

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
2 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2020 AT 3:00 P.M.**
3 **ELECTRONICALLY VIA UBER CONFERENCE**
4

5 **Present:** Chair Greg Summerhays, Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Ed Marshall, Carl
6 Fisher, Barbara Cameron, Sarah Bennett, Annalee Munsey, Brian
7 Hutchinson, Tom Diegel, Will McCarvill, Kirk Nichols
8

9 **CWC Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez,
10 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen
11

12 **1. OPENING**
13

14 **a. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
15 **Council (“SHC”).**
16

17 Stakeholders Council Chair, Greg Summerhays called the meeting to order at approximately
18 3:00 p.m.
19

20 **b. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
21 **Wednesday, January 15, 2020.**
22

23 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, January 15, 2020. Barbara
24 Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
25

26 **2. MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**
27

28 **a. Ed Marshall will Provide an Update on the Work of the Committee to Date.**
29

30 Ed Marshall reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee held its first meeting on February 19.
31 The group met a second time electronically the previous day in anticipation of today’s meeting.
32 At their first meeting, they listed a series of items they would like to obtain information on.
33 Various members of the committee volunteered to pursue information on the issues identified. At
34 the previous day’s meeting, those who obtained information reported back on their findings. They
35 gathered information from three primary sources including the following:
36

- 37 • The U.S. Forest Service;
- 38 • Salt Lake County and the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (“MSD”); and
- 39 • Information about the Boy Scout Camps.
40

41 With respect to the U.S. Forest Service, John Knoblock took the lead and used the Freedom of
42 Information Act to obtain an internal memo from the U.S. Forest Service regarding the fee increase
43 imposed in Millcreek Canyon that went into effect on January 1, 2020. The fee was increased
44 from \$3.00 to \$5.00. The memorandum addressed how to communicate the fee increase and
45 identified how small the increase was compared to other places. There was a five-year projection
46 for an anticipated program of work with the additional fees collected. The \$2.00 increase will

1 increase the net amount going to the U.S. Forest Service for Millcreek Canyon from \$611,000 last
2 year to an anticipated \$912,000 this year. The full amount was not expected to be received since
3 the toll booth has been closed. A table provided indicated how the U.S. Forest Service would like
4 to use the money. \$70,000 was to be used to hire a Project Manager who will design and implement
5 plans for Millcreek Canyon.

6
7 They were also proposing \$140,000 the first year for Forest Protection Officers who would provide
8 interpretive and educational services to canyon visitors. If education does not work, they will have
9 the enforcement authority to issue tickets. John Knoblock would follow up with Ranger Bekee
10 Hotze and give a more detailed report at the next meeting.

11
12 The second set of information came from the County and the MSD. Messrs. Marshall and
13 Knoblock spoke with Salt Lake County's Road Works Department Chief, Leon Barrett. In
14 February he reported that everything but essential maintenance was on hold until they determine
15 whether the FLAP grant application had been approved. Until FLAP grant funds are received,
16 they anticipate using "band-aids" on Millcreek Road, which is a County Road, and sorely in need
17 of repair. The cost estimates obtained by the County to repair it came in at \$1.5 million.
18 Mr. Marshall explained that that was a sum they did not have previously and most certainly will
19 not have now given the priority of road resurfacing. The County's view was that their \$667,000
20 share of the \$10 million FLAP grant will be less than half of the \$1.5 million needed to do the
21 work.

22
23 Mr. Marshall contacted Jared Stewart with the Regional Transportation Planning Department
24 about the timing of the FLAP Grant approval. He provided a brochure showing that the shortlist
25 was initially to be approved in March. He was now hoping for approval in May. The shortlist was
26 to be evaluated from April to July with the final awards announced later this summer. That,
27 however, was expected to be delayed.

28
29 Mr. Marshall also contacted MSD Executive Director, Bart Barker and asked him how the tax
30 money was being spent relative to Millcreek Canyon, particularly with respect to road
31 maintenance, repair, and snowplowing. Mr. Barker provided a three-month report showing what
32 MSD has spent on Millcreek from 2017 to 2019.

