CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
NOTICE & AGENDA
OCTOBER 20, 2026
Revised October 19, 2026

Notice is given that the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake will hold a regular meeting on the above noted date at City Hall, 10 East Center Street, North Salt Lake, Utah. A work session will be held at 6:00 pm followed by the regular session at 7:00 pm in the Council Chambers.

Meetings of the City Council may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §52-4-207 as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and conducted in accordance with the City's Electronic Meetings Policy. The following items of business will be discussed; the order of business may change as time permits:

WORK SESSION – 6:00 p.m.

1. Review of the City's Draft Trails Master Plan by SE Group
2. Adjourn

REGULAR SESSION – 7:00 p.m.

1. Introduction by Mayor Brian Horrocks
2. Thought or Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance ~ Councilmember Jackson
3. Citizen Comment – All citizen comment is welcome, but those wishing to speak should limit their comments to no more than three (3) minutes.
4. Public Hearing and Consideration of Resolution 2026-50R: A Resolution Adopting Amendments to the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 General Fund, Debt Service Rap Tax Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Parks Capital Projects Fund, Roads Capital Projects Fund, and Water Capital Fund Budgets
5. Consideration of Resolution 2026-49R: A Resolution Amending the City of North Salt Lake General Plan Related to the Moderate Income Housing Element
6. Consideration of Ordinance 2026-09: An Ordinance Amending Title 13 of City Code for the Purpose of Allowing the Preservation of Existing Moderate Income Housing Stock for Approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD)
7. Consideration of a General Development Plan for the Walker Ridge Townhomes at 3533 South Highway 89 and the Rezone Request for 3533 South Highway 89 (Highway Commercial, CH) and Gold Mine Acres Condominiums at Approximately 3513 South Highway 89 (Residential, RM-7) to Planned District (P), Applicant Justin Hansen

8. ~~*Consideration of the Mayor's Appointments to the Re-Addressing Committee*~~ *Consideration of Resolution 2026-51R: A Resolution to Dissolve the Re-Addressing Committee*

9. Consent Agenda Items:

    a. Consideration of Bid Award for Reinforced Slope Design Package at 158 and 740 David Way to M.C. Green in the Amount of $184,691.78

    b. Approval of City Council Minutes of October 6, 2026

10. Discussion of Action Items

11. Council Reports

12. City Attorney Report

13. Mayor's Report

14. City Manager Report

15. Adjourn

CLOSED SESSION

1. Possible closed session for the purpose of discussing the character professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; to discuss the purchase, exchange, sale, or lease of real property; or to discuss the deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems. *Utah Code 52-4-205*

City Council meetings are open to the public. Written comments may be submitted to the City Recorder by 5 pm on the date of the meeting at wendyp@nslcity.gov. If you need special accommodation to participate in the meeting, please call (801) 335-8709 with at least 24 hours' notice. This meeting will be broadcasted live through the City's YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/@nslutah4909/streams

Notice of Posting:
I, the duly appointed Deputy City Recorder for the City of North Salt Lake, certify that copies of the forgoing agenda for the City Council meeting(s) were posted on the Utah Public Notice Website: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/, City's Website: https://www.nslcity.gov, and at City Hall: 10 East Center Street, North Salt Lake.

Date Posted: October 19, 2026

Wendy Page, City Recorder



CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Ali Avery, Long Range Planner

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Work Session regarding Trails Master Plan

RECOMMENDATION

No recommended action on this item.

BACKGROUND

For the last 8 months, City Staff and members of the Trails and Active Transportation Committee have been working with SE Group on a Trails Master Plan for the hillside trail system.

The project included desktop and on the ground analyses of the trails, public outreach (online surveys), stakeholder coordination (Salt Lake City, Davis County, U.S. Forest Service, Bountiful City), and regular meetings with the Steering Team. The final draft of the Trails Master Plan includes recommendations for trail maintenance, new trail corridors, and decommissioning of user trails. The Plan contains best practices and cost estimates for all those items, although adoption of the plan does not obligate the City to fund the projects. It is intended to be a guiding document for planning purposes so that City staff has better estimates for future budget requests and to provide the basis for grant applications. The plan also includes a five-year phased implementation plan.

The Trails and Active Transportation Committee recommended the Trails Master Plan for approval on 10/13/26 with the following changes:

1. Add the existing “ravine trail” in the Woodbriar zone to the maps, recommended for decommissioning and update the mileage.
2. Add language about geotechnical analyses prior to trail construction.

The Planning Commission will review the plan at their meeting on 10/27/26 and make a recommendation to the City Council at that time.

The City’s consultant, SE Group, will present the complete draft of the Trails Master Plan to the City Council in the work session. This meeting is simply to provide an update on the progress to date on the draft plan. Adoption of the Trails Master Plan is scheduled for consideration at the November 4th City Council meeting.

Attachments:

A) Draft Trails Master Plan

North Salt Lake

Trails Master Plan

2026

CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

NSL TRAILS & ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION



Contents

Introduction 3
- About the North Salt Lake Trails Master Plan 4
- About the Planning Process 5
- Public Engagement 6

Current Conditions 7
- North Salt Lake Trails Context 8
- Project Area 8
- Use Patterns 10
- Trail System Concerns 11

Goals & Recommendations 13
- Planning Recommendation Zones 14
- NSL Trail System Goals and Objectives 17

Implementation Plan 19
- About the Implementation Plan 20
- Trail Recommendations 23
- Management Recommendations 33
- About the Maintenance Plan 40
- Stewardship and Partnerships 42
- Cost Considerations 47
- Funding Options and Sources 49

Prioritization Plan 55
- 5-Year Prioritization Plan 56

Appendix 60



Introduction

About the North Salt Lake Trails Master Plan

The hillside trails in North Salt Lake (NSL or "the City") are one of the community's most cherished assets. They connect neighborhoods to nature, offer access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail (BST), and serve as a gateway to surrounding public lands. As this trail system has grown in popularity, maintenance needs and the number of unsanctioned social trails have also grown. While these user-created trails have provided important access and recreational opportunities to countless users, many of these trails were constructed at steep grades and in less-than-ideal locations, causing erosion, trail rutting, and other impacts. As the usage of sanctioned and user-created trails in the foothills area of the City has increased, user conflicts have also become more frequent.

In 2024, the City created a Trails and Active Transportation Committee to help resolve these issues and raise the standard for North Salt Lake's trail systems. One of the first steps in resolving the issues is the completion of this Trails Master Plan that reflects community priorities, strengthens partnerships, and supports long-term sustainability.

The results of this planning process, which included analysis of the trail system, public engagement efforts, and input from neighboring jurisdictions and stakeholders, indicate that the North Salt Lake trail system would benefit from a strategic approach focused on simplification, sustainability, and clarity. This master plan includes recommendations for maintaining and managing the North Salt Lake Trail System, re-routing or rehabilitating redundant or poorly designed trails, and improving existing trails. The plan also identifies conceptual connections or additions and maintenance priorities for hillside trails. This plan also provides guidance on improving trail connectivity, enhancing user safety, and protecting natural resources.

The overarching goal of this Trails Master Plan is to support a sustainable and well-connected system of trails and access points that meet the needs of current and future users while balancing resource protection and management capacity.

By consolidating the trail network, improving key routes, and clearly guiding user behavior, the City can build on NSL's well-loved, organically developed trail system and ensure that it remains a resilient and high-quality recreational asset for years to come.

About the Planning Process

The North Salt Lake Trails Master Plan was created between February and September 2026 through a collaborative process involving City staff, a trails and recreation planning consultant team, the NSL Trails and Active Transportation Committee, regional stakeholders, public land management agencies, and the broader community.

The project was guided by the City-led Steering Team, which included North Salt Lake Planning, Public Works, and Parks staff, as well as two members of the Trails and Active Transportation Committee. This group was responsible for meeting with the project consultant team each month, providing guidance on and reviewing interim deliverables, and coordinating public engagement efforts. The Trails and Active Transportation Committee also reviewed project recommendations and key deliverables.

The planning process was structured to combine technical analysis, stakeholder expertise, and public input to create a practical and implementable roadmap for the future of the City's trail system. The process followed five primary phases, beginning with study initiation and project management and concluding with preparation of the final master plan. Each phase overlapped with and built on the previous phase, allowing information gathered through inventory work, public engagement, and stakeholder coordination to inform the development and refinement of recommendations.

Process Elements and Timeline

- Study Initiation and Project Management (February – September 2026)
- Public and Stakeholder Engagement (April – July 2026)
- Existing Conditions Inventory and Assessment (February – July 2026)
- Recommendations Development (June – August 2026)
- Implementation Planning (July – September 2026)

Public Engagement

Public engagement was an important pillar of the planning process, with the City of North Salt Lake, the broader trail user community, neighboring municipalities, and public land management agencies providing input during the visioning, confirmation, and final plan review phases. Below are some of the ways that the community was involved and informed:

- **StoryMap website**: A public website was created and updated throughout the course of the project to provide the public with information about the Trails Master Plan, host public surveys and details about in-person engagement event, and to publish interim deliverables.
- **Stakeholder Meetings**: The project team held multiple meetings with regional stakeholders to inform them of the plan, collaborate on planning recommendations, and ensure regional alignment in trail system priorities and planning efforts. These stakeholders included Davis County, Bountiful City, Salt Lake City, and the US Forest Service Salt Lake City Ranger District.
- **Spring 2026 Visioning Survey & Public Events**: From mid-April to mid-May, a visioning survey was available to the public, supplemented by printed engagement boards at public events, to better understand community values and priorities around the trails in the City of North Salt Lake. The survey was answered by 320 people (239 complete and 81 partial responses), and in-person event feedback was collected from approximately 25 people. The results of this survey helped inform initial project goals, priorities, and initial trail system management ideas. See Appendix A for detailed public engagement results.
- **Summer 2026 Confirmation Survey**: The Summer 2026 Trails Master Plan Survey was open from late June to early July to gauge community preferences around recommended management tools, funding sources, and trail improvements to include in the Trails Master Plan. In total, 79 people responded to the survey. The results of this survey helped refine trail system management recommendations, which became the goals, actions, and implementation elements of this plan. See Appendix B for detailed public engagement results.



Survey Flyer Posted on Trail Signage



Current Conditions

North Salt Lake Trails Context

The City of North Salt Lake is situated in the Salt Lake Valley in Davis County, directly to the north of Salt Lake City and adjacent to the cities of Bountiful and Woods Cross and the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. The City of North Salt Lake's population is approximately 23,474 (2024 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates); however, the City's trail system serves regional users from the significantly larger population base of the Salt Lake Valley.

The trails within the City's boundaries are overseen by the City's Parks Department. Trail maintenance and direct management have been limited in recent years by staff capacity. Most trail maintenance activities have been led by volunteer crews or Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation regional trail crews.

Project Area


The North Salt Lake trail system is highly accessible, heavily used, and well-loved by hikers, mountain bikers, dog walkers, trail runners, and equestrians. The system is anchored by the BST, which serves as the primary regional artery connecting multiple neighborhoods, trailheads, and adjacent jurisdictions. Surrounding the BST is a complex web of established and informal social trails, creating a system reflecting strong community demand for outdoor recreation. Figure 1 illustrates how the trails in the foothills of North Salt Lake connect to trails in neighboring areas, including Bountiful, Salt Lake City, and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Salt Lake Ranger District.

The trail system in this area currently offers many loop options that appeal to different levels of experience and different types of activities. On the whole, the trail system provides visitors with engaging and varied opportunities to connect with nature, challenge themselves, exercise, and spend time with friends and family.

A Regional Recreation Catalyst: Bonneville Shoreline Trail

The BST is a non-motorized, multi-use trail traversing the foothills at the edge of the Wasatch Front metro area along the 18,000 year old shoreline of ice age Lake Bonneville.

Approximately 175 miles of this planned long-distance trail have been completed, including the section passing through the southern portion of Davis County and the City of North Salt Lake. Once finished, this trail will stretch from the Utah/Idaho border north of Logan down to Juab County.



The trails in the project area are also characterized by jurisdictional complexity. In the early stages of this planning process, a project boundary polygon (see Figure 1) was created to encompass trails on land managed by neighboring municipalities and agencies, including the City of North Salt Lake, Bountiful City, Salt Lake City, Davis County, Salt Lake County, and the USFS. While this complexity poses an additional challenge for land managers, trail users often recreate across multiple jurisdictions during a single visit, and stakeholders emphasized the importance of connectivity and access throughout the plan development process. The project boundary polygon provides important context on how trails in North Salt Lake are accessed and connected to other jurisdictions.




Figure 1. Map of Existing Foothills Trails and Connecting Neighborhood Trails in the North Salt Lake Area

Use Patterns

The trails in the foothills of North Salt Lake are used frequently by residents and regional users, often for walking, trail running, hiking, and mountain biking, especially along the highly-trafficked BST and the Wild Rose Trail system.

Survey results from the spring community survey (320 total responses) included the following insights about use patterns on the trail system.

- The majority of survey respondents were happy with the trail system. 75.8% of respondents reported that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the trail system.
- Hiking/walking and mountain biking are the two most common activities on the NSL trail system. 77% of all respondents reported that they had spent time hiking/walking on the trail system. However, when asked which activity they did the most often, mountain biking was most common response (44% of respondents).
- The NSL trails are used frequently. 36% of survey respondents report using the trails "a few times per week" (36%), followed by "a few times per month" (29%), and "daily" (20%).
- The majority of users drive to the trails. More than half of all respondents reported driving to access the NSL trails (54%). Just over a quarter (28%) reported biking, while 18% reported walking. The most common trailheads are Wild Rose and Tunnel Springs.
- The trails are often enjoyed together. Survey respondents most commonly use the trails with friends or family (79%) and alone (57%).
- The trails are popular for dog-walking. More than one-third of respondents (38%) reported using the trails with a pet.
- The BST and Wild Rose Trail were the two most popular trails among survey respondents.

Trail System Concerns

While beloved, the social trail network in the project area has evolved organically over many years, and regular maintenance on system trails has been limited. Due to these factors, the system does not consistently meet design standards and lacks cohesive wayfinding. In high-use areas, particularly the Wild Rose trail system, the network functions as a dense web of overlapping routes, which may impact usability, safety, and long-term sustainability. User conflicts and experiences are also a concern: e-motorcycles, a lack of signage, user conflicts between bikes and pedestrians, dogs, and dog poop were the most common concerns voiced by survey respondents.

The following concerns were identified as part of a comprehensive inventory and assessment of system and informal social trails in the North Salt Lake area (Figure 1) through site visit observations, conversations with NSL and stakeholders, community engagement, and on-the-ground systematic assessment of trail conditions and sustainability.

Social Trail Creation and Locations

Social trail construction has created convenient access from adjacent subdivisions, and users often connect to the BST using existing social trails that provide direct routes. However, the direct access provided in these cases is largely due to the creation of social trails that follow steep, fall-line alignments with limited regard for sustainable design principles. These social trails often face issues, including severe erosion, unstable grades, trail widening or braiding, potholing, and long-term degradation, which increase maintenance needs throughout the system.



Steep and braided fall-line trail, NSL Trails

Drainage and Surface Conditions

Drainage issues, especially on flatter segments and heavily used corridors, can be common after rain events. Standing water and muddy conditions have contributed to rutting from bikes, horses, or motorized vehicles; trail widening; and the creation of social trails as users attempt to avoid the areas. In some locations, vehicle use, particularly along utility corridors, exacerbated these issues by creating deep parallel ruts that further destabilized the trail surface and could confuse users.



Trail drainage issues, NSL Trails

Visibility, Safety, and User Conflict

Narrow corridors, blind corners, and vegetation encroachment limit visibility, particularly on multi-use trails. These conditions increase the likelihood of user conflicts, especially between hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians. Conflicts between bikers and pedestrians were reported by over one-third of survey respondents. Issues were also noted with e-bike or e-moto users and off-leash dogs. Safety concerns can also arise in areas where trail designations (e.g., multi-use vs. downhill-only) may be unclear to new and returning users. These issues are most acute in high-use areas like Wild Rose (where vegetation encroachment is also more common) or the trails heading towards Salt Lake City from Tunnel Springs Park and Trailhead.



Vegetation Overgrowth, NSL Trails

Wayfinding

A lack of consistent wayfinding makes system navigation difficult, especially for new users or those searching for single-use trails. Signage is inconsistent, outdated, deteriorated, or absent, and trail designations can be unclear or contradictory. This can leave users without official guidance on route options, permitted uses, or destinations. In turn, this can lead to confusion and the creation or reinforcement of social trails. This is especially acute in the “spaghetti bowl” of trails in Wild Rose. A signage update plan is already in the works for the Wild Rose trail system.



Deteriorated Signage, NSL Trails

Maintenance and Management Constraints

The system currently reflects a mismatch between maintenance capacity and network scale. Many trails show signs of deferred maintenance, including erosion, vegetation overgrowth, and degraded tread conditions. At the same time, the continued proliferation of social trails increases the overall maintenance burden. Jurisdictional complexity poses an additional challenge for maintenance and management of the current system.



Goals & Recommendations

Planning Recommendation Zones

For the purposes of this planning process, the project focus area was broken into five geographic zones (see Figure 2). The zones were based on geographic characteristics and land ownership. The recommendations in this plan focus primarily on the Wild Rose Zone, the Woodbriar Zone, and the Neighborhood Zone, which are managed by North Salt Lake and the USFS. These zones will be referred to as the "NSL Trail System."

The NSL Trail System

Wild Rose Zone (NSL, USFS)

The Wild Rose Zone features the Wild Rose Trail System originating from Wild Rose Trailhead Park. The park includes many facilities (grills, pavilion, picnic areas and tables, playground, a small amphitheater, restrooms, water fountain, etc.). Plentiful parking is available. According to our survey of trail users, this area is a primary point of origin for trail users and appears to be the most heavily used section of the network. This area attracts many user types and features a dense "spaghetti bowl" of trails.

Woodbriar Zone (NSL, USFS)

The Woodbriar zone provides an informal neighborhood access point into the trail system, connecting the neighborhood to the network and the BST. However, this access has no official network trails and, as such, the informal trailhead and trails currently lack clear definition, durability, and user orientation.



Wild Rose Zone



Woodbriar Zone Informal Access Point

Neighborhood Zone (NSL)

This zone includes the Tunnel Springs Park and Trailhead, Eaglewood Village Trail and Lower Wild Rose Trail, and the Springhill Geologic Park and Gregerson Loop.

Tunnel Springs Park and Trailhead

Tunnel Springs is a key recreational hub and access point into the Salt Lake City Trail System. The park is a popular area featuring public restrooms, a pavilion, a soccer field, playground, tennis courts, etc. This area is known for its accessibility and natural beauty, and it even frequently serves as a backdrop for family photographs.

Eaglewood Village Trail and Lower Wild Rose Trail

This important trail system is adjacent to North Salt Lake neighborhoods and provides direct access to the broader trail network from midtown all the way up into the hillside.

Springhill Geologic Park and Gregerson Loop

This park, which is a former landslide site, includes open space, picnic tables and benches, and a mile-long interpretive loop trail with educational signage. It is a popular trail among area residents and connects two hillside neighborhoods, but it does not seem to be a major destination for visitors from other areas.

Future Planning Zones

Two future planning zones were identified. The Future Planning Zone – Bountiful is located north of North Salt Lake and includes Summerwood Trailhead and trails managed by Bountiful City and the USFS. The Future Planning Zone – Salt Lake City is south of North Salt Lake and includes trails managed by Salt Lake City and the USFS. Due to their proximity to NSL trails, it is recommended that any future trails planning in the project area is coordinated closely with all neighboring municipalities and land management agencies.





Tunnel Springs Park and Trailhead



Wild Rose Park and Trailhead



Springhill Geologic Park




Figure 2. Planning Recommendation Zones

NSL Trail System Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives are guidelines that should be applied to the system of trails managed by North Salt Lake in the Wild Rose, Woodbriar, and Neighborhood Zones. These goals and objectives may also inform planning efforts for trails in other zones that connect to North Salt Lake.

Goal 1: Improve trail network design.

1. Enhance connections to the BST. Review existing connections to BST and consider which should be formalized, which should be closed, and whether any new alignments or connections are needed.
2. Consolidate and formalize key trail connections while removing redundant trail alignments or trail intersections.
3. Consider opportunities to designate distinct user experiences, including beginner-friendly routes, bike-optimized trails, fitness-specific features like challenge stairs, and destination-oriented features.

Goal 2: Improve trail conditions and quality.

1. Conduct maintenance on priority areas according to trail inventory and assessment to improve tread and trail corridor clarity. Complete additional trail improvements or reroutes where necessary to meet USFS standards.
2. Develop and follow a prioritized maintenance schedule based on trail classifications, trail management objectives, visitor use, and maintenance needs. Use maintenance schedule to schedule volunteers at appropriate times and align major trail work with budgets and contractor schedules.

Goal 3: Mitigate the creation and spread of unsanctioned social trails.

3. Consider converting and/or rerouting any social trails that generally follow sustainable alignments and show demonstrated recreation value and low resource conflicts to official system trails.
4. Obliterate trails and actively restore areas that are damaging to natural or cultural resources, redundant, have negative implications for user safety, and/or cannot be maintained to sustainable standards.

Goal 4: Improve wayfinding.

1. Remove inaccurate or faded signage.
2. Establish consistent, standardized signage with clear legends, colors, and icons. Include maps at trailhead kiosks with “You are Here” icons.
3. Place signs and maps at key intersections, clearly delineating which trail users are permitted.
4. Clearly mark access points to the trail system with maps and recommended loops.
5. Ensure online maps match maps on the ground (NSL website, AllTrails, Trailforks, Davis County, etc.).

Goal 5: Effectively manage trails to improve user safety, protect resources, and reduce user conflicts.

1. Clarify and promote trail policies regarding e-bikes, off-leash dogs, etc. Conduct monitoring of trail conflicts and consider enforcement mechanisms.
2. Ensure trail conditions that encourage safe use of shared-use trails by enhancing sight lines and ensuring firm trail tread.
3. Consider the need for seasonal closures of trails for wildlife concerns.

Goal 6. Improve and increase opportunities for public education and stewardship.

1. Promote trail stewardship partnerships with user groups (e.g., local mountain biking teams), individual volunteers, and nonprofit organizations. Update or create working agreements with partners and individuals on a continuous basis.
2. Increase in-person and virtual public education and stewardship around trail use. Inform users about the importance of avoiding trails during wet and muddy conditions, respecting closures, and right-of-way, and discourage the creation and use of unauthorized trails.

Goal 7: Collaborate with neighboring municipalities to ensure a consistent, high-quality trail experience.

1. Coordinate with neighboring municipalities to consider trail signage consistency and increased connectivity, particularly with regional trails such as the BST. Trail routes should aim to provide a continuous user experience regardless of jurisdictional boundaries as much as possible.
2. Coordinate with USFS and neighboring municipalities to understand ongoing maintenance responsibilities.
3. Collaborate and engage on any additional trail plans or updates that are made.
4. Coordinate with Salt Lake City and the USFS to advance trail planning and environmental review for proposed trails that cross or connect to USFS-managed lands.



Implementation Plan

About the Implementation Plan

This Implementation Plan translates the above goals and objectives into a clear framework for action and identifies the physical improvements, management strategies, maintenance needs, partnership opportunities, and implementation priorities needed to guide the trail system over time.

The recommendations included in this section of the plan were developed through GIS analysis, on-the-ground trail assessments, conversations with NSL staff, neighboring municipalities, and stakeholders, and best practices in trail planning and design.

Input from public engagement efforts was also invaluable in creating these recommendations (see appendices for more results on the public engagement effort). Key takeaways from the Summer 2026 Trails Master Plan Survey included the following:

- Respondents want continued investment in expanding and improving the trail system.
- There is strong support for practical management tools that improve safety and reduce conflicts, including signage, directional trails, and increased enforcement of regulations.
- Respondents appear willing to support dedicated investment in trail improvements, including new local funding mechanisms and external grants and donations.
- Dog management, trail etiquette, and user conflicts are key issues to address.
- Trail users value trails primarily as places to connect with nature and stay active.



View of North Salt Lake from Wild Rose Trail

Together, the recommendations below are intended to help NSL create a more sustainable, connected, legible, and enjoyable trail system that balances recreation access with resource protection and long-term management capacity.

Figure 3 provides recommendations for the trails in the NSL Trail System, including maintaining existing trails and removing system or social trails. Conceptual trail corridors were also identified for the Wild Rose and Woodbriar Zones, illustrating broad potential corridors that could inform future trail development.

Figure 4 illustrates use separations and directional trails to show how trails in the NSL Trail System could be managed.




Figure 3. Map of Recommended Actions and Conceptual Additions to the North Salt Lake Trail System




Figure 4. Map of Conceptual Management of the North Salt Lake Trail System


Trail Recommendations

Maintaining Trails

The majority of the trails in the NSL project area are sustainably aligned and are valued by the community. However, the key to a successful trail program is consistent maintenance. Trail managers should prioritize the care and long-term sustainability of existing infrastructure while thoughtfully planning for new trails and facilities. In order to improve trail conditions and quality, all trails in the NSL Trail System should be maintained and brought up to standard following the guidance below.

The trails in the NSL Trail System cross various jurisdictions, primarily between North Salt Lake and USFS land. All trails on National Forest land are required to meet national quality standards for USFS trails, which ensure that trails across the system are consistently constructed and maintained to meet the trail's intended purpose. The trails in the NSL trail system are natural-surface trails that generally align with USFS Trail Class 3, which describes a developed, natural trail with a continuous tread. As a result, it is recommended that the NSL trails be standardized using the Trail Design Parameters below to create a pleasant, consistent user experience and minimize future maintenance needs.

As the backbone of the trail system, the BST should receive considerable maintenance attention. Ideally, the trail should retain a common specification throughout the foothills that is representative of the vision and goals for this long-distance recreational facility. The BST is maintained by Davis County, but it is recommended that maintenance, management, and signage plans for the BST occur in coordination with neighboring jurisdictions, including USFS, Bountiful, and Salt Lake City.



Trail Clearing and Maintenance

Parameters	Shared Use Trails	Bike Optimized Trails	Hike Optimized Trails
Description	Shared-use trails accommodate non-motorized trail users (hikers, cyclists, and equestrians)	Bike-optimized trails are designed and maintained specifically to maximize the fun and efficiency of riding a bike	Hike-optimized trails are designed and maintained specifically to serve hikers, trail runners, etc.
Tread Width	18”-48”	18”-36”	18”-36” (single lane)
Target Grade	3-10%	3-10%, up to 15% for short pitches	3-12%, up to 25% for short pitches depending on soil stability
Short Pitch Maximum	20%	25%	25%
Target Cross Slope	3-5%	3-8%	5-10%
Clearing Height	8 ft minimum, 10 ft where equestrian use is anticipated	8 ft	7-8 ft
Clearing Width	6-8 ft	5-6 ft	3-5 ft
Management Considerations	Shared use trails are less technical and challenging than single use trails, often providing connectivity and the opportunity to experience nature. These trails should provide clear sightlines of faster segments of trail.	Bike-optimized natural surface trails attract mountain bikers looking to get exercise, experience a natural setting, and test skills. These trails may be single-direction to promote safe use.	Hiking trails are most often associated with natural settings offering scenic beauty and solitude. These may be designed as single-use trails; if bicyclists are permitted, direction of travel may be specified

Table 1. North Salt Lake Trail Design Parameters


Decommissioning Trails

3.4 miles of trail in the project area are recommended for decommissioning within the NSL Trail System (see Figure 3). This mileage increases to 4.5 miles when including mileage outside of the NSL Trail System (under Salt Lake City jurisdiction). These trails identified in Figure 3 are recommended for decommissioning due to unsustainable alignment, redundancy, damage to natural resources, undesirable access to neighboring properties, and/or negative implications for user safety. Most of this mileage was originally developed as unsanctioned social trails. Many of these trails lie in classically poor locations along the fall line, with grades commonly in the 20-35% range. Decommissioning these trails will help reduce trail erosion, impacts to natural resources, user safety concerns, and maintenance loads.

Formal decommissioning, targeted site restoration, and signage will be needed to prevent continued use of these corridors, especially where use patterns are well established. In general, when a trail or trail segment is closed or rerouted, the tread should be reclaimed and restored to discourage future use and help return the disturbed area to a natural condition. In the few cases where official system trails are recommended for closure, full trail restoration may be difficult due to historic use and trail alignment.

In many cases, physical barriers such as tree branches, large rocks, or split-rail fencing should be combined with efforts to reduce the visibility of the former tread. Signage can also inform trail users that the closure is intended to support ecological restoration.

While trail closure can be challenging, several best practices can improve its effectiveness.



Trail Decommissioning

Trail Closure Best Practices

To return closed trails to a natural condition, decommissioning should be most intensive at junctions with active trails, where continued use is most likely. Less visible segments may require a lighter treatment. Decommissioning typically includes three levels of intervention as described below: stabilization, scarification, and naturalization.

Stabilization

Stabilization of the trail tread is necessary to stop any further erosion of the tread surface and allow the area to naturalize. This should be done along the whole trail corridor and is the minimum step needed for closure. Drainage control measures, such as check dams, will be needed along any slopes over 25%. Water bars and drainage dips can be used along less steep sections to control stormwater runoff and prevent further erosion.

Brush from downed trees should be placed within the tread corridor to discourage people from walking/riding on the closed trail. The brush should look tangled and haphazard to create a visual and physical barrier that would be unpleasant to walk through. The brush will also provide a stable area for vegetation to re-grow. Brush placement perpendicular to the tread should be especially thick near trail junctions. Using large-diameter vegetation, such as downed trees, will discourage people from just moving the brush out of the corridor. Rocks can be interspersed with the brush to further stabilize the tread.



Brush as trail closure stabilization, Washington Trail Association



Check Dam, Erosion Control Research Program

Scarification

Compacted soil will inhibit vegetation from establishing itself and will need to be loosened for the area to be naturalized. The soil surface should be left relatively loose to give new plants a place to sprout. The tread surface can be loosened by hand or by mechanical means. Helpful tools include a pick mattock, McLeod, fire rake or rouge hoe, or pulaskis. Areas where the trail is cupped or recessed should have the edges of the trail knocked down so it will bend into the original landform.



