



9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS  
COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY,  
FEBRUARY 22, 2022, AT 1:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED  
ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY  
THE GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED MARCH 18, 2020.**

**Present:**

**Committee Members:**

- Chair Paul Diegel
- Ed Marshall
- Del Draper
- John Knoblock
- Tom Diegel
- Brian Hutchinson
- Mike Christensen
- Pat Shea (excused at 1:32 p.m.)

**Others:**

- Bekee Hotze (excused at 2:00 p.m.)
- Polly Hart
- Hilary Jacobs
- Patrick Nelson
- Stephen Lewis
- Mike Jenkins
- Charles Katz
- James Hicks
- Bruce Woolstenhulme
- Rita Lund

**Staff:**

- Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
- Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
- Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Communications Director
- Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator

1 **Opening**

2  
3 1. **Chair Paul Diegel will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon**  
4 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council and Read the**  
5 **Determination of the Chair.**  
6

7 Chair Paul Diegel called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The Legislature, pursuant to Section  
8 52-4-207(4), required the Committee to make a determination, which was as follows:  
9

10 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-207(4), I, as the Chair of the Millcreek Committee  
11 of the Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”), hereby  
12 determine that conducting Committee Meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an  
13 anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be  
14 present at the anchor location. The COVID-19 pandemic remains and the recent rise of  
15 more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another surge in  
16 cases which could again threaten to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’  
17

18 2. **Review and Approval of the Minutes from the November 2021 Meeting.**  
19

20 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to approve the Meeting Minutes from the November 15, 2021,  
21 Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion passed with  
22 the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
23

24 **Discussion: Committee Activities and Priorities for 2022**  
25

26 Chair Diegel reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee previously discussed Committee  
27 activities and priorities for 2022. At that time, it was determined that the Committee should be  
28 ready to respond to the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. A summary of public  
29 comments would be published in the spring and there would be a draft plan later in 2022. Chair  
30 Diegel believed the Committee would want to evaluate and comment on the draft plan. That item  
31 was a high priority for the Committee but did not require immediate action.  
32

33 Additionally, the Committee decided that it was important to remain available to the CWC  
34 Stakeholders Council as issues related to Millcreek Canyon arise. Chair Diegel noted that the  
35 Millcreek Canyon Committee will also focus on Camp Tracy and step in, if appropriate, to  
36 facilitate the protection of that space. John Knoblock pointed out that the Committee could also  
37 provide input on the fire mitigation plans in Millcreek Canyon.  
38

39 Chair Diegel asked Bekee Hotze from the U.S. Forest Service to provide updates on fire mitigation.  
40 Ms. Hotze clarified that the focus was on fuels reduction projects rather than fire mitigation. The  
41 Forest Service started doing fuels work in Lambs Canyons last year. She explained that the  
42 intention was to continue that project and move into Millcreek slightly, by the Mount Aire and  
43 Elbow Fork Trailhead. Ms. Hotze shared a map of the project area. There would only be a little  
44 bit of work done in Fiscal Year 2023 in Millcreek but the intention was to meaningfully break up  
45 the fuels to contain wildfires into smaller areas. For Fiscal Year 2024, there would be a more  
46 significant proposal for Millcreek, and it would predominantly work off of the road. She noted

1 that it would tie into the FLAP grant schedule to reduce road closures. The work would provide a  
2 better fuel break in Millcreek Canyon. Ms. Hotze shared before and after images of Lambs Canyon  
3 to illustrate what the vegetation would look like in the area.  
4

5 Ms. Hotze shared additional information related to fuels reduction. She reported that at the turn  
6 of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, all of the vegetation along the Wasatch Front was cut down. That made the  
7 water undrinkable because, without vegetation, the sediment came down into the valley and  
8 impacted the water source. Between 1905 and 1920, a nursery was created and many trees were  
9 replanted in the area. That project was successful and now there were many old trees along the  
10 Wasatch Front. Since there were homes and facilities in the area, it was important to create  
11 defensible space and cut down trees. The Forest Service was trying to determine where it made  
12 the most sense to put in the fuel breaks. Ed Marshall asked if the work in Fiscal Year 2024 would  
13 only be in the FLAP grant area or if it would also come lower down into the canyon. Ms. Hotze  
14 believed the intention was to come down the canyon.  
15