33
34 The third area in which information was gathered pertained to the Boy Scout Camps in Millcreek
35 Canyon. There was concern that they may have to be sold due to the bankruptcy of the National
36 Boy Scout organization. Del Draper looked into the matter and determined that the title to the land
37 is in the name of the Greater Salt Lake Boy Scouts Council and not in the name of the national
38 association. As a result, the bankruptcy should have no legal impact on the property. He also
39 discovered that the exit of the LDS Church from the Boy Scout organization became effective
40 December 31, 2019. Of the 7,200 campers that used the camp, all but 110 were members of the
41 LDS church. That means that the Greater Salt Lake Council will have very little use for the camp
42 and will need money. Del Draper looked into the potential of obtaining conservation easements
43 and first contacted Wendy Fisher with Utah Open Lands. The issue would be considered in greater
44 detail in the coming months.

1 Brian Hutchinson commented on the issue of lack of management of canyon visitors and problems
2 in parking lots and along trails. He met with the Executive Director of the Parks and Recreation
3 Department who acknowledged that there is a problem. The situation, however, is in flux and he
4 was looking for direction from the Health Department. He acknowledged that there are problems
5 along trails and people not observing the new norms for social distancing.

6
7 Ed Marshall reported that earlier in the day he followed up with Wayne Johnson, who is in charge
8 of the Canyon's Park and Recreation Program. Mr. Johnson indicated that they have no intention
9 of shutting down Millcreek Canyon. He stated that people need recreation now more than ever.
10 Mr. Marshall also contacted Bekee Hotze who indicated that their mandate is to provide recreation
11 to the public. They currently have no intention of shutting down the Canyon or Millcreek Road.

12
13 Mr. Marshall stated that he spoke with Mr. Hutchinson about distinguishing the trails from the
14 roads. For example, the road above the winter gate is two lanes wide and visitors are maintaining
15 social distance and not congregating. The same was true along Porters Fork Road, which is not as
16 wide. Mr. Marshall stated that there is an issue with the Pipeline Trail. If people are not wearing
17 masks and are unable to utilize social distancing, a health issue could be created. The Forest
18 Service recognizes that but had not yet determined what to do.

19
20 Kirk Nichols asked if the Boy Scouts have been contacted and if the Great Salt Lake Council will
21 accept groups that are not boy scouts. Ed Marshall offered to raise the question with Del Draper.
22 There was discussion about the LDS Church and their plans to potentially continue to use the Boy
23 Scout property.

24 25 **3. TRAILS COMMITTEE UPDATE**

26 27 **a. John Knoblock will Provide an Update on the Committee Work Done to Date.**

28
29 John Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee has not yet formally met. Zinnia Wilson, U.S.
30 Forest Service Program Manager for Trails, formed a Trails Committee as part of the Ranger
31 District's Quarterly Stakeholder Meetings. They also plan to create a Trails Committee involving
32 essentially the same people, however, CWC's Trails Committee can work with both federal and
33 non-federal lands. The Salt Lake Ranger District's Trails Committee will include federal lands in
34 the Central Wasatch and the Stansbury Mountains in Davis County. They wanted to avoid
35 duplicating their efforts and wasting time.

36
37 Mr. Knoblock commented that everyone recognizes the need to complete a Master Plan for the
38 Trails in the Central Wasatch. Ms. Wilson was able to get a \$15,000 grant to hire someone over
39 the summer to provide documentation and GIS mapping of all user-created social trails and non-
40 federal trails in the Central Wasatch. A member of Salt Lake County Planning also offered to
41 assist in the effort once a definitive plan is in place. There was significant value in obtaining the
42 \$100,000 needed to hire someone to provide coordination and conduct public outreach meetings
43 and similar efforts.

44
45 Mr. Knoblock acknowledged that there is a great deal going on in the Central Wasatch in terms of
46 trail projects. The Willow Lake Trail Reroute was expected to be completed this summer along

1 with Cardiff Ridge and the Boardwalk. The Forest Service is planning to construct a bridge over
2 the bottom of Butler Fork Trail. The hope was that money will be released from the track fund to
3 complete the trail up Millcreek to the Big Water Trailhead. The Forest Service will reroute
4 Desolation Trail going downhill from Dog Lake to provide switchbacks rather than going straight
5 down.