Tool Types, American Trails

Naturalization

Naturalization will help accelerate the process of blending the closed trail back into the surrounding landscape. While naturalization is unlikely to fully restore a site to its pre-trail condition, it can significantly enhance ecosystem structure and function. Seeding with local plants and organic material from the surrounding landscape will help reduce the introduction of invasives. Leaf litter and sections of topsoil from the surrounding area should be placed over the loosened soil, especially in areas visible from active trails.

Naturalization can require significant time and expenses, so these efforts can be targeted strategically based on the extent of the impact, location, and ecosystem type. Naturalizing the ends of a decommissioned trail can provide the dual benefit of preventing future use of the trail. In addition, organic material excavated from new trails or re-routes within the trail system can be used to help with the naturalization of closed trails. Planting or transplanting a few native trees or shrubs will also help naturalize the trail and send the message that the corridor is being decommissioned.

To avoid introduction of invasive plant species:

- Using top soil and leaf litter from the surrounding area will minimize the introduction of invasives.
- Any imported soil, if required, should be certified to be weed-free.
- Hand-harvest and transplant trees and shrubs from the surrounding forest.
- In especially sensitive areas, use only leaf litter from the surrounding area and allow for natural regrowth.
- Monitor trail closures for invasive plants and eradicate as needed.



Invasive Myrtle Spurge, Utah Association of Garden Clubs

Pursuing New Trail Opportunities


The Wild Rose Zone and the Woodbriar Zone were selected as priority zones for the consideration of new conceptual trail alignments to improve trail network design, user experiences, and connectivity to the BST. Trail corridors were outlined and defined in coordination with a professional trail designer based on GIS analysis, on-the-ground trail assessments, public input, and consultation with North Salt Lake and neighboring municipalities. Those trail corridors are highlighted in Figure 5.

"A trail corridor defines the general path of a trail. It does not define the exact placement of every turn, wriggle, or feature in the trail. That level of detail is known as the trail alignment and is typically determined by the trail builder during construction." - International Mountain Bicycling Association

The conceptual trail corridors identify potential starting and ending points for each trail, as well as possible connections with other trails. These concepts have not been flagged on the ground and are meant to illustrate a broad corridor between potential starting and ending points of the trail, leaving room for flexibility in the final trail alignment design. These corridors are intended to create new opportunities, offer sustainable alternatives to trails recommended for decommissioning, improve connections throughout the trail system and to the BST, and reduce user conflicts.

All of these trails include some segments that would cross USFS land, and further trail design will require collaboration with the USFS and other stakeholders through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. When considering new trail opportunities, planning should account for both the local and broader regional context, ensuring that thoughtfully aligned connections to adjacent trails and systems enhance the overall user experience.

Approximately 9.2 miles of conceptual trail corridors are proposed, including mileage in the Neighborhood Zone and mileage that is conceptualized outside of the NSL Trail System (under Salt Lake City jurisdiction). In total, due to the recommended trail decommissioning in the NSL Trail System and under SLC jurisdiction, this would result in an approximate net increase of 4.7 miles of trail (see Figure 5).



Trail Design Cross-Section




Figure 4. Map of Conceptual Management of the North Salt Lake Trail System

Segment Label	Trail Segment	Use	Direction	Trail Narrative	Approx. Length (miles)	Land Ownership	User Objectives
A	Woodbriar Trailhead to BST	Multi-use	Multi-direction for pedestrians and equestrians, bikes uphill only	Multi-use trail replacing the existing unsanctioned trail from Woodbriar to the BST, providing connectivity to the BST. This would be managed as an uphill-only directional opportunity for bikers to manage speed and visitor use	2.0	USFS	Nature, exercise, connectivity
B	BST to Woodbriar Trailhead	Bike-only	Downhill gravity trail	Purpose-built, intermediate mountain bike trail, creating a dedicated downhill experience for mountain bikers coming off the BST and reducing user conflict	1.9	USFS	Challenge, fun, connectivity
C	Woodbriar Trailhead to Sunset Point	Multi-use	Multi-direction	Multi-use trail providing access from Woodbriar Trailhead to the Wild Rose system and Sunset Point	0.7	USFS	Nature, connectivity
D	Sunset Point to BST Connector	Multi-use	Multi-direction	Multi-use trail replacing/rerouting existing connection to BST from Sunset Point. Provides loop opportunity, connectivity, and access to the proposed, purpose-built downhill bike trail	1.0	USFS	Connectivity, exercise, nature
E	BST to Wild Rose	Bike only	Downhill gravity trail	Purpose-built, intermediate mountain bike trail, creating a dedicated downhill experience for mountain bikers coming off the BST	1.3	Combined USFS and NSL	Challenge, fun, connectivity
F	Wild Rose Trailhead to BST	Multi-use	Multi-direction	Dedicated connection from Wild Rose trailhead to the BST, providing a sustainable, longer loop opportunity from the Wild Rose Trailhead as well as an uphill route for bikers looking to access the proposed purpose-built downhill bike trail	2.0	Combined USFS and NSL	Connectivity, exercise, nature, challenge

Table 2. Conceptual Trail Corridors and Characteristics

Woodbriar Trailhead

It is recommended that NSL coordinate with the USFS to develop a small trailhead at Woodbriar. The trailhead would likely include a gravel parking area for approximately five vehicles and a designated pad for a portable or vault toilet. A kiosk designed to USFS standards should provide wayfinding, trail etiquette, management guidance, and potentially interpretive information about the area. Additional improvements may include parking delineation, trash receptacles, and trail signage at trail entrances.

Public input supported the development of this trailhead to provide access to proposed trails in the Woodbriar Zone. However, site permitting and design should account for nearby residences and the environmental sensitivity of the site and surrounding area. Because of its limited size, the trailhead is not intended to serve as a primary access point to the NSL trail system. Local information, social media, and trail apps should instead encourage most visitors to the larger Wild Rose and Tunnel Springs Trailheads to reduce environmental impacts and crowding at the end of Woodbriar Way. If the trailhead is developed, trail counters should be installed to monitor visitor use patterns. If visitation routinely exceeds expectations, the City and USFS should consider expanding the trailhead to accommodate demand as a Phase 2.

Notes on Trail Design and Safety

During final design, evaluate existing high-use intersections and along any new routes and consider opportunities and needs for slowing features so they can be incorporated efficiently during construction. Depending on site conditions, options may include chicanes, ride-over features, stone qualifiers, gates, or fencing. Managers should also consider providing advance signage where riders need a warning of a slowing feature. For more information, see the sections on Management Recommendations below.


When trail flagging and design occurs, the location of the starting and ending points of the trail should also be considered to prioritize safety, connectivity, and sustainability of trail alignments. For example, the origin of Trail F (see Figure 5) is currently illustrated to follow topographic alignment and prioritize user flow. However, this area is known to experience conflicts between downhill bikes and hikers heading into the park and trailhead at Wild Rose. This trail connection should be closely evaluated during the design phase, with the potential for a separate bike-only access bypass trail to route bikers directly to the parking lot to reduce user conflict and congestion.

In all cases, the final design will determine the appropriate treatments, locations, and signage based on conditions at each site.

Neighborhood Zone Recommendations

Recommendations for the Neighborhood Zone did not include the development of conceptual trail corridors. However, the following actions should be considered for the Neighborhood Zone.

- Decommission the trails identified in Figure 3.
- Coordinate trail maintenance of existing trails across neighborhood access and clarify trail intersections and access.
  - » Removal of social trails as pictured in Figure 3 and consolidation into strategically located access points will be critical.
  - » Installation of wayfinding signage at all access points will also help direct use and limit social trail development.
- Consider options for establishing dedicated access points from key neighborhood areas, particularly along the lower Wild Rose trails. This should include consideration of possible connections to Active Transportation facilities along Highway 89 and connections between trail systems, such as Springhill and Lower Wild Rose/Eaglewood Village.
- Coordinate with the HOA to consider changes to the Eaglewood Village Trail:
  - » Relocate the Eaglewood Village Trailhead from South Lakeside Drive to the nearby pond and redefine the trail and trailhead to prevent future social trail development.
  - » Construct additional trail access to the Eaglewood Village Trail from the 4-car parking stalls off of South Parkview Drive to increase access and avoid social trail development along Eagleridge Drive.
- Strengthen the Tunnel Springs trailhead as a primary orientation point into Salt Lake City and North Salt Lake trail systems. The trailhead should include clear mapping guidance, and corresponding online resources should be updated for consistency.
- Collaborate with Salt Lake City to evaluate, close, reroute, and/or formalize social trails off of Tunnel Springs.



Wild Rose Access Point

Management Recommendations

The trail-specific recommendations outlined above establish a physical framework for improving the NSL trail system through maintenance, decommissioning, new trail opportunities, and targeted access improvements. However, successful implementation will also depend on how the system is managed over time. The following management recommendations outline complementary strategies to support safe, sustainable, and enjoyable use of the trail network.

Separating Use

Shared-use trails provide many benefits: they provide more mileage to all trail users, build a trail community, are resource-efficient and less impactful on the land, and are cost-effective for land managers. By providing a common resource, shared-use trails empower responsible users to steward the trail system. However, single-use trails can be particularly helpful to alleviate crowding, user conflict, and safety concerns in tight, steeper, and mixed-use systems like Wild Rose. Single-use trails can also improve user experiences for all types of users and can provide a more specialized trail experience.

Use separation recommendations are illustrated in Figure 4 and outlined in Table 3.

Trail	Trail Status	Management Recommendation
Wild Rose – Bike Flow 1 (Gully Trail)	Existing dedicated bike trail, downhill only	Continue management
Wild Rose Trail Shortcut	Existing dedicated bike trail, uphill only	Continue management
Wild Rose – Bike Flow 2 (upper)	Existing dedicated bike trail, downhill only	Continue management
Wild Rose – Bike Flow 2 (lower)	Existing dedicated bike trail, downhill only	Recommend removal
Chukkar Loop	Existing dedicated hiking trail	Continue management
Trail A	Proposed trail	Manage as multi-use, bikes uphill only
Trail B	Proposed trail	Manage as dedicated, directional bike trail (downhill)
Trail E	Proposed trail	Manage as dedicated, directional bike trail (downhill)

Table 3. Single-use trail recommendations

Engineering Strategies

Certain parts of the existing trail system tend to have high-speed bike use, including multi-pronged intersections and the section right above Wild Rose Trailhead, colloquially known as “Main Street.” Wayfinding improvements (see Signage and Wayfinding, below) can help improve safety and reduce the potential for conflict in these areas. However, thoughtful and intentional trail design will also be beneficial, particularly at the critical intersections identified in Figure 4.

Trail design should use turns, trail texture, corralling methods alongside trails, and choke points to encourage bikers to reduce their speed. Offset turns, strategically placed rocks or logs, vegetation, fencing, bollards, or narrowed trail corridors can also help slow riders naturally as they approach multi-use intersections. Other engineering strategies, such as a stile, chicane, or width limiter can require bikers to slow down and navigate key sections of the trail. For more information on trail design tactics to control biker speed, see the International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA) resource, Managing Mountain Biking.



Example Chicane

Wildlife

Based on conversations with the UT Division of Wildlife, portions of the trail system may overlap crucial mule deer habitat, presenting opportunities to incorporate strategies that avoid, minimize or mitigate potential impacts. Curtailing illegal motorized use and off-leash dog use will help reduce impacts to mule deer, particularly in winter (see below sections). Other strategies could include seasonal closures of trails between December 1 and April 15. However, given that the BST is open year-round to motorized use near the NSL Trail System, the BST could be considered an effective boundary after which seasonal closures occur.



Mule Deer


E-Bikes

Electric mountain bikes (eMTBs) are a relatively new technology, but they are rapidly growing in popularity. Furthermore, their classification, as a motorized or non-motorized use, is evolving. Type-1 eMTBs offer assistance only when the rider is pedaling and traveling at relatively lower speeds (not to exceed 20 mph). Type-1 eMTBs support broader access to the sport of mountain biking, without compromising the natural experience and safety of all users.

In North Salt Lake, e-bikes are allowed unless otherwise prohibited by signs, though specific trails may restrict Type-2 and Type-3 eMTBs. E-motorcycles are not allowed on any sidewalks, trails, railway corridors, or any other non-roadway right of way in North Salt Lake. However, current regulations on eMTBs for adjacent landowners differ. At present, the USFS does not allow eMTBs on non-motorized trails. Salt Lake City allows e-bikes on trails in the Foothills system when ridden as a standard mountain bike, with no or low pedal assist when riding uphill. Regulations on eMTBs can also be difficult to enforce.

Given the connectivity between the National Forest and the NSL trail system for biking, the policy on natural-surface, hillside trails in the NSL Trail System should match that of the USFS. Given the evolving management of electric mountain bikes (eMTBs) on National Forest System lands, any new trail planning and analysis should consider the potential for a future change in management to allow Class 1 eMTB use. Where appropriate, the analysis and resulting approvals should retain the flexibility to accommodate Class 1 eMTBs, provided that use is consistent with applicable USFS direction and does not result in unacceptable impacts to natural resources, trail conditions, or user experiences.

Type-2 or Type-3 eMTBs are not compatible with the desired character for North Salt Lake and therefore are not recommended for NSL trails at this time. For future considerations, IMBA offers guidance and resources on the management of Type-1 eMTBs.



Current E-Bike Classes, IMBA

Dogs

Dogs are frequently present in the project area. In the first community survey, when asked about their use of the trails, 38% of respondents reported using the trails with a pet. However, 34% of respondents also reported experiencing conflict involving dogs off- or on-leash. Off-leash dogs can also impact the environment, spreading invasive weeds, damaging native plant species, and disrupting wildlife, particularly mule deer in winter range. Leash laws also protect pets, who can be attacked by animals like cougars or coyotes.

Current regulations in the project area indicate that dogs should be leashed. These regulations are also compatible with regulations in adjacent jurisdictions, including Davis County (Code Chapter 6.16), the Salt Lake City Foothills, and the City of Bountiful. It is recommended that this leash policy is placed on signs at trailhead kiosks and throughout the project area. Additional enforcement of the on-leash policy will help reduce user conflict, protect pets, and limit impacts to wildlife and the trail ecosystem.

Monitoring

Monitoring visitor use on a trail system also can provide valuable information about how, why, and when a trail system is being used, and can flag the need for any maintenance or manager action. Installing infrared trail counters, monitoring trailhead parking, or routine monitoring of StravaMetro or Placer.ai data could help improve the understanding of visitor volumes and user patterns. AllTrails comments and even social media can share information about user experiences and help flag trail conflicts or concerns.

Routine monitoring of the trail system should also occur as part of regular trail maintenance (see Maintenance Plan below.)



Infrared Trail Counter, Bryce Canyon National Park

Signage and Wayfinding

Signage is one of the primary ways land managers communicate with trail users. A clear, well-maintained signage system improves navigation, supports a positive visitor experience, and provides important information about the trail network and the surrounding area. It also helps manage risk and support emergency response.

Trail signage should be simple, uncluttered, easy to recognize, and placed at major intersections to help users stay oriented. Signs should serve both frequent trail users and first-time visitors, with placement that is strategic and consistent throughout the system. On-the-ground signage should also be thoughtfully designed and strategically placed to help visitors unfamiliar with the area easily orient themselves, navigate the trail system, and understand applicable rules and regulations. Signage planning and placement should be intentional, assuming visitors have no prior knowledge of the area and may not have cellular service or access to mobile applications. In the case of the NSL trail system, signage should also clearly identify permitted uses and regulations, such as keeping dogs on leashes.

Figure 4 identifies key intersections where signage is recommended, as well as critical intersections where merging trails, different use types, and/or terrain indicate a critical need for signage to encourage users to slow down and increase awareness of their surroundings.

Sign design, recreation type, and the overall number of signs all influence how visitors notice and use signs. A successful signage program deploys signage strategically and must balance visibility, clarity, and user needs.

Signage Types

There are a variety of sign types that can provide information about a trail system:

Informational signs: These types of signs are typically located at the trailhead and major intersections. These types of signs often include the most information and are typically larger, featuring area- or system-wide maps and details on trail types, distances, difficulty levels, and restrictions. Trail users typically stop their activity to read these signs.



Informational Kiosk, Ninemile Campground, Finland, MN



Informational Kiosk, Knoxville, TN

Regulatory signs: These signs specifically outline rules or prohibitions for the trail system as a whole, a specific area, or a specific trail (e.g., no camping throughout trail system, dog leash required areas, bike-only trail). Most importantly, these signs should specify the trail users allowed or prohibited, as well as required directions. These signs should be located throughout the trail system as appropriate. These can be standard fiberglass composite signs with stickers, or a more custom sign. These signs should be intelligible to users who are in motion.



Dog Regulation Sign, Spokane County



Regulatory Sign, Slate Creek, Salt Lake City UT

Directional signs: These signs indicate where specific trails are located, as well as recommended or required direction of trail use (e.g., downhill use only, clockwise recommended, two-way traffic) and can include information about trail difficulty. These can be standard fiberglass composite signs with stickers, or a more custom sign. These signs should be intelligible to users who are in motion.



Directional Sign, Avon CO



Directional Composite Sign, Basin Recreation, UT

Educational or interpretive signs: These signs can provide information to users about responsible recreation guidelines or environmental or cultural resources on the trail or in the area. Trail users typically stop their activity to read these signs. The placement of interpretive signage should take into account user types; for example, hikers may be more likely to stop mid-trail to read an interpretive sign than mountain bikers.



Natural Interpretive Sign



Trail Etiquette Sign

Updating Online Mapping Platforms

Many users rely on online platforms for route planning and mid-trail orientation. As the NSL trail system is updated with new, closed, or altered trails, it is critical that online mapping and trail user platforms reflect updated information. The foundation of many online trail platforms is OpenStreetMap (OSM), a collaborative, open-source mapping platform that relies on contributions from a global mapping community, similar to Wikipedia. It is important to make any trail updates in the OSM system, as well as on specific trail mapping platforms. Upon creating an OSM account, an instructional "walkthrough" demonstrates how to update trail information, including adding new trails, altering trail routes, updating trail permissions, and closing trails.

Once the trails have been updated in OSM, it is recommended that support tickets are filed with each of the most popular trail mapping platforms, which could include OnX/MTB Project, Gaia, Trailforks, AllTrails, and other relevant platforms. Some platforms, such as AllTrails, have public lands management programs (AllTrails Public Lands Program) in which trail managers can more directly update and manage their trails listed on the platform, provide timely updates to trail users, and access visitation data.

About the Maintenance Plan

Many of the sustainability issues on the NSL trail system can be remedied by the projects identified in this Trail Plan and through routine annual maintenance of the trails. Trails that are not maintained to standard can create critical safety hazards, reduce user enjoyment and use, increase social trail development, impact the surrounding environment, and result in much more costly future trail maintenance.

Given the current size of the trail system, all trails should be considered as part of the annual maintenance program. As the system expands and regular maintenance needs and patterns become better established, maintenance frequency may be adjusted based on trail condition, use levels, resource concerns, and demonstrated need. This approach allows higher-priority areas to receive appropriate attention while reducing unnecessary annual maintenance on trails that remain in good condition.

At present, there is a backlog of deferred maintenance, as evidenced by the current condition of the trails. Managing this backlog should be a top priority, along with an annual maintenance schedule that is developed and shared among trail maintainers. Identifying and understanding the types of maintenance activities needed to properly maintain the trails is essential for communicating expectations to maintenance personnel during training and on an ongoing basis.

The following steps are recommended to begin tackling maintenance on the North Salt Lake Trail System.

- Address deferred maintenance to bring trails up to recommended Design Parameters (outlined in Table 1):
  - Start by brushing and clearing the trails identified for maintenance in Figure 3 and cleaning out existing drainage features.
    - Prioritize more substantial work in the Wild Rose Trail System, particularly Wild Rose Trail and Chukkar Loop.
  - Gravity trails should be maintained annually, with particular attention to material collecting at the bottom of turns and drainage features that have filled in.
- After existing trails and drainage are brought up to standard:
  - Identify where new drainage features are needed to keep trails sustainable. This work will take more time and funding, so it can be phased in over time.
  - On an annual basis:
    - Continue light clearing and drainage maintenance across the system each year.
    - Maintain high-use trails more extensively as resources allow.
    - Walk the system at least once a year to confirm priorities, and revisit after major storms or other events that affect trail conditions.

Table 4 below includes a description and general cadence of different types of maintenance activities.

Additional resources on trail maintenance planning can be found in the Forest Service Trail Maintenance and Construction Notebook (2025), the IMBA Mountain Bike Trail Development Guidelines (2023), the Pacific Crest Trail Association Trail Skills Curriculum (2019), and the IMBA Trail Solutions Book (2004).

Maintenance Type	Description	Frequency
Inspections	To understand the type and scale of maintenance needed on the trail system, trail inspections should be performed, either as part of other maintenance activities or as independent activities. Inspections may be helpful before or after busy seasons.	Spring and fall inspections, with additional inspections as needed.
Debris Removal	Debris, such as rocks, branches, and other natural elements, or inorganic trash or litter, should be removed or swept from trail surfaces to prevent tripping and safety hazards, while also protecting trail aesthetics and reducing environmental impact.	Spring and fall inspections and maintenance as needed.
Vegetation Management	Vegetation (branches, bushes, shrubs, etc.) that encroaches into the trail corridor should be trimmed or removed. In general, vegetation should be cleared in accordance with the Trail Design Parameters outlined in Table 1. Potentially hazardous trees should be cleared before they break or fall. Invasive or noxious weeds should be treated as appropriate.	Spring inspection and maintenance, additional maintenance as needed.
Drainage	Drainage structures, such as culverts, water bars, and ditches are critical for preventing erosion, maintaining safety, and ensuring trail sustainability and longevity. Drainage structures should be cleared of debris and vegetation and repaired promptly to ensure proper function.	Spring and fall inspections and maintenance as need. Inspect and maintain after each significant precipitation event.
Tread	The surface of the trails, or the tread, may need to be restored if it has been damaged by debris, water, users, or other factors. This can include fixing ruts and maintaining sculpted features (berms, jumps, etc.) in addition to regular drainage and debris maintenance.	Annual inspection, maintenance as needed.
Structures	Repairing or replacing trail-supportive structures where needed. These include on-trail features such as railings, benches, and steps, as well as trailhead infrastructure such as bike racks, light fixtures, gates and fences, restrooms, and parking. Inspect structures for graffiti.	Annual inspection, maintenance as needed.
Signs and Markings	Repairing or replacing damaged signs and sign posts. Inspect signs for graffiti.	Annual inspection, maintenance as needed.


Table 4. Maintenance Activities and Frequency

Stewardship and Partnerships

Developing and maintaining a robust, fun, and functional NSL trail system requires collaboration among many partners and across jurisdictional boundaries. These partners include federal land managers, such as the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, neighboring municipalities and jurisdictions, including Davis County, Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Bountiful City, and volunteer community members and organizations.

This strong ecosystem of partners is a big opportunity for North Salt Lake to advance projects that may be difficult to accomplish alone, leveraging shared capacity, expertise, funding, and stewardship to achieve larger trail system improvements over time. However, strong partnership also requires strategic planning and coordination to most effectively integrate the capabilities of the city employees, neighboring municipalities, agency partners, and the nonprofit organizations and volunteer groups who all work on and steward these trails. To ensure that North Salt Lake has the capacity to coordinate strong partnerships and manage the trail system, the City should consider hiring a part-time or full-time trails coordinator position. This person could be responsible for periodic trail maintenance inspections, directing maintenance needs, applying for grants, overseeing new trail development, and coordinating with volunteers and partners.

Below are some considerations on how to best collaborate with North Salt Lake's various partners.



Bonneville Shoreline Trail

Working with the National Forest

Successful implementation of this Trails Master Plan will require ongoing coordination with the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, which manages lands within this project area and adjacent to North Salt Lake. These Forest Service lands are managed by the Salt Lake Ranger District and play a key role in future trail connectivity, maintenance, and expansion opportunities. The Forest Service operates within a structured planning and environmental review framework and a codified set of trail and signage standards. Trail projects on USFS land also often require significant lead time. As a result, the City should focus on building long-term relationships with District staff, staying informed about relevant planning efforts, and identifying opportunities to align local priorities with Forest Service recreation and resource management objectives.

Partnership Considerations

- **Engagement**: Engage Forest Service staff early in project development to help identify opportunities, constraints, and information needs before significant resources have been invested. Maintain regular communication with key contacts to stay informed about changing priorities, funding opportunities, and upcoming projects.
- **Shared objectives**: Frame trail proposals in terms of shared objectives, such as improving recreation access, addressing maintenance needs, enhancing connectivity, reducing unauthorized trail development, or improving visitor experiences. Reference the Forest Plan, travel management plans, and recreation plans in these proposals.
- **Capacity**: Recognize that Forest Service staff often manage large trail systems with limited capacity. When feasible, support projects through volunteer programs, stewardship initiatives, grant partnerships, maintenance assistance, or other collaborative efforts that help advance shared goals.
- **Partnership agreements**: Explore formal partnership tools, such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Challenge Cost-Share Agreements, volunteer agreements, and maintenance operating plans, to define responsibilities, leverage City resources, and establish a framework for implementing and maintaining trails across jurisdictional boundaries. Formal agreements can provide continuity through staffing changes and create a clear path for project delivery and long-term stewardship.
- **Data and documentation**: Document trail use, maintenance needs, and community support for proposed projects. Clear data and demonstrated public benefits can help support future planning and funding discussions.
- **Planning updates**: Monitor updates to the Forest Plan, travel management plans, recreation plans, and environmental review processes that may affect long-term trail opportunities. Participation is most effective when communities engage early in the planning process.

See the IMBA resource, Working with the US Forest Service, for more detailed guidance on working with Forest Service partners, last updated in Spring 2026.

Working with the Neighboring Municipalities

North Salt Lake's trail system connects not only to Forest Service land, but also to the regional BST, trails within Bountiful City (Davis County), unincorporated Davis County, and Salt Lake City (Salt Lake County). The boundaries between these different jurisdictions can range from invisible to confusing for trail users and can create logistical challenges for land and trail managers if coordination is not proactive.

Partnership Considerations

- **Coordination frequency**: Establish regular coordination meetings with neighboring jurisdictions to discuss trail planning initiatives, maintenance needs, funding opportunities, and upcoming capital projects that may affect shared trail corridors or regional connectivity.
- **Signage**: Develop a common approach to trail signage, including wayfinding, trail naming conventions, difficulty ratings, regulatory signage, regional trail system maps, and branding conventions, to create a seamless user experience across jurisdictional boundaries.
- **Maintenance**: Coordinate on maintenance standards and expectations, including trail surface conditions, vegetation management, drainage improvements, inspection schedules, and reporting procedures, so that trail users experience a consistent level of quality throughout the regional network.
- **Agreements**: Develop interlocal agreements or other formal partnerships to establish clear maintenance responsibilities and expectations for trails that cross jurisdictional boundaries.



Wild Rose Trail in Winter

- **Funding**: Pursue joint grant applications and funding opportunities for regional trail projects, wayfinding programs, trailhead improvements, maintenance equipment, and connectivity initiatives that benefit multiple jurisdictions.
- **Ongoing collaboration and communication**: Collaborate on trail system planning efforts to ensure new trails, trailheads, and connections support broader regional goals and do not create gaps or inconsistencies in the network. Share trail use data, user feedback, maintenance observations, and planning studies as relevant. In this vein, North Salt Lake is already pursuing a joint effort to complete the NEPA process for trails on USFS land in coordination with Salt Lake City.

Working with the Volunteers

Volunteers are often crucial in developing, activating, and maintaining trail systems. Depending on local capacity and needs, volunteer efforts may support everything from routine maintenance and stewardship to larger workdays that supplement the efforts of city staff, land managers, and professional trail crews. Working with volunteers can expand the city's capacity by mobilizing many hands for relatively little cost, and volunteer hours can sometimes even be used as "in-kind" matches to unlock grant funding. Importantly, volunteer involvement creates a sense of local ownership and pride in the trail system, leading volunteers and the community at large to recreate more frequently and responsibly.

Education and public engagement are critical components of effective trail system management as well. Municipalities and land managers often do not have the resources to manage trail systems independently and must rely on advocacy organizations, community partners, and volunteers to help educate visitors about trail etiquette, responsible use, and applicable rules and regulations. User group-led education and outreach (social media) has proven successful in many communities, helping land managers improve compliance, reduce conflicts, and foster a shared sense of responsibility for the trail system.

That said, having a strong volunteer system still requires significant coordination and management to ensure volunteer time is mobilized effectively. Workdays must be scheduled with the volunteering organizations or the general public, work projects must be scaled to the size and technical capacity of the volunteer groups, and volunteers must be properly trained and outfitted with the proper tools and personal protective equipment to be successful. Because volunteer work may vary in quality and technical skill, it must be closely supervised to ensure that completed work meets City, land manager, and trail design standards and does not create safety issues, environmental impacts, or liability concerns. Public volunteer workdays typically take place on weekends to accommodate public availability, which can be an additional logistical hurdle for city staff, land managers, or professional contractors.

When wielded and managed properly, volunteer partnerships can bring trails projects and ongoing trail maintenance to life. Below are some considerations about how best to engage with volunteer partners.

Partnership Considerations

- **Rightsizing**: Identify the right volunteer roles for the right projects, distinguishing between tasks that are appropriate for general volunteer work days, experienced trail stewards, nonprofit partners, and professional trail builders.
- **Clear direction**: Develop clear work plans before volunteer events, including the location, scope of work, needed tools, safety considerations, staff oversight, and expected outcomes.
- **Training and supervision**: Provide training and on-site supervision so that volunteer work meets City, land manager, and trail design standards and does not create future maintenance issues, safety concerns, or environmental impacts.
- **Coordination**: Coordinate volunteer work with the City's maintenance schedule so that volunteer efforts address priority needs and complement work completed by City staff, contractors, or agency partners.
- **Proper tools**: Equip volunteers with appropriate tools and personal protective equipment, and establish expectations for tool use, safety protocols, weather conditions, and when work should be postponed or stopped.