16 Mr. Knoblock asked if there was anything the Forest Service needed from the Millcreek Canyon  
17 Committee. Ms. Hotze explained that the Forest Service could always use input and suggestions  
18 about how to make things better. They were always open to partnership opportunities. Ms. Hotze  
19 reported that there had been a push from the Washington office to speed up the fuels reduction  
20 programs. This was due to concerns about the fires in California, Washington, and Oregon. They  
21 did not want that type of fire behavior to happen in Utah as well. It was a priority of the Forest  
22 Service to speed up fuels reduction treatments and do more work in a shorter timeframe.  
23

24 Tom Diegel asked about unqualified volunteers. He believed there would be a lot of interest.  
25 Ms. Hotze explained that for liability's sake, it was better for the Forest Service to choose highly  
26 skilled, qualified workers. There would be a contract for that work. However, the Forest Service  
27 would potentially be working with Sageland Collaborative (formerly the Wild Utah Project) to  
28 manage volunteers and do citizen science. She noted that there were other volunteer opportunities  
29 as well. Those interested could reach out to the Forest Service for additional information.  
30

31 Brian Hutchinson noted that two Black Hawk helicopters went down in Mineral Basin. He asked  
32 what the Forest Service policy was on mechanized travel in forest lands, specifically in Emigration  
33 Canyon. Ms. Hotze reported that the Black Hawk helicopters crashed in Mineral Basin. It was  
34 military, and the military has different authorities than the general public. She explained that it was  
35 technically their air space. In terms of helicopter usage in general, there was Powderbird, which  
36 had a long-term permit to drop off at various locations. Powderbird gave the Forest Service an  
37 operating plan each year and there were regular discussions about authorization. As for Emigration  
38 Canyon, a lot of that property is owned by Salt Lake City Public Utilities rather than the Forest  
39 Service. Mr. Hutchinson felt it would be beneficial to review those policies.  
40

#### 41 **Officer Elections**

42

43 Chair Diegel reported that he was at the end of his term as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon  
44 Committee. It was time to choose a new Chair and Vice-Chair for the Committee. Mr. Hutchinson  
45 suggested that the officer elections wait until after the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. It was  
46 scheduled to take place the next day and it would be possible for other interested Stakeholders

1 Council Members to join the Millcreek Canyon Committee prior to nominations. Chair Diegel  
2 pointed out that all current Millcreek Canyon Committee Members were present. Mr. Hutchinson  
3 reported that there are several Stakeholders Council Members who expressed an interest in joining  
4 the Millcreek Canyon Committee. He felt it would be suitable to accept nominations during the  
5 current meeting but wait until the next meeting to make official elections.  
6

7 Polly Hart wondered if Chair Diegel would be interested in remaining in the Chair position for a  
8 second year. Chair Diegel informed those present that he would not be able to continue in his  
9 current position. Mr. Marshall pointed out that there are six active Committee Members. It should  
10 be up to those members to vote on the Chair and Vice-Chair position. He was in support of  
11 nominations taking place during the current meeting.  
12

13 **NOMINATION:** Mr. Marshall nominated Mr. Diegel to serve as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon  
14 Committee. Mr. Knoblock seconded the nomination.  
15

16 There was discussion on the motion, other nominees, and Millcreek Canyon Committee  
17 membership.  
18

19 Chair Diegel addressed the earlier comments from Mr. Hutchinson. He believed the issue of new  
20 Committee Members was separate from the election of new officers. He proposed that the  
21 Committee elect new officers at the current meeting and announce that the Committee was open  
22 to new members at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. Mr. Hutchinson felt it was appropriate  
23 to accept nominations at the current meeting, but hold elections at a later date.  
24

25 Del Draper asked how new Committee Members were added. CWC Communications Director,  
26 Lindsey Nielsen explained that any Stakeholders Council Member who expressed interest in  
27 becoming a Committee Member was welcomed to serve. The meetings are also open to the public.  
28 Mr. Draper wondered if interest had been expressed from other Stakeholders Council Members.  
29 Ms. Nielsen had not heard of any. Mr. Hutchinson believed that there was interest from four  
30 different Stakeholders Council Members. He also noted that Mike Christensen was present at the  
31 meeting.  
32

