avon and County limits, connecting to Hyrum</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>UDOT / County / Hyrum</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville Shoreline</td>
<td>Trail from Blacksmith Fork Canyon connecting to Porcupine Reservoir</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*due to time and budget restraints, these trails were added after the analytical process and were not calculated for relative score.*
## Providence Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 E Quiet Canyon Access</td>
<td>Improve safety for canyon access on foot or bicycle up hill.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Providence/ Private</td>
<td>44.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 N Active Trans. Street</td>
<td>Bike lane and sidewalks provide connection through town</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>54.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 S Bike Lane</td>
<td>Bike lane to provide connectivity to development E and W of SR165</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>54.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench Active Trans. Street</td>
<td>Bike lane connecting bench communities - future road project</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Providence/ Private</td>
<td>43.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway-Providence</td>
<td>Key NS route connecting Providence to neighboring communities</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>49.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek Trail</td>
<td>Aspirational connection to Providence Canyon</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>33.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Access</td>
<td>Walk in access points to Bonneville Shoreline from neighborhoods</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*due to time and budget restraints, these trails were added after the analytical process and were not calculated for relative score.
# Richmond Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300E Pathway</td>
<td>Shared use pathway connecting recreational canyon use</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>20.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek Pathway</td>
<td>Natural surface, shared use pathway providing Cherry Creek access</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Richmond / Private</td>
<td>25.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Creek Trail</td>
<td>Shaded pathway along City Creek</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Richmond / Private</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Street Trail</td>
<td>Shared use pathway accessing northern Richmond development</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Smithfield Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (mi)</th>
<th>Est Cost</th>
<th>ROW?</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Basic description of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600S Bike Lane</td>
<td>Short connection between 200E regional trail and Cache Bikeway</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Canyon Connection</td>
<td>Future connection to Birch Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache Bikeway - Skyview Loop</td>
<td>Key N/S connector through central Smithfield</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>53.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Canyon Connector</td>
<td>Sidepath along road providing canyon access</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Smithfield/ Private</td>
<td>43.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Canal Path</td>
<td>Extension of canal pathway past golf course</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Smithfield/ Private</td>
<td>45.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline Trail</td>
<td>Extension of powerline pathway from North Logan</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Pacificorp/ Private</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Drive Access</td>
<td>Preserve singletrack neighborhood access to Birch Canyon access from Summit Drive</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>49.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Toolbox**

- **Process & Overview**
- **Recommendations**
- **Implementation Toolbox**

---

**Estimated ownership of project corridor**

**Order of magnitude construction cost estimate**

**Analytical score from plan analysis**
Overview
This particular grade separated crossing has been identified as one of the most feasible and most valuable crossing improvements in Cache County. Not only would it provide safe access to the new Ridgeline High School serving the southern half of the valley, but would also provide a safe crossing along the Cache Bikeway route, linking the highway-isolated communities of Hyrum and Nibley with the rest of the eastern bench population in Cache County.

Next Steps
- Work with Nibley, Millville, and Cache County School District to identify funding sources that could be used to approach larger grants
- Continue to identify grant sources that could be leveraged to fund this type of improvement.
- Approach project permitting first, as Blacksmith Fork River impacts are anticipated.

Key Considerations
- This improvement could cost between 1-2 million dollars. Finding funding for this type of project can prove difficult
- UDOT has turned down the first grant request for this improvement as part of a competitive TAP program. Working with UDOT to understand how to improve this project’s competitiveness could help future applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Safety Improvements for Highway Crossing</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Improve crossing of SR30 for cyclists</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>Add signal detection, bulb outs, and improved timing for bike/ped use</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead</td>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>Future BST and other recreational trail access</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>Improve safety for high school students and recreational access</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Utilize bridge at Main to cross under SR89, and link Logan River Trail</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Prioritize east/west bike &amp; ped movement on 100N</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>67.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Connect Logan downtown through mid-block crossing</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>64.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Add cyclists detection to stoplight</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>58.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian safety and comfort at Center Street</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead - Deep Canyon</td>
<td>Mendon</td>
<td>TH on USFS property to access BST and Narrow and Wide Canyons</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead</td>
<td>Millville</td>
<td>Preserve future access to Bonneville Shoreline Trail System</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Activated Crossing Signal</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>Provide safe way for cyclists and pedestrians to cross highway</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>Provide grade separated crossing for trail network connections between multiple communities</td>
<td>$$ $$</td>
<td>32.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>Connect Nibley residences to Hollow Road and Blacksmith Fork Canyon</td>
<td>$$ $$</td>
<td>29.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nibley / Cache Bikeway - Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Nibley</td>
<td>Provide grade separated crossing along Cache Bikeway, linking northern communities with Nibley and Hyrum</td>
<td>$$ $$</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>North Logan</td>
<td>Primary SR91 crossing for bike/ped use</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead</td>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>Future Bonneville Shoreline Trailhead for southern residents</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Spot Improvement Projects - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Primary SR91 crossing for bike/ped use.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Preserve future access to Bonneville Shoreline Trail system</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Primary SR91 crossing for bike/ped use</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>Primary SR91 crossing for bike/ped use</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>City TH to provide canyon and Bonneville Shoreline Access</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Proposed Trailhead</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>Work with Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife to install trailhead improvements and related BST facilities</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Wellsville</td>
<td>Future safe connection of canal pathway</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Improved At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>Wellsville</td>
<td>Primary SR91 Crossing for bike/ped use</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>33.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*due to time and budget restraints, these trails were added after the analytical process and were not calculated for relative score.*
The following pages provide a table of code references from Utah communities which are intended to serve as models to Cache County and her municipalities. As development and municipal codes are reviewed, this toolbox works to ensure that Cache County’s growth will help, not hinder, future trails development through Cache County.

