

**STEAMBOAT SPRINGS TRAILS COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**August 21, 2019**

The meeting of the Steamboat Springs 2A Trails Committee was called to order at approximately 12:03 p.m. on Wednesday, August 21, 2019, in the Crawford Room, Centennial Hall, 124 10th Street, Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

Trails Committee members in attendance were: Chair Pete Wither, Scott Marr, Dan Bonner, Gavin Malia, David High and Harry Martin. City staff members present were Assistant to The City Manager Winnie DelliQuadri, city engineer Ben Beall and Open Space and Trails Supervisor Jenny Carey. Kent Foster represented the US Forest Service. Eric Meyer represented the Trails Alliance. Kyle Pietris and Laraine Martin represented Routt County Riders.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGE NDA**

None.

**Approval of Minutes: June 5**

David High moved to table the June 5, 2019 meeting minutes. Harry Martin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Approval of Minutes: July 17**

Scott Marr moved to table the July 17, 2019 meeting minutes. Gavin Malia seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Walton Creek Hotel Connector**

Scott Marr recused himself from this item.

Ben Beall: We've had some conversations with the property owner of the vacant parcel. There still is some openness to grant an easement that would allow a soft-surface trail connection. Because easements are difficult, we have reached out to our designer to study an alternative now that Stone Lane is in with a sidewalk. There would be a soft-surface trail connection from the termination of the sidewalk there through the City-owned open space to make the connection. We need to go through some additional evaluation. We got a cost estimate for what it would take to complete the design for this section in addition to making the connection in front of Fairfield Inn. That's going to be \$20,000 to take that design effort to a biddable final plan set. We intend to have this built next year regardless of whether we are able to get an easement, but the easement or lack thereof will determine where the soft-surface connection is located.

Bonner: Are you proposing to do the design before we know whether we get the easement?

DelliQuadri: We haven't been successful in getting the easement in three years. If we are going to have a project next year, we need to design it now because we can survey and do the wetlands now.

Beall: We're weeks away from having to make the call to move forward with the alternative design. We'll let him know that we're going to move forward with an alternative design. He may see this as a benefit. We would prefer to do the design with the easement, but we'll need to make the call in 2-3 weeks.

DelliQuadri: We need to take your recommendation to City Council and get it approved; that's going to happen on September 17.

Wither: And we have the funds available.

Bonner: This has always been a big priority for us; I'm in favor of moving forward with the design.

High: I've always had a question as to whether or not a soft surface is the best use or whether a hard surface would be better. I know it's a lot more money, but if we're putting good money into this, does the City have an opinion of whether the connectivity would be better served if this was a hard rather than soft surface?

Beall said hard surface should be used if a trail is going to be maintained in the winter; this is not proposed to be. He said there is zero likelihood of that property owner giving an easement for a hard-surface trail.

Beall: He looks at this as a temporary improvement; he wants to develop that property at some point in the future.

DelliQuadri: Do you want to design this to a hard-surface level?

Beall: I don't think it would change the design fee.

DelliQuadri: When you paid for the design before, we got estimates for hard and soft surface.

Malia asked if the City would maintain that; Beall said it would not likely be plowed in wintertime even if it was hardscape.

High thought this trail would be very beneficial to heads in beds.

## **MOTION**

**David High moved to recommend \$20,000 for design of the Walton Creek Hotel Connector Trail. Dan Bonner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

DelliQuadri said this would need to go before Council on September 17 because this was not a project for which the Committee had recommended approval. Pete Wither will attend the Council meeting.

### **Comparison of Mad Rabbit To Trails Alliance Proposal**

Jason Landers joined the meeting.

DelliQuadri: We have the scope of work from the Forest Service; now you need to decide what trails on that scope relate closely enough to the trails in the Trails Alliance proposal.

Martin confirmed the proposed map could change though not substantially.