- **Documentation**: Use written agreements, waivers, and documentation to clarify roles, responsibilities, liability considerations, and expectations for both volunteers and partner organizations.
- **Weekend coordination**: When working with volunteers or partners, minimize weekend staffing needs by completing project layout and making technical decisions in advance, empowering trained volunteer crew leaders to oversee appropriate work, and consolidating volunteer activities into strategically scheduled workdays.
- **Tracking**: Track volunteer hours and accomplishments so the City can document the value of volunteer contributions, support future grant applications, and better understand ongoing stewardship capacity.
- **Recognition**: Recognize and communicate the value of volunteer contributions through public appreciation, stewardship events, and regular communication to help sustain long-term community ownership of the trail system.

Working with the State Trail Crews

In 2021, the State of Utah created four regional trail crews, housed within the Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation. Each crew is tasked with trail maintenance and rehabilitation, working to keep Utah's extensive trail networks in top condition. The trail crews work with a variety of stakeholders to ensure that Utah remains a desired force in outdoor recreation by developing world-class trail networks. Trail Crews work on both motorized and non-motorized trails throughout the state, typically doing a wide range week-long of restoration and maintenance work, including:

- Vegetation work
- Grooming
- Repair from erosion or wear & tear
- Re-routing
- Rock work or stair building
- Stabilization
- Emergency repair for a trail that is currently not usable
- Hazard tree removal
- Bridge work
- Sign installation
- Trailhead/kiosk

North Salt Lake is located within the Northern Trail Crew Region, based in Salt Lake City, and has worked with this Trail Crew in the past to maintain and restore the trails in North Salt Lake. The regional trail crew is a valuable resource for North Salt Lake and should be included in future trail maintenance and restoration plans.

Cost Considerations

Table 5 provides planning-level cost estimates for trail work, including initial flagging and design, construction, decommissioning, and ongoing maintenance.

Item	Planning Rate
Flagging & Design (layout)	$0.50 per linear foot
Purpose-built Construction – planning estimate	$6.00 per linear foot
Decommissioning	$2.00 per linear foot
Annual Maintenance – Mechanical	$2,000 per mile
Annual Maintenance – Hand crew	$1,200 per mile

Table 5. Planning-Level Cost Estimates

Planning level cost estimates for conceptual trail corridors are preliminary and should not be considered fixed construction costs. Actual costs may vary significantly based on final trail alignments, terrain, access, environmental conditions, construction methods, staff and contractor experience, material costs, crew availability, market conditions, and the type and number of specialty features included. Estimates should be refined as trail alignments and design details are developed. Key planning assumptions include:

- Planned trail corridors can tend to be around 10% shorter than built trail alignments. 10% should be added to corridor distances to ensure construction cost opinions are based on potential alignment lengths.
- Purpose-built construction may range between $2.00-$12.00 per linear foot. Costs are generally lower in simple, accessible terrain and higher in steep, rocky, remote, or technically challenging areas. $6.00 per linear foot is a reasonable estimate for the NSL Trail System.
- Trail decommissioning is estimated at $2.00 per linear foot where mini-excavator access is available. Trails that cannot be reached by machinery will require hand-crew work and may take several seasons to fully rehabilitate and revegetate.
- The condition of existing trails in North Salt Lake is unlikely to require machine maintenance work, which is also quite costly. The city should prioritize hand maintenance, particularly to leverage its volunteer base. Maintenance budgets should be higher during the initial years to address existing deficiencies and bring trails up to standard. Annual system-wide maintenance costs may decrease once the initial backlog has been addressed.

The table below outlines the design, construction, and maintenance costs for conceptual additions to the North Salt Lake Trails System in the Woodbriar and Wild Rose zones.

Trail Segment Label	Trail Name	Length (miles)	Design/ Flagging Cost	Construction Cost (Planning Estimate)	Annual Maintenance – Hand Crew
A	Woodbriar Trailhead to BST	2.00	$5,280	$63,360	$2,400
B	BST to Woodbriar Trailhead	1.90	$5,016	$60,192	$2,280
C	Woodbriar Trailhead to Sunset Point	0.70	$1,848	$22,176	$840
D	Sunset Point to BST connector	1.00	$2,640	$31,680	$1,200
E	BST to Wild Rose (downhill gravity trail)	1.30	$3,432	$41,184	$1,560
F	Wild Rose TH to BST (multi-use)	2.00	$5,280	$63,360	$2,400
N/A	All conceptual additions in Neighborhood Zone	0.28	$739	$8,870	$336
System Total		**9.18**	**$24,235**	**$290,822**	**$11,016**

Table 6: Trail Segment Cost Estimates

In order to maintain 7.40 miles of existing trails identified in Figure 3, annual hand crew maintenance costs are estimated at $8,880. These maintenance costs only include existing trails within the North Salt Lake Trail System (Wild Rose, Woodbriar, and Neighborhood Zones) and do not include the BST, which is maintained by Marion County. Machine maintenance is not anticipated to be needed at this time.

Lastly, it is recommended that $47,740 is budgeted for decommissioning the 4.52 miles of trails identified in Figure 3.

Planning recommendations also include a small trailhead in the Woodbriar Way area. At this conceptual stage, construction costs are difficult to predict accurately, particularly without survey, engineering, and site-specific design information. Using the improvements identified in this plan as a guide, a small, secondary trailhead is estimated to cost between approximately $125,000 and $250,000.

The lower end of the range assumes a basic gravel trailhead with survey and staking, site clearing, excavation and grading, aggregate surfacing, a concrete pad, revegetation, and signs or a kiosk. The upper end allows for additional improvements such as asphalt paving, parking delineation, and a vault toilet. Actual costs may vary based on final design, site conditions, utility needs, permitting requirements, material and labor costs, and market conditions at the time of construction.

Funding Options and Sources


Local Funding Options

North Salt Lake already has several municipal funding tools in place to help implement this plan's recommendations. The City levies a voter-approved Recreation, Arts, and Parks (RAP) tax (a 0.1% local sales tax authorized under Utah Code 59-12-1401) that provides dedicated annual funding for recreation, arts, and parks facilities, including trails. The City also holds general obligation (GO) bond authority, allowing it to ask voters to approve larger capital investments, such as new trailheads or trail construction, repaid over time through property taxes, similar to bonds recently used by other Wasatch Front communities. The City issued a bond in 2009 to finance the construction of Legacy Park, Tunnel Springs Park, and Wild Rose Trailhead Park, using the newly enacted RAP tax revenue to repay the bond. In addition, the City collects parks and trails impact fees on new development to help fund system improvements proportional to growth.

Given the strong community support for more direct trail funding identified through this planning process, the City should consider reaffirming and expanding the scope of the RAP tax to explicitly prioritize trail maintenance and capital needs, evaluating a future GO bond cycle tied to the priority trail projects identified in this plan, and evaluating its impact fee schedule to reflect the proposed trail mileage and facilities recommended here.

External Grants

To supplement local and municipal funding sources, the City of North Salt Lake could apply for the following grant and funding sources to implement the recommendations of this Trails Master Plan. Grant regulations, funding amounts, and relevant projects differ and may change over time.



Wild Rose Trail in Fall

Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant (UORG)

Granting Organization: Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation

Grant Information: https://recreation.utah.gov/grants/utah-outdoor-recreation-grant/

The Utah Outdoor Recreation Grant (UORG) program supports the development of outdoor recreation infrastructure that expands public recreation opportunities, improves quality of life, and strengthens local and regional recreation assets. The program regularly funds trail construction, trailhead development, wayfinding systems, and recreation access improvements. There are three tiered funding categories; each funding category has slightly different purposes and application requirements.

Funding Amounts

- Mini-Grant - Up to $30,000
- Tier 1 - $30,001 - $500,000
- Regional Asset Tier - $500,001 - $1,000,000

Grant Program Regulations & Guidance

- Applicants must be eligible public entities, nonprofit organizations, tribal governments, or other approved entities.
- Projects must provide a publicly accessible recreation benefit.
- Sliding scale match suggests a 50/50 match for municipalities in Davis County.
- Grant-funded improvements must remain available for their intended public recreation purpose.
- Applicable environmental review, permitting, and procurement requirements must be satisfied.
- Projects are evaluated based on:
  - Community need, buy-in and economic impact
  - Recreational value
  - Project readiness
  - Improved physical and recreational access
  - Budget clarity and project costs
  - Special consideration for areas with clear needs

Potential North Salt Lake Applications

- BST connections
- Wild Rose Trail system improvements
- New trailheads and access points
- Wayfinding and interpretive signage
- Accessibility improvements

Recreation Restoration Infrastructure Grant (RRI)

Granting Organization: Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation

Grant Information: https://recreation.utah.gov/grants/recreation-restoration-infrastructure-grant/

RRI funds are available to address the need to restore, repair and/or replace aging or degraded outdoor recreation infrastructure located on public lands, including trails, campground/picnic sites, water recreation infrastructure, and accessible outdoor recreation facilities.

Funding Amount: $5,000 - $250,000

Grant Program Regulations & Guidance

- The infrastructure must be on publicly owned lands, which can be city, county, state or federally owned and managed. If on federal or state-managed lands, coordination with the appropriate land management is essential.
- Projects must focus on restoration, rehabilitation, or repair activities, going beyond basic or recurring maintenance. Projects must address critical issues related to safety, user experience, and the prevention of damage to natural and cultural resources.
- Competitive RRI applications include: eligible projects, fully planned and ready for implementation, specific plans and/or locations for work to be completed, an estimated timeline, established partnerships, and letters of support from associated land managers.
- Funded facilities must be publicly accessible.
- Environmental compliance and permitting requirements apply.
- Sliding scale match suggests a 50/50 match for municipalities in Davis County.

Potential North Salt Lake Applications

- Trail tread stabilization
- Drainage and erosion control projects
- Rehabilitation of degraded trail segments
- Social trail closure and restoration
- Trailhead rehabilitation
- Resource protection projects

Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

Granting Organization: Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation (Federal Highway Administration Funding)

Grant Information: https://recreation.utah.gov/grants/recreational-trails-program/

The Recreational Trails Program provides federal funding for the construction, restoration, and maintenance of motorized, non-motorized, and diverse-use trails and trailside facilities. While managed by the Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation, projects that receive this federal funding are subject to environmental regulations, labor practices, and other federal regulations.

Funding Amount: $10,000 - $200,000

Grant Program Regulations & Guidance

- Projects must serve public recreational trail use. Motorized and non-motorized projects are both accepted and evaluated separately.
- All RTP projects require a NEPA review regardless of the applicant or project location. NEPA studies completed within 18 months of the project start date are eligible for use as local match for the project, though these costs are not reimbursable.
- Accessibility standards must be met where applicable.
- Local match of at least 20% is required.
- Projects funded typically address one or more of the following categories:
  - Development and maintenance: trails, crews, facilities, signage
  - Equipment purchase: maintenance, grooming, construction
  - Education: publications, programming
  - Acquisition: easements, fee-simple
- A high scoring application will likely exhibit budget clarity, community involvement, partnerships, vision, and problem solving.

Potential North Salt Lake Applications

- New trail construction
- Trail reconstruction and rehabilitation
- Trail bridges and drainage improvements
- ADA-accessible trail improvements
- Trailhead facilities
- Trail education and stewardship infrastructure

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

Granting Organization: Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) / Federal Highway Administration

Grant Information: https://wfrc.utah.gov/funding/transportation-project-funding/tap/

The Transportation Alternatives Program funds the planning and construction of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects that improve transportation choice, accessibility, and connectivity.

Funding Amount

By population formula, the federal government currently apportions approximately $1,000,000 in TAP funds each year to the Ogden-Layton Urban Area.

Grant Program Regulations & Guidance

- Funds may be used for planning, design, and construction of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
- Funding eligibility includes Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects.
- Projects must be included within applicable transportation planning processes.
- In order for the WFRC staff to recommend whether a sponsor should submit an application, the “Letter of Intent” must include the project name, project limits, a brief project description, and an estimated total project cost.

Potential North Salt Lake Applications

- Neighborhood-to-trail connections
- Shared-use pathways
- Improved access routes to trailheads
- Crossings serving trail users
- Connections to schools and parks
- Active transportation connections to the regional trail system

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)

Granting Organization: Utah Division of Outdoor Recreation, Federal Funding

Grant Information: https://recreation.utah.gov/grants/land-water-conservation-fund/

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) provides funding for the acquisition and development of outdoor recreation spaces. Through LWCF grants, communities can protect public lands, create parks, and improve recreational facilities in order to expand access to outdoor recreation, preserve natural landscapes, and ensure that these resources are available for future generations.

Funding Amount: $200,000 - $2,000,000

Grant Program Regulations & Guidance

- Funded properties must remain dedicated to public outdoor recreation use in perpetuity.
- A 50/50 match is required.
- Project categories typically include property acquisition to expand and enhance public outdoor recreation opportunities, conserve natural resources, and protect cultural and historic sites; the development of public outdoor recreation facilities; or a combination of both.
- NEPA requires grant applications to undergo an environmental and cultural/historical review process before receiving federal approval. A NEPA pathway must be established before the issuing of a contract.
- Compliance with the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan is required.
- Maintenance of the project is the sole responsibility of the grant awardee.

Potential North Salt Lake Applications

- Trailhead development
- Park-to-trail connections
- Open space access improvements
- Recreation facilities supporting trail use
- Regional recreation amenities



Prioritization Plan

5-Year Prioritization Plan

The recommendations in this Master Plan are intended to transform the North Salt Lake trail system into a more sustainable, cohesive, and easier-to-manage recreational asset. The overall strategy builds upon the core recommendations developed throughout the planning process: improving trail network design, enhancing trail conditions across the system and to the BST, reducing unsanctioned trail development, strengthening wayfinding, improving user management, promoting stewardship, and increasing coordination with neighboring jurisdictions and the United States Forest Service.

This prioritization plan outlines a five-year roadmap for how these strategies can be carried through from ideas through implementation. The implementation of many of the strategies below can and should occur simultaneously, but specific actions can be chosen a la carte to develop and enhance the trail system. Early actions should emphasize maintenance, wayfinding, trail stewardship, and closure of unsustainable routes. These projects are highly visible, relatively low cost, and provide immediate benefits to trail users while building support for more complex future investments. Once these foundational actions are underway, the City can advance environmental review and funding efforts necessary to implement new trail connections, trailhead improvements, and purpose-built trail facilities.

The roadmap below provides an outline for recommended phasing, but the timing of these actions may shift or occur simultaneously due to budgets, staff availability, and timing of environmental review.

Year 1: Stabilize and Build Trust

Year 2: Advance Planning and Environmental Compliance

Year 3: Complete Design

Year 4: Build Access and Connectivity

Year 5: Complete Signature Projects

Year 1: Stabilize and Build Trust

Goals: Address the most visible deficiencies in the current system, establish a consistent management framework, and initiate long-term planning actions.

Design and construction of the Wild Rose to BST Connector

- Complete design and construction of the connector trail between Wild Rose and the BST to replace the small section of user trail and improve connectivity between these two trails.

System-wide maintenance

- Address deferred maintenance backlog. All trails should be considered as part of the annual maintenance program.
- Prioritize high-use trails, drainage issues, vegetation management, and trail safety concerns.
- Establish annual maintenance standards and inspection protocols that include the Trails Committee.

Wayfinding and signage improvements

- Continue working to develop a unified North Salt Lake trail branding and signage program.
- Install directional signs at major intersections.
- Update trailhead maps and improve regulatory signage.
- Coordinate official trail information with digital mapping platforms.

Visitor management measures

- Install trail counters.
- Begin monitoring trailheads and conflict areas, focusing on Wild Rose.

Early social trail closures

- Begin closure and restoration of the highest priority unsustainable routes in Wild Rose and Woodbriar Zones.
- Use signage and public outreach to explain restoration objectives.

Initiate NEPA process and coordinate with neighboring municipalities

- Initiate the NEPA process for projects occurring on USFS lands. Coordinate with the USFS regarding permitting requirements and management expectations.
- Develop and submit Project Proposal Letter (PPL) for submission to the USFS.
- See Appendix D: NEPA Process: Environmental Assessments and Categorical Exclusions for more information.

Partnership development and grant readiness

- Formalize collaboration with the USFS, Davis County, Salt Lake City, and Bountiful, particularly around maintenance responsibilities and new trail projects.
- Explore outreach and partnerships with trail organizations and volunteer stewardship groups.

Year 2: Advance Planning and Environmental Compliance

Goal: Prepare for future capital investments while continuing visible on-the-ground improvements.

Complete NEPA Process

- Complete the environmental review process and advance the project through final analysis in coordination with the USFS.
- Address any remaining environmental, cultural, biological, or design-related requirements identified during the review.
- Obtain the necessary USFS decision and approvals to allow final design and implementation to move forward.

Expand trail closures, restoration, and NSL reroutes

- Continue decommissioning and revegetation of redundant and unsustainable trails throughout the system and in the Neighborhood Zone.
- Pursue Neighborhood Zone improvements, including options with the HOA to consider rerouting trail and relocating trailhead.

Grant and funding pursuit

- Pursue federal, state, and recreation grant opportunities. Engage adjacent municipalities as potential partners and build partnerships and coalitions with different trail groups.
- Develop funding packages for trailhead facilities, connectors, and purpose-built trail construction.

Year 3: Complete Design

Goal: Move from planning into implementation readiness.

Preconstruction design

- Refine conceptual trail corridors within Wild Rose and Woodbriar.
- Complete trail flagging and field-based alignment reviews.
- Finalize trailhead concepts and access improvements.

Continue maintenance and monitoring

- Maintain the system-wide maintenance program established in Years 1 and 2.
- Use trail counter and any user feedback data to adjust priorities.

Year 4: Build Access and Connectivity

Goal: Deliver the first major capital improvements.

Begin to construct purpose-built trail opportunities

- Develop the recommended downhill bicycle trail experiences in Wild Rose and Woodbriar. Trailhead construction can be phased alongside purpose-built trail construction if desired.

Construct key connector routes

- Prioritize trail segments that improve connectivity to the BST and create sustainable loop opportunities.
- Implement additional use-separation strategies

Improve management of directional and single-use trails where recommended.

- Install associated signage and trail-control features at key intersections.

Year 5: Complete Signature Projects

Goal: Deliver the highest-value recreation investments identified in the Master Plan.

Continue to construct purpose-built trail opportunities

- Develop the recommended downhill bicycle trail experiences in Wild Rose and Woodbriar.
- Complete remaining priority trail connections identified through prior phases.

Construct trailheads and portal improvements

- Develop trailhead access improvements, including potential Woodbriar trailhead enhancements. Trailhead construction can be phased alongside purpose-built trail construction if desired.
- Improve visitor orientation and system entry points.

System optimization

- Evaluate effectiveness of trail closures, visitor management strategies, signage, and maintenance investments.
- Update priorities based on monitoring results and user demand.



Appendix

Appendix A: Spring Community Engagement Summary

Introduction

The North Salt Lake Trails Master Plan online Visioning Survey was available to the public from April 23rd – May 17th. This survey was advertised through digital and print channels, as well as at several in-person engagement events. This survey was supplemented by printed engagement boards to capture in-person feedback, which is included in this summary. The survey received 320 total responses; 239 complete, and 81 partial, all of which are included in this summary. Approximately 25 individuals provided in-person feedback.

Key Takeaways and Themes

- **Hiking/walking and mountain biking are the two most common activities on the NSL trail system**. Hiking/walking is an activity that was reported most frequently by all users, but when asked which activity they did the most, mountain biking was most common.
- **The NSL trails are used frequently**; 36% of survey respondents report using the trails "a few times per week," followed by "a few times a month" and "daily."
- **The majority of users drive to the trails** and often use the trails with friends or family or alone. Just over one-third of respondents report using the trails with a pet.
- **More than three-quarters of respondents were "satisfied" or "very satisfied"** with the current trail system.
- **The BST and Wild Rose Trail** were the two most popular trails. A common concern and suggestion among respondents was to improve the connection between these two trails, as the current connection is very steep and challenging.
- **E-motorcycles, a lack of signage, user conflicts between bikes and pedestrians, dogs, and dog poop** were the most common concerns voiced by survey respondents.
- **The majority of survey respondents are residents of North Salt Lake and are primarily in the 35 – 64 age range.** There is less representation of users under 34 or over 65.

Trail Access & Usage

How often do you use the trails in this area?

Survey respondents most commonly use the trails “a few times per week” (36%), followed by “a few times per month" (29%), and “daily” (20%). Only 15% of respondents use the trails “a few times per year” and only 2 respondents (1%) never use them.

Value	Percent	Responses
Daily	19.6%	62
A few times per week	35.6%	113
A few times per month	29.0%	92
A few times per year	15.1%	48
I've never used these trails	0.6%	2
	Totals: 317	

Who do you typically use the trails with? Please select all that apply.

Survey respondents most commonly use the trails with friends or family (79%) and alone (57%). More than one-third of respondents (38%) reported using the trails with a pet, and nearly a quarter (23%) reported using the trails with children under the age of 10. Only 7% (23 respondents) reported using the trails with adults aged 65 or older, and 2% (7 respondents) reported using the trails with individuals with physical disabilities.

13 of the 17 respondents who selected “other” wrote in comments about biking, predominantly with mountain biking teams. Additional comments included mentions of a service dog and horses.

Value	Percent	Responses
Alone	57.4%	182
With a pet	37.5%	119
With friends or family	78.9%	250
With children under the age of 10	22.7%	72
With adults over the age of 65	7.3%	23
With individuals with physical disabilities	2.2%	7
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	5.4%	17

How do you typically get to the trails in this area? Please select your most common transportation method.

More than half of all respondents reported driving to access the NSL trails (54%). Just over a quarter (28%) reported biking, while 18% reported walking. The two "other" responses reported running to the trails.

Value	Percent	Responses
Walk	17.8%	57
Bike	27.5%	88
Drive	54.1%	173
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	0.6%	2

Totals: 320

What types of activities do you engage in on these trails? Choose all that apply.

The majority of survey respondents report hiking and walking (77%) and mountain biking (62%) on the NSL trails. Approximately one third of respondents also report walking a dog (39%) and trail running (33%). Winter usage is moderate, including snowshoeing (12%) and written comments including hiking with spikes, backcountry skiing, and snow biking. Only two respondents (1%) reported horseback riding. Other written comments included several mentions of birding and wildlife viewing/sightseeing, hunting access, and road biking.

Value	Percent	Responses
Hiking/walking	77.3%	245
Walking a dog	38.8%	123
Mountain biking	61.5%	195
Trail running	33.1%	105
Horseback riding	0.6%	2
Snowshoeing	12.0%	38
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	3.8%	12

What activity do you do most often on these trails? Choose one.

When users were asked to select their most common activity, the top response was mountain biking (45%), followed by hiking/walking (34%). Trail running (11%) and walking a dog (10%) were less common, and only one respondent listed horseback riding as their top activity. Written comments included birding and road biking.

Value	Percent	Responses
Hiking/walking	33.6%	107
Walking a dog	9.4%	30
Mountain biking	45.0%	143
Trail running	11.0%	35
Horseback riding	0.3%	1
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	0.6%	2
		Totals: 318

Trail-Specific Questions

What is your favorite trail in the area?

The **Bonneville Shoreline Trail** (BST) was the most popular among respondents (34%), followed by **Wild Rose Trail (upper)** (22%) and **Wild Rose Trail (middle/lower)** (20%). Tunnel Springs trail was listed as a favorite by 13% of respondents, while Woodbriar Trails received 4% and Springhill/Gregerson Trail received 1%.

Written comments included eight mentions of the Lost Lad trail, two mentions of Mueller Park, and Wild Rose to Dude Peak. Several comments listed "all of them," with one mention each of Foxboro trails, Summerwood, Hidden Lake switchbacks, future connector to BST, and one comment asking for better trails.


Value	Percent	Responses
Bonneville Shoreline Trail	33.5%	105
Tunnel Springs Trail	12.5%	39
Wild Rose Trail (upper)	22.4%	70
Wild Rose Trail (middle/lower)	20.1%	63
Springhill/Gregerson Trail	0.6%	2
Woodbriar Trails	3.5%	11
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	7.3%	23
		Totals: 313

On the in-person engagement boards, "favorite trail" stickers were placed at the Tunnel Springs trailhead, on the Wild Rose trail, at Woodbriar Way Trailhead, and along the Eagle Crest trail.

Please click on the map to identify: Where you typically access the trail network (trailhead, parking lot, etc.)

Respondents left 182 "most common access point pins on the map," with the most common access points at the Wild Rose Trailhead, followed by the Tunnel Springs Park. Respondents were


able to leave comments with their pins, and several left elaborations or clarifications on their specific access points. On the in-person engagement boards, the majority of "access point" stickers were placed at the Wild Rose Trailhead, with a few at Tunnel Springs Park and the Hidden Lakes ("Summerwood") Trailhead.



Please click on the map to identify: Area(s) that need additional maintenance

Respondents left 62 "maintenance needed" pins on the map, the majority of which were located at or near the Wild Rose Trailhead, as well as in the Tunnel Springs section of the trail system. Respondents could leave comments with the pins they placed, and 23 did; their comments are listed in the table below with approximate locations. On the in-person engagement boards, two "maintenance needed" stickers were placed at Woodbriar Way Trailhead and along Lost the Lad trail.

View Answer Option: Maintenance need




Approx. Location	Comment
Wild Rose Trailhead	Signage is terrible! You can't tell if you're in a bike or hiking trail. This is super dangerous! And all the signs are faded. Even All trails is confused.
Wild Rose Upper	There is a steep, loose uphill at the start of "Wild Rose Overlook (Upper) that would be nice to have trail rerouted with switch backs for easier use and access.
Wild Rose/BST Connection	Existing connection from wild to BST is steep and rocky.
Wild Rose/BST Connection	The connection to the BST needs to be reworked. It is to steep and loose.
Wild Rose/BST Connection	This section is very steep and requires a hike a bike. It would be nice to have some switchbacks.
Wild Rose/BST Connection	Super steep
Wild Rose Loop	Sometime last year some 'trailwork' was done on the original wild rose trail loop and it was absolutely unnecessary. I imagine it was a youth group or event or something but they dug drains where they were not needed and now the trail condition is much worse which is really unfortunate because the trail was built so well with universal design in mind and used grade reversals and modern techniques very well. But instead of there just being light maintenance done there was real damage done. It would be great to engage whoever did this and work to educate the entire trail using community on trail design and what actually needs maintenance vs what doesn't.

Chukar Loop	The signs for Chukar Loop are unclear. I keep having bikers argue with me when I tell them it's only a foot path.
Tunnel Springs Park	The gate at the back of tunnel springs Park is always muddy.
Tunnel Springs Trailhead	Would be nice to have a trash can at the gate entering the meadow.
Tunnel Springs Trailhead	It would be great to have gravel added to the trail from the trailhead to the first hill (southbound from Tunnel Springs to the cell tower).
Springhill Geologic Park	Washed out
Woodbriar Trailhead	Create a “FOOT TRAFFIC ONLY” trail system. Mountain bikers are terrorizing hikers on low visibility trails at high speeds. ENOUGH mountain bikers trails! It’s time to honor the reason these trails exist: HIKERS!
Woodbriar/BST Intersection	Washed out
Tunnel Springs Trails	A lot of dog poop along the trails and off leash dogs
Tunnel Springs Trails	Tunnel Springs (like all trails) has many off-leash dogs, uncollected dog waste, and dog waste bags on the ground.
Tunnel Springs/BST	I think there is a very large need for collaboration with SLC and with UOL (utah open lands) most people do not understand what the Bonn. shoreline preserve is and that it only exists because it was protected by a conservation easement through utah open lands, otherwise it would likely be more homes. People treat it like any thing but a conservation easement. Mtn bike teams are building unauthorized trails, folks have dogs off leash primarily, the amount of family's with portraits taken off trail must be in the 10000's at this point, and unfortunately now we are seeing e-moto usage too. Anyway, but opportunity for engagement and education here.
Tunnel Springs/BST	Erosion. The trail has increased dramatically because when it is muddy, traffic will use the edges that push it out and widen the trail footprint
Tunnel Springs/BST	The whole first section of the BST from tunnel springs Park needs some grading and maybe some fences to prevent trail widening
Tunnel Springs/BST	More signs for the trail that goes over to SLV
Hidden Lakes Trailhead	Motorcycles, trucks and atv's have been accessing this area and causing damage, just up from the trailhead.

Please click on the map to identify: Area(s) where you would like to see additional trail connections. You can place as many markers as applicable.

Respondents left 74 “opportunity for trail connection” pins on the map, many of which were concentrated at Woodbriar Way and on the Wild Rose Trail. Respondents were able to leave comments with the pins that they placed, and 23 respondents did; their comments are listed in the table below with approximate locations. The most common comment was about better connections between the Wild Rose trail and the BST to replace the current steep, dangerous connector (11 comments). On the in-person engagement boards, “additional trail connection” stickers were placed at the Wild Rose/BST connection, at the Woodbriar Way trailhead and in the drainage above, and at Springhill Geologic Park.

View Answer Option: Opportunity for trail conn



Approx. Location	Comment
Wild Rose/BST	The trail from wild rose to BST has a trail that is really steep. I would love to see switch backs put in on that section to make it more rideable on Mtn bikes.
Wild Rose/BST	We need a better connector from Wild Rose up to the BST. The super steep rocky trail from the bench up to the trail is not rideable by most.
Wild Rose/BST	Hike a bike section needs a better connection
Wild Rose/BST	Hike a bike needs a better connector
Wild Rose/BST	I would love this to become a sanctioned trail allowing access from Wild Rose towards the far end of tunnel springs
Wild Rose/BST	Connect wild rose with bst
Wild Rose/BST	It would be great to see the BST connected from davis county over to BST hell canyon
Wild Rose/BST	BST just ends here
Wild Rose/BST	Biggest need is to fix the connection between wild rose and bonneville shoreline where it is really rocky and steep
Wild Rose/BST	The biggest pain point on the trail system. Connecting wild rose to BST.
Wild Rose/BST	Extend BST south to connect to SLC. The south access from wild Rose is too steep and loose.
Eagle Ridge	Make a formal trail head that doesn't require entrance into the apartment complex
Woodbriar/Wild Rose	Opportunities for downhill mountain bike trails coming off BST into wild roses and/or woodbriar to relieve some of the traffic on BST.