The furthest right column in the chart provides direct web links to the source code on-line, if this document is being viewed on a computer with an internet connection.

Code references are intended to achieve the following goals:

- Establish Purpose and Intent of Trails Plan requirements
- Define what trail and active transportation types are governed by the plan and code
- Allow the community to require trail development as part of development agreements
- Codify use of trails plan in development review.
- Provide flexibility to allow trails in place of park dedication
- Ensure that trail development is of a consistent quality, and reference master trails plan guidance
- Ensure developments have adequate access and circulation plans for people to walk and bicycle
- Ensure that development does not restrict residents from existing trail networks
- Ensure that development does not restrict access to trails along canals, rivers, or streams
- Establish plan for information and wayfinding signage
- Establish development standards
- Establish plans for ongoing maintenance of trails
- Make clear the design and use of trail corridors through private land
- Encourage facilities that include all forms of transportation including bicycle and pedestrian
- Provide an incentive for development to go beyond what is necessary in trail development

Provo River Trail, Provo UT
### Establish Purpose and Intent of Trails Plan requirements

**Purpose and intent.**
The pathway element of the Ogden Valley general plan (Ogden Valley pathways master plan) was developed to promote, plan and protect non-motorized public pathways in order to maintain and enhance the Ogden Valley’s beauty, pastoral atmosphere, rural lifestyle, outdoor recreational opportunities and sense of community. The vision is to establish a network of pathways linking all of Ogden Valley and to enable residents, visitors and their children to travel in safety on foot, bicycle, horseback, skates, snowshoes or skis, to a wide variety of destinations throughout the valley.

(Ord. of 1956, § 40-1)

### Define what trail and active transportation types are governed by the plan and code

**10-1-4.5 Non-Motorized Trail Use DEFINITIONS.**

1. “Multi-Use Pathway” means a way or path no less than eight (8') feet in width that has a surface of concrete or asphalt and is separated from the roadway by an open space, a curb or other barrier.

2. “Natural Surface Trail” means a way or route with a surface other than concrete or asphalt, which serves the primary purpose of passive recreational use, such as hiking, mountain biking, snowshoeing, cross-country skiing and equestrian activities.

### Allow the community to require trail development as part of development agreements.

**13.06.070: EFFECT OF THE OFFICIAL PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS MAP:**

A. The city may adopt an official parks, recreation, and trails map.

B. The effect of the official parks, recreation, and trails map:

1. May require a landowner to dedicate and construct parks, recreation, and trails as a condition of development approval; and
2. Does not require the city to immediately acquire property it has designated for eventual use for parks, recreation, and trails.

