



2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
4 **COUNCIL TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 2022,**
5 **AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**
6

7 **Present:** John Knoblock, Chair
8 Sarah Bennett
9 Patrick Shea
10 Barbara Cameron
11

12 **Staff:** Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
13 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
14 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
15

16 **Excused:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
17

18 **Others:** Cody Ross
19 Zinnia Wilson
20 James Hicks
21 Mike Mikhalev
22 Steve Van Maren
23 Jessica Kirby
24 Betsy Byrne
25

26 **OPEN TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING**
27

28 **1. Introductions, Agenda Review.**
29

30 Chair John Knoblock called the meeting to order at approximately 2:00 p.m.
31

32 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Committee to make a
33 determination, which was as follows:
34

35 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207(4), I, as the Chair of the Trails Committee of the
36 Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission, hereby determine that
37 conducting meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a
38 substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.
39 The World Health Organization, The President of the United States, The Governor of Utah
40 and the Salt Lake County Mayor and Health Department, have all recognized that a global
41 pandemic exists related to the new strain of the coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19).

1
2 Due to the nature of emergency caused by the global pandemic, I find that conducting a
3 meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes
4 a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the location.
5 According to information from state epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an
6 acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the state’s healthcare system.’
7

8 Chair John Knoblock reviewed the agenda items for the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”)
9 Stakeholders Council Trails Committee. He suggested that one item be added to the end of the
10 Trails Committee agenda. Dennis Goreham previously suggested that the Committee brainstorm
11 trail and trailhead amenity funding ideas. He believed the end of the meeting was an appropriate
12 time to have those discussions. Chair Knoblock made note of those present at the meeting. Patrick
13 Shea felt it would be appropriate to recommend to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board that
14 a trail be named after Elizabeth Haigh. Chair Knoblock expressed his appreciation.
15

16 **2. Last Meeting Minutes Review and Approval.**
17

18 Chair Knoblock noted that there was a section in the December 9, 2021, Meeting minutes related
19 to trail funding. It referenced Zinnia Wilson and the trail inventory and stated:
20

- 21 • According to Ms. Wilson, 2022 would be spent looking at the system trails to determine
22 where amenities should be installed. For instance, which trailheads required restrooms,
23 picnic tables, and signs. If all of the basic amenities are in place, the Forest Service could
24 legally charge users to park trailheads.
25

26 Chair Knoblock noted that the language was not attributed to Ms. Wilson and was based on
27 discussions he had with Salt Lake District Ranger, Bekee Hotze. He added that this was one of
28 the potential solutions the Salt Lake Ranger District was exploring and was not a definitive plan.
29

30 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the December 9, 2021 Trails Committee Meeting
31 Minutes, as amended. Sarah Bennett seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
32 consent of the Committee.
33

34 **3. Trails Committee Chair and Vice-Chair for 2022 Nominations and Approval Process.**
35

36 Chair Knoblock explained that according to the CWC Stakeholders Council rules, there is an
37 opportunity to appoint a New Chair and Vice-Chair each year. Stakeholders Council leadership,
38 Will McCarvill and Barbara Cameron were responsible for appointing the Committee leadership.
39 Ms. Cameron noted that Chair Knoblock and Vice-Chair Sarah Bennett had both done an excellent
40 job and wondered if they would be willing to continue in those positions for 2022. Chair Knoblock
41 and Vice-Chair Bennett were both willing to continue in their current roles.
42

43 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved that the Trails Committee recommend to the Stakeholders
44 Council that John Knoblock and Sarah Bennett be retained as Chair and Vice-Chair. The motion
45 was not seconded.
46

1 Mr. Shea noted that a second is not necessary under Robert’s Rule of Order. Office Administrator,
2 Kaye Mickelson stated that the motion was sufficient according to the Rules and Procedures for
3 the Stakeholders Council. CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez explained that the intention was
4 for the Trails Committee to make a recommendation to the Stakeholders Council, so Council
5 leadership could appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair. Based on the Rules and Procedures, the
6 Stakeholders Council leadership would appoint roles for the different Committees, but it was
7 appropriate for those Committees to make a recommendation. Chair Knoblock reiterated that the
8 Trails Committee recommended that Trails Committee leadership remain as-is.
9

10 **4. Status of U.S. Forest Service (“USFS”) Central Wasatch Trail Planning and Timeline**
11 **– Zinnia/Chelsea.**
12

13 Chair Knoblock reported that Ms. Wilson would share updates related to the U.S. Forest Service
14 Central Wasatch trail planning and timeline. Additionally, she would discuss the Salt Lake County
15 Trails Master Plan. Chair Knoblock noted that Ms. Wilson met with Walt Gilmore, Associate
16 Division Director of Planning and Development for Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation to
17 discuss the latter. As a result, he stated that Items 4 and 5 would be discussed together.
18