Foster created a table demarcating the proposal as well as his thoughts on which segments could replace the trails in the Trails Alliance proposal.

Lower West Summit: Old highway extension, four downhill options.  
The proposed action carries forward two of the downhill options, plus the old highway and the old highway extension, which is Segment 25 on the form. Segments 23-24 are pretty close to what was identified in the STA proposal as Downhill #1 and Downhill #2.

Bonner: I think 23 and 24 are pretty straightforward as being in line with the original STA proposal.

DelliQuadri noted that this was proposed by the Trails Alliance as a 1.5-mile, expert-level, directional mountain bike trail. Segment 23 is a mile longer and the most difficult.

Landers: I think they're pretty much in line. I think it serves the purpose that was identified in the STA proposal.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Meyer confirmed that the proposed trail classes matched. He noted that the STA proposal calls for a trail with constructed features while the Forest Service proposal calls for a trail with no constructed features.

Foster said this would best align with Directional #4 in the STA proposal.

Foster: Forest Service standards don't allow for built wooden features as called for in the STA proposal. We would need a special use permit to build wooden features as you see at the Ski Area.

High confirmed that every trail on the Forest Service proposal would include only natural features.

Malia: If the land manager is prohibiting a certain provision, that's outside of our control.

Meyer: If not here, where, is going to be the discussion at some point.

**MOTION**

**Gavin Malia moved to accept Segment 23 as in alignment with the STA-proposed Lower West Summit Directional #1 and #4. Scott Marr seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

Segment 24:

Foster: Segment 24 is an intermediate/more difficult downhill trail. Pretty much parallels the old highway connector. It's a little bit shorter than the trail proposed in the STA proposal.

Foster thought it would most closely adhere to Lower West Summit Directional #3.

**MOTION**

**Malia moved to approve Segment 24 to be in line with Directional Trail #3 as outlined in the STA proposal. Bonner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with no public comment.**

Segment 25: Old Highway 40 Extension: 5 miles, accessible.

Foster: This is the Old Highway and the Old Highway 40 extension as described in the STA proposal. The STA proposal was closer to the forest boundary.

Bonner pointed out that 24 and 25 parallel up to the west summit.

Martin: That's almost what the STA proposal says.

Foster recounted that the Forest Service received significant public comment asking for accessible, multi-use trails. This will be wide enough for two-way traffic or people hiking side-by-side. Accessible to hand bikes.

Foster: We're getting a lot of comments on ebikes. Right now any ebike is considered motorized, so it's treated similar to a motorcycle. If we look at it in a site-specific analysis, we can allow ebikes of certain classes. Tahoe Basin just opened up about 30 trails to Class 1 ebikes. It has to be done at the project level, which this could be. That could happen in this analysis or in the future.

Martin: There's something in front of Congress right now that's talking about treating Class 1 ebikes as mountain bikes.

**MOTION**

**Malia moved to approve Segment 25 to correlate to the Old Highway 40 Trail and Old Highway 40 Extension trail. Scott Marr seconded the motion. Discussion: Meyer said this would be segments 25 and 22 in order to reach the summit. Malia amended his motion appropriately; Marr seconded. The motion carried unanimously.**

Segments 26-27

Foster: 26 was identified in the STA proposal as Directional #2. 27 parallels one of those. Based on our public comment, we're looking at this as a way to bring some loops to the area which are multi-use. They would be beginner and accessible multi-use.

Meyer: It was not envisioned as a multi-use trail in the STA proposal, but that's really the only difference I see.

Foster: Public comment mentioned that if we it would be good to have a beginner directional trail that is multi-use.

Meyer: We don't have the perimeter trail now which would typically be the climbing route that would get high use; without that, you might need to be climbing the multi-use, multidirectional #27 to do laps early season down there. When you take one trail out of the system, it totally changes the whole aspect of the planned system.