Woodbriar Trailhead	Parking for access would be great
Woodbriar/Lost Lad	The trail here up to lost lad is really steep. Switchbacks would be awesome.
BST	Link the bst from the south
Tunnel Springs Trails	Better connector
Tunnel Springs Trails	Lots of potential for sanctioned bike trails
Tunnel Springs Trails	A connector from wild rose to tunnel springs would be amazing
Tunnel Springs Trails	The two main things I have an issue with our dog poop and dog poop bags being left on the trail and illegal E motorcycles, E dirt bikes being used on the trail
Lost Lad	Better access to the trails on the south side such as "Lost Lad" etc...

Trail Concerns & Improvements

What specific concerns do you have related to the trails in this project area? Please check your top three concerns

The most common concern listed by respondents was poor trail surface quality (rutting, potholing) (26%), followed by “Other” (22%), difficulty getting where I want to go/trails are not well connected (22%), off-leash dogs (22%), user conflicts (21%), and trash (20%).

The most common “other” write-in comments included concerns about dog poop (10) and bicycle user conflicts with hikers or equestrians (6).

Additional comments made by several users included:

- better signage and wayfinding, especially for restricted or directional trails
- dedicated off-leash dog areas
- better connection from Wild Rose to BST
- more trails and better trail connectivity
- directional mountain biking trails
- poor trail design and minimal maintenance
- vegetation growth and invasive species

Value	Percent	Responses
Poor trail surface quality (rutting, potholing)	25.6%	62
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	22.3%	54
Difficulty getting where I want to go / trails are not well connected	21.9%	53
Off-leash dogs	21.5%	52
User conflicts	21.1%	51
Trash	19.8%	48
Erosion or trampled vegetation near trails	18.2%	44
Wayfinding confusion or difficulty	14.5%	35
User created trails (informal/social trails)	12.8%	31
Difficulty accessing trails on foot or bike from nearby neighborhoods	9.1%	22
Difficulty finding parking	8.3%	20
Graffiti and/or crime	4.1%	10
Human encounters with wildlife	2.9%	7

Have you experienced the following conflicts with trail users? Please check all that apply.

The most common conflict reported was between bikers and pedestrians (38%), followed by conflicts involving dogs off- or on-leash (34%). More than a quarter of respondents (27%) indicated that they had not experienced any conflicts. Conflicts involving e-bikes (20%), crowding (20%), and motorized vehicles (15%) were also concerns for some respondents. Conflicts related to equestrians were among the lowest, with equestrian and bike conflicts reported by 7% of respondents, and conflicts between pedestrians and equestrians reported by 3% of respondents.

Written comments included many conflicts related to e-motorcycles riding on the trails, bikers accidentally riding hiking-only trails or not yielding to pedestrians, and dog poop.


Value	Percent	Responses
Conflict between bikers and pedestrians	37.8%	95
Conflict between pedestrians and equestrians	3.2%	8
Conflict between equestrians and bikers	6.8%	17
Conflict involving dogs off- or on-leash	33.9%	85
Conflict involving motorized vehicles (4x4, OHV, etc.)	15.1%	38
Conflict involving e-bikes	20.3%	51
Crowding	19.5%	49
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	7.6%	19
None/Not applicable	26.7%	67

Overall, how satisfied are you with this trail system?

Three-quarters of respondents reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the trail system. Approximately 19% of respondents were “neutral,” followed by 4% being “dissatisfied” and 1% (2 respondents) being “very dissatisfied.”

Value	Percent	Responses
Very satisfied	25.4%	66
Satisfied	50.4%	131
Neutral	19.2%	50
Dissatisfied	4.2%	11
Very satisfied	0.8%	2
	Totals: 260	

If you have ever used the social trails in this map, please tell us why. Please check all that apply.



The most common reason for using social trails on the map was “I didn’t realize they weren’t official trails” (40%), followed by 26% of respondents indicating that they have never used the social trails. Other common reasons included “they are less crowded” (25%), “there are no formal trail connections to the places I want to go” (21%), and “they are more scenic” (21%).

Written comments highlighted reasons including inconsistent or confusing signage (signs for social trails), online trail maps not distinguishing between official and social trails, users with dogs avoiding heavily-trafficked bike trails, extensive use leading social trails to look like official trails, social trails providing better biking terrain, and the need for more and better connections to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

Value	Percent	Responses
They provide a more direct route	17.9%	42
There are no formal trail connections to the places I want to go	21.4%	50
They are less crowded	24.8%	58
They feel more natural or less developed	19.7%	46
They are more challenging (steeper, technical, etc.)	17.1%	40
They are more scenic	20.9%	49
They are closer to my home or access point	8.5%	20
I didn't realize they weren't official trails	39.7%	93
I have never used the social trails	26.1%	61
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	6.8%	16

What types of improvements would you like to see in the trail system? Select your top three:

The most common improvement selected by respondents was “additional trails in the area” (46%), followed by “better connections to other trails” (35%), “better wayfinding and signage” (28%), and “improved conditions of existing trails” (24%).

Value	Percent	Responses
Improved conditions of existing trails (e.g., surfacing)	24.0%	56
Improved maintenance of existing trails (vegetation overgrowth, trash, etc.)	21.5%	50
Safer design (visibility, separation of trail uses, etc.)	12.0%	28
Reduced user conflicts on trails	13.7%	32
Fewer informal social / user-created trails	6.9%	16
Protection of the natural resources and landscape around trails	21.5%	50
Better wayfinding and signage	28.3%	66
Better access to existing trails	16.7%	39
Better connections to other trails	35.2%	82
Direct connections to bike lanes, paved paths, etc.	6.0%	14
Additional trails in the area	46.4%	108
Improvements to trailheads (e.g., bike racks, picnic tables, drinking fountains, restrooms, bike repair stations)	11.2%	26
Additional parking at trailheads	6.4%	15

Do you have any other feedback or suggestions you'd like to share?

There were 118 survey respondents who left open-ended feedback to this question, the majority of which can be summarized into the following themes:

Expand trails and improve connections

Many respondents want more trails and better links between Wild Rose, Tunnel Springs, BST, Mueller Park, Bountiful, and Salt Lake City. The Wild Rose-to-BST connection was repeatedly called out as too steep, rocky, or unrideable.

Reduce user conflict through trail design

People suggested more separated-use or directional trails, including hiking-only routes, MTB-only trails, downhill bike trails, and clearer routing to spread out users and reduce crowding.

Improve enforcement and safety

A major concern is safety related to off-leash dogs, fast bikes, e-bikes, e-motorcycles, youth riders, and unclear right-of-way behavior. Respondents asked for more enforcement, penalties, police presence, and etiquette education.

Address dogs, waste, and cleanliness

Dog poop, abandoned poop bags, and off-leash dogs were among the most frequent complaints. Many asked for better signage, leash-law enforcement, and more cleanup expectations.

Add amenities, signage, and maintenance

Respondents requested better wayfinding, clearer bike/hike signage, wildlife or history signs, trail app updates, improved connector trails, traction improvements, shade or water, and kid-focused MTB amenities like pump tracks or skills parks.

Preserve open space while continuing investment

Many expressed gratitude for the trails and support for continued investment, but also emphasized protecting natural beauty, wildlife, vegetation, public access, and preventing development from encroaching on the mountains and trails.

Demographics

What is your age?

The most common age group who responded to the survey was 45 – 54 (36%), followed by 35 – 44 (26%), and 55 – 64 (16%); respondents aged 35 – 64 accounted for over three quarters (78%) of all respondents. There were notably very few respondents under the age of 24 or over the age of 65, which highlights a gap in information on trail priorities and needs with the youth and older adults who live in North Salt Lake or use these trails.

Value	Percent	Responses
17 or younger	5.4%	13
18 to 24	0.8%	2
25 to 34	10.0%	24
35 to 44	25.5%	61
45 to 54	36.4%	87
55 to 64	15.9%	38
65 to 74	4.2%	10
75 or older	1.7%	4
	Totals: 239	

Where do you live?

More than half of all respondents (56%) live within the city of North Salt Lake. An additional 36% live elsewhere in Davis County, while 5% live in Salt Lake County, and 3% live elsewhere in Utah. 1% of respondents (2 people) live outside of Utah.

Value	Percent	Responses
North Salt Lake	56.1%	134
Elsewhere in Davis County	35.6%	85
Salt Lake County	5.0%	12
Elsewhere in Utah	2.5%	6
Outside of Utah	0.8%	2
	Totals: 239	

Appendix B: Summer 2026 Survey Analysis

Introduction

The Summer 2026 Trails Master Plan Survey was open from June 26th to July 17th to gauge community preferences around recommended management tools, funding sources, and trail improvements to include in the Trails Master Plan. This survey was available for residents and trail users to fill out online and was advertised through a mix of online and print formats. In total, 79 people responded to the survey.

Key Takeaways

- **Residents want continued investment in expanding and improving the trail system.** Expanding the trail system was ranked as the highest management priority, followed closely by maintaining and improving existing trails and facilities. Open-ended comments also emphasized new trail connections, loop opportunities, better trailhead access, and stronger regional connectivity.
- **There is strong support for practical management tools that improve safety and reduce conflicts.** Respondents showed the highest levels of support for improved signage on shared trails, designated uphill/downhill bike trails where feasible, and increased enforcement of trail use rules and etiquette.
- **Respondents appear willing to support dedicated investment in trail improvements**. The strongest funding support was for establishing new local funding mechanisms, followed closely by pursuing outside funding through grants and donations, while lower-cost volunteer-led improvements received the least support, suggesting that residents favor a more proactive investment approach.
- **Dog management, trail etiquette, and user conflicts are key issues to address.** Many open-ended comments focused on conflicts among hikers, bikers, dog owners, and other users, with repeated concerns about off-leash dogs, dog waste, safety, and enforcement.
- **Trail users value trails primarily as places to connect with nature and stay active.** When asked what features would be most important in new trails, respondents most frequently selected opportunities to connect to nature and opportunities to get exercise.

Question Breakdowns

What is your primary activity on these trails? Choose one.

The most common response among survey respondents was hiking/walking (41.8%), followed by mountain biking (31.6%). Trail running was selected by 12.7% of respondents, and walking a dog was selected by 11.4% of respondents. One respondent (1.3%) selected horseback riding, and one respondent selected "other" and wrote in "Gravel Biking."

Other: Gravel Biking

Value	Percent	Responses
Hiking/walking	41.8%	33
Walking a dog	11.4%	9
Mountain biking	31.6%	25
Trail running	12.7%	10
Horseback riding	1.3%	1
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	1.3%	1
		Totals: 79

The plan must balance management needs across the study area. Please rank the following management priorities from 1 (Highest Priority) to 6 (Lowest Priority).

Respondents were asked to rank six different management strategies in order of priority. The response with the highest rank was "**expanding the trail system (formalizing social trails or adding new trails or trailheads)**", followed closely by "**maintaining and improving existing trails and facilities.**" Respondents placed "improving connectivity of trails to regional trail systems or neighborhoods" in the middle of the rankings, with "protecting natural resources and wildlife habitat" and "improving wayfinding, signage, and stewardship" somewhat lower; "increasing enforcement to improve safety and compliance" ranked last by a significant margin.

Item	Overall Rank	Rank Distribution	Score	No. of Rankings
Expanding the trail system (formalizing social trails or adding new trails or trailheads)	1		329	77
Maintaining and improving existing trails and facilities	2		318	76
Improving connectivity of trails to regional trail systems or neighborhoods	3		298	74
Protecting natural resources and wildlife habitat	4		281	76
Improving wayfinding, signage, and stewardship	5		231	75
Increasing enforcement to improve safety and compliance	6		147	75



To help reduce user conflicts and resource impacts, to what extent would you support or oppose each of the following potential management actions on the trails in this area?

Respondents showed the strongest support for improved signage on shared trails, with 84.6% indicating they “support” or “strongly support” this action. Designating directional bike trails also received strong support (80.7%), followed by increased enforcement of existing trail use rules (71.8%).

Restrictions on certain uses received slightly lower support. A majority of respondents supported restricting e-bikes or motorized use on specific trails (64.1%). Converting existing trails to single-use designations was more mixed, though still supported by over half of respondents. 56.4% supported or strongly supported converting trails to hike-only use, while 23.1% opposed or strongly opposed it. By comparison, 53.9% supported or strongly supported converting trails to bike-only use, while 32.1% opposed or strongly opposed it.

When considering rules around leashed dogs, more respondents favored increased enforcement of existing rules (51.3% “support” or “strongly support”) rather than designating specific trails as off-leash areas (42% “support” or “strongly support”).

	Strongly oppose	Oppose	Neither oppose nor support	Support	Strongly support	Responses
Convert some existing trails to hike-only Count Row %	8 10.3%	10 12.8%	16 20.5%	22 28.2%	22 28.2%	78
Convert some existing trails to bike-only Count Row %	12 15.4%	13 16.7%	11 14.1%	24 30.8%	18 23.1%	78
Designate separate uphill/downhill bike trails where feasible Count Row %	4 5.1%	0 0.0%	11 14.1%	31 39.7%	32 41.0%	78
Increase enforcement of leashed dog rules Count Row %	8 10.3%	12 15.4%	18 23.1%	11 14.1%	29 37.2%	78
Designate specific trails as off-leash areas Count Row %	15 19.2%	12 15.4%	18 23.1%	26 33.3%	7 9.0%	78
Restrict or prohibit e-bikes and motorized use on certain trails Count Row %	7 9.0%	8 10.3%	13 16.7%	18 23.1%	32 41.0%	78
Improve signage on shared trails Count Row %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 15.4%	39 50.0%	27 34.6%	78
Increase enforcement of trail use rules (trail etiquette, trail use, Leave No Trace, etc.) Count Row %	1 1.3%	1 1.3%	20 25.6%	35 44.9%	21 26.9%	78
Totals Total Responses						78

The City is exploring dedicated funding streams for trail improvements. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about potential funding mechanisms.

Over 66% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that "The City should establish **new local funding mechanisms** to guarantee funding for trail improvements (e.g., bond measure(s), new dedicated local tax)." Outside funding was also supported by survey respondents: 65% agreed or strongly agreed that "The City should prioritize pursuing **outside funding** for trail improvements (such as grants and donations) over spending local funds, even if it means funding will not be guaranteed."

The option "The City should reallocate existing local funds away from other budget area to guarantee funding for trail improvements" received a moderate amount of support (59.8%), and the option "The City should prioritize lower-cost trail improvement projects that can be completed

primarily by volunteers, even if it means that larger projects cannot be completed" received the least amount of support (33.8%).

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Responses
The City should establish new local funding mechanisms to guarantee funding for trail improvements (e.g., bond measure(s), new dedicated local tax) Count Row %	3 3.9%	5 6.5%	18 23.4%	31 40.3%	20 26.0%	77
The City should reallocate existing local funds away from other budget area to guarantee funding for trail improvements Count Row %	0 0.0%	3 3.9%	28 36.4%	30 39.0%	16 20.8%	77
The City should prioritize pursuing outside funding for trail improvements (such as grants and donations) over spending local funds, even if it means funding will not be guaranteed Count Row %	2 2.6%	7 9.1%	18 23.4%	31 40.3%	19 24.7%	77
The City should prioritize lower-cost trail improvement projects that can be completed primarily by volunteers, even if it means that larger projects cannot be completed Count Row %	3 3.9%	26 33.8%	22 28.6%	20 26.0%	6 7.8%	77
Totals Total Responses						77

If new trails were added to the system, which trail features or opportunities would be the most important to you? Choose up to three.

The option that the most respondents selected as most important was "Opportunity to connect to nature" (70.5%), followed by "Opportunity to get a workout/exercise" (61.5%). "Trails feel playful and fun" was selected by 34.6% of respondents, followed closely by "Feeling of solitude and privacy" with 32.1% of respondents.

Value	Percent	Responses
Opportunity to get a workout/exercise	61.5%	48
Opportunity to connect to nature	70.5%	55
Feeling of solitude and privacy	32.1%	25
Personal safety while recreating on the trails	17.9%	14
Trails feel playful and fun	34.6%	27
Opportunity to challenge myself	20.5%	16
Opportunity to relax	11.5%	9
Opportunity to connect with friends and family	10.3%	8
Efficient routes that get me where I need to go	17.9%	14
Other - Write In (Required) (click to view)	6.4%	5

"Other" responses:

- Trails should be the width of a sidewalk. The Rose (? correct name) trail reminds me of a short cut my kid made to his friends house, not a walking trail.
- Add some benches out here
- Good signage and reduction of cut trails
- I think designating certain trails or days for use by specific groups reduces conflict and crowding and enhances enjoyment for all. I enjoy riding horses, hiking and mountain biking and would like to see some trails tailored to such activities. For example a hiking/horse riding trail where you don't have to worry about a biker flying up behind you and if I'm biking down a trail I don't need to worry about coming up on a group of hikers. People are usually just great at etiquette but sometimes separation can be good!
- Stimulates my dog. And gives my dog exercise.

Do you have any additional thoughts or ideas you would like to provide about the North Salt Lake trails?

Approximately 45 respondents provided open response comments to this question. Below are the four most common themes; a full list of comments is available at the end of this document.

Trail Expansion, Connectivity, and Access: Residents expressed strong interest in expanding and better connecting the trail system, including new trails, loop opportunities, trailhead access improvements, and regional connections.

- "More trails = less congestion. I love the idea of building them out. Let's keep growing the system. Thank you!!"
- "Create a better access trail for lost lad."

- "We should build more trails that descend from and connect to the BST."
- "Please prioritize connecting Bonnevile Shoreline Trail's south end to the existing trails in SLC. I realize this requires working with SLC, perhaps you can put some pressure on them to prioritize this on their end as well. Thanks."
- "A new loop or connecter trail up towards woodbriar would be really nice :)"
- "Trails need to connect and be continuous like St. George, where possible."

Managing User Conflicts and Trail Uses: Many comments focused on balancing the needs of hikers, bikers, equestrians, and dog owners through designated uses, trail design, improved etiquette, and enforcement.

- "Designate separate bike and hike trails. They come into conflict too much. Also, enforce dogs on leash. I've been attacked a few times running on trails."
- "Stop prioritizing mountain bikers at the expense of foot traffic. Our community is already facing a significant shortage of walking and hiking-only trails. The outdoors should remain safe, quiet, and accessible for pedestrians."
- "Instead of designated bike/hike trails, you could implement designated on/off-leash trails like Mill Creek Canyon to minimize bike/hike/dog conflicts."
- "Hikers, bikers and dog owners can figure this out how we share the trails. I believe we need some more reminders."
- "Perhaps an even odd day split allowing bikers lone access without giving sole access. Essentially equal without shared access for safety. Could also be putting hiking always biking in even and off leash on odd days."
- "… Leave some trails rugged to slow down bike traffic."

Dog Management and Enforcement: Concerns about off-leash dogs, dog waste, and safety were among the most frequently repeated comments.

- "Designate separate bike and hike trails. They come into conflict too much. Also, enforce dogs on leash. I've been attacked a few times running on trails."
- "My dog was attacked & severely injured by an off leash dog. Trail etiquette signs for what users yield to whom used to be very common place at trailheads. I rarely see them anymore & wish the signs would return."
- "Please enforce leash laws for dogs. Dogs off leash and the accompanying dog poop because owners don't watch their dogs damages the trails as well as putting all the other recreators at risk especially bikers and young children. I personally have been bit by dogs on our trails twice by unleashed dogs. Once the owner swore it was the first and the second the owner yelled at me for being on the trail while his dogs were there. Leashed dogs are better for sharing. Unleashed dog trails are only good for dogs and exclude all other trail users to the benefit of the dogs."
- "While I appreciate that people have a need to walk their dogs, some dogs that we encounter are aggressive. And, some owners leave dog poop on trails. This is very disappointing and needs to be addressed."
- "… One reason I am opposed to off leash dogs is that I run these trails often and off leash dogs visit poison ivy and deliver it to people. Owners are usually unaware that their dog is carrying those oils after going berserk on the trail system."

- "Keep dogs off narrow, steep trails. I was bitten hard last fall by a dog on a short leash. Only about half the dogs I pass are on leash. Too many people do NOT clean up after their dogs. Leave some trails rugged to slow down bike traffic."

Maintenance, Signage, and Trail Amenities: Respondents frequently emphasized maintaining existing trails and improving wayfinding, safety information, and amenities.

- "The trails desperately need more regular maintenance. Unusable most of the year because of overgrowth. I'd also love better connection to salt lake through tunnel springs."
- "More waste disposal containers along trails."
- "More benches, better connections to trailheads"
- "The signage has really improved, really happy and hope it continues to get better. Some signs specify mileage back to WR... which in an emergency could be important. However they don't acknowledge how steep the trail is to create the lower mileage, which would be great info for people that might not handle steep incline/decline well..."
- "Maintain existing trails so they don't get overgrown with brush and shrubbery, work with SLC to build new trails above the Tunnel Springs area connecting. Build a pump/jump track just west of the tunnel springs gravel parking lot."
- "Trails need to be cleared. The entire trail has been over grown with weeds and grasses over the pathways."

Question 6 full responses

1. Trails on the west side of the city matter too! Please include the West side for all funding too
2. SUP on the south end of town, connecting down to Beck Street, is often covered in dirt/mud washouts which can make biking unsafe on that path.
3. As a resident of North Salt Lake for over 20 years and an avid outdoor recreationist, I have watched a troubling pattern emerge in our neighboring cities. All too often, local elected representatives make development choices that cater to wealthy enclaves or out-of-town visitors, rather than the everyday citizens who live and pay taxes here. We are at a critical crossroads. Look at the North Canyon and Elephant Rock trails in Bountiful, or Draper's Corner Canyon. Those systems were overrun by catering heavily to non-resident trail users, leaving local residents to deal with the congestion and consequences. I deeply fear NSL is on track to repeat these exact mistakes. North Salt Lake is already fantastic for mountain biking; between the "new" BST, Wild Rose, and Tunnel Springs, that community is well-served. What our community drastically lacks—and what our residents actually need—is peaceful, foot-traffic-only spaces. I urge you to break the mold of nearby municipalities. Show our residents that NSL puts its own community first. Please dedicate our next trail developments exclusively to hiking-only trails, preserving safety, tranquility, and access for the citizens who call this city home.
4. Given the map area there are plenty of trails that already exist and adding more could overcrowd the area. Designating the wild rise loop as uphill only would help funnel mtn bikers to the downhill trail in a safe manner. Mtn biking is my second most common use of these trails but I believe there is not room to responsibly add more mtn bike only trails. Increasing awareness of the portion of the wild rose trail that goes all the down to the valley floor and working to improve it could be a great way to offload some traffic in wild rose park itself. That section is one of my favorites and could support sections of downhill and uphill only to provide a really high quality mtn bike descent.
5. Designate separate bike and hike trails. They come into conflict too much. Also, enforce dogs on leash. I've been attacked a few times running on trails.
6. The wild rose trails, while valued, show that volunteer-built trails can limit the overall experience and leave much to be desired.
7. More trails = less congestion. I love the idea of building them out. Let's keep growing the system. Thank you!!
8. Thank you for working on trails!
9. Thank you so much for asking!
10. My dog was attacked & severely injured by an off leash dog. Trail etiquette signs for what users yield to whom used to be very common place at trailheads. I rarely see them anymore & wish the signs would return.
11. I love having trails that are accessible to me close to home! It helps me stay active and enjoy nature. Thank you for maintaining and improving the trails! It is a great benefit of living in NSL!
12. Thank you for your efforts. And I would like to volunteer for trail building and maintenance.

13. Create a better access trail for lost lad.
14. We should build more trails that descend from and connect to the BST.
15. Thank you for making the priority.
16. I have donated to bountiful trail system and they have done an outstanding job.
17. Please enforce leash laws for dogs. Dogs off leash and the accompanying dog poop because owners don't watch their dogs damages the trails as well as putting all the other recreators at risk especially bikers and young children. I personally have been bit by dogs on our trails twice by unleashed dogs. Once the owner swore it was the first and the second the owner yelled at me for being on the trail while his dogs were there. Leashed dogs are better for sharing. Unleashed dog trails are only good for dogs and exclude all other trail users to the benefit of the dogs.
18. Please prioritize connecting Bonnevile Shoreline Trail's south end to the existing trails in SLC. I realize this requires working with SLC, perhaps you can put some pressure on them to prioritize this on their end as well. Thanks.
19. Thanks for all your efforts!!
20. I love loop trails and would multiple routes to get to the same end point. Springhill is a great small example
21. More waste disposal containers along trails.
22. While I appreciate that people have a need to walk their dogs, some dogs that we encounter are aggressive. And, some owners leave dog poop on trails. This is very disappointing and needs to be addressed.
23. I'd love to see a new connector for that super rocky uphill that connects from Wild Rose to Summerwood. Thanks for caring about our trails!! :)
24. Stop prioritizing mountain bikers at the expense of foot traffic. Our community is already facing a significant shortage of walking and hiking-only trails. The outdoors should remain safe, quiet, and accessible for pedestrians.
25. DO NOT DEVELOP NEAR THE TRAILS PLEASE WE NEED TO MAINTAIN THE LITTLE BIT OF NATURE LEFT IN NORTH SALT LAKE PLEASE IM BEGGING YOU
26. Instead of designated bike/hike trails, you could implement designated on/off-leash trails like Mill Creek Canyon to minimize bike/hike/dog conflicts.
27. A new loop or connecter trail up towards woodbriar would be really nice :)
28. I strongly support regulating and enforcing bans on motorized usage, which is significantly more damaging and dangerous in shared trails, but hope NSL will still allow pedal-assist e-MTBs, which are truly a different category than machines with throttles.
29. Thanks for reaching out for input! We love using the trail system.
30. The trails desperately need more regular maintenance. Unusable most of the year because of overgrowth. I'd also love better connection to salt lake through tunnel springs.

31. No
32. More benches, better connections to trailheads
33. No
34. I agree that e-bikes with throttles and other motorized vehicles should be considered in a safety ban, but pedal assist Class I e-bikes should be allowed.
35. The signage has really improved, really happy and hope it continues to get better. Some signs specify mileage back to WR... which in an emergency could be important. However they don't acknowledge how steep the trail is to create the lower mileage, which would be great info for people that might not handle steep incline/decline well. I also think that it's worth acknowledging at least at the trailhead that poison ivy is here. One reason I am opposed to off leash dogs is that I run these trails often and off leash dogs visit poison ivy and deliver it to people. Owners are usually unaware that their dog is carrying those oils after going berserk on the trail system.
36. Keep dogs off narrow, steep trails. I was bitten hard last fall by a dog on a short leash. Only about half the dogs I pass are on leash. Too many people do NOT clean up after their dogs. Leave some trails rugged to slow down bike traffic.
37. Maintain existing trails so they don't get overgrown with brush and shrubbery, work with SLC to build new trails above the Tunnel Springs area connecting. Build a pump/jump track just west of the tunnel springs gravel parking lot.
38. I'm supportive of allowing e bicycles on trails, as long as they stay on trails. I don't want motorized or electric motorcycles. I also feel the trail system is good and doesn't need to be expanded, especially if it means additional debt or increased taxes.
39. One of favorite things about where I like are the trails. I love them so much. Thanks for creating spaces like this
40. Hikers, bikers and dog owners can figure this out how we share the trails. I believe we need some more reminders.
41. Trails need to connect and be continous like St. George, where possible.
42. Perhaps an even odd day split allowing bikers lone access without giving sole access. Essentially equal without shared access for safety. Could also be putting hiking always biking in even and off leash on odd days.
43. The questions here are a but vague, so its harder ro give good feedback. But in general, interconnected trails I terest me the most and expanding current trail system. I don't experience too many shares trail issues and I hike and bike on existing trails somewhat regularly
44. Trails need to be cleared. The entire trail has been over grown with weeds and grasses over the pathways.
45. Thank you for investing in this important community wellness priority!

Appendix C: Trail User Objectives

Defining Trail User Objectives for each trail you plan within a trail system helps determine which specific trail elements and features to incorporate into the design to meet those objectives.


The following trail user objectives are outlined in Mountain Bike Trail Development: Guidelines for Successfully Managing the Process.

Typical trail user objectives include:
NATURE - Connecting to nature
ESCAPE - Something that takes you away from your daily grind and allows you to get lost in the experience of riding
SOLITUDE - Getting away from the urban environment and people; being active, alone, and quiet in the outdoors
CHALLENGE - Seeking to improve technical riding abilities; conquering or mastering a trail feature; creating a sense of accomplishment
RISK - Exposure to danger, harm, or loss; intentional interaction with uncertainty
FUN/PLAY/PLAYFULNESS - Engaging in the activity purely for the enjoyment. On a trail, this can mean simply riding from point to point for the enjoyment it brings, or it can mean seeking features to enhance or alter the experience (playfulness). Playfulness is an extremely important characteristic of mountain bike trails and distinguishes mountain bike trail users' experiences from many other trail-users' goals (such as the goals of hikers or equestrians)
EXERCISE - Health and fitness. For some, this is a primary goal; for others a bonus, and for some, an obstacle. Defining the physical fitness needed for a particular ride is important in setting user expectations appropriately. Recognition that some riders have a high skill level and low fitness level (or vice versa) plays an important role in trail planning
VARIETY - Multiple trail options as well as diversity of experience within a trail system. Variety should be provided in several forms where possible: trail skill rating, features, surface, setting, grade, distance, etc.
CONNECTIVITY - Series of loops and/or trail segments linked by other trails or transportation routes. This allows for a customized experience, change of plans, adding onto a ride
SOCIALIZING - Provides a shared experience and improves the comfort level for riders. Mountain biking is often a social activity. Offering "go-arounds" for more challenging features can allow riders of differing skill levels (within reason) to still ride together and both have fun, adding to the social value
SAFETY/SECURITY - Could range from trailhead security for parking to personal safety unrelated to recreational use
EFFICIENCY - Getting to a destination or accomplishing a task with the least amount of time or effort expended. In mountain biking, efficiency is more commonly associated with trails that are designed to get riders to the "good stuff," such as a return climb that allows riders to repeat fun trail sections over and over, or a road connection between trails


Mountain Bike Trail Development Guidelines 36

Appendix D: NEPA Process: Environmental Assessments and Categorical Exclusions

The documents below outline the process and typical timeline for Environmental Assessments and Categorical Exclusions under the National Environmental Policy Act.


