

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MILLCREEK CANYON**  
2 **COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2021, AT 1:00 P.M. THE**  
3 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL**  
4 **LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED**  
5 **MARCH 18, 2020.**

6  
7 **Present:**

8  
9 **Committee Members:** Chair Ed Marshall, Del Draper, Paul Diegel, Tom Diegel,  
10 John Knoblock, **Helen** Peters (Salt Lake County)

11  
12 **Public:** Hilary Jacobs, Polly Hart, Rita Lund (left meeting at  
13 1:40 p.m.), Brian Hutchinson (joined the meeting at  
14 1:30 p.m.)

15  
16 **Staff:** CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez, CWC Communications  
17 Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye  
18 Mickelson

19  
20 Chair Ed Marshall called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

21  
22 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Committee to make the following  
23 determination:

24  
25 ‘I, as the Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee of the Stakeholders Council  
26 of the Central Wasatch Commission hereby determine that conducting council  
27 meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a  
28 substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor  
29 location. The World Health Organization, the President of the United States, the  
30 Governor of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Health Department have  
31 all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to the new strain of the  
32 Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2. Due to the state of emergency caused by the global  
33 pandemic, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the  
34 current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the  
35 health and safety of those who may be present at the location. According to the  
36 information and from State epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an  
37 acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the State’s health care  
38 system.’

39  
40 **1. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the December 21, 2020 Meeting.**

41  
42 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to approve the minutes from the December 21, 2020, Millcreek  
43 Canyon Committee Meeting. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
44 unanimous consent of the Committee.

45  
46 **2. Review and Approval of Chairman’s 2020 Final Report to SHC and CWC.**

1  
2 Chair Marshall believed that a 2020 Final Report was necessary to have a clear starting point for  
3 2021. He reported that CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez sent the report to the Stakeholders  
4 Council. However, Chair Marshall found a few typos that would need to be corrected before the  
5 report is forwarded to the CWC Board.

6  
7 Del Draper asked if Paul Diegel was elected as the new Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair. Chair  
8 Marshall explained that he had not yet been elected. By the time the report is forwarded to the  
9 CWC Board, the election process will have taken place.

10  
11 **MOTION:** Chair Marshall asked for approval of the Chairman’s 2020 Final Report. The motion  
12 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

13  
14 **3. Updates from Committee Members and Others Who Have New Information.**

15  
16 Rita Lund discussed the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. The committee making  
17 the final decision on the FLAP grant funds will select the recipient within the next few months.  
18 Helen Peters noted that the committee had not provided a specific date. She believed a decision  
19 would be made by the end of March. Ms. Lund commented that the FLAP grant funds will  
20 concentrate on the upper portion of the canyon. She also reported that Millcreek City hired a  
21 consultant to look at the property lines and topography of the fee booth area. John Knoblock asked  
22 Ms. Peters about the competition for the FLAP grant. Ms. Peters stated that there were four or  
23 five other groups in the running for the grant and they were all based in Utah.

24  
25 Mr. Knoblock shared trail updates with the Millcreek Canyon Committee. He reported that a  
26 contractor was on board to finish the last one-third of a mile on the trail that connects Elbow Fork  
27 Trail to Big Water Trail. The work was to take place in the spring after the snow cleared.  
28 Mr. Knoblock stated that he would reach out to Steve Brown with the U.S. Forest Service for  
29 updates related to the bridge at Elbow Fork that was crushed by a tree during a windstorm.  
30 Mr. Knoblock asked Ms. Peters for confirmation that the County Council approved the  
31 Transportation Choice Fund for the Rattlesnake Gulch Trail project. Ms. Peters confirmed this  
32 but noted that it was a post-performance reimbursement.

33  
34 It was reported that Zinnia Wilson from the Forest Service would be focused on maintenance of  
35 the Wasatch Crest Trail this summer. Further communication with Salt Lake County Parks and  
36 Recreation would be needed to ensure that the approved funding was still there. The work would  
37 go from the top of Millcreek Canyon and head south on the Wasatch Crest Trail. Mr. Knoblock  
38 reported that there was a two to three-foot gully in the middle of the trail that would be repaired.  
39 There was also a steep section where there would be switchbacks. The Committee Members  
40 discussed the exact location where the maintenance would take place.