33 Mr. Marshall was in support of additional Stakeholders Council Members joining the Millcreek  
34 Canyon Committee. However, those members had not joined and were not present at the meeting.  
35 The meeting and the vote for officer elections had been properly noticed. Mr. Knoblock explained  
36 that he would be hesitant to have someone that had not participated in the Committee become the  
37 Chair or Vice-Chair. Chair Diegel agreed. CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez pointed out that  
38 there is currently a quorum of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and the meeting had been properly  
39 noticed.  
40

41 Mr. Draper believed there needed to be a formal way to determine who is on the Committee. That  
42 was important in terms of votes. However, he agreed that there was no reason to hold up the  
43 election of officers due to confusion over potential new members. Mr. Perez shared the Rules and  
44 Procedures document. Chair Diegel noted that it sounded like Committee Members would be  
45 appointed by the Chair. Mr. Perez clarified that the Chair referenced was the Stakeholders Council

1 Chair rather than the Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair. Mr. Draper suggested that discussions  
2 take place with Will McCarvill, the Stakeholders Council Chair.

3  
4 It was clarified that although the Millcreek Canyon Committee would nominate and vote on a  
5 Chair and Vice-Chair, the appointment would be finalized by the Chair of the Stakeholders  
6 Council. Mr. Hutchinson wondered if it would be appropriate for the nominations to take place  
7 during the current meeting. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker believed it was appropriate  
8 to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair and for the elections to be approved by the Chair of the  
9 Stakeholders Council. The officer elections were noticed as an item on the Millcreek Canyon  
10 Committee agenda, so it made sense for the Committee to take action.

11  
12 Mr. Diegel noted that the next Stakeholders Council Meeting would be focused on The Central  
13 Wasatch Compact. He did not feel it would be appropriate to discuss Millcreek Canyon Committee  
14 membership during that time. It made sense to move ahead and vote for a Chair and Vice-Chair  
15 since there was a quorum of current members. Chair Diegel agreed. He believed the Committee  
16 should move forward, select a new Chair and Vice-Chair, and the next meeting could be focused  
17 on the introduction of new Committee Members.

18  
19 There was discussion regarding nominees. Mr. Marshall had already nominated Mr. Diegel as  
20 Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and Mr. Knoblock seconded the motion.  
21 Mr. Hutchinson nominated Mr. Draper to serve as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee.  
22 Mr. Perez pointed out that the Committee could nominate Mr. Diegel as Chair and Mr. Draper as  
23 Vice-Chair. Chair Diegel liked that suggestion and made that motion. Mr. Knoblock seconded  
24 the motion. Further discussions were had and it was determined that the nominees should be voted  
25 on separately.

26  
27 There were two nominees for Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee. The votes were:

- 28  
29
- Tom Diegel for Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee:
    - Paul Diegel, Del Draper, John Knoblock, and Ed Marshall.
  - Del Draper for Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee:
    - Brian Hutchinson and Tom Diegel.
- 30  
31  
32  
33

34 Based on the 4-to-2 vote, Tom Diegel was selected to serve as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon  
35 Committee.

36  
37 **MOTION:** Paul Diegel moved to nominate Del Draper to serve as Vice-Chair of the Millcreek  
38 Canyon Committee. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous  
39 consent of the Committee.

40  
41 Mr. Perez informed the Committee that the agenda for the next Stakeholders Council Meeting had  
42 already been published. CWC Staff would inform Stakeholders Council leadership about the  
43 officer elections and the appointments would be made official at a future Stakeholders Council  
44 Meeting. The Committee further discussed Committee membership. Office Administrator, Kaye  
45 Mickelson believed Mike Christensen could vote because he is a member of the Stakeholders  
46 Council and any member was subsequently a member of the Committee. He had been present at

