



9
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
11 **COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING ON MONDAY,**
12 **SEPTEMBER 18, 2023, AT 1:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-**
13 **PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC**
14 **OFFICES LOCATED AT GATEWAY AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE**
15 **102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

16
17 **Present:** Tom Diegel, Chair
18 John Knoblock
19 Patrick Nelson
20 Mike Christensen
21 Rusty Vetter
22 Steve Van Maren
23 Wendy Fisher
24 Maura Hahnenberger
25 Ed Marshall
26 Del Draper

27
28 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
29 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

30 **Opening**

31
32 **1. Chair Tom Diegel will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon**
33 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

34
35 Chair Tom Diegel called the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

36
37 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the August 24, 2023 Meeting.**

38
39 **MOTION:** Maura Hahnenberger moved to APPROVE the August 24, 2023, Millcreek Canyon
40 Committee Minutes. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
41 consent of the Committee.
42

1 **Available Canyon Land Parcel Discussion**

2
3 **1. Committee Members will Discuss Available Land Parcels in Millcreek Canyon.**

4
5 Chair Diegel reported that a land parcel was put up for sale last month near the mouth of the
6 canyon. It is approximately 18.3 acres and has a cost of \$2.3 million. The parcel was discussed
7 at the last Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Based on those discussions, there was a desire
8 to speak to the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board to determine whether it might be
9 possible to assist with the purchase of the land. Wendy Fisher, the Executive Director of Utah
10 Open Lands, would soon join the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to share information. He
11 noted that Utah Open Lands often acts as a broker for open space lands across the State. The
12 Committee Members were asked to discuss the land parcel before her arrival.

13
14 Rusty Vetter noted that he was not at the last meeting. He wondered if water availability had been
15 discussed. Patrick Nelson did not have anything official to share with the Committee about that
16 but based on initial research, he had not been able to find any water associated with the parcel. It
17 is outside the boundary areas of service for the City. As far as membership in any other irrigation
18 company, that had not yet been confirmed. Chair Diegel expressed concerns that there did not
19 seem to be any water commitments associated with the parcel.

20
21 Del Draper wondered if Boundary Springs was an independent association. Mr. Nelson was not
22 familiar with all of those details. He noted that a private company distributes the water.
23 Mr. Draper got the impression that Boundary Springs is a private entity. Salt Lake City tried
24 unsuccessfully to purchase it approximately 15 years ago. If someone wanted to approach
25 Boundary Springs to purchase water, it was likely doable, but it was noted that there was a limited
26 number of water shares. Mr. Nelson reiterated that he was not making an official declaration on
27 behalf of Salt Lake City. In his research, he was not been able to confirm that any water shares
28 are held in Boundary Springs. Additionally, the parcel is not within the service area boundaries.
29 The research done so far was inconclusive but it was possible to buy water shares.

30
31 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, stated that there was a comment in the Zoom chat box. Steve
32 Van Maren noted that Carl Fisher advised the Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation Director that
33 a parcel was available. The County did not have enough funding on hand to pursue the parcel
34 without further discussion. Chair Diegel wondered if it would be possible to engage with the
35 County so there could be more discussion. He offered to reach out to someone at the County.

36
37 Chair Diegel referenced the Land and Water Conservation Fund (“LWCF”) from the U.S. Forest
38 Service. Based on discussions, it seemed that the Forest Service would need to spearhead that and
39 it likely would not start until next year at the earliest. The LWCF process is lengthy but it might
40 be worth looking into to confirm some of the timeline details for potential projects. It would also
41 be worthwhile to find out if the Forest Service is interested in participating. Mr. Vetter reported
42 that there were past examples where the County, Salt Lake City, and the Forest Service joined
43 together to obtain funds to purchase parcels.

44
45 Chair Diegel explained that there had been some general discussions with Ms. Fisher about the
46 parcel already. When parcels like this go up for sale, many people want to know what Utah Open

1 Lands thinks. He asked what Ms. Fisher knew about the sale and whether Utah Open Lands was
2 interested in getting involved. Ms. Fisher stated that Utah Open Lands wants to support the
3 acquisition of key parcels within the canyon area. A lot of conservation needed to be done, but
4 trying to prioritize the parcels that were pursued could be difficult. The biggest challenge in this
5 case was determining how developable the parcels were. Additionally, it was important to
6 determine whether it would be possible to work with willing landowners. It was critical to have
7 landowners who have a desire to find conservation solutions.