41  
42 Mr. Knoblock reported that Ms. Wilson also discussed Mountain Meadows Trail, also known as  
43 Millcreek Meadows Trail. It is located on the upper part of the canyon, parallel to the Great  
44 Western Trail, coming down into Millcreek, off the Wasatch Crest Trail. The trail had been closed  
45 by the Forest Service approximately 18 years ago. Over time, it was used more and more  
46 frequently by hikers. Although the trail is not an official Forest Service system trail, Mr. Knoblock

1 believed it should continue to be used. He pointed out that improvements would need to be made  
2 to fix eroded areas. Tom Diegel felt it would be beneficial to have an alternative trail available to  
3 disperse trail use in the area. Additionally, the trail could be improved upon without a considerable  
4 amount of work. Paul Diegel commented that he had spoken to Ms. Wilson about the trail last  
5 summer. She thought the trail was in a good location, but certain areas were still in need of repair.  
6

7 Chair Marshall mentioned the Bonneville Shoreline Trail map distributed by Mr. Draper and the  
8 map sent out by CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker. Mr. Draper had been in discussions with  
9 the Nature Conservancy about Camp Tracy. The map Mr. Becker distributed showed the greater  
10 exchanges of land for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Mr. Knoblock noted that there was a slight  
11 difference between the maps. He discussed the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Advancement Act but  
12 was not sure if the Bonneville Shoreline Trail bill would move forward.  
13

14 Mr. Knoblock believed it was important for there to be a conservation easement on the Boy Scout  
15 property. Mr. Draper agreed. He discussed the issue with the Nature Conservancy and Utah Open  
16 Lands. The Nature Conservancy felt the project would be better suited to Utah Open Lands.  
17 Mr. Draper believed someone needed to approach the Forest Service to determine whether they  
18 were willing to approach Millcreek City and Salt Lake County about a conservation easement on  
19 the land. Mr. Knoblock suggested that the CWC could take the lead on the issue. He noted that  
20 the Mountain Accord mentioned purchasing lands as they become available for protection and  
21 conservation. The Boy Scout property would fit in well with the mission of the Mountain Accord  
22 and as a result, the CWC. Mr. Knoblock believed the issue could be raised to the CWC Board.  
23

24 Ms. Peters wondered if someone could speak to the Boy Scouts directly about a conservation  
25 easement. Mr. Draper raised concerns about a governmental entity approaching the Boy Scouts.  
26 Ms. Peters noted that the Boy Scouts seemed to have plans for the property moving forward.  
27 Mr. Draper commented that those plans would not rule out a conservation easement. He discussed  
28 the uncertainty around the future of the Boy Scouts. The Boy Scouts went from having  
29 approximately 7,000 troops in Utah to 110 with the loss of the partnership with the Church of Jesus  
30 Christ of Latter-day Saints. Mr. Draper believed the numbers suggested that there may be issues  
31 down the road. He liked Mr. Knoblock's suggestion to discuss the potential conservation easement  
32 with the CWC Board.  
33

34 There was discussion regarding how to move forward. Ms. Peters believed it was important to  
35 determine what the property owners planned to do. Mr. Draper commented that he could reach  
36 out to them and report back at the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Mr. Tom Diegel  
37 noted that there is decent parking on the land as well as amenities and shelters. If the land were  
38 lost to development, it would be a loss of opportunity for the community. Chair Marshall asked if  
39 Utah Open Lands or the Nature Conservancy would be willing to approach the Forest Service.  
40 Mr. Draper responded that he was early into the discussions with the Nature Conservancy and Utah  
41 Open Lands was sidetracked with several other projects. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that the Nature  
42 Conservancy looked more at habitat land for animals.  
43

44 Mr. Knoblock believed it made sense to talk to the people at Camp Tracy. He wondered if there  
45 was a way that a conservation easement could be purchased from them that would:  
46

- 1 • Allow normal operations to continue.
- 2 • Allow for continued infrastructure development that is within their mission of running a
- 3 Boy Scout camp; and
- 4 • Prohibit the land from being developed for other uses.

5  
6 Mr. Draper offered to reach out and report back. Chair Marshall believed it would be best for  
7 Mr. Draper to reach out as a private citizen rather than a representative of the CWC. The  
8 Committee discussed the need to move forward on the conservation easement. Mr. Perez  
9 suggested that Mr. Draper pursue the discussions individually and draft something for the next  
10 Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. He reminded the Committee Members that the  
11 information would eventually need to be forwarded to the Stakeholders Council and then the CWC  
12 Board.