DelliQuadri: The Old Highway 40 Perimeter Trail was proposed as a 4-mile intermediate trail that connects west summit parking to the Old Highway 40 Trail. When you look at Segment 27, it's an intermediate trail that is connecting something that gets to the west summit. It is an intermediate trail in the general area.

Meyer: It was envisioned to reduce the conflict on 22 and 25 that's going to see high-traffic commercial shuttling. Climbing up that is going to be a conflict.

DelliQuadri: So it's clear that the STA vision is not being fully realized. The land manager has chosen to scale it back. The question is: Which of the trails in the STA proposal fits into what the Forest Service is proposing based on type of trail, generic distance, whichever of the other factors you want to consider?

Bonner thought 26 and 27 combined mirror directional 2 and 3 from the STA proposal.

Landers: But the Forest Service doesn't have it as directional, though that's still under public comment.

DelliQuadri: Segment 27 is in the same place as Directional #3. 24 + 27 actually looks like it equals Directional #3. In the STA proposal, 3 is 1.5 miles; in the Forest Service scope of work, 24 is the intermediate trail that's a mile, and 27 is a half a mile.

Foster: 25 and 22 are really the Old Highway and the Old Highway Connector.

Bonner: 26 and 27 are really like 2 for the most part.

Foster: 26 is very close to the Lower West Summit Downhill #2 except multi-use.

Bonner: In location and in difficulty, but 27 is similar in difficulty and distance – just a little different location. So I'm thinking that 26 and 27 fit under Directional #2.

## MOTION

**Bonner moved to approve Forest Service Segments 26 and 27 as correlating with Directional #2 in the STA proposal. Harry Martin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

Segment 19:

Foster: The Upper West Summit created some loops coming off of Walton Rim. The loops were created based on our desire to minimize the encroachment into the roadless area.

19 is actually the perimeter of Bruce's Trail if you've skied up there. 19A is a connector to the new trailhead. 20 went from the end of 19 over to the Fox Curve trailhead. 21 goes from our new trailhead up to an overlook, follows the alignment of the 1A trail; crosses at 296 and comes down on what would be the 1B trail. 19 is 1.8 miles. If you were to connect 19 and 21, you'd get about a 6-mile trail which would replace that first loop which is six miles. If you were to connect 19A, 19 and 20, you would have about nine miles; that could substitute for Loop 2. One of the comments we've been receiving is even though there's quantity, it might not be the quality as identified in the STA proposal. 19 would replace that beginner loop. 20 is a little longer; I think it was Segment 2 on the Upper West Summit. You've got an out and back for a good part of it, which is not as desirable as the loop.

Martin: Could you consider 19-22 a mixture of loops 1 and 2 in the STA proposal?

DelliQuadri: Loop 1 would be 21. In the proposal, the first part of Loop 1 is Walton Rim.

Meyer: You're not going to get that miles without doing the total loop #2 or 3. Connecting 21 and 22 would be an option to get a six-mile loop with maybe only two intersections.

DelliQuadri: The 21 that we have is 4.5 miles in a similar place. Loop 1 says it's a flowing intermediate single-track.

Martin: Loop 2 almost covers this same thing, 19-22; almost the same mileage; easy-to-moderate; slightly different location.

Foster confirmed that the Forest Service could create a connector between 23 and 21.

Foster: That was a great comment Eric just made.

Malia: If that connection was made, you could increase the distances of these loops by creating more loops. It wouldn't expand your footprint into the roadless area any further.

## MOTION

**Martin moved that segments 19 to 21 realign with Upper Summit Network Loop 2 in the STA proposal. Scott Marr seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

Segment 14:

Foster: We were trying to match this with the epic loop to connect to the Ski Area. We understand we want to have a long-distance trail somewhere. Per CPW's request, we tried to stay along the highway corridor and existing area. We tried to create a loop that went around and connected to the Ski Area, but instead of going through the roadless area, it just went on the edge of it. 14 would be this parallel trail that went out along the highway, connects in pretty close to Dumont Lake Road. Connector #12 would head up and connect into the Liman Trail. For that concept of a long-distance trail, we also connected Segment 8 and 7, which brought us out to where the Fish Creek Trail takes off. This is an approximately 20-mile trail connecting these segments to create a long-distance loop. From here you could continue to Buffalo Pass.