8
9 In this particular area, there were potential challenges with water and access. Ms. Fisher explained
10 that those factors play a part in how different parcels are prioritized for potential funding. Chair
11 Diegel explained that John Knoblock had spoken to the property owner past. At the last Millcreek
12 Canyon Committee Meeting, it was reported that the current owner was interested in a
13 Conservation Easement but there was a desired purchase price. That being said, the owner seemed
14 to recognize the special nature of the area and the public impact.

15
16 Mr. Knoblock reported that he spoke to the landowner about the property in the past because it
17 was possible to extend the Bonneville Shoreline Trail from the Rattlesnake Trailhead to where the
18 fee booth was located. There was talk at one point of moving the fee booth because currently, it
19 is located on the road easement within the property. Mr. Knoblock stated that there are potentially
20 three buildable parcel areas on the property. Water to service the lots still needed to be determined.
21 There needs to be water, electricity, and sewer, which would be a significant expense, but he
22 believed it was located in the Salt Lake City Water District boundary. Chair Diegel clarified that
23 Mr. Nelson stated those parcels cannot receive Salt Lake City water but there may be opportunities
24 with Boundary Springs. Mr. Nelson reiterated that the parcel does not appear to be within the Salt
25 Lake City Department of Public Utilities water service boundaries based on the initial research
26 conducted. Mr. Knoblock reported that he reached out to the Millcreek City Planner and asked
27 that research be done to look into whether it was possible to build on those lots. He offered to
28 reach out again.

29
30 Ms. Fisher shared additional information about the Utah Open Lands process. She explained that
31 there will need to be an appraisal. The appraiser would do a cost-benefit analysis to determine
32 what it would take to potentially obtain sewer and water. It sounded like the owner was a willing
33 individual who was interested in conservation. As a result, it could be worth pursuing further.
34 That being said, appraisals cost money upfront. There was a lot to think about from an
35 organizational perspective. Mr. Knoblock reported that the landowner lives in Olympus Cove and
36 has a personal connection to Millcreek. He wanted to ensure that the land was purchased by
37 someone who loves the land as much as he does. He wondered who would be ideal for the
38 appraisal and what the estimated cost would be. Ms. Fisher reported that there are a number of
39 different appraisers. The best place to start is with a Letter of Intent with the landowner. She
40 believed there needs to be clear rules and guidelines outlined with the landowner to create a more
41 seamless process.

42
43 Mr. Knoblock wondered if it made sense for the Millcreek City Planner to share their interpretation
44 first. Ms. Fisher explained that the appraiser would have those conversations and would likely
45 talk to the Millcreek City Planner and others. Chair Diegel asked who a potential Letter of Intent
46 would come from. Ms. Fisher stated that Utah Open Lands could assist with a Letter of Intent.

1 Mr. Knoblock noted that he could continue to speak with the current landowner. He offered to
2 reach out to Ms. Fisher in the future to further discuss the Letter of Intent.

3
4 Ms. Fisher suggested that there be a discussion with the Millcreek City Planner and Mr. Nelson to
5 better understand what is desired and what the facts are. She explained that appraisers are ideal
6 because this is a third party who does not have a desired outcome. Before money is spent on an
7 appraisal, which would cost \$4,000 to \$10,000, it made sense to understand what was desired.
8 Mr. Knoblock liked the approach suggested.

9
10 Mr. Draper wondered if the land was previously owned by the Boy Scouts of America and asked
11 when the landowner acquired the property and the cost. Mr. Knoblock was not sure but heard
12 rumors about the purchase price being around \$220,000, which was 10 to 15 years ago. He
13 believed the purchase was from the Boy Scouts. Ms. Fisher noted that the Boy Scouts are a non-
14 profit organization. She presumed that there would have been due diligence there because it was
15 not possible to privately benefit someone by offering the property for a lot less than it was worth.