19 Ms. Wilson thanked the Trails Committee for the opportunity to share updates. She reported that
20 the Forest Service was moving forward on a Trails Master Plan for Forest Service lands within the
21 tri-canyon area. The Forest Service now has enough funding to complete a Tri-Canyon Trails
22 Master Plan. Currently, the Forest Service is taking time to work with partners to make sure that
23 the outlined process matches their needs. The end result will be a trails plan with coordinated
24 actions, which would provide high-quality recreation that could handle increased visitation without
25 compromising water and other ecosystem services. Ms. Wilson explained that further meetings
26 were needed with Mr. Gilmore to determine how much of the funding will come from Salt Lake
27 County. Some of the funding would be left with the County for public meetings and outreach.
28

29 Mr. Shea asked if the Forest Service would do a capacity study for the trails outlined in the Tri-
30 Canyon Trails Master Plan. Ms. Wilson noted that it would be up to Ms. Hotze and Dave
31 Whittekiend to answer that and share details. However, she did note that there would be research
32 related to water quality impacts and how shorelines and aquatic habitats can change with increased
33 use. The intention was to look at how use may impact resources and how those impacts could be
34 mitigated. Mr. Shea reported that the CWC was developing the Environmental Dashboard. That
35 work could be a starting point for the Forest Service. Ms. Wilson stated that the Forest Service
36 intends to discuss whether there could be coordination with that process.
37

38 Mr. Shea noted that when he was with the Federal Government, some trails had to be closed off
39 or were available by reservation only. He asked if that was something the Forest Service would
40 do to manage the trail system. Ms. Wilson explained that questions would be posed to determine
41 whether the intention was to build for use or if use needed to be limited in problematic areas. There
42 were not currently discussions about closing off trails but if use dramatically increases, the Forest
43 Service would need to determine how to make sure trails and infrastructure allowed for heavy
44 visitation with minimal impacts. Alternatively, they could look into odd/even days for different
45 uses or implement other limitations.
46

1 Mr. Shea noted that according to Josh Van Jura from the Utah Department of Transportation
2 (“UDOT”), the Utah Legislature passed a bill two years ago that said if there was tolling, that
3 money must be used exclusively for the maintenance of the road. Chair Knoblock felt that
4 comment related to the last agenda item, which was about raising funds to adequately maintain the
5 amenities in the canyons. There was discussion regarding the Visitor Use Study. Communications
6 Director, Lindsey Nielsen reported that the Visitor Use Study would look at the tri-canyon area.
7 The project managers for both the Visitor Use Study and Environmental Dashboard met to discuss
8 how to best incorporate the data from the Visitor Use Study into a sixth element (human element)
9 for the Environmental Dashboard project.

10
11 Chair Knoblock asked Ms. Wilson if Salt Lake County intends to have regional planners work on
12 the project or if a third-party consultant will do the mapping and public outreach. Ms. Wilson
13 explained that Mr. Gilmore wanted to see a scope of work to determine if the work fits with the
14 County's skillset and timeframe. If not, an outside contractor would be considered. Chair
15 Knoblock pointed out that the Forest Service has jurisdiction over Forest Service land, but there is
16 some land in Big Cottonwood Canyon and throughout the tri-canyon region that does not belong
17 to the Forest Service. He felt that the County could put together a plan that would include not only
18 Forest Service lands, but properties owned by other entities. Ms. Wilson agreed that coordination
19 would be essential to address land not owned by the Forest Service.

20
21 Mr. Shea stated that in his last two positions in the Federal Government, he spent 30 to 40 percent
22 of his time dealing with jurisdictional disputes. He suggested that the Trails Committee and
23 Stakeholders Council recommend an ombudsman look into potential jurisdictional conflicts that
24 are slowing down or stopping progress. It needed to be someone that all of the involved
25 organizations trusted. Ms. Wilson wondered what time in the process he felt an ombudsman would
26 be most appropriate. Mr. Shea felt it should be done in the middle of the process. Ms. Wilson
27 asked if this was something the CWC could potentially sponsor. Mr. Shea felt there were others
28 at the meeting who could speak to that possibility better than he could. Ms. Cameron liked the
29 suggestion.