Wither: Grouse and Soda.

DelliQuadri: With the STA epic trails, Walton Rim was supposed to be beginner connecting Rabbit Ears to the Ski Area; Drunken Hogan was supposed to be advanced/technical, 15 miles.

Meyer: It comes down to elevation gain, and Walton Rim had no elevation gain for 20 miles. So that was a realistic attempt at a beginner trail. People could also cut off the first ten miles if they wanted. Drunken Hogan can be the 8 and 7, but we've lost any representation of Walton Rim. As far as epic, along a road definitely does not meet the definition of epic; it needs to be a back-country ride that's not along the highway.

Landers: Does 14 as proposed fit into any of this?

DelliQuadri: When you look at the description in the STA proposal, it says a 20-mile, multi-use trail that connects the west summit of Rabbit Ears Pass to Pete's Wicked Trail on the Steamboat Ski Area. Beginner trail. We haven't looked at the STA descriptions of Loop 1 or Loop 3, and we need to look at those as well.

Foster: Loop 1 was six miles. If you were to connect 19, 19A and 21...

DelliQuadri: Loop 1: Six-mile, beginner friendly Intermediate-advanced single-track. Loop 2 is a short, 2.5-mile loop that provides access to the Walton Rim Trail; between existing parking lots; expands the loop options giving users more choice over route length and difficulty; beginner single track, approximately 2.5 miles.

Foster: 14A itself is 1.69; moderate; a little bit of elevation gain. It's only really accessible if you get there from part of 14. It would definitely be an out-and-back.

DelliQuadri: 14 and 14A together are 7.2 miles.

Foster: I would count half the distance on 14 for that comparison.

DelliQuadri: It's a little bit longer than Loop 1, and it's intermediate. Loop 1 was supposed to be six miles, intermediate.

Meyer: And these Forest Service numbers could be renumbered to better align.

Foster: I think the whole group: 14, 14A, 7, 8 and 12 is sort of a combination between Hogan and Walton Rim. I think the whole group is a compromise to essentially get you to the same place on a longer ride.

DelliQuadri asked if #5 and 6 should be added.

Bonner: Not 5 but 6. That still gets you there on the Mountain View Trail. But 5 doesn't need to be included in that comparison.

Martin: It seems like 5, 6, 7 and 8 are replacing Drunken Hogan.

Meyer: Similar to the concept in a different location.

Bonner: I think you have to include 14 and 12 in that to make it a complete connection.

Martin: Loop 1 is more similar to 14. It's definitely not meeting the purpose of Walton Rim.

Malia: Do you do 12, 8, 7, 6 and 5? You've got to start at a trailhead, right?

Foster: It seems like some of these segments can be used for more than one of the trails identified in the STA proposal.

Committee members agreed.

Meyer: The concept of Drunken Hogan was to avoid the CDT. Right now it looks like you're going to use 12, then use a component of the CDT, then get back. So there will be no events on that route. 12 doesn't really help you because there's no way to get from the end of 12 to a non-CDT route to get to 8 and 99. You could take the existing road in an event out to 8, 7, 6 and 5. 12 is a different animal.

DelliQuadri: For the sections where there is additional trail, it would reduce pressure and resource damage on the CDT.

Meyer: 8, 7, 6 and 5; you can always take the road out to 8. I wouldn't include 12 as a part of Drunken Hogan. 12 could make a loop at Dumont Lake. It could be Loop #3, the shortest one.

Landers confirmed that the difficulty rating on 12 would be moderate.

Loop #3 is a 2.5-mile beginner single track.