16
17 Chair Diegel asked that discussions related to the parcel and possible appraisal take place. He
18 would reach out to Mr. Knoblock in the near future to make sure that work was moving forward.

19
20 **2. The committee will Discuss and Draft a Recommendation for Possible Action During**
21 **the 9/25/23 Stakeholders Council Meeting.**

22
23 Ms. Nielsen had heard that the Millcreek Canyon Committee was interested in bringing an action
24 item to the full Stakeholders Council for consideration at the September 25, 2023, Stakeholders
25 Council Meeting. This was confirmed. Ms. Nielsen reported that bringing action items from the
26 Committee to the Stakeholders' Council is the appropriate process. She wanted to make sure the
27 Stakeholders Council was not being asked to vote on matters that they had not had a chance to
28 read about. If the Committee wants the Council to vote on a recommendation specific to the land
29 parcel available in Millcreek, she suggested that Committee Members draft something before the
30 meeting. She wanted to ensure that Council Members had time to review the materials.

31
32 Whatever the Council Members were being asked to consider should be included in the Meeting
33 Materials Packet. Ideally, the meeting agenda and the Meeting Materials Packet would be sent out
34 one week in advance. That would not be possible in this instance, but it would be possible to send
35 out the materials within the next few days. That would allow time for Council Members to review.
36 Chair Diegel offered to draft something that could be shared with the Stakeholders Council.

37
38 Mr. Knoblock believed the intention was to ask the Stakeholders Council to recommend that the
39 CWC Board work with the various public entities that could help acquire the parcel at the base of
40 Millcreek Canyon. This would ensure that the land would be in public hands and not developed
41 privately. Chair Diegel suggested that instead of “work with” the language asks for a “willingness
42 to support efforts.” Mr. Knoblock wondered if the language should be to “support efforts to put
43 that parcel into public ownership.” Chair Diegel was supportive of that type of language.
44 Mr. Marshall thought it was premature to ask for the support of the Stakeholders Council and CWC
45 Board since the information gathering was still taking place. This was within the jurisdiction of
46 Millcreek City, so he thought it would be best to approach them about it first.

1
2 Mr. Knoblock wondered if it would be better to bring the matter to the CWC Board as an
3 informational item for right now. Since the CWC Board cared about the Central Wasatch, it was
4 important for Board Members to be aware of the parcel that was for sale. Ms. Nielsen explained
5 that she could include information in the Executive Director Report. She noted that the Executive
6 Director Report was a new component of the meeting agendas and the briefing would be provided
7 at the October 2, 2023, CWC Board Meeting. The Stakeholders Council would meet again in
8 November, so there would be another opportunity to bring the matter to the Council.

9
10 Chair Diegel asked if it would be appropriate to share a verbal update during the next Stakeholders
11 Council Meeting. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that Committee updates were regularly shared during
12 Stakeholders Council Meetings, so it would be appropriate to share that information with Council
13 Members. Mr. Marshall thought that was the best way to move forward at the current time.

14 **FLAP Grant Update and Discussion**

15 **1. Committee Members will Discuss the Ongoing FLAP Grant.**

16
17
18
19 Chair Diegel reported that there were two elements to discuss with regard to the Federal Lands
20 Access Program (“FLAP”) grant consisting of the FLAP grant work itself and the proposed
21 Millcreek Canyon shuttle. Ms. Nielsen reported that research was conducted on the feasibility of
22 a Millcreek Canyon shuttle service. That research was submitted to the Forest Service. The Forest
23 Service considered what was in the proposal, which included cost estimates and potential parking
24 locations. The document submitted highlights the need to study the potential impacts of letting
25 large groups of people off at certain locations. Given that information and research, the Forest
26 Service was not interested in pursuing the shuttle service with the CWC further. This was largely
27 due to the parking issues and the cost of the services. The Forest Service pointed out that shuttle
28 programs are often mostly or partially subsidized. An operational price point of \$1 million per
29 year was outside the capacity of the Forest Service to consider offsetting at the moment.