30
31 Chair Knoblock asked for further details about the meeting between Ms. Wilson and Mr. Gilmore.
32 He wanted to know if there was an envisioned timeline. Ms. Wilson reported that there was a two-
33 year timeline laid out but that timeline could shift based on discussions with Forest Service
34 leadership, Salt Lake City Watershed, and Salt Lake County. Chair Knoblock asked if anything
35 further had been heard from Patrick Nelson or Laura Briefer regarding the timing of the Salt Lake
36 City Watershed Management Plan. Ms. Wilson believed the intention was for the plan to be
37 completed by the end of summer. Mr. Perez reported that he had spoken to Mr. Nelson recently.
38 The public engagement process would likely begin within the next several weeks.

39
40 Ms. Wilson discussed the process for the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. She explained that the
41 Forest Service would start by outlining a set of questions that needed to be answered. Those
42 questions would be taken to Salt Lake City Watershed and Salt Lake County for feedback and
43 refinement. From there, the questions would be taken to partners, stakeholders, the Town of
44 Brighton, the Town of Alta, and ski areas. This process would allow the questions to be refined
45 further. She explained that most of the steps would follow the same format.

1 Chair Knoblock noted that Betsy Byrne from the National Park Service – Rivers, Trails, and
2 Conservation Assistance (“NPS-RTCA”) program was at the meeting. He had invited her to see
3 whether the organization may be beneficial to the trails planning process. Ms. Wilson stated that
4 she recently reached out to Ms. Byrne to set up a meeting. She hoped to make use of her knowledge
5 and potentially her organizational position.
6

7 Ms. Byrne discussed the NPS-RTCA. She explained that the program is the community assistance
8 arm of the National Park Service. The NPS-RTCA provides support to community-led projects.
9 Typically, community groups, cities, counties, and non-profits applied. She was not sure where
10 the Forest Service was in their discussions, but NPS-RTCA could potentially coordinate between
11 different entities or help facilitate discussions. Applications were due by March 1, 2022.
12 However, if the Forest Service was interested in a smaller role, such as the facilitation of one
13 meeting, an application would not necessarily be needed. Vice-Chair Bennett asked whether
14 Ms. Byrne had experience handling multi-jurisdictional planning in the past. The Trails
15 Committee wanted to make sure that all of the pieces aligned and there was not a duplication of
16 efforts. Ms. Byrne shared examples of coordinated projects and stated that NPS-RTCA could be
17 of assistance. She would speak to Ms. Wilson about the specific needs of the Forest Service.
18

19 Chair Knoblock asked about the initial timeframe for the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan.
20 Ms. Wilson reported that the initial timeframe was for the plan to be completed at the end of 2023.
21 She would share updates with the Trails Committee in the future. Ms. Cameron asked if restrooms
22 would be part of the plan. Ms. Wilson stated that the plan would look at trail infrastructure and
23 the trail user experience. There were a number of planning efforts where the outcomes were still
24 unclear, such as the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant in Millcreek, the UDOT Little
25 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”), and the Central Wasatch National
26 Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCR”). It was important to develop a plan that is
27 flexible enough to accommodate the possible outcomes. The Forest Service wanted to look at
28 restrooms, parking, and signage wherever users are active on trails.
29

30 Mr. Shea felt that outdoor restrooms in the Central Wasatch should be prioritized. He explained
31 that water indexes done in the Albion Basin showed that in both the winter and summer, the water
32 is being polluted. Ms. Wilson explained that abundant high-quality water is the number one
33 priority for the canyons in the Forest Plan. It was important to consider how trail tread impacts
34 water quality, how users that use facilities impact water quality, and how users who do not use
35 facilities impact water quality. Chair Knoblock believed it was essential to have enough well-
36 maintained restrooms in the canyons. He referenced previous issues with maintenance.
37

38 **5. Salt Lake County (“SLCo”) Trails Master Plan 2022 Transportation Choice Tax**
39 **Funding and Plan Development.**
40

41 The above item was discussed with Item 4 on the Trails Committee Meeting Agenda.
42

43 **6. SLC Watershed Management Plan 2022 Timeline for Draft and Public Comments.**
44

45 The above item was mentioned during the Item 4 discussions. Nothing further was added.
46

1 **7. Trail Project Suggestions for 2022.**

2
3 Chair Knoblock noted that Mr. Goreham previously suggested that the Trails Committee revisit
4 funding ideas for trails and trailhead amenities. He shared a document related to trail and trailhead
5 funding needs and ideas. He read from the document, which stated:
6