C. This section does not prohibit the city from:

1. Recommending that an applicant consider and accommodate the location of the proposed parks, recreation, and trails in the planning of a development proposal in a manner that is consistent with law concerning exactions.
2. Acquiring the property through purchase, gift, voluntary dedication, or eminent domain.
3. Requiring the dedication and improvement of parks, recreation, and trails if it is found necessary by the municipality because of a proposed development and if the dedication and improvement are consistent with law concerning exactions. (Ord. 12-15, 7-11-2012)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Code Intent</th>
<th>Code Example</th>
<th>Source &amp; Additional Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Standards And Criteria: Development plan review shall be based on the following building and site design standards and criteria, which are formulated to achieve the intents and purposes of the mixed use districts in the short and long term. These standards and criteria shall be met unless an acceptable alternative is proposed that, upon review by the city and the SPARC, better meets the intents and purposes of the area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. General Criteria: (1) Continue Farmington City’s physical character of its traditional neighborhoods, including mixed use development, tree lined streets, detached sidewalks with park strips, interconnected street networks, and convenient access to parks, open space, transit and trails; (2) Provide an adaptable and interconnected transportation system that allows multiple modes of transportation, disperses traffic and provides streets that accommodate multiple transportation modes, including motor vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians;</td>
<td>Additional Examples: Park City, UT 15-7.3-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Review</td>
<td>Provide flexibility to allow trails in place of park dedication.</td>
<td>11-10-060: SITE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS: D. Trail Dedications: Developers of major subdivisions in agricultural zones may be required by the city to dedicate equestrian and/or pedestrian trails, waterways or other open space corridors in order to allow internal circulation, separated from vehicular traffic, and connections to a regional trail system. At the discretion of the city, such dedications may be made in lieu of the park acquisition and development fee required by, and according to the standards established in, the subdivision ordinance.</td>
<td>Source: Farmington, UT 11-10-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Standards</td>
<td>Ensure that trail development is of a consistent quality, and reference master trails plan guidance.</td>
<td>15-7.3-8 Sidewalks, Hiking Trails, Bike Paths, And Horse Trails A. REQUIRED IMPROVEMENTS. 1. Sidewalks shall be included within the dedicated non-pavement Right-of-Way of all roads unless an alternate location has been specifically approved by the Planning Commission. In many cases pedestrian paths separate from the road Right-of-Way may be preferable due to snow removal concerns. 2. Concrete curbs are required for all roads where sidewalks are required by these regulations or where required in the discretion of the Planning Commission. 3. Sidewalks shall be improved as required in Section 15-7.3-4(F)(2) of these regulations. 4. Trails, pedestrian paths, and bike paths shall be related appropriately to topography, require a minimum of Site disturbance, permit efficient drainage, and provide safe Access. 5. Hiking trails, bike paths, and horse trails shall be provided by the Developer in accordance with the City Trails Master Plan and where otherwise necessary as determined by the Planning Commission. Trails should connect traffic generators such as schools, recreation facilities, commercial Areas, parks, and other significant natural features. Such trails shall be built to City specifications and easements shall be dedicated for such trails. The trails shall be constructed at the time of road construction, unless the Planning Commission determines otherwise, in which case cash deposits shall be required pursuant to Section 15-7.2 of this Code.</td>
<td>Source: Park City, UT 15-7.3-8 Additional Examples: Ogden, UT, Sec 15-10-4 Weber County, Sec. 108-17-3 Weber County, Sec. 108-17-4 Taylorsville, UT, Sec 13.21.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Code Intent</td>
<td>Code Example</td>
<td>Source &amp; Additional Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Standards</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that trail development is of a consistent quality, and reference master trails plan guidance.</td>
<td>12D-115 Development Regulations (5) Trails: Layout of trails shall conform to United States Forest Service (USFS) or International Mountain Bike Association (IMBA) trails construction guidelines (natural surface trails) or NACTO/AASHTO standards (paved surface trails). Rights-of-way and easements should be of sufficient width to allow for a path or trail at the location which most nearly provides a level or uniform slope, minimizes the cost of construction and maintenance, and protects adjacent natural features, including but not limited to vegetation, associated with the trail. Trail location sizes and standards shall be in accordance with the City’s general plan for trails.</td>
<td>Source: North Logan, UT Sec. 12D-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foothill Development</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that development does not restrict residents from existing trail networks</td>
<td>11-30-050: REQUIRED PLANS AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS: G. Streets And Ways: 6. Development sites which are located near canyon trails will provide reasonable access to those trails. Parking areas may be required by the planning commission at trailheads.</td>
<td>Source: Farmington, UT 11-30-050 Additional Examples: Ogden, UT Sec. 15-27-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Along Waterways</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that development does not restrict access to trails along canals, rivers, or streams</td>
<td>16.16.060 PUBLIC ACCESS ALONG WATERWAYS All subdivisions that contain or abut a canal, river, or stream shall dedicate to the city a permanent fifteen foot (15’) right of way along the west or south bank of said waterway, unless actual property is dedicated to the county for trails. The right of way, which shall be measured from the inside bank of the waterway, will be for the purpose of providing permanent public access to the waterway for maintenance and recreational purposes. In the event the proposed development borders the east and north banks and the west and south banks have already been developed, then the dedication shall be from the east and north banks.</td>
<td>Source: Smithfield, UT 16.16.060 Additional Examples: North Logan, UT 12C-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>Encourage the use of bicycle racks to encourage active transportation</td>
<td>11-19-100: PARKING: F. Bicycle Racks: Secure bicycle racks may be provided at likely destination stops to encourage the use of bicycles as a way to access those destinations. Racks shall be designed consistent with standards contained in the Farmington City trails and sidewalks master plan.</td>
<td>Source: Farmington, UT 11-19-100 Additional Examples: Salt Lake City, UT 21A.44.050 Taylorsville, UT 13.24.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage</strong></td>
<td>Establish plan for information and wayfinding signage</td>
<td>(3) Signage and facilities. a. Standard and consistent signs shall be used to designate trail heads, pathway uses, directional information, educational information and historical information along the pathways. Signs shall conform to the Ogden Valley sign ordinance which requires the use of natural materials.</td>
<td>Source: Weber County, UT Sec. 108-17-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IMPLEMENTATION TOOLBOX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Code Intent</th>
<th>Code Example</th>
<th>Source &amp; Additional Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establish plan for ongoing maintenance of trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>108-17-4. - Pathway types and development standards. (5) Maintenance. a. Prior to construction of a pathway, the entity to be responsible for maintenance shall sign a maintenance agreement to be approved by the county attorney and the county commissioners. Privately owned pathways, such as one in a gated community, shall be the sole responsibility of the homeowner’s association. Maintenance of a pathway on privately owned land over which a public easement is granted shall be determined by agreement between the county and the landowner. b. Volunteers from the Ogden Valley chapter of Weber Pathways and from other trail-advocacy organizations shall monitor the pathway system to report necessary maintenance issues to the county. In addition, volunteer efforts, by groups such as the Boy Scouts and various trail users, may be used for simple maintenance tasks. An adopt-a-trail program may be initiated.</td>
<td>Source: Weber County, UT Sec. 108-17-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make clear the design and use of trail corridors through private land</strong></td>
<td>Sec. 108-17-5. - Landowner relations. (a) Respect for priv. property rights is an essential aspect of the pathways program. As shown on the master pathways map, the scenarios under which pathways are to be constructed or designated for public use invite the cooperation of private property owners &amp; the expression of their opinions &amp; concerns. Whenever a pathway is constructed along a pre-existing corridor formerly used for a different purpose, such as a canal or a power line, any pre-existing rights held by adjacent landowners concerning drainage, ditch maintenance, crossing and access, and other matters will continue to be honored. (b) Trespassing and liability are of concern to property owners adjacent to trails. ... signs shall be posted at all trail heads reminding users to respect private property by staying on the trail. Access shall not be allowed or provided from a pathway onto private property without the permission of the landowner. Landowners adjacent to a pathway may, &amp; are encouraged to create their own access paths to connect to the pathway. (c) The q. of liability cannot be solved by the Ogden Valley pathways master plan or by this chapter; however, ... the potential liability incurred by property adjacent to a pathway is no greater than that experienced adjacent to a roadway. (...) the State of Utah has adopted a Limitation of Landowner Liability Public Recreation Act (section 57-14-1 et seq.). This act specifically protects landowners who allow the public onto their property free of charge for recreational purposes.</td>
<td>Source: Weber County, UT Sec. 108-17-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following section outlines basic dimensions and design of various trail and active transportation facilities recommended in the Cache County Trails and Active Transportation Master plan.