National Environmental Policy Act
and the Environmental Assessment Process
Official "Project Proposal Letter" (PPL) Submitted by Proponent to USFS
PPL submitted by Proponent to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS).
USFS Evaluation of PPL and Proposal Acceptance
PPL reviewed for consistency with the Forest Plan, USFS Direction, and the Master Development Plan.
Based on predicted environmental impacts, the USFS determines if an EA would be necessary to analyze the proposal.
Project proposal accepted by USFS, if appropriate.
Proposed Action Development
USFS Interdisciplinary Team (ID) Team resource specialists work with Proponent to develop Proposed Action, project design criteria, and mitigation and monitoring measures to minimize environmental impacts.
NEPA PROCESS BEGINS - 1 YR. CLOCK STARTS
NEPA Process Begins: Public Scoping/Comment Period (Public Comment Opportunity)
Notice of Proposed Action, including project purpose and need, description, and Preliminary Findings mailed to the public and agencies.
Scoping period initiated when the Legal Notice is published in the newspaper of record.
Public has opportunity to present comments on the project specific website and/or in writing, by fax, by email, or in person.
Public Open House may be held during scoping/comment period (the opportunity for the public to be informed of the project proposal, ask questions, and submit comments).
3 MONTHS
Issues and Alternatives Identified by USFS ID Team Based on Internal and External Comments
Comments received during the scoping/comment period are reviewed by the ID Team.
Issues raised through external public and agency or internal USFS scoping may drive the modification of the Proposed Action or the formulation of additional action alternatives.
NEPA requires the development of a "reasonable range of alternatives."
6 MONTHS
Studies and Analysis Conducted
Preparation of the EA.
Remaining field surveys are conducted.
Technical reports are prepared, including Biological Evaluation submitted to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 Requirement.
EA is comprised of the Purpose & Need for Action, Description of Alternatives, Affected Environment, and Environmental Consequences, as well as mitigation measures to minimize impacts to resources.
Issues raised through scoping process provide the foundation for the resource analysis and the effects are compared by alternative.
Preparation of Response to Comments (Appendix to EA).
Preparation of Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, if appropriate.
Pre-Decisional Objection and Resolution Period
EA Response to Comments and Draft Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact published, if appropriate.
45-day Pre-Decisional Objection Period.
If objections are received, a 45-day objection review period begins.
3 MONTHS
NEPA PROCESS CLOCK ENDS
Publication/Issuance of Final Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact, if Appropriate
If no objections are filed, issue decision on or before fifth business day after close of objection period.
If objections are filed, decision issued after all objections have been responded to in writing.
Implementation possible after Decision Notice is signed.
SE GROUP

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT AND THE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION PROCESS



CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution 2026-50R: A Resolution approving and adopting amendments to the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 General Fund, Debt Service Rap Tax Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Parks Capital Projects Fund, Roads Capital Projects Fund, and Water Capital Fund budgets.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council approve Resolution 2026-50R, authorizing amendments to the fiscal year 2026-2027 Budget.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant UCA 10-6-127 and 10-6-128, municipal budgets may be modified by resolution of the City Council up until the final day of the fiscal year. Amendments incorporating increases in expenditure require that a public hearing be held prior to resolution adoption. All budget appropriations lapse at the end of the fiscal year, except for any remaining appropriations for Capital Projects, which may be transferred to the new budget year without a public hearing.

SUMMARY

The requested budget changes include increases for grant revenues, operating expenditures, and capital expenses, as detailed below:

Interfund Transfer: net zero

- $16,000,000 transfer of construction fund proceeds from Debt Service Fund to Parks Capital Fund
- $250,000 transfer of fund balance reserves from the Capital Projects Fund to the Parks Capital Fund for the City Hall Triangle project

Increase in Operating Expenditures

- Increase for lease of office space for public safety: $9,000
- Reallocate engineering wages budget to professional services for contract work while employee is on military leave: $0
- Roll forward unspent Trails Master Plan budget, plus add $4,000 for contract timeline extension: $31,220

Increase in Capital Expenditures

- Increase for property acquisition near Springhill geological area: $13,015
- Increase in cost of interior painting of administration building (additional spaces added to bid): $5,000
- Increase for Phase 2 of David Way Emergency Repairs: $250,000
- Increase for Gary Way Waterline project (water tank line replacement and additional streets work): $107,000 total, $80,000 for water and $27,000 for streets
- Increase in Revenues and Expenditures for Pacific and Overland Sidepath Grant funded project: $460,000 (net zero)
- Emergency Waterline Repairs on Eagleridge Drive: $325,000

The total requested amendments represent a net use of fund balances of $740,235, of which $682,000 is related to Roads and Water Capital Projects. Additional details related to the budget amendment may be found in the attached Exhibit A.

POSSIBLE MOTION

I move that the City Council approve Resolution 2026-50R: A Resolution approving and adopting amendments to the 2026-2027 General Fund, Debt Service Rap Tax Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Parks Capital Projects Fund, Roads Capital Projects Fund, and Water Capital Fund budgets.

Attachments:

1) Resolution 2026-50R
2) Resolution 2026-50R Exhibit A

RESOLUTION 2026-50R

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE APPROVING AND ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2026~2027 GENERAL FUND, DEBT SERVICE RAP TAX FUND, CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND, PARKS CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND, ROAD CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND, AND WATER CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND BUDGETS

WHEREAS, the City of North Salt Lake has considered the adoption of an amendment to increase the 2026~2027 budget for the General Fund, Debt Service Rap Tax Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Parks Capital Projects Fund, Roads Capital Projects Fund, and Water Capital Funds and finds that it is in the best interest of the citizens and the City as a whole to adopt the aforesaid budgets; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was properly noticed and held on Tuesday, October 20, 2026 for the purpose of receiving public comment concerning the adoption of said budget amendments; and

WHEREAS, such action is authorized by statute.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake, Utah that the amendments as set forth in Exhibit "A" which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, are hereby authorized and approved.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City of North Salt Lake, Utah, on this 20th day of October, 2026.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
By:

_____
BRIAN J. HORROCKS
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
WENDY PAGE
City Recorder

City Council Vote as Recorded:

Council Member Clayton _____
Council Member Jackson _____
Council Member Knowlton _____
Council Member Smoot _____
Council Member Van Langeveld _____

EXHIBIT A
BUDGET AMENDMENT HEARING - OCTOBER 20, 2026

	ACCOUNT #	ACCOUNT TITLE	CURRENT BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENT	TOTAL BUDGET	REASON
FUND 10 - GENERAL FUND						
EXP	10-2400-42120	RENTAL OF EQUIPMENT & VEHICLES	13,500	9,000	22,500	Increase for newly leased office space
EXP	10-3300-41101	WAGE REGULAR EMPLOYEES	48,000	(30,000)	18,000	Adjust wages to move services to contract labor
EXP	10-3300-42100	PROF & TECHNICAL SERVICES	20,000	30,000	50,000	Adjust wages to move services to contract labor
EXP	10-1130-46010	GRANT - CONTRACT PAYMENTS	-	27,220	27,220	Roll unspent Trails budget
EXP	10-1130-46010	GRANT - CONTRACT PAYMENTS	-	4,000	4,000	Additional $4k for Trails Master Plan for contract over time limit
				(40,220)		**NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**
FUND 32 - DEBT SERVICE FUND (RAP TAX)						
EXP	32-5328-49141	TRANSFERS TO PARK CAPITAL	-	16,000,000	16,000,000	Transfer of Hatch Park construction funds
				(16,000,000)		**NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**
FUND 40 - CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND						
EXP	40-3046-57975	LAND ACQUISITION	-	13,015	13,015	Property Acquisition adjacent to Springhill Geological area
EXP	40-3046-57979	NEW CITY HALL - FURN/FIX/REMOD	38,050	5,000	43,050	Additional for Admin Bldg Interior Paint Project
EXP	40-3048-49141	TRANSFER TO PARKS	-	250,000	250,000	As authorized at the August 18, 2026 City Council Meeting
				(268,015)		**NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**
FUND 41 - PARKS CAPITAL PROJECTS						
REV	41-5302-37132	TRANSFER FROM DEBT SERVICE-RAP	-	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	Transfer of Hatch Park construction funds
REV	41-5302-37140	TRANSFERS FROM CAPITAL PROJECT	-	(250,000)	(250,000)	As authorized at the August 18, 2026 City Council Meeting
				16,250,000		**NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**
FUND 44 - ROAD CAPITAL PROJECTS						
REV	44-3502-33301	CAPITAL GRANTS - LOCAL GVRNMT	(750,000)	(460,000)	(1,210,000)	Recognize Grant Revenue for Sidepath Construction on Pacific and Overland Project
EXP	44-3505-52445	DAVID WAY EMER REPAIRS	-	250,000	250,000	Phase 2 of repair project contract and additional work.
EXP	44-3505-52529	GARY WAY WATERLINE REPLACE	61,383	27,000	88,383	Additional street work needed on waterline replacement project
EXP	44-3506-52549	PACIFIC & OVERLAND	242,962	460,000	702,962	Recognize additional cost for Sidepath Construction on Pacific and Overland Project
				(277,000)		**NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**
FUND 52 - WATER CAPITAL PROJECTS						
EXP	52-3126-52529	EAGLERIDGE DR EMERGENCY REPAIRS	150,553	80,000	230,553	Additional work for replacement of the water tank line
	TBD	EAGLERIDGE DR EMERGENCY REPAIRS	-	325,000	325,000	As authorized at the October 6, 2026 City Council Meeting
				(405,000)		**NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**
TOTAL ALL FUNDS				**(740,235)**		**TOTAL NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE**

CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution 2026-49R: A resolution approving a General Plan Amendment updating the Moderate Income Housing Element

---

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission recommends to the City Council the approval of the draft update to the Moderate Income Housing Element of the General Plan with the following findings:

1. The state legislature has determined that cities must facilitate a reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing, including moderate income housing; and
2. The proposed draft meets the requirements of the State Code to address moderate income housing.

BACKGROUND

The State Code in section 10-21-201 requires that municipalities prepare a General Plan to address the present and future needs of the city and guide future growth and development. One of the requirements in a General Plan is a moderate income housing element. The State Code requires the following of a moderate income housing element:

- Provides a realistic opportunity to meet the need for additional moderate income housing within the next five years
- Selects three or more moderate income housing strategies described in Subsection (3)(a)(iii)
- Includes an implementation plan as provided in Subsection (4)

The last update to the Moderate Income Housing Element was in 2022. Each year, cities are required to report findings to the State regarding their implementation progress to be in compliance with recent State Code changes. The City's compliance with State Code regarding moderate income housing will allow the City to get funding from the State through different grant programs. It is required that the City include a minimum of three strategies in the Plan in order to qualify for funding, and five or more strategies to qualify for priority funding. In the past, the City has included six strategies in the Plan to ensure priority funding, and this update will include 12 strategies.

An opportunity was recently identified to update the PUD regulations in the City Code to allow for a PUD in cases where it includes the preservation of existing Moderate Income Housing. This amendment would qualify, according to State Code, as an implementation strategy for the

Moderate Income Housing Element of the City's General Plan. So, City staff is requesting that the General Plan be updated to reflect this strategy prior to approval of the Code Amendment being considered later on this meeting's agenda. This update is the City's attempt to comply with the State Code requirements regarding housing strategies and implementation without doing a full update of the data in the Plan so that the Moderate Income Housing Element can be updated along with the rest of the General Plan next year. Nothing in the Plan has changed except the Goals and Strategies section starting on Page 21.

The Plan is being updated to extend the implementation dates for the various strategies and following is a summary of the other proposed amendments:

Goal 1, Strategy 1.1-update goal language to remove citation to specific programs in favor of a more broad statement of supporting Davis County affordable housing programs.

Goal 2, Strategy 2.5.2-Goal to increase affordable rental opportunities by amending the code to allow single room occupancy apartments (studio apartments).

Goal 3, Strategy 3.2-remove weatherization program for a more general strategy to assist in lowering utility costs for MIH and creating a "hardship assistance" program in the city.

Goal 4, Strategy 4.1-reduce household transportation expenses for MIH by providing zoning amendments to allow high density residential uses in the "Centers" the City has identified on the Wasatch Choice Vision and City General Plan.

Goal 4, Strategy 4.3-reduction of parking requirements along transit lines with implementation to restrict "unbundling" of parking in multi-family residential developments.

New Goal 5-promote construction of new and preservation of existing MIH
- Strategy 5.1-reduce or eliminate impact fees (study required)
- Strategy 5.2-implement zoning incentives (amend PUD to allow preservation of existing MIH)
- Strategy 5.3-rezone for densities to facilitate MIH (use P Districts where appropriate and upzone other zones near Town Center)
- Strategy 5.4-apply for state and federal funds to promote new construction of MIH
- Strategy 5.5-create or allow multi-family dwelling (identify zone areas to allow medium density where appropriate)

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2026 as required by Utah State Code and made a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

PROPOSED MOTION

I move that the City Council approve Resolution 2026-49R: a resolution amending the proposed Moderate Income Housing Element of the City General Plan with the following findings:

1. The state legislature has determined that cities must facilitate a reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing, including moderate income housing; and
2. The proposed draft meets the requirements of the State Code to address moderate income housing.

Attachments:

A) Resolution 2026-49R
B) Moderate Income Housing Element update (amendments on pages 21-26)

RESOLUTION 2026-49R

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE GENERAL PLAN RELATED TO THE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING ELEMENT

WHEREAS, City of North Salt Lake is an incorporated city in Davis County Utah; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of North Salt Lake, in accordance with Utah State Statute 10-21-201, adopted a Moderate Income Housing Plan on November 17, 2020 as an amendment to the City General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the State Legislature of Utah has determined that cities must facilitate a reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing, including moderate income housing; and

WHEREAS, the State of Utah Statute 10-21-201(3) requires a specified municipality include recommendations for the implementation of chosen strategies listed within that section; and

WHEREAS, the City has identified other strategies that could be added to those currently listed within the adopted Moderate Income Housing Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the proposed updates to the plan on October 13, 2026 and made a favorable recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that it is in the public interest that the North Salt Lake General Plan be amended at this time to revise the Moderate Income Housing Plan.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Body of the City of North Salt Lake hereby amends the City's Moderate Income Housing Plan as the attached Exhibit "A" – Moderate Income Housing Plan.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City of North Salt Lake, Utah, on this 20th day of October, 2026.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
By:

_____
BRIAN J. HORROCKS
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
WENDY PAGE
City Recorder

City Council Vote as Recorded:

Council Member Clayton	_____
Council Member Jackson	_____
Council Member Knowlton	_____
Council Member Smoot	_____
Council Member Van Langeveld	_____

Evaluation of Fair Housing Legal Status

Utah's Fair Housing Act (Utah Code Annotated §57-21-1) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, familial status, disability or source of income in the rental, purchase and sale of real property. According to The Utah Anti-discrimination and Labor Division, there were 8 fair housing related complaints in North Salt Lake between January 1, 2010 and October 31, 2020. One of the complaints was related to discrimination, four cases were related to national origin, 1 case was related to mental disability, 1 case was related to physical disability, and 1 case was related to sex/sexual orientation. This compares to 86 complaints in Davis County as a whole during the same time period. Because there have been only a few fair housing complaints in North Salt Lake in the last several years, the data suggests that discrimination is not an impediment to fair housing choice in North Salt Lake.

Currently, the only formal mechanism for identifying discrimination cases, based upon the parameters of the Fair Housing Act, is the incident of fair housing complaints. There are several annual trainings throughout the county geared to train landlords on housing discrimination. The City should remain diligent in its efforts to ensure that housing is provided in accordance with the Utah Fair Housing Act.

Goals and Strategies

Revised ~~September 20,~~ ~~2022~~October 20, 2026

**items marked with an asterisk are strategies from Utah State Code*

Goal 1: Increase Opportunities for Low to Moderate Income Households to Purchase Affordable Housing

Strategy 1.1 — Work with the Davis Community Housing Authority and support their affordable housing programs. ~~Such programs may include the Family Self-Sufficiency Program and the Down Payment Assistance for First Time Home Buyers Program that would assist low-income households to purchase homes.~~

Implementation 1.1.1 – Refer prospective residents to the Davis Community Housing Authority to participate in affordable housing programs and advertise their programs on the city's website and social media.

Timing – Annual; Ongoing

*Strategy 1.2** — Inventory sites for consideration of re-zoning, especially those within close proximity to public transit, which may be appropriate for more diverse owner-occupied housing options which are harmonious with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Implementation 1.2.1 – Create an inventory of sites that are appropriate for re-zoning to allow for more diverse owner-occupied housing options and pursue re-zoning of those properties.

Timing – ~~2022-2025~~2026 - 2031

Goal 2: Increase Affordable Rental Opportunities for Low to Moderate Income Households

Strategy 2.1 — Work with the Davis Community Housing Authority to address affordable housing needs in North Salt Lake, including support for the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program.

Implementation 2.1.1 – Refer prospective residents to the Davis Community Housing Authority to participate in affordable housing programs and advertise their programs on the city's website and social media.

Timing – Annual; Ongoing

*Strategy 2.2** – Create or allow for, and reduce regulations to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zones

Implementation 2.2.1 - Continue to promote the establishment of "accessory dwelling units," such as basement apartments to increase the supply of affordable rental units and assist cost burdened homeowners. This can be accomplished through continuing to provide free permits for existing ADUs and promoting legalizing ADUs on the city's website and social media.

Timing – Annual; Ongoing

Strategy 2.3 - Promote the construction of housing units across all income categories to facilitate the natural attrition of existing housing stock to become available for low to moderate income households.

Implementation 2.3.1 – Create an inventory of the housing stock in the City and consider re-zoning, where appropriate, to allow for a good balance of diverse housing options.

Timing – ~~2022 – 2025~~2026 - 2031

*Strategy 2.4** – Demonstrate utilization of a moderate income housing set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency to create or subsidize moderate income housing

Implementation 2.4.1 – Use moderate income housing set aside funds from the U.S. 89 CDA to incentivize moderate income housing developments in the Town Center.

Timing – ~~2022 – 2027~~2026 - 2031

*Strategy 2.5** – Amend land use regulations to allow for single room occupancy developments

Implementation 2.5.1 – This should be accomplished through the adoption of the Town Center ~~Form-Based Code~~ Urban Design Standards to explicitly allow for single room

occupancy developments. In the interim, this can be accomplished through including such allowances in Planned (P) District development agreements.

Timing – 2022 – 2025

Implementation 2.5.2 – Amend the City Code to explicitly allow for single room occupancy developments in all zoning districts that allow multi-family residential.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

Goal 3: Rehabilitate Existing Housing to Increase Rental Opportunities, Homeownership, Retention, and Reinvestment in North Salt Lake.

Strategy 3.1 — Promote the use of the Emergency Repair Program (supported by CDBG funds and administered by the Davis Community Housing Authority) to extremely low and moderate income households. This program offers grants for maintaining and rehabilitating housing.

Implementation 3.1.1 - Refer prospective residents to the Davis Community Housing Authority to participate in affordable housing programs and advertise their programs on the city's website and social media.

Timing – Annual; Ongoing

Implementation 3.1.2 - Create a City-sponsored Home Repair Grant Program to provide grants for low-to-moderate income homeowners to make needed repairs on their homes.

Timing – ~~2022 – 2024~~2026 - 2031

Strategy 3.2 — ~~Identify low-to-moderate income families that need weatherization assistance. Assist these households in contacting the respective utility companies to participate in their weatherization programs. The Weatherization program lowers monthly utility bills by making housing more energy efficient~~ Assist in reducing the cost of utilities for low-to-moderate income households.

Implementation 3.2.1 – Refer prospective residents to the appropriate utility companies to participate in weatherization programs and advertise their programs on the city's website and social media.

Timing – Annual; Ongoing

Implementation 3.2.2 – Create and implement a "hardship assistance" utility billing policy to assist low-to-moderate income households with City utility payments.

Timing – 2025 - 2030

Goal 4: Reduce household transportation expenses for low-to-moderate income households.

*Strategy 4.1** – Zone or rezone for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers

Implementation 4.1.1 - Promote the establishment of low-to-moderate income housing within and near the Town Center. With a walkable Town Center, residents will have better access to shopping, work, and recreation without the need for a vehicle. This should be accomplished through the adoption of the Town Center ~~Form-Based Code~~ Urban Design Standards and subsequent rezoning of all properties within the Town Center district. In the interim, properties can be rezoned to allow for higher density residential developments and/or moderate income residential developments through the Planned (P) District rezoning process.

Timing – 2022 – ~~2025~~2026

Implementation 4.1.2 – Allow for higher density residential developments in Planned (P) Districts or other zoning districts near areas identified as Centers on the Wasatch Choice Vision and/or in the City's General Plan.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

*Strategy 4.2** – Amend land use regulations to allow for higher density or new moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors

Implementation 4.2.1 - Promote the establishment of low-to-moderate income housing near public transportation routes. Locating affordable housing near public transportation will enable residents to get to work without owning a vehicle. This should be accomplished through the adoption of the Town Center ~~Form-Based Code~~Urban Design Standards. In the interim, higher density residential developments and/or moderate income residential developments should be included in Planned (P) District development agreements within the Town Center.

Timing – 2022 – ~~2025~~2026

*Strategy 4.3** – Amend land use regulations to eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on the residents own vehicle, such as residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities

Implementation 4.3.1 - Reduce parking requirements for housing developments in the Town Center and near public transportation routes to reduce the cost of parking

infrastructure that is passed on to tenants. This should be accomplished through the adoption of the Town Center ~~Form-Based Code~~Urban Design Standards. In the interim, parked reductions should be included in Planned (P) District development agreements within the Town Center.

Timing – 2022 – ~~2025~~2026

Implementation 4.3.2 – Amend the City Code to restrict the "unbundling" of parking in any multi-family residential developments.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

Goal 5: Promote the construction of new, and preservation of existing, affordable housing units.

*Strategy 5.1** – reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing

Implementation 5.1.1 – Conduct a fee study to analyze the impacts of reducing, waiving, or eliminating impact fees related to moderate income housing and update the Comprehensive Fee Schedule accordingly.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

*Strategy 5.2** – implement zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments

Implementation 5.2.1 – Amend the Planned Unit Development (PUD) requirements in City Code to allow for PUDs in instances that include the preservation of existing moderate income housing stock which might not otherwise be preserved due to non-conformance to minimum lot size, building setbacks or lot width standards.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

*Strategy 5.3** – rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate income housing

Implementation 5.3.1 – Utilize the Planned (P) District process to incentivize the creation of moderate income housing units through development agreements.

Timing – 2026 – 2031

Implementation 5.3.2 – Rezone properties currently zoned as single-family, nearby commercial zoning districts, within and around the Town Center, along major street or transit corridors, and in walkable districts that are more effectively utilized as medium-density or higher-density zones.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

Strategy 5.4 –* apply for or partner with an entity that applies for state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of moderate income housing, an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within the Utah Housing Corporation's funding capacity, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Division of Housing and Community Development within the Governor's Office of Economic Development, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act, an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create moderate income housing, or any other entity that applies for programs or services that promote the construction or preservation of moderate income housing

Implementation 5.4.1 – Partner with organizations and/or developers to promote the construction and administration of moderate income housing.

Timing – 2026 - 2031

Strategy 5.5 –* create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, multifamily residential dwellings compatible in scale and form with detached single-family residential dwellings and located in walkable communities within residential or mixed-use zones

Implementation 5.5.1 – Inventory single-family residential zoning districts in the city and update regulations to allow for medium-density and "missing middle" housing, where appropriate.

Timing – 2026 – 2031

This Plan was prepared by the City of North Salt Lake staff.

Contact:
Ali Avery, Long Range Planner
~~alia@nslcity.org~~ alia@nslcity.gov
(801) 335-8729

CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Consideration of Ordinance 2026-09: an Ordinance amending City Code 13-6-1, amending the Planned Unit Development section to allow the preservation of existing moderate income housing to qualify for a PUD.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission recommends the proposed amendment to City Code Section 13-6-1 with the following findings:

1. The proposed amendment is in accord with the comprehensive general plan, goals and policies of the City.

2. Changed or changing conditions make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to carry out the "purposes" stated in this title.

BACKGROUND

City Code Title 13 Chapter 6 provides regulations for subdivisions, specifically Planned Unit Developments (PUD). The purpose of a PUD is to permit flexibility in land use regulation to cluster dwellings for a variety of reasons, including preserving open spaces, natural features, variety of land uses, and efficient use of infrastructure. A PUD allows the Planning Commission to reduce some development standards such as setback, lot width , frontage, or road width. There are seven listed circumstances under which a PUD may be considered.

City Staff was approached by Clay Smith, the owner of a home and lot at 3826 South 775 West. The property is zoned R1-7 and is 0.3 acres. The existing home was built in 1957 in unincorporated Davis County. The home is presently situated on the lot such that the home has no rear setback. Mr. Smith also owns another 0.3 acre lot directly west of this property also containing a home built in 1941, but recently rehabilitated. In an effort to address the rear setback issue for the 3826 South home, Mr. Smith has filed a lot line adjustment between the two lots. The lot line adjustment will increase the rear setback from 0' to 13' and maintain a side setback for the second home of 8 feet. The lot line adjustment increases the lot size for the 3826 South home to 0.34 acres (14,810 sq. ft.) and decreases the second lot to 0.26 acres (11,325 sq. ft.). The minimum lot size in the R1-7 zone is 7,000 sq. ft.

In addition to the lot line adjustment Mr. Smith wishes to now subdivide the 3826 South lot into two lots. Although the amended lot for 3826 contains the required size and frontage for 2 lots, the non-conforming setbacks for the existing home will not allow that home to be preserved if subdivided. In order to qualify for a subdivision Mr. Smith would have to raze the existing home, but would then be allowed to build 2 new homes. Mr. Smith expressed concern regarding evicting the current tenants from a home that, while small, is in good condition and is an affordable rental property in South Davis County. In review of the code it was determined that preserving existing affordable housing stock is not a listed circumstance under which the Planning Commission could approve a PUD. Mr. Smith has filed an application to amend the code to add the preservation of existing moderate income housing stock. In his particular case the amendment would allow a 2 lot PUD with a new 7,000 sq. ft. lot and maintain the existing home on a 8,106 sq. ft. lot with a rear setback of 13' and a side setback of 5'.

In review of the proposed amendment to the PUD regulations it was determined that the preservation of existing affordable housing is a goal of the City's Moderate Income Housing Plan, a part of the City's General Plan. Each year the City is required to report to the State the actions implemented by the City to support and preserve moderate income housing and it was determined that this implementation policy could be added to the City's Plan, as noted in the previous application. In evaluation of properties under similar circumstances that this proposed change may benefit, only a handful of properties could be identified that might qualify.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2026 and made a favorable recommendation of the proposed amendment as a small improvement to the Code that would assist in preserving some affordable housing units within the City.

PROPOSED MOTION

I move that the City Council approve Ordinance 2026-09: an Ordinance amending City Code 13-6-1(B) with the following findings:

2. The proposed amendment is in accord with the comprehensive general plan, goals and policies of the City.

2. Changed or changing conditions make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to carry out the "purposes" stated in this title.

Attachments:

A) Ordinance 2026-09
B) Draft Amendment Exhibit
C) Aerial/Zoning Map
D) Property Survey

ORDINANCE 2026-09

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE AMENDING TITLE 13 OF THE CITY CODE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOWING THE PRESERVATION OF EXISTING MODERATE INCOME HOUSING STOCK FOR APPROVAL OF A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD)

WHEREAS, the City of North Salt Lake is an incorporated city in Davis County Utah; and

WHEREAS, the City Code has received an application to amend City Code Section 13-6-1 to allow the preservation of existing moderate income housing as justification for allowing a planned unit development; and

WHEREAS, the City's Moderate Income Housing Plan Element of the General Plan identifies Implementation Strategy 5.2 to approve code amendments that preserve existing moderate income housing; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendment on October 13, 2026 and made a recommendation for approval to the City Council for the amendment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake, Utah, as follows:

Section 1. Pursuant to Utah Code 10-20-502, Title 13 of the City Code is hereby amended as attached in Exhibit A**.**

Section 2. Severability. If any section, part or provision of this Ordinance is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Ordinance, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Ordinance shall be severable.

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective upon publication or posting.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City of North Salt Lake, Utah on this 20th day of October 2026.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
By:

_____
BRIAN J. HORROCKS
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
WENDY PAGE
City Recorder

City Council Vote as Recorded:

Council Member Clayton	_____
Council Member Jackson	_____
Council Member Knowlton	_____
Council Member Smoot	_____
Council Member Van Langeveld	_____

Certificate of Posting Ordinance:
I, the duly appointed recorder for the City of North Salt Lake, hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance 2026-09 was passed by the governing body on the date shown above, and that copies were posted as required by Utah Code 10-3-713 within the municipality.

[Seal]

Recorded this _____ day of _____, 2026.

_____
Wendy Page, City Recorder

13-6-1: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS; SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS:

A. Purpose: The purpose of planned unit development (PUD) is to permit flexibility in land use regulations and for the consolidation of open spaces by clustering dwelling units, in order to preserve natural features, allow a variety of land uses, provide meaningful and usable open spaces, and to make efficient use of essential infrastructure and public facilities. The application of planned unit development concept is intended to encourage neighborhoods, housing, design, open space and facilities compatible with the present living environment in the City as described by the General Plan, while at the same time ensuring compliance with practices which will assure the health, safety and public welfare of the future inhabitants of the planned unit development, as well as maximizing the energy utilization efficiency of the project. In exchange for the additional services provided by the developer in a planned unit development, this chapter will allow for increased intensity of buildings and more flexible uses of the land.