6
7 Barbara Cameron asked Mr. Knoblock if he was working with Ms. Wilson on a bridge on the
8 Desolation Trail. Mr. Knoblock explained that they are doing a reroute on the section of the
9 Desolation Trail that is immediately downhill from Dog Lake. They plan to construct switchbacks
10 across the terrain edge coming down from the east side of Reynolds. He stated that two bridges
11 are needed.

12
13 Carl Fisher asked Mr. Knoblock to update the Council on efforts to remove wilderness for the
14 Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Mr. Knoblock stated that it is still moving forward but did not think
15 anything had been submitted or entered at the federal level.

16
17 Will McCarvill was troubled by the process by which the Bonneville Shoreline Trail went through.
18 It was not vetted and did not go through the Mountain Accord Central Wasatch process. The CWC
19 website states that with respect to the Stakeholders Council, they are working to resolve issues and
20 move forward. He considered the Bonneville Shoreline Trail effort to be an end-run around the
21 Stakeholders Council and the CWC and a commitment to what is needed in terms of collaborative
22 processes to move forward.

23
24 Mr. Knoblock noted that it was not initiated by the Bonneville Shoreline Trails Committee or
25 Trails Utah but by the International Mountain Bike Association. The intent was to move something
26 forward that is not detrimental to the overall Central Wasatch National Conservation Recreation
27 Area (“CWNCR”) Act. They would still strongly support that. Mr. McCarvill’s opinion was
28 that moving something forward in the wrong way is more detrimental in the long term than doing
29 it correctly.

30
31 Executive Director, Ralph Becker, reviewed the Bonneville Shoreline issues as they relate to the
32 CWC. The proposal was put forward by Congressman Curtis. The CWC concluded very early on
33 to remain neutral because there was no consensus and great conflict within the trails and
34 conservation communities. CWC leadership met on a few occasions with Congressman Curtis
35 and his staff. There was no resolution of the conflict so CWC decided to remain neutral and
36 uninvolved.

37
38 **4. VISITOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE UPDATE**

39
40 **a. Annalee Munsey and Will McCarvill will Provide Update on Next Steps for**
41 **the Committee.**

42
43 Annalee Munsey reported that the Visitor Management Committee scheduled meetings for
44 February, however, they did not feel they could meet yet as they were still seeking direction from
45 the CWC Board.

1 Will McCarvill reported on ideas he and Dr. Kelly Bricker discussed. He considered the Visitor
2 Management effort to be key in achieving the goals of the Environmental Dashboard, the current
3 Forest Plan, the Canyons Master Plan, and the Salt Lake Watershed Plan being updated. He
4 believed that visitors have the greatest impact on mountain resources. He proposed that the
5 subcommittee discuss how visitor management can interact positively with other efforts in helping
6 to achieve their goals.

7
8 Dr. Bricker echoed Mr. McCarvill’s comments and stated that they need direction from the
9 Commission. They answered questions that have arisen and reported that the first phase involved
10 compiling information and creating a plan moving forward that allows them to explore other
11 opportunities.

12
13 Mr. Becker reported that the CWC Board has addressed the issue on a few occasions and there
14 have been supportive comments from some Board Members that it would be valuable and perhaps
15 necessary to complete a Visitor Management Study. The CWC does not have the needed funds
16 currently but encouraged the Stakeholders Council to continue pursuing potential funding.