### Linear Facility Guidelines

- **Natural Surface Trail / Singletrack**
- **Shared Use Path, Canal Corridor**
- **Shared Use Path, Powerline Corridor**
- **Shared Use Path, Railroad Corridor**
- **Sidepath**
- **Cycletrack**
- **2 Way Cycletrack**
- **Protected Bike Lane**
- **On Street Bike Lane**
- **Shared Roadway**

### Treatments & Techniques

- **Lane Reconfiguration / Road Diets**
- **Traffic Calming Measures**
- **Wayfinding Signage**

### Spot Improvement Guidelines

- **Grade Separated Crossings**
- **At Grade Crossing Improvements**
- **Trailheads**
Natural Surface Trail: Singletrack Trails

These simple paths through the natural landscape are some of the lowest cost facilities possible, and with appropriate construction techniques, need only a minimal amount of annual maintenance.

Expert construction is critical, however, as inexperienced trail construction can create erosion issues and maintenance headaches.

Though our public lands hold many miles of this type of facility, public input and use patterns in our front range canyons indicate significant passion and desire for improved singletrack closer to the valley floor.

Average Width & Surfacing:
- 3-5 feet - natural surface

Trail Construction Methods:
- Hand tools and volunteers for narrow, natural surface trails
- Mini excavators / Swecos to speed construction or improve compaction

Critical Considerations:
- Erosion will destroy poorly aligned trails. Keep horizontal slopes under 8%, with trail tread outsloped to approximately 1.5%
- Vertical clearance to be maintained to 9’
- Horizontal clearance to be maintained to 6’
- Vegetation management crucial to upkeep of trail

Some natural surface trails inaccessible for strollers/wheelchairs

Planning Estimate Cost:
- $7000/Mile

Local Examples:
- Green Canyon, Jardine Juniper, Wind Caves Trails
- River Trail (crushed gravel surface)

Additional Resources:
- USFS Trail Construction and Maintenance Notebook
- International Mountain Bike Association’s Guide to Building Sweet Singletrack
Canal companies have easement along canal banks, most of which are privately owned. Where possible, agreements should be created that can create an accessible trail system linking multiple communities in our valley.

Average Width & Surfacing:
- 6-12 feet - crushed gravel surface

Trail Construction Methods:
- Construction equipment for improved pathways & use of piped canal corridors
- Utilize Canal maintenance easements where possible.

Critical Considerations:
- Some natural surface trails present accessibility challenges for strollers/wheelchairs
- Canal company and property owners must agree in writing to public trail along canal.
- City stormwater funding partnerships recommended
- Look for alternate connections where public access permission is not granted.

Planning Estimate Cost:
- $500,000/Mile

Local Examples:
- Logan’s Canyon Road & Lundstrom Trails
- Smithfield’s Middle Canal Trail
- Murdock Canal Trail (Utah County)

Additional Resources/Contacts:
- Jim Price, Mountainland Association of Governments Active Transportation Planner (developed Murdock Canal Trail) - jprice@mountainland.org
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
Where powerline easements have been established, the land below them can be utilized for trails with the private landowner’s permission and alteration of the original easement documents with Pacificorp energy.

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- 8-12 Feet - crushed gravel or paved (asphalt/concrete)

**Critical Considerations:**
- Pacificorp / Rocky Mountain Power has easement with individual property owners
- Each property owner must agree to public trail usage through Pacificorp easement
- If property owners agree to trail easement, Pacificorp has ability to act as funding partner.
- Trails are an ideal use for this land, as no structures can be built below powerlines.

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $500,000/mile, dependent on surfacing

**Local Examples:**
- North Logan Bonneville Shoreline Alternate

**Additional Resources:**
- George Humbert, Rocky Mountain Power - 801.629.4221 :: george.humbert@rockymountainpower.net
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
The Union Pacific rail corridor that connects Hyrum to Richmond and beyond is an ideal candidate for a rail with trail corridor, as rail usage is no more than a single train daily. Numerous examples exist around the country where active rail lines coexist with recreational trail use safely.

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- 8-12 feet - crushed gravel or paved asphalt/concrete
- Union Pacific controls access to rail corridors
- 10-25’ minimum separation from active rail lines required
- 20’ minimum separation recommended for user comfort
- Fencing likely required along active rail corridors
- Saw cut joints recommended in concrete pathways

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $1,000,000/mile

**Local Examples:**
- Historic Union Pacific Rail Trail (Summit County)

**Additional Resources:**
- Union Pacific Idaho & Utah Contact: Lance Kippen, 303.405.5039
- [www.railstotrails.org](http://www.railstotrails.org)
- FHWA: Rails-with-Trails: Lessons Learned, 2002
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016

**Key Consideration:**
- Where railroad is located on easement, rather than owned right of way, reversionary easements may revert land to adjacent property owners should the rail line be abandoned. Research into this potential, and associated legal precedent is of value.
Shared Use Path (Sidepath)

Also known as a sidepath, a shared use path is a two way travel path located immediately adjacent and parallel to a roadway. Sidepaths offer a high quality and safe experience for all ages and abilities, as opposed to on-street facilities. However, care must be taken to preserve continuity and not allow driveways and private parking to block and endanger sidepath users.