- 7 • The Central Wasatch is loved by many for its beauty, watershed, flora, fauna, skiing,
8 climbing, and summer trail recreation. We all want to protect these attributes and ensure
9 that the Wasatch is protected from degradation and too much love. Specifically, an area of
10 need is funding for trailheads and trails. There are, of course, many other significant
11 funding needs, such as historic mining, contaminated runoff, and wildfire prevention. This
12 document is a draft to address potential sources of funding for maintaining and improving
13 trailheads and trails. Here are several ideas for the CWC Stakeholders Council to consider:
14
 - 15 ○ Implement UDOT tolling on the roads, similar to Millcreek Canyon, and use the
16 fees collected to maintain the roadside amenities, such as trailhead parking lots and
17 trailhead amenities (picnic tables, signage, and restrooms);
 - 18 ○ Expand the Friends of the Salt Lake Ranger District, the non-profit that was started,
19 but had not been acted on. Alternatively, a new non-profit could raise funds for
20 items like restroom maintenance, trail and trailhead maintenance;
 - 21 ○ Expand the fundraising scope of the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation;
 - 22 ○ Expand the Adopt-A-Trail program to raise funds for trail and trailhead
23 maintenance, including restroom maintenance and the installation of new facilities;
 - 24 ○ Encourage Salt Lake County to directly fund the trails and trailheads;
 - 25 ○ Have the Forest Service charge user fees for trailhead parking, which would require
26 the trailheads to have standard amenities, such as picnic tables, signage and
27 restrooms. Certain amenities were needed for user fees to be permitted.
28

29 Ms. Cameron wondered if the Forest Service user fees would cover the expenses of building and
30 maintaining restrooms and signage. Mr. Wilson noted that the Forest Service would still need to
31 look into strategies for restroom maintenance for trailheads that were not part of the fee structure.
32 She explained that even if the Forest Service was able to implement a user fee for more developed
33 trailheads with appropriate amenities, some areas would still need to be funded. Ms. Wilson
34 suggested that there could be an entrance fee if the CWNRCA was implemented. Chair Knoblock
35 noted that National Recreation Areas are not allowed to charge fees, but National Conservation
36 Areas are. It was not straightforward where the designation would fall with respect to the existing
37 legal framework.
38

39 Ms. Byrne noted that The Cache Trails Alliance in Cache County has developed a good system
40 and suggested that the Trails Committee reach out to learn more about that model. Mr. Shea
41 reported that he received an email from Mr. Nelson. The email stated that he had been unable to
42 attend the Trails Committee Meeting due to a scheduling conflict. He explained that the Salt Lake
43 City Public Utilities lands were not on the table for trails planning until the Watershed
44 Management Plan was updated, which should be done by late 2022 or in 2023.
45

1 Cody Ross discussed the Adopt-A-Trail program. In the future, it would be possible to discuss
2 how the program could be expanded further, but he wanted to make sure the current program was
3 solid before expanding the scope. Mr. Ross added that everyone involved with the Adopt-A-Trail
4 program last season had recommitted to another season. The goal was to focus on companies that
5 will provide long-term commitments to the program. He noted that there was a list of companies
6 that the program would approach at the beginning of February 2022.

7
8 Ms. Cameron wondered if the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation is handling any restroom
9 maintenance. Mr. Ross noted that there was a partnership with the Forest Service for the Silver
10 Lake Trailhead restrooms. However, they did not have partnerships in place for other restrooms
11 in the canyons. Chair Knoblock suggested that the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation could raise
12 funds to handle restroom maintenance throughout the canyons. Alternatively, Friends of the Salt
13 Lake Ranger District may be able to raise funds. Mr. Ross felt it was important for all of the
14 Cottonwood Canyons Foundation programs to run smoothly before expanding the scope further.

15
16 Ms. Wilson noted that if the Ski Hill Resources for Economic Development (“SHRED”) Act was
17 enacted, some portion of what was retained by the Forest Service could be used for recreation
18 infrastructure and maintenance within the ski area boundaries. That was another possible source
19 of funding that could be added to the brainstorming list.

20
21 Chair Knoblock shared trail project updates. He reported that the Forest Service hoped to complete
22 the section from Ferguson Canyon to Big Cottonwood Canyon in 2022. Additionally, Trails Utah
23 was working with Salt Lake County and Millcreek to try to get the Bonneville Shoreline Trail
24 finished from the end of the Pipeline Trail down to Parleys Canyon. That work would be done in
25 the summer. Chair Knoblock added Salt Lake County would use money from the Millcreek
26 Canyon fee station to replace the bridge at Elbow Fork.

27
28 **CLOSE TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING**

- 29
30 1. **Chair John Knoblock will Close the Public Meeting as Chair of the Trails Committee**
31 **of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

32
33 **MOTION:** Chair Knoblock moved to adjourn. Vice-Chair Bennett seconded the motion. The
34 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

35
36 The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Trails Committee Meeting held Thursday, January 13, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____