B. The PUD approach is expected to result in development that is superior to what could be obtained through ordinary lot-by-lot development. It is not intended to circumvent conventional land use regulations. The City may apply the flexibility of the planned unit development regulations, when the development, through its design and establishment, will provide benefits that may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

1. The stabilization and preservation of the existing or planned land uses in abutting areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods;

2. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion;

3. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the City;

4. Maximizing and preserving vegetation and open space and/or other special development amenities to provide light, air and privacy, to buffer abutting properties and to provide active and passive recreation opportunities for residents of the planned development and/or the community;

5. Minimize significant through traffic impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods;

6. Provide an appropriate transition or buffering between uses of differing intensities both on site and off site; ~~and~~

7. Provide safe and convenient vehicle and pedestrian connections between adjacent uses~~.~~;

8. Preserve existing moderate income housing stock which might not otherwise be preserved due to non-conformance to minimum lot size, building setbacks or lot width standards.

C. In return for greater flexibility in site development, the PUD introduces some special requirements and standards for design approval. These conditions will be employed to maximize quality of site design. They will not be used to cause undue delays nor unwarranted increase in costs, when compared to more conventional development. The PUD process will not be used as a device to force a decrease in residential density below that otherwise allowed by the comprehensive plan and underlying zoning.

D. Planned Unit Developments Approval: A development which is to be developed as a PUD shall be processed in the same manner as subdivisions. PUD developments shall comply with the underlying zoning requirements except as specifically varied by this section.

E. Deviation From Design And Improvement Standards: Requests for design deviations, other than those outlined in this section or as approved by development agreement in conjunction with a P-District rezone, may only be approved as a legislative decision by the City Council. Where, in the opinion of the City Council, the literal enforcement of the design and improvement standards in this Title would result in an unreasonable utilization of land and water or undue hardship due to unique circumstances compliance with one or more of the design and improvement standards may be waived, according to the following procedure:

1. Application: Application for a modification of design standards shall be made on a form provided by the City and shall include:

a. A description of the land to be developed;

b. An identification of the title provision from which the modification is requested;

c. A description of the peculiar physical conditions pertaining to the land in question and which do not pertain to other lands in the general area;

d. A description of the hardships which will accrue to the detriment of the property owner if the requested modification is not granted;

e. A nonrefundable modification review fee, where established and payable to the City, in accordance with the Comprehensive Fee Schedule as adopted by resolution of the City Council.

2. Public Hearing; Notice: The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing before making a recommendation on the requested modification. Notice of said public hearing shall be given in accordance with USC 10-20-205 as a class B notice.

3. Recommendation To City Council: The Planning Commission shall review the modification application and shall submit its written recommendations for approval or disapproval of such application to the City Council, along with written reasons therefore within thirty (30) calendar days from receipt of said application at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may at its own discretion conditionally approve a preliminary plat subject to approval of the modification by the City Council, or may table action on a preliminary plat until the City Council has acted on the modification request.

4. Decision Of City Council: The City Council may approve the requested modification upon making a finding based upon the record submitted that the issuance of the modification will not be detrimental to the interest of the public safety, health or welfare, the proposed development substantially complies with the City General Plan and adopted Zoning Ordinance, and the proposed modification will result in improved overall development design.

5. Records Maintained: A record of all correspondence, recommendations, submissions and official action regarding all design modifications applications shall be maintained permanently by the City as a public record.

Development/Application
Zoning



Development/Application
Aerial




SYCAMORE SUBDIVISION, 1ST AMENDMENT

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST SALT LAKE BASE & MERIDIAN
BOUNTIFUL CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH
JUNE 2026


NARRATIVE

THE PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY WAS TO DO CREATE A 3 LOT SUBDIVISION AS SHOWN AND DESCRIBED HEREON. THE SURVEY IS BASED ON THE COMMITMENT FOR TITLE INSURANCE PROVIDED BY FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, COMMITMENT NUMBER FTUT2600187-DW AND FTUT2600186-DW WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF JANUARY 2, 2026 AT 8:00 A.M. THE SURVEY WAS ORDERED BY CLAY SMITH. THE BASIS OF BEARING IS THE NORTH LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 1 TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN BETWEEN THE NORTH WEST QUARTER AND THE CENTER POINT, WHICH BEARS SOUTH 89°43'50" EAST, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH, NAD 83 STATE PLANE GRID BEARING.



VICINITY MAP

NOT TO SCALE



N
W CCI E
S

GRAPHIC SCALE

20 0 10 20 40

(IN FEET)
1 inch = 20 ft.

LEGEND

- COUNTY MONUMENT AS DESCRIBED
- PROPERTY CORNER AS DESCRIBED
- SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY
- LOT LINE
- ADJACENT PARCEL
- SECTION LINE
- EASEMENT

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, BOUNTIFUL CITY, DAVIS COUNTY UTAH. MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 18, SYCAMORE SUBDIVISION, SAID POINT BEING NORTH 89°43'50" WEST 142.63 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 1 AND SOUTH 0°16'14" WEST 291.93 FEET FROM THE CENTER OF SAID SECTION 1 AND RUNNING THENCE;

SOUTH 0°05'00" EAST 148.00 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 88°09'34" WEST 177.46 FEET;
THENCE NORTH 0°05'00" WEST 150.05 FEET;
THENCE NORTH 88°58'00" EAST 177.40 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 26,473 SQ. FT. OR 0.608 ACRES MORE OR LESS AND 3 LOTS.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I, Willis D. Long, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR IN THE STATE OF UTAH AND THAT I HOLD CERTIFICATE NO. 10708886 IN ACCORDANCE WITH TITLE 58, CHAPTER 22, OF THE PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS ACT; I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT BY AUTHORITY OF THE OWNERS I HAVE COMPLETED A SURVEY OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED ON THIS RECORD OF SURVEY PLAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 17-23-20 AND HAVE VERIFIED ALL MEASUREMENTS; THAT THE REFERENCE MONUMENTS SHOWN ON THIS RECORD OF SURVEY PLAT ARE LOCATED AS INDICATED AND ARE SUFFICIENT TO RETRACE OR REESTABLISH THIS SURVEY; AND THAT THE INFORMATION SHOWN HEREIN IS SUFFICIENT TO ACCURATELY ESTABLISH THE LATERAL BOUNDARIES OF THE HEREIN DESCRIBED TRACT OF REAL PROPERTY.

SIGNED THIS 29TH DAY OF JUNE, 2025.

LICENSED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
06/29/2026
WILLIS D. LONG
10708886
STATE OF UTAH

Willis D. Long, PLS NO. 10708886

OWNER'S DEDICATION

I THE UNDERSIGNED OWNER OF THE HEREON DESCRIBED TRACT OF LAND, HEREBY SET APART AND SUBDIVIDE THE SAME INTO LOTS, PARCELS AND STREETS AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AND NAME SAID TRACT:

SYCAMORE SUBDIVISION, 1ST AMENDMENT

AND HEREBY DEDICATE, GRANT AND CONVEY TO BOUNTIFUL CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH ALL THOSE PARTS OR PORTIONS OF SAID TRACT OF LAND DESIGNATED AS A PERPETUAL EASEMENT OVER, UPON AND UNDER THE LANDS DESIGNATED ON THE PLAT AS PUBLIC UTILITY, THE SAME TO BE USED FOR THE INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC UTILITY SERVICE LINES, STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES OR FOR THE PERPETUAL PRESERVATION OF WATER DRAINAGE CHANNELS IN THEIR NATURAL STATE WHICHEVER IS APPLICABLE AS MAY BE AUTHORIZED BY GOVERNING AUTHORITY, WITH NO BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES BEING ERECTED WITHIN SUCH EASEMENTS.

SIGNED THIS _____DAY OF _____, 2026.

_____
BY:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

STATE OF UTAH)
§
COUNTY OF ____)

On this____day of _____, in the year 20___, before me _____, a notary public, personally appeared Clay Smith the owner of C&J Smith Properties LLC proved on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to in the foregoing Owner's Dedication regarding the Syracuse Subdivision, 1st Amendment and was signed by him/her on behalf of said C&J Smith Properties LLC and acknowledged that he executed the same.

Commission Number _____
My Commission Expires _____

_____
Print Name: _____
A Notary Public Commissioned in Utah

CCI systems
Professional Land Surveying
(801) 663-1641 Willis.long@cciutonsurveys.com
837 S 500 W, STE. 201
WOODS CROSS, UT 84010

PUBLIC WORKS

THIS PLAT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY OUR OFFICE AND IS HEREBY APPROVED AND ACCEPTED.

_____
DATE BOUNTIFUL CITY PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

COUNTY ASSESSOR

REVIEWED AND ACCEPTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE BOUNTIFUL CITY ASSESSOR THIS ____ DAY OF _____,2025.

_____
BOUNTIFUL CITY ASSESSOR

BOUNTIFUL CITY FIRE SERVICE DISTRICT

THIS PLAT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE BOUNTIFUL CITY FIRE SERVICE DISTRICT.

_____
DATE BOUNTIFUL CITY FIRE MARSHAL

COUNTY ENGINEER

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE HAD THIS PLAT REVIEWED BY THIS OFFICE AND IT IS CORRECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH AVAILABLE INFORMATION ON FILE IN THIS OFFICE.

_____
DATE BOUNTIFUL CITY ENGINEER

GOVERNING BODY APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE

APPROVED THIS____DAY OF _____,2025 ON BEHALF OF THE BOUNTIFUL CITY COUNCIL.

_____
DATE BOUNTIFUL CITY MAYOR

APPROVAL AS TO FORM

APPROVED AS TO FORM ON THIS __ DAY OF _____,2025.

_____
BOUNTIFUL CITY ATTORNEY

SYCAMORE SUBDIVISION, 1ST AMENDMENT
LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP
1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST SALT LAKE BASE & MERIDIAN
BOUNTIFUL CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH

S1/1

COUNTY RECORDER

ENTRY NO. _____ FEE PAID _____

FILED FOR AND RECORDED _____,

AT _____. IN BOOK _____ OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, PAGE _____. RECORDED FOR _____

_____
COUNTY RECORDER

BY: _____

CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Consideration of a General Development Plan for Walker Ridge Townhomes at 3533 South Highway 89 and the rezone request for 3533 South Highway 89 (Highway Commercial, CH) and Gold Mine Acres Condominiums at approximately 3513 South Highway 89 (Residential, RM-7) to Planned District (P)

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission recommends approval of the General Development Plan for Walker Ridge Townhomes at 3533 South Highway 89 with the following conditions to be determined at the time of Development Agreement approval:

1. Final architecture design;
2. Final layout;
3. Final engineering;
4. Submittal of required Development Agreement;
5. Unit 8 be setback a minimum of 8 feet from the south property line;
6. All lighting be directed downward; and
7. The maximum building height for all structures be 35 feet.

BACKGROUND

Gold Mine Acres Condominiums is located at approximately 3513 South Highway 89 and is zoned RM-7. It consists of 11 existing condo units, ten of which are owned by the Hansen family who have acquired the adjoining property to the west known as 3533 South Highway 89. The newly acquired property is 0.3933 acres, zoned Highway Commercial, and has an existing single-family home. The property is located north of 3800 South and the Town Center boundary.

The applicant, Justin Hansen, plans to demolish the existing single-family home at 3533 South, proposes to construct eight new for sale townhomes, and incorporate the property into the Gold Mine Acres HOA. The request is to rezone the Gold Mine Acres property from RM-7 and the 3533 South property from Highway Commercial (CH) into a Planned District called Walker Ridge

Townhomes or Gold Mine Acres Phase 2 that will regulate the existing condo units and the eight new residential units. The rezone encompasses approximately 1.32 acres.

Planned Districts require submittal of a General Development Plan (Concept) in conjunction with a rezone application. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing on the plan and rezone and makes a recommendation to the City Council for the General Development Plan. If the City Council approves the General Development Plan, the applicant will prepare a preliminary subdivision plan for review by the Planning Commission after a recommendation on the zone change will be forwarded to the City Council in conjunction with a development agreement.

REVIEW

The Highway 89 Corridor Agreement with UDOT requires 77' of road width measured from back of curb. From the back of curb, there must be an additional 16' of right of way which contains an 8' park strip and 8' sidewalk. Based on the existing conditions and property line, the applicant must dedicate an additional 8 feet of right of way to UDOT and relocate the sidewalk and increase the park strip width from 4 feet to 8 feet as part of this project. The new townhome units will be accessed from the private street currently servicing the Gold Mine Acres Condos and the commercial building to the north.

The first row of townhomes fronting Highway 89 will be staggered to complement the angle of the property line and Highway 89 alignment. The side setback on the south property line was proposed at 5 feet, however the Planning Commission is recommending unit 8 be a minimum of 8 feet from the property line adjacent to the neighboring single family lot.

City Code 10-6-1(H)4 sets minimum parking standards for PUDs and multifamily developments based on the number of bedrooms in a unit. The development will provides four parking spaces per unit (2 garage and 2 driveway spaces).

	Unity Quantity	Min. Spaces per Unit	Required Spaces
2 Bedroom Unit	2	2	4
3+ Bedroom Unit	6	2.5	15
		Total Required	19
		Total Provided (Garage)	16
		Total Provided (Driveway)	16
		Total Provided	32

The proposed townhomes elevations are three stories and have a maximum height of 36.5 feet from finished grade to roof peak. The maximum height for all buildings in the neighboring residential R1-7 zone is 35 feet. The Planning Commission is recommending the height be limited to 35 feet. The architectural treatments include stucco, fiber-cement board, and brick siding. The first floor on the end units will be treated with fiber-cement board and stucco for aesthetic appeal.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2026. Five residents provided comment concerning the use, maximum height, minimum setback on the south property line, lighting, and emergency access. As a result of the public comment, the Planning Commission recommended that the minimum setback for Unit 8 be increased from 5 feet to 8 feet on the south property line, the Development Agreement require that all lighting be directed downward as to not become a nuisance to abutting properties, and that the maximum height be reduced from the requested 36.5 feet to 35 feet. The developer was amenable to these conditions.

PROPOSED MOTION

I move that the City Council approve the General Development Plan for Walker Ridge Townhomes at 3533 South Highway 89 with the following conditions to be determined at the time of Development Agreement approval:

1. Final architecture design;
2. Final layout;
3. Final engineering;
4. Submittal of required Development Agreement;
5. Unit 8 be setback a minimum of 8 feet from the south property line;
6. All lighting be directed downward; and
7. The maximum building height for all structures be 35 feet.

Attachments:


1) Zoning Map
2) Aerial Map
3) General Development Plan (Concept)
4) Color Renderings


General Development Plan
Walker Ridge Townhomes
Zoning



General Development Plan
Walker Ridge Townhomes
Aerial







TYPICAL UNIT DIMENSIONS
SCALE: NTS



Scale: 1" = 20'

GENERAL NOTES

1. VERTICAL HEIGHT OF BUILDING TO BE 30'-0" MAX PER IFC 2024 D 105.1.

DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

ZONING:	P, P-DISTRICT		
PARCEL AREA:	17,133 SQ FT	0.39 ACRES	(100%)
BUILDING AREA:	5,556 SQ FT	0.13 ACRES	(32.4%)
HARD SURFACE AREA:	7,833 SQ FT	0.18 ACRES	(45.7%)
LANDSCAPE AREA:	3,744 SQ FT	0.09 ACRES	(21.9%)

NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS

THE EXISTENCE AND PLACEMENT OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR STRUCTURES REPRESENTED IN THESE PLANS HAVE BEEN SOURCED FROM THE MOST CURRENT DATA ACCESSIBLE. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE POSITIONS INDICATED ON THESE PLANS ARE APPROXIMATE. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO VERIFY THESE LOCATIONS. SHOULD ANY CONFLICTS OR INCONSISTENCIES OCCUR, PROMPTLY REACH OUT TO THE PROPERTY OWNER OR THE ENGINEER OF RECORD. FURTHERMORE, THE CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO CONTACT THE RELEVANT UTILITY COMPANIES AND TAKE PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES TO SAFEGUARD ALL UTILITIES, WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE DEPICTED ON THESE PLANS.

811 Know what's **below.** **Call** before you dig.

HUNT DAY ENGINEERING
3445 ANTELOPE DRIVE, ST 200
SYRACUSE, UT 84075
PH: 801.664.4724
EM: THOMAS@HUNTDAY.CO

PROJECT TITLE

WALKER RIDGE TOWNHOMES

3533 NORTH HWY 89
NORTH SALT LAKE, UT 84054

LOCATED IN THE NW QUARTER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 1N, RANGE 1W, SL BASE AND MERIDIAN

REVISIONS

REV.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY

SEAL

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
10854988
THOMAS J. HUNT
STATE OF UTAH

VERIFY SCALES

BAR IS ONE INCH ON ORIGINAL DRAWING
0 1"

IF NOT ONE INCH ON THIS SHEET, ADJUST SCALES ACCORDINGLY

PROJECT INFO.

Engineer:	G. Day
Drawn:	R. Hatfield
Date:	06 / 02 / 2026
Proj. No.	211 - 01

SHEET TITLE

CONCEPT PLAN

SHEET NO.

C1.00

RYAN H C:\Users\Ryan H\Hunt Day Dropbox\Projects\211-01 North Salt Lake P-District\03_DRAWINGS\01_AUTOCAD\04_CONSTRUCTION\211-01_Walker Ridge Townhomes 2026.09.24 9/29/2026 1:44 PM





CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution 2026-51R: a Resolution dissolving the North Salt Lake Re-Addressing Committee

---

BACKGROUND

Based upon the feedback received at the public comment meeting on October 6, 2026, the Council has indicated that it would consider dissolving the addressing committee and not consider changing the addresses within the annexation area or those properties otherwise using the Bountiful Address System.

PROPOSED MOTION

I move that the City Council approve Resolution 2026-51R: a Resolution dissolving the North Salt Lake Re-Addressing Committee.

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-51R

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE DISSOLVING THE RE-ADDRESSING COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, the City of North Salt Lake has annexed certain properties and geographic areas into its corporate municipal limits; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has received public comment from businesses and residents that would be affected by the re-addressing of those areas not currently utilizing the North Salt Lake Addressing System; and,

WHEREAS, that public comment was overwhelmingly against readdressing and those residents stated that they have not experienced any issues related to the continued use of the Bountiful Addresses since the annexation.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Governing Body of the City of North Salt Lake, the following:

SECTION 1. Dissolution. The Addressing Committee is hereby officially dissolved.

SECTION 2. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect upon passage.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City of North Salt Lake, Utah, on this 20th day of October, 2026.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
By:

_____
BRIAN J. HORROCKS
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
WENDY PAGE
City Recorder

City Council Vote as Recorded:

Council Member Clayton _____
Council Member Jackson _____
Council Member Knowlton _____
Council Member Smoot _____
Council Member Van Langeveld _____

CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Karyn Baxter, City Engineer

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Bid Award for Reinforced Slope Design Package at 158 and 740 David Way

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends awarding the Reinforced Slope Design Package at 158 and 740 David Way to M.C. Green for the bid amount of $184,694.78.

BACKGROUND

The slope stabilization at 158 and 740 David Way is necessary to complete the restoration. Previously, a soil nail wall was installed to prevent slope failure on this property. The soil nail wall was the first of two steps and was completed in January 2026. This step stabilized the nearly vertical excavation area, protecting the roadway and existing public utilities, as well creating a safe work zone for the upcoming slope replacement. The soil nail wall is considered temporary stabilization, which is estimated to be a period of up to three years.

The second phase will be the installation of the Reinforced Slope Design Package prepared by IGES. It is not possible to simply put back compacted dirt, as the slope would not be stable enough. The engineered design is for the installation of welded wire forms that are then reinforced with geogrid, similar to the construction methods used for retaining walls. This will leave a stepped pattern on the face of the slope, with topsoil used at the surface along the face to encourage regrowth of native vegetation. The plan sheets detailing this construction method are provided as an attachment.

The City received two bids and they are shown below:

Contractor	Price
MC Green	$ 184,691.78
Pride Constructors	$ 215,743.80


The cost for the portion of the work is $184,691.78. Additional imported backfill material will be required and is not included in this price as the quantities are not known. This material will be paid for on a per ton basis as required to complete the slope stabilization.

POSSIBLE MOTION

I move that the City Council award the Reinforced Slope Design Package at 158 and 740 David Way to M.C. Green for the bid amount of $184,691.78.

Attachments:

1) Reinforced slope details from design package



TYPICAL SECTION VIEW

GRAPHICAL SCALE: 1 INCH = 8 FEET (11X17 ONLY)

0 2 4 6 8 16

SCALE: 1" = 8'

REV	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHK

REVISIONS

IGES EST. 1998

12429 SOUTH 300 EAST
DRAPER, UTAH 84020
(801) 748-4044

REINFORCED SLOPE DESIGN PACKAGE
ORDONEZ RESIDENCE
158 AND 740 DAVID WAY
NORTH SALT LAKE, UTAH


DESIGN SECTION C SECTION VIEW

DESIGNED BY:	NJS	6-25-2026	PLOT SCALE 1=1
DRAWN BY:	NJS	6-25-2026	
CHECKED BY:	DLB	6-25-2026	DWG SCALE 1"=8'
APPROVED BY:	DLB	6-25-2026	
IGES PROJECT NO: 04833-002		SHEET NO: 4	REV -

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
5148339
DAVEY L. BREINHOLT
06/29/2026
ELECTRONIC SEAL
STATE OF UTAH


WELDED WIRE FORM DETAIL AND CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE

- EXCAVATE FOR LEVEL BASE TO A LENGTH ADEQUATE FOR REINFORCEMENT EMBEDMENT.
- SET GRADING STAKES AT A 0.50 FT OFFSET TO FACILITATE PROPER BASKET ALIGNMENT.
- EMBED BOTTOM BASKET AT FACE OF WALL AS SHOWN ON WALL PROFILE.




STEP 1

- FOR THE FIRST COURSE OF THE WALL, ALIGN BASKETS WITHOUT SPACES.
- INSTALL STRUTS AT 2.00 FT SPACING.




STEP 2

- PLACE GEOGRID REINFORCEMENT (SEE ELEVATION AND SECTION VIEWS FOR TYPE, LENGTH AND OTHER DETAILS).
- PLACE GEOTEXTILE FACING WRAP AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION VIEW.
- DRAPE GEOTEXTILE OVER BASKET ALLOWING FOR THE REQUIRED WRAP EMBEDMENT.
- INSTALL STRUTS AT REQUIRED SPACING (2-FT MAX).




STEP 3

- BACKFILL CAREFULLY FOR A 9-INCH THICK (MAXIMUM) COMPACTED LIFT.
- COMPACT BACKFILL AND PROVIDE COMPACTION TESTING TO MEET OR EXCEED THE REQUIRED DENSITIES PER PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS.




STEP 4

- PLACE AND COMPACT LIFT 2.
- PLACE SCREENED, APPROVED TOPSOIL FACING FILL.
- PULL GEOTEXTILE WRAP OVER COMPACTED FILL AND ANCHOR WITH SOIL.
- PLACE SECOND COURSE OF GEOGRID REINFORCEMENT.
- INSTALL BASKET USING RUNNING BOND INSTALLATION (STAGGERED).



STEP 5

- REPEAT STEPS 2 THRU 5 UNTIL DESIGN HEIGHT OF WALL IS REACHED.



STEP 6

REV	REVISION DESCRIPTION	DATE	BY	CHK
	REVISIONS			

IGES EST. 1998
12429 SOUTH 300 EAST
DRAPER, UTAH 84020
(801) 748-4044

REINFORCED SLOPE DESIGN PACKAGE
ORDONEZ RESIDENCE
158 AND 740 DAVID WAY
NORTH SALT LAKE, UTAH
DETAILS (1)

DESIGNED BY:	NJS	6-25-2026	PLOT SCALE 1=1
DRAWN BY:	NJS	6-25-2026	
CHECKED BY:	DLB	6-25-2026	DWG SCALE NTS
APPROVED BY:	DLB	6-25-2026	
IGES PROJECT NO: 04833-002		SHEET NO: 5	REV -

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
5148339
DAVEY L. BREINHOLT
06/29/2026
ELECTRONIC SEAL
STATE OF UTAH

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-WORK SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
OCTOBER 6, 2026

DRAFT

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 6:03 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Ted Knowlton
Councilmember Heidi Smoot
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Wendy Page, City Recorder.

OTHERS PRESENT: Jo Ellen Ashworth, Frances Marcus, Elaine Christensen Moss, Chris Moss, Sabrina Harman, Christopher Harman, Carri Herron, Diane Sjoherg, Carolyn Jacobson, Jennifer Graves, Gary Gatherum, Curtis Creek, Lorna Ivie, Janis Twede, Rebecca Sherman, Pat B. Nageli, Todd Summers, Dee Lalliss, Michelle Fairbanks, Brandi Wendel, Nicholas Nelson, Cindy Powell, Steve Beazer, Ryan Holbrook, Jared Wendel, Bradley Anderson, Gentry Holbrook, Amber Ivie Stringham, Peter Wirthlin, Jacob Gordon, Ashlyn Hawkins, Shandell Smoot, Eric Wood, Melou Cline, Russell Cline, Alexis Pena, James Van Langeveld, Barry Bryson, Richard, residents.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON PROPOSED ADDRESS CHANGES RELATED TO PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE BOUNDARIES

Sherrie Pace provided background related to the proposed address changes related to properties within the City boundaries. She explained that on November 15, 2022 the City Council annexed the Val Verde area at the request of Davis County. She added that part of the motion related to the adoption of Ordinance 2022-09 included that address changes would not be considered until January 2024 and after the formation of a committee. She continued that there were approximately 350 properties with Bountiful addresses including 25 properties that were already in the City before the annexation took place. Ms. Pace shared a map highlighting the 350

properties including approximately 15 businesses. She said staff had drafted the proposed new house/building numbers within the City's grid system but had not drafted any street names.

Sherrie Pace continued that the City Council had requested a public comment meeting be held. She reported that staff prepared a mailing list and on September 10th mailed 498 notices for the meeting to both the property owners' mailing addresses on file with the County Recorder's Office and to current tenants for properties that appeared to be occupied by renters or tenants.

She shared that the draft resolution for the committee included nine committee members comprised of one City Councilmember, four community members including two local business owners and two neighborhood representatives, and one staff member from the following departments: community development, police, public works, and South Davis Metro Fire. She clarified that the mailed postcards contained a QR code requesting applications for community representatives. Ms. Pace said six applications had already been received and the deadline for those applications had been extended to October 13th. She noted that the community representatives would be appointed by the Mayor with consent by the City Council likely on October 20, 2026.

Sherrie Pace reviewed the draft scope of the committee including:

- Estimating associated costs
- Developing a public communications plan
- Identify potential impacts
- Create owner transition packets
- Recommendations to the City Council
    - Street names
    - Reimbursement for expenses
    - Timeline for implementation

Ms. Pace then presented the timeline and possible meeting agenda items for the committee:

Timeline

- Committee appointments 10/20/26
- 6-8 biweekly meetings from November-January 2027
- Public open house in February 2027
- Final committee meeting in February 2027
- Recommendation to the City Council March 2027

Meeting agenda items

- Review of the proposed addresses, street names, and coordinates
- Meetings with stakeholder representatives (USPS, Davis County, other City staff)
- Assessment of implementation costs to property owners and businesses
- Proposed timeline for implementation
- Management of public feedback and open house
- Final recommendations to the City Council

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if there was the possibility for more than nine committee members. Sherrie Pace replied that more members could be chosen and suggested the City Council update the resolution to reflect this and any other changes they wished to make prior to approval of the resolution. She added that the committee meetings would be public meetings which anyone could attend and that the meetings would be recorded along with written minutes.

Councilmember Jackson asked staff to explain why this item was being discussed now and the City's reasons for why this should happen. Sherrie Pace responded that the City Council had directed staff to work on this project for city wide continuity with addressing, package delivery issues with current addressing, and possible emergency service delays. She gave the example of how Orchard Drive had City addresses on the east side and Bountiful addresses on the west side of the road. She continued that these properties were now part of North Salt Lake City and the City Council could evaluate the pros and cons to make a final decision on the addressing issue.

Mayor Horrocks added that he had received comments from some residents in the annexation area that it was time to update the addresses. He also shared one case where someone had purchased a home in the annexation area and buyers did not realize they were in North Salt Lake instead of Bountiful. He stated those new owners went to Bountiful City to sign up for utility services and were told then that they were actually in North Salt Lake. He questioned how long the City should continue to perpetuate incorrect addresses.

Councilmember Jackson asked if there were issues with sales tax capture with the current addressing. Sherrie Pace replied that sales tax was tied to the four digit code at the end of the five digit zip code or each property and those had been tied to the City, so there is not issue with that.

Councilmember Knowlton requested the addition of individual household costs and benefits (pros/cons) to the proposed committee scope. He asked how Bountiful City could engage in this process. Sherrie Pace said a representative from each of the stakeholders including those from Bountiful City could be invited to a committee meeting if the committee felt there was some information that was warranted. She proposed generating a list of those stakeholders and entities

with the committee at their first meeting. Possible stakeholders would include the USPS, Davis County, County Clerk, DMV, etc.

Mayor Horrocks opened the public comment at 6:18 p.m.

Jo Ellen Ashworth, property owner, spoke on the Salt Lake valley addressing system and suggested the City change its addressing system to match Bountiful City. She said in the August 4th City Council meeting discussing readdressing a comment was made that the cost to the City would be minimal, and she believed that the cost to residents would not be minimal. She disputed that Bountiful City, the post office, or public safety entities had no concerns with the current addressing. Ms. Ashworth requested contact information for the committee members and how to be notified of the meetings. She felt there were no problems in retaining Bountiful addresses that could not be resolved.