30
31 Chair Diegel expressed his disappointment that the Forest Service was not interested in pursuing
32 the shuttle service further. Ms. Nielsen noted that there were other potential options. The CWC
33 could apply for grants or make a future fulfillment ask from the State. However, at the current
34 time, none of that was in the works. If there were any further questions, it would be possible to
35 reach out to Bekee Hotze with the Forest Service. The Forest Service may still be looking into
36 alternate avenues for the shuttle, but the CWC portion of the work is complete for right now.

37
38 Mr. Knoblock asked about the \$1 million cost estimate for the shuttle program. Ms. Nielsen
39 explained that the number had been determined after speaking to various shuttle companies. A
40 certain amount of money was needed to purchase the vans, pay operators, maintain the vans, pay
41 for liability costs, and insurance costs. Mr. Knoblock wondered if the State Office of Outdoor
42 Recreation might be able to fund the capital costs. Ms. Nielsen did not believe that money was
43 the main issue but believed the lack of parking was the primary concern.

44
45 Mr. Knoblock thought there were feasible solutions to the parking. He referenced an area north of
46 the glass recycling area. There is a lot of unused land there that could turn into parking. He offered

1 to speak to Mayor Jeff Silvestrini about that. He acknowledged that part of the land included the
2 Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) right-of-way, but it was worth considering. Mr.
3 Draper pointed out that there was another potential parking location on the other side of the
4 freeway. There is a frontage road that runs along the west side of I-215 where there could be
5 parking on an angle against the sound wall. Parking like that had already been put in on the other
6 side of the street. There were viable options that were fairly close to the canyon.

7
8 Chair Diegel wondered if those locations were included in the proposal to the Forest Service.
9 Ms. Nielsen denied this. The proposed locations include the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) Park
10 and Ride lot, the Olympus commercial lot, and the lot that is currently for sale. The size of the
11 program that the Forest Service is interested in is 400 people per day. As a result, a lot of parking
12 needs to be accounted for. Chair Diegel offered to reach out to Ms. Hotze to ask about the two
13 potential parking options that were suggested by the Committee. He would write a draft email and
14 present it to the Millcreek Canyon Committee before it is sent.

15
16 Ms. Nielsen pointed out that before suggesting the two potential parking locations, it is necessary
17 to determine who owns the parcels. Mr. Knoblock stated that Mayor Silvestrini was supportive of
18 a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. Due to this level of support, it might be possible for the Millcreek
19 City Planner to conduct research and look into the potential parking locations. It was determined
20 that there would be research done first before reaching out to Ms. Hotze. Chair Diegel offered to
21 draft an email to Mayor Silvestrini about the parcel for sale near the mouth of the canyon as well
22 as the potential parking locations. He would send a copy of the draft email to Committee Members.

23
24 With regard to the FLAP grant work itself, not much had happened since the last Millcreek Canyon
25 Committee Meeting. Chair Diegel reported that he reached out to Braden Peters three or four
26 times, who was the project lead. He wanted clarity about the statement that only some bicyclists
27 went above Elbow Fork but he only received one brief response. Mr. Peters stated that email
28 comments could still be submitted and emails were being monitored. However, that was in conflict
29 with what was outlined on the FLAP grant website. Chair Diegel explained that he did not have a
30 comment but a question about the data and had not heard back again.

31
32 Chair Diegel reported that he received the public comments via a Government Records and
33 Management Act (“GRAMA”) request. A recurring theme was that Millcreek Canyon is loved as
34 it was. There were concerns that straightening, widening, and striping would decrease safety and
35 alter the character of the canyon. There were not a lot of comments in support of the project as
36 outlined. Chair Diegel was concerned that the project would move ahead in direct opposition to
37 what was desired by the public.

38
39 Mr. Vetter referenced the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). During the previous
40 presentation, it was stated that the NEPA report would be presented around this time of year. From
41 there, he believed there would be another opportunity for public comments. He wondered whether
42 that report had been issued. Chair Diegel did not believe it had been issued. Mr. Vetter thought
43 something would be seen before the end of the year that would allow for additional comments.