Average Width & Surfacing:
- 8–12 feet - paved, concrete or asphalt

Critical Considerations:
- Reducing driveway crossings to a minimum protects user safety and improves attractiveness/use of facility
- Maximizing buffer between street and non-motorized facility improves user comfort and safety
- Prohibit parking or other visual restrictions at intersections
- Road ROW must accommodate facility, else property acquisition required
- Plowing facility during snowy months requires specialized equipment

Planning Estimate Cost:
- $1,000,000/mile (w/o property acquisition)

Local Examples:
- Logan Boulevard Trail
- Logan Canyon Connector Trail (est. construction 2017)
- Green Canyon Access Trail (1900 North)

Additional Resources:
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
Bike lanes designate an exclusive space for bicyclists through the use of pavement markings and signage. The bike lane is typically located on the right side of the street, between the adjacent travel lane and curb, and is used in the same direction as motor vehicle traffic.

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- 5-7 feet wide - asphalt surface similar to roadway

**Critical Considerations:**
- 4 foot minimum when no curb and gutter is present
- 5 foot minimum when adjacent to curb and gutter (3 feet more than the gutter pan width)
- 5 foot minimum if adjacent to on-street parking
- 7 foot maximum width for use adjacent to arterials with high travel speeds. Greater widths may encourage motor vehicle use of bike lane
- Configure as buffered bicycle lanes when a wider facility is desired

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $150,000/mile (w/o property acquisition)

**Local Examples:**
- 1000 N, Logan, UT
- 400 W, Logan, UT

**Additional Resources:**
- [FHWA. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. 2009.](#)
- [NACTO. Urban Bikeway Design Guide. 2012](#)
- [FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016](#)
**IMPLEMENTATION TOOLBOX**

*Active Transportation Street: Protected Bike Lane*

Protected bike lanes are conventional bicycle lanes paired with a designated buffer space, physically separating the bicycle lane from the adjacent motor vehicle travel lane and/or parking lane. These buffers are designed to increase the space between the bike lane and the travel lane and/or parked cars.

---

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- 5-7 feet wide - asphalt surface similar to roadway
- 2-3 foot separation from auto travel lane

**Critical Considerations:**
- Prohibit parking or other visual restrictions at intersections across raised protected bike lane
- Bollards, paint, movable planters, or raised barriers are possible separation options
- Plowing facility during snowy months requires specialized equipment
- This type of facility improves cyclist and pedestrian safety as well as the perception of safety

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $1,000,000/Mile (w/o property acquisition)

**Local Examples:**
- Grant Avenue, Ogden, UT
- 300 South, Salt Lake City, UT

**Additional Resources:**
- FHWA. Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
Two way protected bike lanes are physically separated facilities that allow bicycle movement in both directions on one side of the road. They may be configured as a raised facility or on street level, and be separated by a raised curb, flexible bollards, or a wide paint strip and parking.

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- Minimum 12 feet wide travel lane
- Minimum desired barrier: 3 feet
- Barrier can be painted separation to reduce cost

**Critical Considerations:**
- Prohibit parking near intersections to improve visibility
- Prohibit street trees or other impediments in 20’ sight triangles around intersections.
- Plowing facility during snowy months requires specialized equipment
- This type of facility improves cyclist and pedestrian safety as well as the perception of safety

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $1,000,000/mile (w/o property acquisition)

**Utilize When:**
- Major destinations (schools / places of worship) are on one side of the street
- Streets with few crossing conflicts
- Desire for clear connection to other facility such as separated pathway or trail

**Additional Resources:**
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
Another form of protected bike lane is those created at the sidewalk level. These facilities are very common in Europe and provide a comfortable space for walking and bicycling, but require significant amounts of ROW to be implemented.

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- 5-7 feet - asphalt surface similar to roadway, or concrete similar to sidewalk

**Critical Considerations:**
- Prohibit parking or other visual restrictions at intersections and crossings across raised protected bike lane
- Plowing facility during snowy months requires specialized equipment
- This type of facility improves cyclist and pedestrian safety as well as the perception of safety
- 3’ roadway buffer required if on-street parking is present. Without on street parking, 1’ buffer acceptable

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $1,000,000/mile (w/o property acquisition)

**Utilize When:**
- Adjacent roadways are high volume or high speed
- Streets where cars parking in the bike lane may be a concern
- Streets where high bicycle use is desired

**Additional Resources:**
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
**IMPLEMENTATION TOOLBOX**

**Shared Roadway**

These facilities are appropriate only in situations where automotive traffic is light enough that anyone would feel comfortable in the street.