Meyer: It's probably 2.5 from that trailhead to the Dumont trailhead. It's not too far off. 11 is an existing route until you get past the lake. That's really flat and essentially a road, so that could be considered beginner until it gets windy. If that was beginner-intermediate, that would be pretty close. Connecting two trailheads, 2.5 miles. That's pretty close to 3.

Martin: So 5-8 really fall into what Drunken Hogan was trying to do.

## **MOTION**

**Harry Martin moved that segments 5-8 fall within the STA proposal for Drunken Hogan. Malia seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

Segment 14, 14A and 12

Foster: 14 and 14A together are 7.2 miles. Loop #1 is an approximately 6-mile intermediate-advanced. 14 and 14A would be 7.2, easy to difficult. Different systems.

Wither: More like Loop 1.

Meyer: That's a funny-looking loop, but it's not far off. How confident is the Forest Service that those lines are getting through those wetlands?

Foster: We'll be shifting around. There's some places to get through by the CDOT barn and closer to the highway; just some creek crossings instead of wetland crossings.

Meyer: The mileage might potentially change.

Bonner: So we can say this is similar to Loop 1 but in a different location?

Wither: That's what it looks like to me. It's intermediate-advanced single track. Loop 1 is six miles; this is seven.

## **MOTION**

**Bonner moved to classify segments 14 and 14A as eligible due to their similarity to Loop 1 in the STA proposal. Martin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

Segment 12:

## MOTION

**Bonner moved to classify Segment 12 as comparable to Loop 3 in the STA proposal. Malia seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.**

DelliQuadri: One of the things that was in the proposal is the hiking-only trail, which was originally proposed to be kind of across from Ferndale. However, that's not the location this is in. What the STA says is: A purpose-built trail for hiking; no bikes; approximately three miles; beginner/intermediate hiking only. 9, 11 and 18 are more focused on walking instead of biking. Even though they're not walk-only trails – I don't know that the Forest Service does any hiking-only trails.

Segment 18:

Meyer: 18 was a hiking-only trail in the proposal.

Foster: It seemed to be a loop trail to go around the campground.

Foster: What we identified for 18 was to create a loop around the campground. I don't know if that would be accessible. Tara's idea was to make this a braille trail. That would be hiking only.

Segment 11:

Foster: The concept was to build a wheelchair-accessible trail around the lake. We've got user trails around this but to create some good bumpouts. We did something similar around Hahns Peak Lake Campground. We built an accessible trail, and we had great partnerships to do that.

Segment 9:

Foster: This is the last couple hundred yards up to Rabbit Ears going straight up the fall line. These were not necessarily included in the proposal, but they are hiking trails.

DelliQuadri confirmed that the Forest Service has not constructed any hiker-only trails.

Foster: We design the trails for hiking, biking or motorcycling or whatever. We don't restrict it.

Bonner: I think it's a stretch to say that 11 and 18 are comparable to hiking only. That doesn't mean they shouldn't be built; it just means maybe we shouldn't fund them. If we decide it's not a fit, it doesn't prevent Forest Service from building the trails.

Foster: We're thinking that 18 could be a great hiking/interpretive trail. Beginner bikes, kids, opportunities for that.

Landers: If we stretch these alignments, do people start questioning what we're doing with the other trails?

## **MOTION**

**Marr moved to consider 18 and 11 as equivalent to the hiking only trail on the Lower West Summit network as described in the STA document. Landers seconded the motion.**

Beall urged that these segments be included as good beginner trails to allow parents to introduce their kids to the outdoors.

The motion carried 4-3, with Bonner, Landers and Martin opposing.

**Next Meeting: September 4**  
**Budget meeting.**

## **Adjournment**

David High moved to adjourn the meeting at 1:37 p.m. Jason Landers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES PREPARED, REVIEWED AND RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY: Timothy Keenan and Winnie DelliQuadri. Approved this 4th Day of September, 2019.