44
45 Ed Marshall reported that he reviewed the public comments as well. The overwhelming theme
46 was that there was no desire for road widening. The public wanted to preserve the environmental

1 character. That was repeated repeatedly in the comments. There were contradictory comments as
2 well where people did not want to widen the road but wanted bicycle lanes to be added. It was
3 noted that there are different options available. There was discussion about safety in the canyon
4 as well as common locations for accidents. Chair Diegel offered to reach out to Mr. Peters again
5 and share updates with the Committee. Mr. Knoblock suggested that he share a comment during
6 a County Council Meeting as an individual.
7

8 Mr. Marshall shared information about reporting accidents in the canyon. He explained that it is
9 difficult to report accidents from the upper portion of the canyon, so people often come down to
10 Log Haven to report. Mr. Marshall discussed the speed limits. If there was a desire to reduce the
11 speed below 30 MPH in the lower canyon there would be a lot of frustrated drivers. Only one fatal
12 accident had occurred there in the last few decades, which was the result of distracted driving and
13 not speeding. Although speeding is statistically significant, it has not had a significant impact on
14 accidents within the canyon.
15

16 **Camp Tracy Update and Discussion**

17 **1. Committee Members will Discuss Updates to Camp Tracy.**

18 Mr. Draper reported that he had spoken to the Boy Scouts of America about Camp Tracy three
19 times in the past as there was interest in a Conservation Easement. With that, it would be possible
20 for the Boy Scouts to run the camp in perpetuity but the idea was to sell the development rights.
21 He believed that should be appealing to the Boy Scouts because the national organization is facing
22 a lot of litigation. All three times he was told that there was no interest in selling the development
23 rights. He offered to reach out again and see if there could be a discussion about the Camp Tracy
24 lands being part of a Conservation Easement. Before he did so, he wanted to confirm that the
25 previously discussed Millcreek parcel is land that the Boy Scouts sold. It was also important to
26 know when that transaction occurred so he could share those details.
27
28
29

30 There was additional discussion about the land and who owned it previously. Mr. Van Maren left
31 a comment in the Zoom chat box noting that the County Recorder has open records. Mr. Knoblock
32 confirmed that the County Recorder could answer questions. It was also possible to look through
33 the historical records for parcels. Mr. Marshall noted that the land value could be determined by
34 looking at the transfer tax on the deed and finding out the rate at that time. He stated that the
35 original use of the land may have previously been limited to Boy Scouts camps. That might be
36 worth looking into as well, which he offered to do following the meeting.
37

38 **Potential New Membership for Millcreek Canyon Committee**

39 **1. The committee will Discuss New Members to Add During the 9/25/23 Stakeholders** 40 **Council Meeting.**

41 Chair Diegel discussed the possibility of adding new members to the Committee. Ms. Nielsen
42 stated that based on the Rules and Procedures document, the method for adding new official
43 members was through a consensus of the Stakeholders Council. That meant Committee Members
44 needed to be added during public Stakeholders Council Meetings. No official Millcreek Canyon
45
46

1 Committee Members had been added in that manner since the formation of the Millcreek Canyon
2 Committee. There needed to be a request to add members during a Council meeting.

3
4 During the next Stakeholders Council Meeting, the bulk of the meeting would be focused on
5 adding members and electing leadership for the newly created Systems Committees. The addition
6 of Millcreek Canyon Committee Members could also be done during that meeting. When there
7 was not something like that on the meeting agenda, the request could be made during the Open
8 Comment section. Ms. Nielsen noted that members of the public could be official members of the
9 Committee but are not able to vote on items. There was discussion about the Stakeholders Council
10 Meeting agenda. The Committee could draft a letter to nominate new members.

11
12 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved that the Millcreek Canyon Committee SUPPORT the
13 membership of Mike Christensen, Maura Hahnenberger, and Rusty Vetter. Additionally, Del
14 Draper should be authorized to write a letter about that matter for the Stakeholders Council. Del
15 Draper seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

16
17 **Closing**

18
19 **1. Chair Tom Diegel will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Millcreek Committee**
20 **Meeting.**

21
22 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to ADJOURN. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion
23 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

24
25 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 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 on Monday, September 18, 2023.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____