**Average Width & Surfacing:**
- Standard roadway cross sections may be used.

**Critical Considerations:**
- Install wayfinding signage to clearly mark designated rural cycling routes and destinations
- Routes should be signed to alert motorists to the presence of bicyclists in the roadway
- Establish policies for regular sweeping and maintenance of cracks and potholes to keep the road surface safe for bicyclists
- When possible, as funding is available or as roads are resurfaced, shoulders should be widened to separate bicyclists from vehicles
- As development occurs and traffic volumes increase, transition to separated facilities such as bike lanes or multi-use paths

**Planning Estimate Cost:**
- $880/mile (signage costs only)

**Local Examples:**
- Hollow Road connecting to Blacksmith Fork Canyon
- Smithfield Canyon Road

**Additional Resources:**
- [FHWA. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. 2009.](#)
- [FHWA. Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016](#)
Grade Separated Crossings

Grade separated crossings are by far the best way to ensure that active transportation users remain as safe as possible. Grade separated crossings allow a trail or active transportation facility to cross even the busiest highway without exposing users to any risk or discomfort posed by crossing a roadway at grade. However, the cost of a single grade separated crossing can cost a million dollars or more.

Critical Considerations

- Groundwater levels and soil types can limit applicability
- Ideal to install as part of larger roadway project
- Existing roadway bridges or other structures can reduce costs of installation
- Lighting of space under roadway must be considered to improve safety and attractiveness
- Aesthetics of overpass may be poorly received by broader community
- UDOT and others do not prefer overpasses due to purported lack of use. (People prefer not to walk upstairs and down to cross a road)

Local Examples

- Logan Canyon Gateway Trail underneath Highway 89 (Logan Canyon)
- 1st Dam to Bonneville Shoreline underneath Highway 89

Additional Information:

- FHWA. Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
At Grade Crossings

In most cases, trails and active transportation facilities will cross roadways at grade, meaning that people on foot and bicycle must be afforded a safe and low-stress method of crossing a roadway.

Bike Boxes
- Demarcated in green paint, bike boxes encourage cyclists to cue in front of traffic, reducing accidents from cars turning right and not seeing cyclists next to them.

Bike Lanes at Right Turn Only Lanes
- The solid boundary stripes of a bike lane should be marked with a single dashed line where cars will merge to a right hand turn lane. Where space allows, the bike lane should maintain its own space to the left of the right hand turn lane, or if space is limited, merged inside this lane.

Intersection Crossing Markings
- Dashed lines or dashed green bars are current best practices for indicating areas in crossings where potential for conflict exists and alerting motorists to the presence of people walking or on bicycle.

Roundabouts
- Roundabouts can slow traffic at crossings, reduce idling times and emissions, and provide safe access for people on foot and bicycle. See the design guidance links below for additional information.

Additional Resources:
- FHWA, Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks, 2016
As trails and active transportation facilities are developed throughout the valley, it is critical to consider how your community will access them, now and in the future. For on-street bicycle networks, trailheads may be unnecessary, but for projects like the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, each community should devote resources to planning for community-wide access to the recreational tails system, or risk losing access to private development.

**Design Considerations**

- Trailheads can be designed as large, park-like facilities that serve the larger community, or simple neighborhood access points which serve only the local neighborhood. See the master plan map for conceptual locations of each.

- Large, developed trailheads should focus at canyon mouths where multiple trail access points exist. Neighborhood trailheads should be preserved in subdivision agreements and exist to focus neighborhood use at 1 mile intervals along the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

- Some conservation groups may be able to act as partners in land acquisition or license agreements to develop trailheads on non-civic property.

**Design Elements**

- Trailheads must include trail wayfinding signs and trail access

- Large trailheads should consider including: parking, restrooms, rest and picnic areas, interpretive signage or kiosks, and/or water fountains.
Lane Reconfiguration / Road Diet

Depending on a street’s existing configuration, traffic operations, user needs, and safety concerns, various lane reduction configurations may apply. For instance, a four lane street (with two travel lanes in each direction) could be modified to provide one travel lane in each direction, a center turn lane, and bike lanes.

Prior to implementing this measure, a traffic analysis should identify potential impacts.

Critical Considerations
- Lane configuration is dependent on context - middle turn lanes are not always merited when adjacent land uses are residential, park, or agricultural uses
- Reduction or slimming of lanes can provide needed real estate for on street active transportation facilities
Traffic Calming Measures

Motor vehicle speeds affect the severity of crashes that can occur on a roadway. Maintaining motor vehicle speeds closer to those of bicyclists greatly improves bicyclists’ comfort on a street.

Slower vehicular speeds are often preferable for community residents who live alongside a street. Traffic calming measures consist of both vertical and horizontal calming measures.

Horizontal Traffic Calming Measures
- Bulb outs and curb extensions temporarily narrow the roadway and slow passing traffic. They can also benefit pedestrians by reducing crossing distances.
- Chicanes are a series of curb extensions, parking bays, or edge islands that require drivers to move in an ‘S’ pattern through narrowed travel lanes.
- Traffic circles are raised islands placed at intersections that reduce vehicle speeds by narrowing turning radii and travel lane width.

Vertical Traffic Calming Measures
- Speed humps are raised areas placed across both lanes. 14’ long humps reduce impact to emergency vehicles.
- Speed cushions are designed to have gaps to allow easier access for emergency vehicles.
- Speed tables are long top speed humps that can be combined with pedestrian crossings.
- For all vertical traffic calming, slopes should never exceed 1:10 or be under 1:25.

Additional Resources
**Wayfinding Signage**

Comprehensive signing and/or pavement markings provide a clear method of guiding cyclists to destinations along preferred routes. Signs are placed at decision points along routes, at the intersection of two or more trails or active transportation facilities, and other key locations leading to and from a route.