17
18 **5. CWC COMMITTEE UPDATES.**

19
20 **a. Short-Term Projects Committee.**

21
22 **i. Lindsey Nielsen will Provide an Update on the Process for the CWC’s**
23 **Short-Term Projects Call for Ideas.**

24
25 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen reported that the Short-Term Projects Committee is
26 comprised of three CWC Board Members including Mayor Erin Mendenhall from Salt Lake City,
27 Councilman Jim Bradley from Salt Lake County, and Council Member Marci Houseman. One of
28 the motivating factors for establishing the committee was to explore potential projects that can be
29 accomplished in the short term and that would be largely noticeable by the public. The committee
30 put out a request for project ideas on March 13 and has completed the first review of the ideas
31 submitted before April 3. The projects were scored against a set of criteria in collaboration with
32 the U.S. Forest Service and a list of finalist projects were identified that would be moved on to the
33 next step in the process. They will next build out the initial project ideas into full proposals that
34 include a timeline, budget, and Letter of Support from the Forest Service.

35
36 The Short-Term Projects Committee will meet again on April 29 at which time they will review
37 the proposals submitted and make recommendations to the CWC Board for funding at the May 4
38 meeting.

39
40 Dr. Bricker asked if there will be coordination with the State on the Outdoor Recreation grants.
41 Ms. Nielsen explained that staff was exploring potential pathways to create an Outdoor Recreation
42 grant application for the Silver Lake Boardwalk Project. They faced insurmountable roadblocks
43 that prevented them from submitting the proposal. She reported that the CWC has about \$60,000
44 earmarked for special projects. They are trying to determine how best to spend that money to
45 serve the Central Wasatch Mountains and its users.

1 Barbara Cameron thanked Ms. Nielsen for her work on the Silver Lake Project and for organizing
2 the various projects.

3
4 **b. Transportation Committee.**

5
6 **i. Blake Perez and Greg Summerhays will Lead a Discussion on the**
7 **Mountain Transportation System Attributes and Objectives**
8 **Prioritization and Value Exercise.**
9

10 Chair Summerhays reported that the CWC Board began a Mountain Transportation initiative
11 earlier in the year to continue discussions regarding Mountain Accord. The Board asked that staff
12 help develop a process that would help prioritize the attributes and objectives of the Mountain
13 Transportation System (“MST”).
14

15 CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez reviewed the tentative results of the survey with the results to
16 be presented to the Transportation Committee. The recommendations will then be on to the CWC
17 Board with respect to the attributes and objectives. Mr. Perez reported that in November 2019 the
18 CWC formed various committees including the Transportation Committee. The goal of the
19 Transportation Committee at the time was to stay engaged in the Little Cottonwood Canyon
20 Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) process, provide comments, have a voice in the process,
21 continue the initiatives of Mountain Accord, and come to a consensus on a Mountain
22 Transportation System.
23

24 With regard to the timeline, in January they reviewed the initial planning process, released the
25 initial draft scoping document from Mountain Accord, and took public comment. Last week the
26 CWC Board approved the scope, attributes, and objectives and there was a request to identify,
27 value, and prioritize attributes and outcomes. Throughout the spring and early summer, they will
28 look at different modes and management strategies and evaluate them against the attributes and
29 objectives currently being prioritized. Later in the summer they will hold a public hearing on the
30 evaluation of the modes and management and get feedback from the public and the Stakeholders
31 Council. In the fall they will begin to develop preferred alternatives. They hope to host a
32 Transportation Summit and ultimately come up with a preferred local alternative that will go out
33 for public comment. In the winter they would like to send a locally preferred alternative to the
34 CWC for action and approval.
35

36 Mr. Perez next reported on the public comment and staff recommendations report. The initial
37 scoping document was released in February after which there was a public hearing. The report
38 was prepared in March and presented to the CWC Board the previous week. Comments were
39 received from 366 individuals, community groups, and businesses and categorized into four main
40 topics. The previous Monday, the report and recommendations were presented to the CWC Board
41 who granted approval and asked staff to prioritize the attributes and objectives. A survey was sent
42 out assigning a value to the attributes and objectives. A similar exercise was to be conducted with
43 the Transportation Committee after which a recommendation would be made to the CWC Board.
44

45 The survey results were presented. Mr. Perez reported that there were 18 participants and 31
46 members on the Stakeholders Council. The survey would be available for one more week to allow

1 all members of the Stakeholders Council to complete it. With respect to attributes, the highest was
2 6.44 and the lowest was 4.17. Nearly 24 objectives were outlined and approved in the report with
3 the high being 6.59 and a low of 4.39. Mr. Perez planned to send the survey out again to get full
4 participation. The data obtained will be used by the Transportation Committee to make a
5 recommendation to the CWC Board. The next Transportation Committee Meeting was scheduled
6 for Friday, May 1.