1 the last few meetings and was listed in the Meeting Minutes as a member. Mr. Knoblock believed  
2 the Rules and Procedures document states that the Chair of the Stakeholders Council needs to  
3 appoint Committee Members. Mr. Perez confirmed that the Rules and Procedures document did  
4 state that. However, the Committees operated less formally in the past. Formal rosters for each  
5 of the Committees could be implemented in the future, if necessary.  
6

7 Mr. Knoblock was concerned that there were written rules that were not being followed. It was  
8 important to discuss that with the Chair of the Stakeholders Council to ensure that the Rules and  
9 Procedures match the actions of the Committees. Mr. Becker felt it would be beneficial to go  
10 through the Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures to add further clarifications. That work  
11 could be done following the CWC Situational Assessment.  
12

### 13 **Other Business and Updates Relating to Millcreek Canyon**

14  
15 Chair Diegel asked that any other business or updates related to Millcreek Canyon be shared.  
16 Mr. Marshall asked when Mr. Becker would leave the CWC. Mr. Becker reported that both he  
17 and Ms. Mickelson were retiring effective June 30, 2022.  
18

19 Mr. Diegel pointed out that there were 20 participants during the current meeting. He was  
20 encouraged by the fact that there were so many people willing to dedicate time to the Committee.  
21 It was a testament to how passionate people are about Millcreek Canyon. He hoped to see even  
22 more participation in the future, either from Stakeholders Council Members or members of the  
23 public.  
24

25 Mr. Knoblock felt it would be beneficial for the Millcreek Canyon Committee to reach out to Salt  
26 Lake County about the bridge over the stream at Elbow Fork Trail. If they informed Salt Lake  
27 County that the project was a priority for the Committee, it may encourage them to focus on the  
28 project earlier in the year. Chair Diegel believed that was something the Committee could do. It  
29 could be an action item at the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Mr. Diegel noted that  
30 it had been 1 ½ years since the bridge was removed. He agreed that the installation of the bridge  
31 should be a high priority and would reach out to Mr. Knoblock following the meeting.  
32

33 Mr. Marshall thanked Chair Diegel for all of the work he had done over the past year as Chair of  
34 the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Mr. Knoblock shared an additional update with the Committee  
35 related to the section of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that would go from Rattlesnake Trailhead  
36 to the fee station. There was a large triangle of private property just above the existing fee station  
37 location that spanned both sides of the road. He had spoken to the owner of that lot and the  
38 intention was to build three private residences there. Mr. Knoblock felt that was something to be  
39 concerned about and was something the Committee could follow.  
40

41 Mr. Hutchinson wondered if the Committee was privy to the results of the survey conducted by  
42 Salt Lake County on the Millcreek Canyon FLAP grant. He felt it was important to see the raw  
43 data to accurately interpret the results. Chair Diegel believed all public comments would become  
44 a matter of public record. He suggested that the Committee standby and see what was released.  
45 If there was information missing, that information could be requested. Mr. Hutchinson stressed

1 the importance of raw data. Mr. Knoblock suggested that Mr. Hutchinson look into obtaining the  
2 raw data and share any relevant information at the next Millcreek Canyon Meeting.

3  
4 Mr. Diegel clarified that there had been a public comment period for the FLAP grant and a survey  
5 had not been conducted. The data would likely be a compilation of the comments. Mr. Hutchinson  
6 noted that there would be a lot of text and interpretation involved. He was concerned that the  
7 interpretations may not be accurate. As a result, it was important to have the raw data. Mr. Diegel  
8 agreed that it was a good idea to look at the comments. He offered to work with Mr. Hutchinson  
9 on that. Chair Diegel noted that public comments could illustrate the overall level of support.

10  
11 Mr. Marshall asked about the survey conducted by the Common Ground Institute (“CGI”). He  
12 wondered if CWC Board Members would see the survey results. Ms. Mickelson explained that  
13 according to the request for proposal (“RFP”), the final report would include those results. CWC  
14 Staff had not seen anything from the survey but were told there were 170 responses.

15  
16 **Adjourn.**

17  
18 **1. Chair Diegel will Close the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Committee of**  
19 **the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

20  
21 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to adjourn. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. The  
22 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

23  
24 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at 2:39 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*  
2 *Stakeholders Council Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting held Tuesday, February 22, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_