**Design Considerations**

- **MUTCD standards (section 9B.01)** provides guidance for signage mounting height and lateral placement from edge of path or roadway. Additional standards are found in section 9B.20.
- Decision signs should be ordered with the nearest destination at top, and farther destinations ordered below.
Cache County Wayfinding Signage Templates
This page illustrates trail signs templates currently utilized by Logan City. Additional cities are encouraged to adopt similarly styled sign packages to assist in a unified and legible trail wayfinding experience across the County.

Contact the Cache County Trails Planner for assistance in locating, funding, and designing a wayfinding package for your community.

Additional Resources:
- Logan City Planning: 435.716.9021
Cache County Regulatory Signage Templates
This page illustrates a regulatory sign currently utilized by Logan City & Cache County on the Highline Trail.

Posting and maintenance of these signs, along with legible wayfinding signs are crucial to limit public liability associated with trails.

Contact the Cache County Trails Planner for assistance in locating, funding, and designing a regulatory sign package for your community.

Additional Resources:
- Cache County Trails Planning Division: 435.755.1640
Risk Management
Like all public facilities, trail development comes with risks. These risks can be mitigated through including risk management planning with any new trail. The following are, at a minimum, questions that should be answered by any community developing new off-street trails.

- How will trail be maintained? 2x annual minimum inspection is recommended for most urban trails.
- What elements of trail damage or changes should be reported and addressed?
- How will law enforcement handle new trails? Are patrols integrated to new trail networks within Cache County Jurisdictions?
- Can law enforcement and parks staff access the trail easily and quickly when needed?
- Consider volunteer trail stewards as a good resource for upkeep and patrol of trails.
- How can your town communicate with the community to convey safe and responsible use of trails?

Logan City Parks and Rec can serve as good resources for templates on how they have managed the expansion of their trail system risk in recent years.

Additional Resources:
- Cache County Trails Planning Division: 435.755.1640
- Logan City Parks and Recreation Department 435.716.9250
**Cost Estimates**

The following pages contain cost estimate values for trail projects as of 2016. Where possible, sources are listed for the cost estimate for clarification or further investigation.

**Important Note:**
These figures are conceptual in nature only, and are only intended as an order of magnitude view of trail construction costs. Actual costs will certainly vary based on material and transportation costs at the time of bid.

**2016 Planning Level Cost Estimates**
These very high level cost estimates are useful when applying for grant funding or budgeting the early stages of a project. When all that exists is a line on a map and public outreach, schematic and construction design documents, and bids are all still to come, these figures help develop a gross estimate of a future project’s cost.

**2016 Planning Level Cost Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Protected Bike Lane</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Separated Bike Path</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>per foot</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Striped Crosswalk</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Hi - Viz Crosswalk</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Raised Crosswalks</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>In-Pavement Flashing Crosswalk</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>HAWK Beacon</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Crosswalk Illumination</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Streetlight</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Natural Surface Trail</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Conservation Corps</td>
<td>UCC crew costs + 25% for incidentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Crushed Stone Trail</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$105,600.00</td>
<td>Tony Boone Trails</td>
<td>10’ wide trail, @ 2$ psf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 Construction Level Cost Estimates

Once some preliminary designs are done, and you have an idea of the type of trail or active transportation facility that you are seeking to develop, the following figures help better determine rough costs of the facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Base Course 4” thick, 10’ wide</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Base course 6” thick, 14’ wide</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Borrow - 14’ wide</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Road Base, 4” depth, 10’ wide</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>4” Thick Concrete, 10’ wide</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$13.75</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td>$110 per cubic yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Permanent Lane Striping</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>Does not include mobiliz. costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Surfacing</td>
<td>Lane Paint Symbol (Sharrow etc.)</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>Does not include mobiliz. costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Bike Repair Stands</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$1,650.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Bike Repair Stands</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Fencing - Wood</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Fencing - Chain Link</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td>Low Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Fencing - Chain Link</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>Alta Planning</td>
<td>High Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material - Amenities</td>
<td>Pedestrian Gate</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Utah Transit Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLEMENTATION TOOLBOX

2016 Labor Cost Estimates

From drawing a plan, to precisely built construction documents, or field verifying a final trail alignment, paid professionals are what make great trails happen. The following table outlines labor costs, both administrative and direct construction estimates.

2016 Labor Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin / Design</td>
<td>UDOT Oversight</td>
<td>pct</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>% of total project costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin / Design</td>
<td>Prelim. Engineering and Environmental</td>
<td>pct</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>% of total project costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Admin / Design</td>
<td>Const. Engineering</td>
<td>pct</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td>16% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Utah Conservation Corps 4 Person Crew</td>
<td>wk</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td>Utah Conservation Corps</td>
<td>Actual Cost may be 1600 after Americorp matching funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Rough Grading</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$0.32</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Sub-Grading + Compaction</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$0.52</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Final Grading + Compaction</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$0.52</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Final Finish Work</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Equipment Operators</td>
<td>hr</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>Cache County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Mobilization</td>
<td>Mobilization - Crushed Gravel Trail</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Mobilization</td>
<td>Mobilization - Asphalt Trail</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Mobilization</td>
<td>Mobilization - Concrete Trail</td>
<td>lf</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>JUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Operations and Management Cost Estimates

Clearing vegetation, replacing amenities and signage, and surface repair all require additional funding to maintain public facilities. The following tables provides some basic figures to be used by trail managers to estimate annual cost for public trail maintenance.