Chris Moss, resident, expressed concern that those on the committee who did not live in the area would be making decisions for those residents who did. He requested that the City leave the residents alone and control speeding cars on the streets.

Richard Herron, resident, commented that no one in the annexation area wanted to be part of the City. He continued that services went down and taxes increased. He said people moved to the unincorporated area because they did not want to be part of North Salt Lake or Bountiful. He added that he did not understand the purpose of the committee as the City Council had already made the decision to change the addresses.

Councilmember Knowlton commented that the decision had not been made.

Richard Herron, resident, continued that he felt the same unfair process of going through the formalities occurred during the annexation. He asked that the City provide notice of when the address changes would occur so he could sell his home before it was put in place.

Michelle Fairbanks, resident, commented that while the Council stated that decision had not been made, she felt it had because staff stated that the new house numbers had already been chosen. She requested that the addressing remain the same and said there were already inconsistencies with the current City addressing. She spoke on the waste of money to update street signs and how she felt the City made decisions without serving the residents.

Sabrina Harman, resident, said while the annexed area was incorporated in North Salt Lake in 2022 that these residents had been living at their established addresses for many years prior to that. She noted that there had been no issues in the four years since the annexation and the

reasons behind the address change including Bountiful City's request and EMS concerns. She continued that she had a hard time understanding why residents had to change the address connected to their mortgages, insurance, banks, utilities, vehicle registration, etc. which would create hours of burden. She concluded that there was an issue of trust with the City and City Council for suggesting the address change without showing evidence of a real problem.

Resident, not identified, commented that she grew up in the area and said there were no address issues in West Bountiful using Bountiful addresses. She expressed distaste for the number of car dealerships on Highway 89. She forcefully asked the City to leave the addresses as is.

Steve Beazer, resident, said he had lived in the area for over 50 years and had been involved in annexation issue over the years. He spoke on trusting the elected City officials and said while the assimilation into the City had been mostly pleasant, the change itself was part of the problem. He shared that he had recently had an issue with his medical insurance due to his address being a Bountiful address but being physically in North Salt Lake caused confusion at the pharmacy. He said the purpose of the committee was to do the research, receive local input, and figure out the right thing without a predetermined decision.

Elaine Christensen Moss, resident, commented that she did not want a new address as she did not want to be associated with Salt Lake or North Salt Lake. She said she had never had issues with deliveries, pharmacies, or EMS due to her address. She mentioned her frustration with the City due to a proposal for condos near her home, rules and regulations related to easements, owning roosters, etc.

Richard Herron, resident, returned to ask the follow up question if the City Council received a raise after the area was annexed into the City.

Councilmember Jackson commented that she had not received a raise.

Councilmember Van Langeveld clarified that the City Councilmembers received about $15,000 per year.

Richard Herron reiterated that his taxes increased and services decreased following the annexation. He said previously the County provided great service and police presence. He spoke on speeding issues and lack of sidewalks in the area. He also requested speed bumps and offered a $10,000 donation towards installation and requested the speed limit be reduced to 20 mph.

Councilmember Knowlton asked what street he was referring to. Richard replied that it was 3500 South. He continued with his concerns related to speeding and a request for officers to patrol the area. He stated that he had video of speeders and their license plates.

Mayor Horrocks asked for a show of hands for those present who did not have sidewalks and those who would want them to raise their hand.

Resident, not identified, commented from the audience on her concerns related to sidewalks and how it would require utilizing resident's yards if they were installed on various streets in the annexation area. She also mentioned frustrations with street parking during the winter, and City plowing.

Janice Twede, resident, shared concerns related to townhomes and apartments in her area with noise and traffic and how this had changed her quiet neighborhood. She was not in favor of the proposed address change as she had lived there for 57 years.

Resident, not identified, commented that he was not surprised things were happening this way. He shared his concerns with the incorporation and the address change.

Amber Ivie Stringham, resident, shared that her parents had lived in their home for 57 years and when her father passed away two months ago, the EMS had no issues finding their address on 3800 South. She said while change was inevitable or necessary that the address change was not needed. She also suggested the City adopt Bountiful addresses to be consistent with the Salt Lake County addressing system.

Cindy Powell, resident, commented on the residents sharing their opinions and having their voice matter along with trust that the City Council would listen. She spoke on the hope that City leaders could be trusted with resident concerns She shared parking and safety concerns related to Chesham Village. She was also against an address change.

Lorna Ivie, resident, said that she had lived on 3800 South for 57 years and had recently lost her husband. She shared her concerns with the problems associated with an address change.

Mayor Horrocks closed the public comments at 6:52 p.m.

Councilmember Knowlton thanked those in attendance for sharing their opinions. He said the City Council had not discussed this for several months beyond a brief discussion in August. He explained the purpose of the proposed committee was to obtain information for the City Council to then make a decision. He urged those in attendance to apply for the committee and ensure that

the neighborhood affected was represented. He continued that the committee would review pros and cons of a potential address change so the Council could then deliberate.

Councilmember Knowlton shared that he did not like the current name of the City, as it implies a connection to Salt Lake City, because the City has a stronger connection to our neighbors in Bountiful. He noted that he lived near many of those who had provided public comment in the previously unincorporated Davis County. He said that the City Council was part of the same community and had heard from residents on how painful the annexation was. He added that the previous elected officials for the area were the County Commissioners and that their new elected officials were now the City Council that lived in their city.
Councilmember Knowlton concluded with the desire to address the other issues raised during the public comment as well and how the City Council was not an adversary.

Mayor Horrocks commented that the unincorporated area had approximately 1,000 residents and around 75 had shown up today. He asked if that meant that they should assume that those other 900 residents were in favor of the address change. He also mentioned the number one complaint he had heard related to the annexation was the loss of utilizing the Bountiful landfill. He added that while the unincorporated area did not vote to be annexed that Davis County residents had been subsidizing services to those areas and City residents had been paying for parks and other City facilities that those in the unincorporated areas utilized.

Mayor Horrocks also added that Davis County had requested the annexation due to the cost and impracticality of providing services to the unincorporated area (snow plowing, police, etc.) and that there was not an option for the area to become part of Bountiful.

An audience member commented that promises had been made that while taxes would increase that services would be better. He said services had not been better and shared concerns about the lack of sidewalks in the area as well.

Mayor Horrocks reiterated that nothing had been decided but said that incorrect addressing was being perpetuated and should be fixed at some point.

An audience member commented that he believed someone would be hurt by EMS not being able to find an address if they were changed. He said the proposed address change would result in confusion.

Councilmember Clayton commented that she had lived in this neighborhood her entire life, including times in the Bountiful portion and the unincorporated Davis County portion, as well as now within North Salt Lake. She spoke on her love for the City and said it was a nice place to be

from. She mentioned how the committee would be a good thing and allow residents to share their opinions and work together.

Councilmember Van Langeveld thanked the residents for their comments and said the City Council was listening. She said if the addresses were changed that the comments made would help to solve some of the issues. She shared a potential idea that paperwork could be created to show that the old address equaled the new address for any legal needs (trust, end of life, housing transitions). She mentioned another idea that could be explored to determine if the new addresses could become effective upon a change of property ownership or an opt-in system.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said that other public comment had been received where residents were in favor of the address change. She also mentioned that several residents from the annexation area were now serving on the Planning Commission and other committees in the City and had been a real asset to those committees. She echoed the request that residents apply to serve on the addressing committee.

Councilmember Jackson commented she also grew up and then continued to reside in the Bountiful/North Salt Lake area. She said each of the Councilmembers ran for different reasons but primarily to represent the residents and not make high level decisions in spite of residents. She confirmed that the proposed change would affect the residents that were annexed and how the Council wanted to hear their comments before a decision was made.

Resident, not identified, commented that while the City Council may like where they lived that they made the choice to move to North Salt Lake and how those in the annexation area were not given the choice. She said they liked their addresses and community and how North Salt Lake was not their community. Councilmember Jackson replied that the City was not the adversary but their neighbors and part of the same community regardless of the boundaries. She said the City Council also represented the annexation area residents and they were open to emails and calls.

Resident asked if the residents in the annexation area could chose the two citizen representatives to be on the committee. She then asked if there could be more than two citizen representatives and what the criteria would be for the Mayor to chose those representatives. Mayor Horrocks said the criteria had not yet been determined.

2. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 7:12 p.m. to begin the regular session.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-REGULAR SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
OCTOBER 6, 2026

DRAFT

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 7:27 p.m. Tammy Clayton provided a thought and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Ted Knowlton
Councilmember Heidi Smoot
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Wendy Page, City Recorder.

OTHERS PRESENT: Jo Ellen Ashworth, Frances Marcus, Elaine Christensen Moss, Chris Moss, Sabrina Harman, Christopher Harman, Carri Herron, Diane Sjoherg, Carolyn Jacobson, Jennifer Graves, Gary Gatherum, Curtis Creek, Lorna Ivie, Janis Twede, Rebecca Sherman, Pat B. Nageli, Todd Summers, Dee Lalliss, Michelle Fairbanks, Brandi Wendel, Nicholas Nelson, Cindy Powell, Steve Beazer, Ryan Holbrook, Jared Wendel, Bradley Anderson, G. Holbrook, Amber Ivie Stringham, Peter Wirthlin, Jacob Gordon, Ashlyn Hawkins, Shandell Smoot, Eric Wood, Melou Cline, Russell Cline, Alexis Pena, James Van Langeveld, Barry Bryson, Jake, residents; Marcie Clark, Davis County Health Department; Michael Romero, UDOT.

1. CITIZEN COMMENT

Mayor Horrocks invited those with comments related to the Nights Out agenda item to hold off until that item on the agenda was discussed when he would allow those comments to be shared.

There were no citizen comments given at this time.

2. PRESENTATION BY THE DAVIS COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT OF AVAILABLE ONLINE RESOURCES

Marcie Clark, Davis County Health Department, reported on Davis Links which was a community connector network of resources, services, and programs in Davis County. She said part of Davis Links was an online resource directory (davislinks.org) with resources, services, and programs related to health, wellbeing, basic needs, etc. She reviewed the structure and groups that were involved in the five year community health improvement plan. She continued that the priorities of the plan were to improve mental, emotional, and social wellbeing and improve access to resources and services.

Marcie Clark said Davis Links included four components including the online resources, resource forums, workgroups, and partners. She reviewed how to use the davislinks.org website including how to search the online resource directory for everything from basic needs to emergency services or through a partnership with 211 for those who would rather call and be connected with a service navigator to connect to resources. She then reviewed how many searches were done, common search terms, most searched categories, and utilization by zip code.

Ms. Clark concluded with ways to promote Davis Links include the ability to add a widget to the City's website, staff training, social media guides, and through participation in outreach events in the community.

Councilmember Van Langeveld thanked Ms. Clark for presenting and said that Davis Links was valuable resource. She noted she was a member of the City's Health and Wellness Committee and how one of the goals of this committee was to ensure that resources were not duplicated. She spoke on how the City was already promoting Davis Links on their website and that a representative from Davis County had provided outreach at a recent City Nights Out event. She provided feedback that the City was grateful to partner with Davis Links which had extensive resources and was user friendly.

3. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-43R: A RESOLUTION APPROVING MASTER AGREEMENT AMENDMENT 1 RELATED TO BETTERMENTS AT THE CITY'S I-15 INTERCHANGES AT 2600 SOUTH AND US89

Ken Leetham reported on the I-15 project and the steps required before the project was built including landscape betterments at the two City interchanges which were 2600 South and the future US89 location. He said a year ago UDOT approached the City about the 2600 interchange which the City shares with Woods Cross. He continued that this included a review of concept drawings by the City Council who then provided feedback to UDOT. He shared a list of material

quantities and an estimate of how much landscaping UDOT would pay for which was approximately $100,000 per interchange.

Mr. Leetham said this agreement included establishing a baseline of how much material would be provided by UDOT for these interchanges. He continued that the next step in the process would be working with the design build team which had not yet been chosen. He noted that Michael Romero with UDOT was in attendance at this meeting. He envisioned that the City Council may want to add landscaping after reviewing the plan once it was completed.

Michael Romero, UDOT, introduced himself as the project director for the I-15 reconstruction project and noted that they had been working with City staff for over a year. He explained the design build project including creating a concept that was 30% design and allowed for the generation of cost estimates and working with cities to obtain expectations. He continued that the estimate process would include figuring out how many cubic yards of material such as rock mulch, weed barrier, or concrete curb would be needed. He shared the process from obtaining information from the cities, to selecting a design builder, and then to installation.

Mayor Horrocks commented that he had equal parts anticipation and dread for this project. He asked about the timeframe. Michael Romero said proposals were due tomorrow with a selection of the contractor to come in several weeks. He hoped to have a notice to proceed to the selected contractor in January and then finalization followed by a 24 month design period. He continued that clearing, prepping, traffic shifts, and other upfront work may begin now.

Councilmember Knowlton asked what the timeline pertained to, whether it was the entire project or just the City's portion of the improvements. Michael Romero replied that the entire project spanned from Farmington to Salt Lake and included reconstruction of every interchange in the corridor including a new service interchange at 1-15 and I-215 (new Hwy 89 interchange). He said they anticipated a three or four year construction schedule depending on bids received. He spoke on the size and scale of this project and how to accomplish it at the lowest price through the design build process.

Councilmember Knowlton asked about the approximate end date of 2031. Michael Romero confirmed that the project completion date was July 2031 to July 2032 timeframe.

Mayor Horrocks confirmed that next year would entail working on the design. He asked if Legacy Highway would be completed by then. Michael Romero replied affirmatively and said construction on Legacy would wrap in November 2026. He anticipated early work on I-15 would be completed next year followed by a traffic shift on I-15 to provide room for contractors to commence work.

Councilmember Smoot noted that it was $100,000 of landscaping per intersection and the plan that was being presented tonight, showed only eight trees. Michael Romero replied that this plan was representative and said each city took a different approach and each interchange had its own unique challenges. He continued that each city were given the option of rock mulch, native type vegetation, low water or irrigation systems. He said that each cities RFP were reflective of the input received.

Michael Romero added that each city would take on maintenance responsibilities for the aesthetically improved areas.

Councilmember Jackson asked what was needed tonight from the City Council. Michael Romero responded that they had worked with staff and the betterment agreement reflected the City's interest in participating above and beyond the baseline of the aesthetics program. He noted the City would need to fund a portion above the basic plan and the proposed quantities included this. He added that if the final design did not make sense, it could be scaled back or up.

Ken Leetham added that the Resolution 2026-43R was the specific adoption of amendment one to the master agreement. He said this resolution would give the design build team the City's goal to beautify these interchanges.

Councilmember Jackson moved that the City Council approve Resolution 2026-43R: a resolution approving Master Agreement Amendment 1 related to betterments at the City's I-15 interchange with I-215 and US89. Councilmember Knowlton seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

4. CONSIDERATION OF NIGHTS OUT EVENTS FOR 2027

Mayor Horrocks commented that this item was discussed and then tabled during the previous City Council meeting.

Ken Leetham noted that there may be residents wishing to make comment and stated that several emails had also been received which would become part of the public record.

Mayor Horrocks summarized an email from Jared Stewart who was in support of continuing the Nights Out Events in 2027. He continued with an email from Karma Nelson who had concerns that these events should bring residents together and not separate them. He concluded with an email from Barry Bryson who suggested studying each event individually based on overall community inclusiveness, total budget impact, and level of resident support.

Mayor Horrocks opened the public comment at 8:00 p.m.

Gentry Holbrook, resident, said she had attended the Latino Heritage event and mentioned many attendees expressed appreciation for the community joining them sharing in their talents both dance and culture. She commented that she had started an online petition with 123 signatures from residents who wanted to continue the Nights Out Events, specifically Juneteenth, Pride, and Latino Heritage. She noted how these events pulled the community together as people built friendships and unity. She spoke on expanding this through additional events with citizen chairs and noted that while others had been encouraged to volunteer that no one came forward at the Events Committee meeting to chair a new event for 2027. Ms. Holbrook shared the importance of hosting these events where everyone could come together to learn about other cultures and backgrounds. She mentioned how Juneteenth was not only for Black people and was about bringing people together to learn and educate on what the Black community had dealt with.

Jake Gordon, resident, commented how if the Nights Out Events were cancelled that this would be a mistake that people would look back on with regret. He was also in favor of adding additional events and knew of many residents who would also be upset if these events were canceled.

Dee Lalliss, resident, said his concern was that if the City sponsored events then they may be liable for those events. He suggested that each event had to be sanctioned and could then receive a certain amount of funds with a limit of ten events per year. He felt these events were unifying and brought diversity and helped residents to feel part of the community.

Russ Cline, resident, commented that he was a long time resident and how his children had graduated from Woods Cross High School. He noted that the school had a madrigals choir with a wide diversity of students including his son who was Polynesian. He said while he had not attended the Nights Out Events that he felt they should continue and suggested a Polynesian Night Out event. He expressed concern if any of these events included pushing an agenda or focusing on one group at the exclusion of the whole and suggested the City structure these events in a way that they were broad and inviting to all.

Fran Marcus, resident, commented that she was part of the Events Committee. She spoke on the volunteers who put in the time and effort to make these events successful. She said that in order for the City Council or others to make an informed decision that they needed to attend these events. She noted that she had seen Mayor Horrocks, Councilmembers Van Langeveld and Clayton at these events. She expressed concern that people had commented there was an agenda being pushed when there was not and cautioned those people who made a decision when they were not fully informed.

JJ Van Langeveld, resident, commented that this was a great use of taxpayer funds based on the data shared in the spreadsheet at the last City Council meeting. He noted that the data showed each individual Nights Out Event drew about 5% of the City's population and cost $600 or less per event. He spoke on attending these events and seeing that they were inclusive of all those in attendance. He said there was no agenda being pushed other than inclusion which made him proud to be a resident of the City.

Melou Cline, resident, commented on the passion she had seen in residents including in 2004 when she stood before the City Council in regards to the medial waste incinerator, Stericycle, in Foxboro. She spoke on gathering together and was in support of reconsideration of the City's current structure of these events. She noted that a City Councilmember had received campaign funds from a Political Action Committee (PAC) group and this was concerning to her even in terms of remaining intersectional even though she felt that group was positive. She continued with providing equality for everyone and to expand the events to include a Polynesian, Japanese, or Greek, etc. and restructuring these in way to support all groups and cultures.

Ashlyn Hawkins, resident, said she appreciated the desire to help people feel welcome and connected to the community. She hoped that the City would focus less on the things that divided people into different groups and more on the things that were shared including being part of the City. She spoke on celebrating differences while creating events that brought everyone together as one community.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on the time spent considering this including the comments from residents. She said this was not a discussion about groups that the Council liked or did not like but an overarching City policy discussion. She continued that the question was "what was the policy of the City in using compulsory taxpayer dollars." She felt the policy should be to use these dollars for events that every taxpayer felt comfortable and included in.

Councilmember Jackson shared that the inundation of letters and the yearly discussion showed that this was divisive and would always be so. She said whenever small groups were singled out through funding, advertising, etc. that it was at the exclusion of other small groups and was unsustainable with tax dollars, staff time, or committee time. She added that this did not apply to the Youth City Council or the Senior Lunch Bunch as everyone had been a child and would be a senior or knew and loved a child or senior. She felt the easy policy decision related to the Nights Out Events was to take contention out and only pick events that were universal.

Councilmember Jackson stated the City Council needed to determine if the policy was to do a few events well and choosing events that everyone felt their taxpayer dollars and their feet can attend. She gave the example of the Girls Night Out and a little boy that asked if he could attend

the event or if there would be a boy's night out. She said whenever there was a small subset of society taken that inherently other subsets of society would be excluded. She noted that when you included small and promoted small that you inherently excluded.

Councilmember Jackson continued that the question was what the City should do moving forward and how none of the other cities in Davis County had chosen to take up this gauntlet and it may cause division within their cities. She said the other part of the equation was representing the residents that reached out in the small amount of time the City Councilmembers served. She shared that she had been consistent and heard from many people that did not agree with these small subsets being highlighted every year. She noted that they would like a multicultural night or an I am proud to be an American or events that everyone felt a part of.

Councilmember Jackson said the other small events like the Greek Festival should be held by volunteers at City parks without City funding or advertising. She continued that those events could be sponsored with personal funds, corporate sponsors, or by religious or other groups. She noted that she had been consistent in where she stood for three years and saw a lot of division with these events. She felt as a City that it was an easy lift to decide to just choose events that did not cause consternation within the community.

Fran Marcus, resident, asked who decided the universal events. Mayor Horrocks responded that our government was not a democracy but a representative republic and noted there were five elected representatives on the City Council who get to make the decisions. He said that hopefully the residents had elected people that reflected their values and would vote like they would. He added that the most obvious thing in this whole process is that we are not always going to agree.

Councilmember Jackson said this was a great question and was at the heart of the problem which is who decided which small groups were highlighted every year and which small groups were not highlighted. She felt it was easy to support children with Back to School Night, veterans, Flag Day which stood for America, and universal subjects such as the Kite Festival. She continued that there were many events to choose that represent everyone as a whole and expressed her point rather than picking and choosing was who gets to choose these events.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that the Events Committee chose the events.

Mayor Horrocks said it was his understanding the reason this came up in the Events Committee was that they wondered who decided and the answer was nobody should and there should not be events that were divisive. He stated the Committee's point was rather than recommending or deciding what Nights Out events the City would hold, none should be held. He continued that this point was lost in the last City Council meeting with the discussion on dollar amounts and

attendance. He noted that those were irrelevant and that the focus was what the City was supporting or not supporting. He felt the Events Committee no longer wanted to host these events. He added that instead the Committee suggested that any group that wanted to host an event was welcome to.

Councilmember Knowlton agreed that the first thing was that the Council would not agree or change each other's minds. He spoke on finding a solution and sticking with whatever was determined at least with the current composition of the Council. He noted that a lot of great points had been made by residents and felt the community was in earnest even with differing perspectives. He shared his thoughts that this was a welcoming community and how the people who attended the Pride and Latino Nights would feel welcome in their community but said that the majority of the City events should speak to a broader population that made sure to welcome everybody.

Councilmember Knowlton continued that taking away Latino or Pride Night from those communities would result in some level of hurt but at the same time he said the majority of the Nights Out Events should be for a broader population. He did not think that Pride and Latino nights were only for those populations and were intended to be broadly inclusive but the majority of the events should be for patriotism or veterans, etc. He suggested maintaining the current number of events due to the burden on staff and the majority of those events should be for a broad audience.

Councilmember Knowlton shared a third suggestion to open up the events for one that catered to a notable population in the community on a rotation basis. He noted that this suggestion came from former Councilmember Baskin and resident Dee Lalliss. He reiterated his suggestions of rotating the events for those that the Events Committee felt were valid, maintaining the same number of events, and that the majority of events were broadly inclusive. He mentioned that Juneteenth was for all Americans as the abolition of slavery was of huge historical importance for everybody and should be celebrated as a majority event.

Councilmember Clayton commented that she had shared her feelings and thoughts during the last Council discussion on this item. She expressed appreciation for all those who had sent emails and expressed their opinions. She noted how there were emails in support of and against the current setup. She mentioned an email related to a Citywide service project and felt this would be a good way to bring the community together.

Councilmember Clayton invited anyone who had not attended the Nights Out Event to come see what they were about. She added that the Nights Out Events helped support the Food Truck and Vendor Fair Nights to be more profitable as well.

Councilmember Smoot commented that this had weighed on the Council for three weeks and said that there was more that united the City than divided it. She did not feel like any event should be canceled and spoke on broadening the tent. She shared instances of discussing the events process with residents including an application or chairing an event. She suggested broadening the Latino Night to be a cultural heritage night so that one specific group did not have the weight of sponsoring the whole event by themselves.

Councilmember Smoot mentioned that the Governor had proposed June as Fidelity Month to celebrate loyalty and relationships and a former Utah Supreme Court Justice who spoke on the great Utah Compromise with different groups to ensure that neither side had to compromise their values. She advocated for a compromise to champion City events that were sponsored and to broaden the tent to include everything and help support little groups who may not be able to carry an event on their own. She added if there was a small group that was organized and funded that wanted to have an event that the City could provide public space such as parks for those public events.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said she was thrilled with the level of citizen engagement regardless of the point being made. She felt that these events had caused people to have conversations that may not have happened otherwise. She continued that she had been involved with the City including on the City Council for over ten years and was grateful for the engagement. She spoke on unintended negative consequences and that this was an important part of the conversation related to these Nights Out Events.

Councilmember Van Langeveld shared the reason behind why these events were created four years ago. She said the events were corrected and new iterations occurred every year by design which was good City policy. She explained that these events were always intended to be citizen lead which meant the City would not pick and choose the events. She spoke on the procedure and said there was an open invitation for any individual to come share an event idea. She continued the second part of this was that these events were intended to be small compared to some regional events the City hosted.

Councilmember Van Langeveld shared that there was a Pacific Islander event in the past but no citizen chair stepped forward to continue the event so it fell out of rotation. She gave the example of the Greek Festival in Salt Lake and noted it was a regional event that had an entrance fee. She spoke on how larger events required more funding, decreased oversight, and increased regional attendance. She said there was a regional event in the City which was not City sponsored and the outcome resulted in damage done to City property.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said these events started with Juneteenth when Governor Cox declared Juneteenth as a State holiday. She continued that when the City declared Juneteenth as a holiday that there was a discussion on how else the City could recognize the importance of this day. She noted that the City also had a dark stain on their reputation for being a racist City due to incidents with the school district and the Council at that time created opportunities to counter that. She spoke on the Wellness Survey, per the Health and Wellness Committee, that showed residents felt a lack of connection to the City and a lack of cultural opportunities.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said these events helped counter those issues. She appreciated the idea of creating City policy for these events and explained that there was already an open door for additional events to be presented to the Events Committee who made the decision. She continued that it made sense to cap the number of events to ensure that staff was not overloaded. She mentioned that she spoke with Jon Rueckert who provided the feedback that staff opted into these events and were not forced to work overtime.

Councilmember Van Langeveld shared that another discussion had centered around creating a menu of resources that the Nights Out chairs could use related to items the City would offer such as chairs or garbage cans to ensure it was uniform for all events. She felt it would be a great procedure to ask event chairs if they would like to opt into a rotation. She reiterated that these were citizen led events and not City generated. She mentioned the comment that events focused on being American and patriotism were universal but said it was not accurate to say everyone felt connected to those things.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said all events at some level were speaking to a subgroup and while she was in favor of focusing on the events that could be as large as possible that she valued having a range of events. She spoke on her dislike of Liberty Fest due to the traffic and said while this was a large event which was universal for the City, that not all residents loved it. She felt it was important to acknowledge that not all patriotic events were universal. She mentioned that while we all know seniors or children that we also all know LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer) or Latinos as well.

Councilmember Van Langeveld invited every person to come to these events as they were casual and no one would feel unwelcome. She was open to the idea of rotating events but did not feel like this should be done until the number of events had met capacity. She spoke on the Mayor’s comment on electing people who reflected the same values. She said while this was important that it was also important to elect people who would use their best reasoned decision making to iron out policy.

Councilmember Van Langeveld also mentioned the comments related to the use of taxpayer dollars and said the $600 budget for these events demonstrated being very careful in how those funds were spent. She said while there was criticism that the public comment was overwhelmingly in support of these events. She concluded that she would operate with values and integrity in making reasoned decisions and would continue to support these events.

Mayor Horrocks commented that this had been one of the most difficult things he had wrestled with in his 20 years in city government. He said there had been great comments and suggestions on both sides of this complex issue. He spoke on the proper role as a City and mentioned the idea of getting out of it altogether so that no choosing had to be done. He mentioned the specific events on the agenda for discussion and said in a sense the City was saying this is what we are about as a City.

Mayor Horrocks shared a concern that for every event there were groups that had the exact opposite sense and opening the City up to other event ideas such as Latino Night and then the next week some anti-immigration group would want to hold an event and the City would have to advertise it, pay for it and put the City's name behind it. He noted several alternative groups that may want to host an event in the City. He expressed concern about the City opening up the ability for all groups to host events and how he did not want to be in that position.

Mayor Horrocks suggested that while he was happy to have groups do their own thing the City could provide the facilities but did not want to endorse them. Councilmember Van Langeveld clarified that there was a procedure in place to decide that process and said the examples mentioned by the Mayor were sponsored by organizations and how the current events were generally not sponsored by specific organizations, with the exception of A Bolder Way Forward and Why I Love America. She continued that this could be a clear procedural decision that the City would not sponsor groups.

Mayor Horrocks asked if an individual Islamist came forward if that would be ok. Councilmember Van Langeveld replied if there was a demonstrated population in the City that was represented by that group, that would be a consideration.

Mayor Horrocks acknowledged he was being totally out in left field with these concerns. He spoke on picking winners and felt that was not the role of government. Councilmember Van Langeveld said this was not about picking anyone. Mayor Horrocks disagreed.

Mayor Horrocks said the suggestions included having family night to include all kinds of families including men/men or women/women families and said this would be more inclusive.

He expressed that he wanted the City to get out of the business of picking sides and said he did not feel good about any of this.

Todd Godfrey commented that these discussions had made him uncomfortable due to the expenditure of public funds as they need to honor the requirements of State law, honor the principles of the Constitution, and abide by the restrictions of the Bill of Rights. He said the City was walking a fine line when they offered public support to events with any type of decision matrix whatever it might be. He continued that while it was the City's decision to make policy that he was a legal adviser and would like to be able to help structure this in a way to ensure the City was observing Constitutional and State law restrictions on the expenditure of public funds.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked where the City was at risk. Todd Godfrey replied that any time the City expended public funds or there was a decision process whether it was first come first serve that if one group continued to get the first cut that the City ran some legal risk including being sued. He said the City could be sued by any group that felt excluded for any reason.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said there was a clear procedure for this process. She said it was in the public record per this discussion and had been discussed in the Events Committee. Todd Godfrey responded that he would like to review this procedure.

Councilmember Van Langeveld continued that while the City might get sued that reasonable justification would be the procedure related to how the decision was made. Todd Godfrey said he was not comfortable with that at this point.