7
8 Dr. Bricker suggested that the attributes and objectives be fleshed out in greater detail and
9 categorized. She stated that prioritizing within themes may be useful.

10
11 Mike Marker commented that some of the comments are duplicated. He suggested there be
12 separation in the strategies and responses. Mr. Perez agreed and commented that there is a gray
13 area between the attributes and objectives.

14
15 Tom Diegel asked Dr. Bricker to describe statistically significant differences. Dr. Bricker stated
16 that with more participation they could conduct an analysis to see if attributes cluster and then look
17 at the mean score within that cluster.

18
19 Mr. Diegel next inquired about the MTS comment report. He referenced page 22 of the report and
20 stated that his understanding was that the study was intended to look at attributes and not
21 necessarily make actual recommendations. He asked for clarification on issues pertaining to
22 canyon connectivity. Mr. Becker explained that in the report wherever there is discussion about
23 the connections and the issue of connections between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon, the
24 Cottonwood Canyons, and Park City there is conflicting language. The map identifies potential
25 new transit connections but it does not support the verbiage. The intent was to look at the full
26 range including connections from the Salt Lake Valley to the Cottonwood Canyons and the
27 Wasatch Back. The objective was not for the report to list it as an objective but to find a geographic
28 scope. Mr. Becker suggested that the language be clarified. He stressed that they are not proposing
29 that the connection be made. Mr. Diegel suggested there be a formal clarification to that effect
30 moving forward. Mr. Becker agreed to bring the matter forward to the Transportation Committee
31 at the next meeting.

32
33 **c. Land Tenure Committee.**

34
35 **i. Ralph Becker will Provide an Update on the Land Tenure Committee.**

36
37 Mr. Becker reported that the Land Tenure Committee met on March 20 with the minutes available
38 on the Public Notice website. Mayor Wilson serves as Chair and has assigned the work to Mike
39 Reberg. Chris Robinson chaired the last meeting in Mayor Wilson's absence. The other members
40 of the committee were identified as Mayor Harris Sondak and Mayor Jeff Silvestrini from the
41 CWC Board. Two main questions were raised. The first was if it is worthwhile for the CWC,
42 recognizing that the land exchanges as proposed in Mountain Accord and the early legislative
43 proposals are not feasible, to move forward and find a way to address land tenure and land
44 ownership issues.

1 There was agreement that the land exchanges as proposed will not work and that other options
2 should be explored. The committee spent much of the remaining time addressing whether to
3 consider a directed land exchange. The desire was to move beyond the issues that have been
4 paralyzed in the administrative process. Ultimately, the decision was made to further consider a
5 directed land exchange and incorporate that concept into legislation moving forward. Mr. Becker
6 reported that the other approaches presented did not result in much discussion but there seemed to
7 be some interest.

8
9 **6. OPEN DISCUSSION**

10
11 Barbara Cameron asked about busing and stated that after the ski resorts shut down, the buses still
12 ran for a few more weeks. She asked that UTA be encouraged to be nimbler in response to
13 situations. Mr. Becker stated that staff met with UTA and explained that routes cannot shut down
14 immediately. UTA continued to run buses up the canyon but at a reduced schedule. UTA has
15 been collecting and analyzing information from the increased bus service, which was very
16 successful in terms of ridership. The CWC obtained a \$50,000 appropriation to provide for a bus
17 bypass service. It would allow law enforcement to escort buses around traffic at the mouths of the
18 canyons to improve flow and provide a greater incentive for people to ride buses.

19
20 **7. ADJOURNMENT**

21
22 The next Stakeholders Council Meeting was scheduled for July 15.

23
24 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
25 4:24 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, April 15, 2020.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____