2016 Operations and Management Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>UTA Tiger Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Protected Bike Lane</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>UTA Tiger Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>UTA Tiger Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>sf</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>UTA Tiger Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Eligible Projects</td>
<td>Process Timing</td>
<td>Local Match Required</td>
<td>Funding Amount</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache County RAPZ</td>
<td>Wide range of capital projects and operating expenses for publicly owned or operated recreation, parks, and zoos.</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Up to $200,000 - Typically around $50-100k</td>
<td>Cameron Jensen (435) 755-1855 <a href="mailto:Cameron.Jensen@CacheCounty.org">Cameron.Jensen@CacheCounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant</td>
<td>Outdoor recreation infrastructure including trails, trail facilities, all-ability outdoor rec facilities, natural-themed playgrounds, whitewater parks, not-for-profit camping facilities, etc. Cannot be used for project planning or the purchase of property.</td>
<td>Application period open May-June</td>
<td>Given as a 50/50 match. Up to 25% of total may be an in-kind match.</td>
<td>Various tiered grant sizes available from $20,000 up to $75,000 (will change in 2018)</td>
<td>Tara McKee (801) 538-8686 <a href="mailto:tmckee@utah.gov">tmckee@utah.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trail Program</td>
<td>Construction and maintenance of trails and facilities; trailheads; restroom facilities; trail signage; acquisition of property or easements; purchase / lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment; educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection.</td>
<td>Application period open February - May 1</td>
<td>50% (cash, in-kind services, volunteer labor, or donations)</td>
<td>Depends on federal funding</td>
<td>Utah DNR State Parks Chris Haller (801) 349-0487 <a href="mailto:chrishaller@utah.gov">chrishaller@utah.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; Water Conservation Fund</td>
<td>Ball fields, sports courts, spray parks, golf courses, public restrooms, swimming pools, skate parks, walking trails, land acquisition for recreation (must relate to the 2014 Utah State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP))</td>
<td>Application period open February - May 1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Depends on federal funding for the program</td>
<td>Utah DNR State Parks Susan Zarekarizi (801) 538-7496 <a href="mailto:susanzarekarizi@utah.gov">susanzarekarizi@utah.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)</td>
<td>Planning, construction and maintenance of public facilities in cities and towns of fewer than 50,000 in population and counties fewer than 200,000 people</td>
<td>Must attend a workshop, held in October / November</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Varies, typically up to $150,000</td>
<td>Bear River Association of Governments (435) 752-7242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Federal</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Eligible Projects</td>
<td>Process Timing</td>
<td>Local Match Required</td>
<td>Funding Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) (includes set aside for Transportation Alternatives)</td>
<td>Construction, planning, and design of bicycle transportation facilities or pedestrian walkways; recreational trails; safe routes to school projects; environmental mitigation related to stormwater and habitat connectivity; vegetation management.</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Can vary; up to 20%</td>
<td>Varies depending on federal funding &amp; state allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA Congestion Mitigation &amp; Air Quality (CMAQ)</td>
<td>Non-recreational bike/ped transportation improvements; projects that reduce air pollution or that shift traffic demand to other transportation modes.</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Can vary; up to 20%</td>
<td>Varies depending on federal funding and state allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>Safety projects that are consistent with the State’s strategic highway safety plan (SHSP), including pedestrian hybrid beacons, improvements that separate pedestrians from vehicles.</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>None specified</td>
<td>Varies depending on federal funding and state allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Qualification is within 2 miles of school; new sidewalks, off-street bike/ped facilities, pavement markings, connections between locations, bike parking facilities, traffic calming, installing school related signs.</td>
<td>Currently not available, but round of funding may take place in Fall 2017</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Currently not available, but round of funding may take place in Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Non-Profit & Foundation Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Eligible Projects</th>
<th>Process Timing</th>
<th>Local Match Required</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Forest Foundation On-the-Ground, Matching Awards Program</strong></td>
<td>Recreation or restoration projects; trail maintenance, bridge and crossing construction or repair, installation of trail drainage structures; engaging youth/underserved populations in stewardship; employing youth crews in restoration work.</td>
<td>Round 1: January Round 2: June</td>
<td>1:1 cash match</td>
<td>$500-$125,000 average is $30,000</td>
<td>Adam Liljeblad (406) 830-3357</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nationalforests.org/grant-programs/map">https://www.nationalforests.org/grant-programs/map</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doppelt Family Trail Development Fund (Rails-to-Trails Conservancy)</strong></td>
<td>New multi-use trail construction, trail facility/infrastructure (e.g., trailheads, bathrooms), improvements to existing trails; land acquisition; trail signage; significant maintenance tasks; capacity building for nonprofits or friends groups. (Preference given for rail-trails)</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Project Transformation grant: $15,000 - $50,000; Community Support grant: $5,000 - $10,000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grants@railstotrails.org">grants@railstotrails.org</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.railstotrails.org/our-work/doppelt-family-trail-development-fund/">https://www.railstotrails.org/our-work/doppelt-family-trail-development-fund/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People for Bikes Community Grants</strong></td>
<td>Bike paths, lanes, trails, bridges, rail-trails, mountain bike trails, bike parks, BMX facilities, bike racks, bike parking/storage; large-scale bicycle advocacy initiatives.</td>
<td>Two grant cycles a year, Spring and Fall; check website for process</td>
<td>None specified, but grant must not amount to &gt;50% of project budget</td>
<td>$5,000 to $10,000</td>
<td>Zoe Kircos (303) 449-4893 x106 <a href="mailto:zoe@peopleforbikes.org">zoe@peopleforbikes.org</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/community-grants">http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/community-grants</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>