Councilmember Smoot asked if she could make a motion related to finding a compromise. She said there were strong feelings and valid points on both sides and the desire to feel seen and acknowledged. She asked if there was a way to find a compromise so that no one was canceled and to enlarge the tent to celebrate what united the City. She suggested four events including a cultural heritage night, a family night or a fidelity night to celebrate what brough the residents together.

Councilmember Smoot put forth a motion to find a compromise. Councilmember Knowlton was in support of the idea of a compromise. He said the nature of the compromise was the thing for the Council to debate.

Councilmember Jackson clarified that this was an overarching City policy. She spoke on City support of these events including advertising and opening up the City to liability. She continued that these events could include any small subset of the population and how another small subset

could take recourse. She added that it took her a year to determine whether there was a procedure for choosing these events and said it did not seem like there was a clear procedure. She felt the easiest way to step out of this quagmire was to not choose these events and stick with the main City events or make the tent so broad that no subset felt like they were not chosen.

Councilmember Clayton asked if the events were so broad that it may be messier or that someone might be missed. Councilmember Jackson said the point was it would be so broad that no one would be missed.

Ken Leetham suggested a closed session discussion to understand what the City Attorney had mentioned related to legal risks. He said one outcome could be to ask the City Attorney to craft a policy that protected the City.

Todd Godfrey recommended his firm prepare a legal written memorandum for the City Council to review. He suggested this discussion return at a future date after further legal discussion.

Councilmember Jackson asked if the Nights Out Events were canceled or used universal titles if the City would no longer be open to related legal action. Todd Godfrey replied that not funding these events would be a safe harbor and the easiest route. He said creating broadly inclusive events would always have some risk associated but would be safer than an approach which required the City to make decisions that respected certain groups. He noted that steps could be taken to minimize the risk and place the City in the best position but said there were some associated risks in holding events.

Councilmember Smoot asked about allowing citizen groups to host events on public property. Todd Godfrey replied that there were some things he would counsel the City to do in that circumstance but said this could be allowed.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said even in allowing groups to host events on City property that this still opened the City up to legal liability. Todd Godfrey confirmed that if policy was structured in a way that public property was open for use by anyone, including the Ku Klux Klan, then the City could avoid legal liability.

Councilmember Van Langeveld argued that the City was allowed more oversight when the events were City sponsored and did not include partnerships with organizations. Ken Leetham strongly recommended that the Council allow legal counsel to advise them in writing.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said there were two issues at hand including approving the events for 2027 as well as continuing the discussion on creating a City policy that limited legal risk. She noted that her motion would be to address both of these items.

Councilmember Van Langeveld moved that the City Council approve the current slate of Nights Out Events as recommended by the Events Committee for 2027 and instruct the City Attorney to generate a memoranda for the City Council to consider at a future date at our legal risk of holding the Nights Out Events.

Mayor Horrocks asked if there was a second.

Mayor Horrocks asked for clarification in the motion and said if the events were approved and the legal counsel was in opposition to what had been approved that it seemed counterintuitive. Councilmember Van Langeveld replied that the City had already held these events for four years without any legal implications. She felt the conversation regarding the legal risk was valuable but did not think the City had to hold off on the decision for 2027. She added that continuing to revisit these events each year was part of the design as well to ensure improvement.

Mayor Horrocks asked again if there was a second on the motion.

Councilmember Jackson said the City had been rolling the dice and was just lucky the last four years. She continued that a lot of public awareness had been brought each year and mentioned that several of the email comments were from lawyers. She felt it would be safer to protect the City legally.

Mayor Horrocks indicated there was a motion that was offered and asked if there was a second.

Mayor Horrocks noted that the motion died for lack of a second.

Councilmember Knowlton asked if part of the intent of the motion was to help the Events Committee to move forward with planning. He asked about the proposed composition for 2027. Councilmember Van Langeveld added that the City also established an events calendar for the following year that was published in December. She noted the proposed events were Juneteenth, Pride, Back to School, Bolder Way Forward, and Latino Heritage.

Councilmember Smoot asked if there was a compromise here. Councilmember Van Langeveld said the compromise was the continued conversation.

Councilmember Smoot proposed that the City Council pick four nights and broaden the scope to be more inclusive. She cautioned against doing this at the advice of legal counsel and in being respectful of what it may expose or increase liability for the City. She felt moving forward with the status quo was not considering all the public comments that were received. She felt that the City was evenly divided on the unity events. She requested finding a compromise without giving up values or positions and that moving forward with the status quo was disingenuous.

Councilmember Smoot moved to have four City events with incredibly big umbrellas and also to wait to approve those four events until after we have counsel from the City Attorney. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on her thoughts regarding a motion of pausing these events until the City Council heard from the City Attorney on what stipulations there might be on the event titles that were broad enough.

Mayor Horrocks asked for clarification on if the Events Committee should be instructed to come up with ideas while the Council waited to receive legal advice. Councilmember Clayton replied that currently the event chairs were willing to continue the Nights Out events but if the events were broadened there may not be willing volunteers to chair them. She stated the current motion would mean the Events Committee would then be responsible for those events and felt it was a big ask and requested it be tabled instead.

Councilmembers Smoot and Clayton were in favor of tabling the discussion and pausing the Nights Out events. Councilmember Jackson was in favor of pausing the events pending legal counsel.

Mayor Horrocks commented that there had been a motion and a second so a substitute motion could be made to pause the events.

Councilmember Smoot rescinded her motion.

Councilmember Smoot moved to pause all Unity or Nights Out events until the City Council had legal counsel. Councilmember Knowlton seconded the motion.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that compromise was baked into the process already. She said the compromise was that the City Council discussed the events every year and the Events Committee reviewed the details. She continued that the compromise was discussing the events with staff on what Public Works would offer. She was in agreement that there should be a compromise but felt that this process was already happening.

The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, and Smoot. Councilmember Van Langeveld voted in opposition to the motion.

5. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-42R: A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS MANUALS FOR STREETS, WATER, STORM WATER AND PARKS

Karyn Baxter reported that the City Council was required to officially adopt the engineering regulations and standards per state law. She continued that these standards regulated construction including building sidewalks, roads, trenches, backfill, etc. She said the last adoption was a year ago and was based on American Public Works Association (APWA) with additional information customized to clarify City specific requirements. She reviewed the changes including typos and technical updates as well as the following five changes:

- Inclusion of irrigation details (Parks)
- Separation fabric between gravel and trench backfill in storm drain trenches (Storm Water)
- Updates to street light standards (Streets)
- Updates street light location map (Streets)
- Inclusion of existing concrete specifications (Streets)

Sherrie Pace added when staff chose the Town Center lighting that they were to be equipped with plant hangers. She said the intention was that the hanging baskets would be provided and maintained by the adjacent property owners. She continued that in other cities, it was the City owned the baskets and maintained them. She asked if the City Council wanted to continue equipping the town center street lights with provisions for these hanging baskets with the understanding that it may require more funding or staff.

Councilmember Smoot asked if the hanging baskets would require drip line installation to every basket. Sherrie Pace replied that a drip line is built into the interior of the pole. She said for example that the baskets in Clinton City were owned by the city and hand watered by city staff. She commented that this should be a policy decision that the City Council directed.

Mayor Horrocks was in favor of the hanging baskets and asked about the cost. Sherrie Pace suggested adopting the street light location map update without designating the streets where plant hangers would be installed and then staff could present a suggested plan for management. She said staff could research how other cities managed this and then the Council could make a decision on where or if these should be implemented.

Councilmember Jackson asked if the options were either a plant holder or a banner arm for the street lights. Sherrie Pace responded that both options were available on the same pole with the banner arm towards the street and the plant hanger facing towards the sidewalk. She said there were currently about 10 street lights with the plant hangers on Center Street and 130 East. She said those were the only Town Center lights that had been installed and noted additional proposed locations including adjacent to Hatch Park along Center Street and Main Street.

Karyn Baxter presented a drawing of the street lights and noted the location of the banner arm and the plant hanger. She said the bars could be added to existing poles but the infrastructure for the drip system would not be in place. She continued that staff recommended the adoption of the proposed standards at this time followed by further review of the plant hanger arms. She noted staff would return with a plan and cost information for the street light options.

Mayor Horrocks opened the public hearing at 9:38 p.m.

There were no public comments.

Mayor Horrocks closed the public hearing at 9:39 p.m.

Councilmember Knowlton moved that the City Council approve Resolution No. 2026-42R amending the adopted Standards and Specifications Manuals for Public Infrastructure for Streets, Water, Storm Water and Parks. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

6. RATIFICATION OF CITY MANAGER'S APPROVAL OF EMERGENCY REPAIRS ON EAGLEWOOD DRIVE

Ken Leetham shared a map detailing the location of the water line break which damaged a portion of Fairway Drive and Eaglewood Drive. He said repairs were started quickly and that he and Karyn Baxter identified a contractor, Black Forest Paving, who was available and provided competitive pricing for the repair. He continued that he then authorized the repair and was requesting the Council's ratification of this approval. He estimated the extensive repair would cover 42,300 to 50,900 square feet of repair work on both streets and would be similar to a road reconstruction project. Mr. Leetham said the total project cost was estimated at $325,000 but noted that due to several factors it may go over that amount, so it was preferred to not include an amount in the motion.

Councilmember Jackson commended the staff on the speed of their response to address the issue.

Councilmember Smoot mentioned that she visited the incident site and the traffic issues she witnessed at Eaglewood Drive and Fairway Drive. She spoke on the earlier concerns in the annexation area and said the traffic issues she saw were everywhere and were due to reckless driving.

Councilmember Smoot moved that the City Council ratify the City Manager's approval of emergency repairs on Eaglewood and Fairway Drives. Councilmember Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

7. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS
    a. CONSIDERATION OF LEASE AGREEMENT FOR OFFICE SPACE FOR THE NORTH SALT LAKE POLICE DEPARTMENT

The North Salt Lake Police Department was authorized to enter a lease agreement for office space for detectives not to exceed $40,000 per year.

    b. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-44R: A RESOLUTION APPOINTING COUNCILMEMBER SUZETTE JACKSON TO THE SOUTH DAVIS RECREATION DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL BOARD

A resolution appointing Councilmember Jackson to the South Davis Recreation District Board was approved.

    c. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-45R: A RESOLUTION APPOINTING MAYOR BRIAN J. HORROCKS TO THE WASATCH INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT BOARD

A Resolution appointing Mayor Horrocks to the Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District Board was approved.

    d. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-46R: A RESOLUTION APPROVING SURPLUS VEHICLES IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT

A resolution declaring surplus and authorizing disposal of five vehicles in the Police Department was approved.

e. CONSIDERATION OF BID AWARD FOR THE REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF THE ROOF ON THE GARY WAY PUMP STATION BUILDING TO THE GARLAND COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF $49,480

A bid award for the Gary Way Pump Station Roof Replacement Project to The Garland Company, Inc in the amount of $49,480 was approved.

f. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-47R: A RESOLUTION CREATING A NORTH SALT LAKE ADDRESSING COMMITTEE

Councilmember Van Langeveld requested an amendment be made to the addressing committee and requested this item be moved to the regular agenda.

Councilmember Van Langeveld moved that the City Council remove the address annexation committee item out of the consent agenda to the regular agenda for discussion. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

g. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-48R: A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS COUNTY FOR PACIFIC AVENUE SIDEPATH PROJECT UTILIZING THE 4TH QUARTER COUNTY OPTION SALES AND USE TAX FOR HIGHWAYS OR PUBLIC TRANSIT FUNDING AND AUTHORIZING MATCHING FUNDS

The resolution approving an Interlocal Agreement with Davis County for the Pacific Avenue Sidepath project utilizing the 4th Quarter County Option Sales and Use Tax for Highways or Public Transit funding and authorizing matching funds was approved.

h. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2026

The City Council minutes of September 15, 2026 were approved as written.

Councilmember Knowlton moved that the City Council approve the consent agenda as amended. Councilmember Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

8. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2026-47R: A RESOLUTION CREATING A NORTH SALT LAKE ADDRESSING COMMITTEE

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented that the only change she wanted to make to the formulation of the address committee was to stipulate that the committee include at least four community representatives and may include more. She said that rather than limiting it to four (with two businesses and two residents) that the committee include at least four committee representatives and may include more.

Councilmember Van Langeveld moved to approve Resolution 2026-47R: a resolution creating a North Salt Lake Addressing Committee with the change that the committee includes at least four community representatives and may include more. Councilmember Knowlton seconded the motion.

Councilmember Smoot was in favor of increasing representation including two businesses and two residences and asked how to ensure there was someone who was for the change and someone who was against the address change to have both perspectives.

Councilmember Jackson said there was also a suggestion to form subcommittees to tackle different aspects. She noted that this suggestion was to obtain more community engagement in the process.

Councilmember Knowlton said the purpose of the committee was to provide the City Council with pros and cons to inform the Council's decision. He was in support of additional members on the committee as it provided flexibility.

Councilmember Van Langeveld felt it would not be a bad idea to accept everybody versus trying to decide who had greater input and who did not.

Sherrie Pace commented that one of the things she envisioned with the representatives from the community would be that they could discuss this with their neighbors. She suggested two businesses and four community representatives that were equally dispersed in the area. She continued that the representatives could also be two that were supportive and two that were not.

Councilmember Jackson felt that selecting representatives based on location seemed more logical. Sherrie Pace said this option would also allow those representatives to work with their neighbors on street names. She mentioned one gentleman who wanted to name a street after a child that had recently passed away.

Councilmember Jackson clarified that this committee was not bringing back suggestions on how to move forward with readdressing but would only be providing information on the pros and cons to the City Council at this time.

Sherrie Pace responded to public comment made earlier in the meeting regarding staff having pre-determined the proposed house/building numbers, was that due to the extremely tedious process of readdressing 350 properties to ensure accuracy. She said it took the engineering interns months to go through the block grid system and assign numbers and staff several more months to ensure it was correct. She noted that the decision had not been made but that the numbers needed to be correct for review by the committee, which would not be possible if they were not created prior to the committee.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if there were duplicate numbers in the annexation area and elsewhere in the City. Sherrie Pace replied that this was an issue that staff wanted to make certain that did not happen. She explained the difficulty is how the NSL and Bountiful grids line up. For example between Orchard Drive and 850 West the current house numbers run from 600 West to 850 West, the same street on the North Salt Lake grid have numbers that run 400 East to 650 East. She noted the City would not want to reuse a house number that was used like 625 West on a home across the street that would be 625 East, because this could create some confusion if the new 625 East updated their house number before the 625 West updated theirs and we had two houses with the same number 625 posted. She shared that the issues related to ensuring that odd and even numbers on both sides of the street were correct and that unique addresses could be created and minimize confusion.

Councilmember Van Langeveld then asked if it would be possible to keep the existing addresses and just change the city from Bountiful to North Salt Lake. Sherrie Pace responded no because Bountiful's system and the City's system had different coordinates. She noted that Bountiful's 000 line would be out of line with the City's system. She said there were rules that had to be followed related to naming and numbering.

Councilmember Clayton wondered when someone sold their home if they would then become a North Salt Lake address. Sherrie Pace replied that this had not yet been decided but this could be studied by the committee and then a recommendation on the idea made to the City Council.

Mayor Horrocks noted that per real estate law, there are things had to be disclosed such as the correct address including the city, which is why it may be important to have correct addresses assigned to the properties of the city where they are located.

The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

9. DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEMS

The action items list was reviewed. Completed items were removed from the list.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if an action item needed to be added related to a legal memoranda for the City Council about the Nights Out risk. Todd Godfrey replied that he planned to have this memoranda completed prior to the next City Council meeting.

10. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Jackson reported the South Davis Recreation District Board has a meeting scheduled for next week.

Councilmember Smoot reported on the Arts Committee and said committee member Jean Montanaro was moving forward with a mural program at Orchard Elementary. She noted that Orchard Elementary had agreed to partner and the estimated cost for the City was $600. She continued that the water tower at the entrance to the City was also being considered for a mural but ownership had not been determined. She spoke on other locations including a Brighton building on Redwood Road, one on Center Street, a building adjacent to Lee's Market, and wrapping utility boxes around the City. She shared that the utility boxes could include historical photos or art that had been donated which would result in minimal costs to the City.

Councilmember Smoot also mentioned the possibility of partnering to advertise the graphic novel theme for NSL Reads at the new library location on Redwood Road.

Councilmember Knowlton reported on the Trails Committee and a recommendation to the City Council on the Trails Master Plan was forthcoming. He continued that the City Council would review the plan during their October 20th meeting with potential adoption on November 14th. He then spoke on the Utah Foundation which conducted an annual survey related to quality of life in Utah. He said there were seven categories and listed those items that had been ranked poor and very poor including jobs, air, water quality, public transit, traffic, cost of living, and housing affordability.

Councilmember Van Langeveld reported on the Health and Wellness Committee and discussions related to options to address air quality in the City. She said this included monitoring and said that per the Wellness Survey that air quality was a chief concern for residents. She then shared

that she taught at the Hinkley Institute of Politics today and represented the City in a campaign management class about local elections.

Mayor Horrocks asked about air quality and if the results were good, fair, or bad. Councilmember Van Langeveld replied the City was not collecting or monitoring data. She said the data from the City's Purple monitors was available on a website. She continued that the purpose was for residents to monitor the air quality themselves.

Ken Leetham added that the City was looking into an EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) grant to install some fairly sophisticated air quality monitoring devices on the west side of the City. He said this would come to the City Council for approval as there would likely be a cost share. He spoke on the benefits of knowing what was happening on the west side of the City and potentially doing more around the gravel pit area as well.

Councilmember Clayton shared that the Halloween Spooktacular would be on October 24th. She mentioned the City's photo contest and thought the winners would be presented to the City Council on October 20th.

11. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Todd Godfrey had nothing to report.

12. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Horrocks reported that the 5th 5th Local Option Sales Tax was passed by the County and it would be a benefit for the City. He said the Sewer District had budgeted $2 million to address the odor issue. He then mentioned a ribbon cutting for the former Red Barn Academy which was now the John Volken Academy and commended the transformation in the countenance of the individuals who participate in the program. He reported on the trail cleanup on Saturday which had included the installation of signage.

Mayor Horrocks noted that he had received comments that Eaglewood Golf Course had been watering. Councilmember Smoot stated she understood the reason was because they had water in their own ponds. Ken Leetham replied that this was correct and said the water came from two sources including the irrigation ponds which were pumped up to the golf course after the secondary water supply from Weber Basin was turned off for the season. He shared that those ponds also collected storm water detention and because it rained recently that augmented the supply available in the ponds to continue watering at the golf course.

13. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Ken Leetham reported that he made the decision to finish the landscaping on the corner property adjacent to City Hall this fall including to continue watering with culinary water of the new landscaping for several weeks to get it established before winter. He noted that there would be plantings that needed to stay wet and may be watered for up to 30 minutes during the day. He said watering was necessary to keep the plantings alive and said if the landscaping installation had waited until next year that it would have resulted in some erosion on the site.

Mr. Leetham reported there was a Fire District event where two Deputy Fire Chiefs would be recognized and said it would be great if the Council was able to attend. He said the event would be held on October 7th at the Bountiful Main Station at 6:00 p.m.

14. ADJOURN INTO CLOSED SESSION

At 10:17 p.m. Councilmember Van Langeveld moved that the City Council hold a closed session for the purpose of discussing the legal risks regarding the Nights Out agenda item. Councilmember Knowlton seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, Smoot, and Van Langeveld.

15. ADJOURN

The meetings were adjourned during the closed session at 10:32 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday October 20, 2026 by unanimous vote of all members present.

_____ _____

Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor *Wendy Page, City Recorder*

City Council Action Items for October 20 2026

Item	Staff	Description	Staff Responses
New			
Current			
26-05	Sherrie	(5-19-26 CM Smoot) Request staff pursue contacting owner (Big West Oil) of large round structure to see if there is interest for a mural.	*(6-10-26) Sherrie called and emailed Pam Metzger with Big West Oil on 5/21/26 regarding the proposed mural location and has not received any response. Follow up email sent again on 6/10/2026.*
26-04	Ken/Linda	(5-5-26 CM Knowlton) Request to increase the City's public outreach efforts regarding water conservation by launching a focused communications campaign to inform residents about existing landscaping conversion incentives and other water conservation strategies. Promote these resources across multiple communication channels for several months. All supported the idea to make the outreach effort a formal action item and mailer suggested by Ken Leetham. Ted would like City staff to also track households that make significant improvements such as trading out landscaping for xeriscape or drought tolerant materials.	*(6-11-26) City staff is working on a set of publications to inform the public about their options to replace high water use landscaping. These will include social media posts and a formal newsletter or direct mail approach to educate the public.* *(7-28-26) Staff has been working on water conservation strategies and a plan to perform consistent and timely outreach to the public regarding water conservation. We will present the draft strategies to the Council in a September work meeting.* *(10-1-26) Staff has scheduled a report on this item for the November 17, 2026 Council meeting when we will have data related to the 2026 irrigation season.*
26-03	Ken	(4-7-26 CM Jackson) Find out the current terms for the national fitness campaign and funding availability for an outdoor Fitness Court.	
26-01	Ken/Sherrie	(1-20-26 CM Knowlton) Completion of property deed related to US89 Greenway.	*(6-10-26) Waiting on UDOT for the signed agreement (2026-01A), then staff will pursue the property transfer for the Greenway.* *(8-13-26) The fully executed agreement has been received by the City. The City has made a written request for instructions about how to effectuate the transfer of property and complete this issue.*
25-30	Ken/Sherrie	(10-21-25 CM Van Langeveld) Investigate possible ordinance amendments for entrances of City area.	

Item	Staff	Description	Staff Responses
25-12	Ken/Jon/Sherrie	(5-7-24 CM Jackson) Possibility for an app that would provide the status of possible rail blockages. (8-6-24 CM Jackson) signage notifications for rail blockages. (3-4-25 CM Van Langeveld) Interested in a City app and to know costs. This app would help residents to stay informed, report issues, and access city services – similar to SLC, Syracuse or Sandy.	*(7-15-25) This action item is two items: 1) a request to develop a mobile train crossing warning system; and, 2) investigate having a City app that would contain lots of useful information for the public about city events and services.* *Train crossing warning system: Staff is working to prepare a presentation on alternatives for a mobile train access warning system. We are looking at a system in the Midwest and a system operated by Salt Lake City where there are multiple at-grade crossings subject to delay. This part of the project will require a few more months of work and a deadline of March 1, 2026 has been established.* *(11-25-25) City Staff made a presentation to the City Council on this action item is November 18, 2025. Staff will work with vendors to come up with a proposed app and app features. It is felt that the best way to address a rail crossing alert system is to direct app users to both a traffic software such as Wayz or Google Maps where users self-report delays and a traffic camera system that allows users to visually see the rail crossings in real time.* *(2-24-26) City staff has evaluated the feasibility of installing cameras at all railroad crossings within the city. Using existing infrastructure, cameras can be installed at the Center Street and 1100 North crossings with minimal capital costs. The live feeds will be available on the City's website and future mobile app. In addition to monitoring train related delays, staff is evaluating additional applications and identifying the most appropriate equipment to support these uses.*
25-11	Ken	(5-21-24 CM Knowlton) Prepare talking points for the 2600 South / 1100 North bridge challenges.	*(1-2-25) Ken is preparing talking points and will then update City website for public awareness.* *(7-15-25) The City has not moved forward on this project and the main reason is that the bridge cannot be built unless it is approximately 2,200 feet long. That length would be a significant disruption to several properties, require the re-routing and/or disconnection of Main Street, does not have the support of Woods Cross (adjacent to the project) and cost approximately $50-60 million.*
25-08	Sherrie	(2-18-25 All) Project to evaluate readdressing all County addresses to City addresses.	*(6-11-25) Staff has met to discuss the framework for the committee, the goals or recommendations to be considered, potential committee members, timeline and review 345 properties affected. Staff will draft assigned addresses for affected properties and provide timeline for Council.* *(7-15-25) City staff is working to assemble a data base of all addresses in the City that require adjustment. That will be completed by the end of 2025.*

Item	Staff	Description	Staff Responses
			After that time, City staff will propose to the Council a working group of members of the public, staff and Council representative to review the entire scope of the project, City costs and overall impacts of the project. Estimated completion, which is City Council taking action on a plan to move forward is April 1, 2026. *(4-2-26) The draft addresses are completed and being reviewed with engineering. A work plan will be prepared for the Council (May 2026) to establish a citizen group to review and make recommendations to the City Council.* *(6-10-26) The proposed address changes have been drafted. A proposal related to the committee will be presented in the 7-21-26 work session.* *(10-1-26) There is a public information meeting on October 6 for residents to ask questions and provide input. At that same time, the Council will consider a resolution forming an addressing committee to complete this assignment.*
25-02	Ken/David	(5-20-25 CM Knowlton) Explore options to property purchase for expanding the Public Works facilities.	*(11-12-25) The City Council reviewed options to provide more space at the existing PW facility (see 10-21-25 minutes). Further work to be done on property acquisition. CC would also like to see options for vehicle storage including rental of garage space rather than construction of new facilities at the present time.* *(7-28-26) Ken Leetham made a proposal to the City Council on July 21 to perform a needs analysis for public works facilities expansion. Use of Redwood Road CDA funds was proposed to hire professional consulting services in order to complete the analysis.*
Future Agenda Item Discussion Requests			
25-35	Ken	(12-2-25 CM Knowlton & Van Langeveld) Request for analysis / discussion at future meeting regarding solar panels on any City properties.	
25-22	Sherrie	(10-3-23 CM Knowlton) Future work session item to discuss parking (restrictions, shared parking, time of day, on street, etc.)	*(7-15-25) This project is from October of 2023. We have had some discussions about parking since that time, but the Council should clarify for the staff what is needed or wanted with this assignment.*

Item	Staff	Description	Staff Responses
25-21	Sherrie/Jon	*Combined Action Items:* (1-2-24) Work session on Code amendments related to park strip landscaping and street trees. Evaluate City owned park strips and properties for recommendation on conversion to water wise landscape & review compliance notifications and processes. (3-21-23) Look into increasing tree plantings on City owned land.	*(7-15-25) This project is to landscaping, water conservation methods and tree planting on City-owned property. This project requires City staff to provide an inventory and analysis of City-owned park strips and properties which might be good candidates for conversion from turf to water wise landscaping treatments. A second minor piece of this project is to evaluate our compliance notifications and processes related to conversion of areas to low water use treatments. Deadline for this project is September 16, 2025.* *This item also includes a policy question for the City Council related to what level of investment should the City be making each year for tree planting. The current General Plan and City budgets identify tree planting as a priority in the City and this project should articulate the City's specific action plan to increase tree plantings on City property. Deadline for this project is November 11, 2025.* *(10-15-25) On 9/16/2025 Staff reviewed possible locations with the City Council and was directed to obtain bids for the City Hall park strip and return to the Council for approval and budget allocation.*
25-19	Ken / David	(4-2-24 All) Staff will make future proposal on trees/sidewalk damage policies.	*(5-16-24) Funds have been proposed in the FY25 budget of $100k for the purpose of sidewalk repair. An ordinance relating to trees and public rights-of-way needs to be put forward.* *(7-15-25) This item is part of a larger issue of sidewalk condition and repair Citywide. Two parts of the project are: 1) creating a policy for when trees on private property damage public sidewalks (should they be removed, sidewalk relocated, etc.). This first part also includes a policy related to the obligations of the adjacent property owners to participate in the costs of repair and replacement of sidewalk or removal of trees. 2) The City must address a citywide infrastructure need to repair and replace sidewalks throughout the City. This is a policy decision by the City Council.* *Deadline for Part 1: October 21, 2025* *Deadline for Part 2: January 20, 2026* *(11-12-25) City staff presented information on October 21, 2025 and the City Council requested a draft policy (ordinance) be prepared to address sidewalk repair and the preservation of trees.*
Completed			

REPORTING ON PC ACTION ITEMS

(No Council Action Required)

CITY OF
NORTH SALT LAKE
UTAH

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
801.335.8700
www.nslcity.gov

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director

DATE: October 20, 2026

SUBJECT: Planning Commission Action Report for 10-13-2026

The following is provided regarding actions taken by the Planning Commission at their October 13, 2026 meeting. No meeting was held on September 22, 2026

1. **Conditional Use Permit** for a specialty fence at 702 South Tanglewood Loop-the new owner of this lot in Eaglewood Cove 13 is employed in a high profile office for the State of Utah and will be constructing a new home at this location. The security detail has requested a 6 foot fence in the front yard area setback. The Code allows fences in the front yard to be a max height of 4 feet unless a conditional use is approved. The fence will be wrought iron with masonry pillars.

2. **Public Hearing** consideration of a General Development Plan and P-District Rezone at 3533 S Highway 89. The owner of the Gold Mine Acres Condos at 3513 S Highway 89 has purchased the existing single family home in front of the condos. He is proposing a P-District for the addition of 8 for sale townhomes. The Planning Commission made a unanimous recommendation for approval, which is detailed in packet materials for the City Council meeting on October 20, 2026.

3. **Public Hearing** for consideration of an amendment to the Moderate Income Housing Plan, a required element of the City's General Plan. In conjunction with the subsequent application for a code amendment to consider the preservation of moderate income housing stock as a qualifying justification to allow a property to be subdivided as a Planned Unit Development type. In addition, other strategies now available under state code have been added along with updated implementation timelines. The Planning Commission made a unanimous recommendation for approval.

4. **Public Hearing** for consideration of a code amendment to the Title 13 Subdivision Ordinance to allow the preservation of moderate income housing stock as a qualifying justification to allow a property to be subdivided as a Planned Unit Development type. A property owner has requested the amendment to allow them to subdivide a lot with an existing home that does not meet the minimum setbacks. The home was constructed in the

county in the 1960s and does not meet current setback standards. The home is currently being rented and is considered affordable housing stock. Without the amendment the applicant would have to tear down the home to subdivide the lot. The Planning Commission made a unanimous recommendation to approve the code amendment.