13  
14 Chair Marshall reported that Mr. Tom Diegel sent an email to Salt Lake District Ranger, Bekee  
15 Hotze, and Sergeant Ed Twohill from the Unified Police Department (“UPD”). He received an  
16 email response from Marshall Alford regarding Porter Fork. Mr. Tom Diegel explained that Porter  
17 Fork road is heavily used. The Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has had a camera at the trailhead  
18 for the last few years and there was a 60% increase in use for the season. Additionally, at the  
19 bottom of Porter Fork Road, there is a sign that indicates that odd/even dog leash rules are in place.  
20 However, further up the road, there are unofficial signs that say dogs must be always on-leash.  
21 Mr. Tom Diegel asked the Forest Service for clarification on the regulations. According to  
22 Mr. Alford, further clarification was needed.

23  
24 Mr. Tom Diegel also asked about wheeled vehicles when the road is snow-covered. He noted that  
25 some of the cabin owners drive their cars on the road when there is snow, which destroys the track  
26 for skiers. Mr. Tom Diegel also wanted to determine whether the leash law applied to the trail  
27 past the end of Porter Fork Road. That area was much narrower and steeper. As a result, there  
28 was a higher likelihood that conflicts could take place. Mr. Tom Diegel offered to follow up with  
29 Mr. Alford, FIDOS, and the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. He felt it was important to establish  
30 clarity on these issues and then focus on education and outreach.

31  
32 Mr. Paul Diegel noted that the unofficial signs had been posted on Porter Fork for the last four to  
33 five years. Even among Forest Service employees, there seemed to be a lack of clarity about the  
34 rules. Mr. Knoblock commented that roadways require dogs to be on-leash. As far as the  
35 Committee had been told, only the upper road past the winter gate had been declared a trail. Chair  
36 Marshall reported that Mr. Alford stated in his email that Porter Fork is a trail year-round because  
37 the gate is closed. The odd/even leash rules were applied to the upper canyon by the County.  
38 However, the Forest Service closure order does not address the specifics for Porter Fork.  
39 Mr. Alford believed the trail had a year-round closed to public vehicles condition. He reiterated  
40 that clarity was needed.

41  
42 Chair Marshall addressed the homeowners in the area. He reported that they paid for the  
43 resurfacing of the road that took place last summer. As a result, some of the homeowners may  
44 view the road as their own and may be responsible for the unofficial signs. The Committee  
45 discussed the signs. It was suggested that the unofficial Forest Service signs be removed to

1 eliminate any unnecessary confusion. Mr. Tom Diegel wondered if there is a Homeowners  
2 Association for Porter Fork. Chair Marshall confirmed this. He offered to share contact  
3 information with Mr. Tom Diegel.

4  
5 Mr. Draper wondered if the homeowners had a Special Use Permit from the Forest Service that  
6 allowed them to maintain and travel over the road. Mr. Tom Diegel stated that he would ask  
7 Mr. Alford for a copy of the permit in his follow-up email. Chair Marshall asked that the original  
8 email and reply be forwarded to the rest of the Millcreek Canyon Committee Members for review.

9  
10 Mr. Paul Diegel reported that he emailed Mr. Alford and Ms. Hotze to inform them that the  
11 Millcreek Canyon Committee would be undergoing a change in leadership. He also inquired about  
12 how the Committee could best support the Forest Service in their efforts. Chair Marshall believed  
13 Ms. Hotze would prefer that everything be handled through the Forest Service Stakeholders  
14 Council rather than there also being a separate CWC Committee. The more the Millcreek Canyon  
15 Committee can establish their independence from the Forest Service Stakeholders Committee, the  
16 more cooperation there will be. Mr. Knoblock noted that there was a CWC Stakeholders Council  
17 scheduled on January 20, 2021, and a Forest Service Stakeholders Council Meeting scheduled on  
18 January 21, 2021.

19  
20 Mr. Draper asked a follow-up question related to the Boy Scout maps. He noted that the shape of  
21 the parcel looked different on the map he shared versus the map that Becker shared. Mr. Perez  
22 commented that he would follow up on the two maps. Mr. Knoblock discussed the Assessor Parcel  
23 Viewer on the Salt Lake County website. He reported that the online tool could be used to view  
24 various parcels of land as well as ownership, sizes, and boundaries.

25  
26 Mr. Draper asked about the funding for the Rattlesnake Gulch Trail project. Mr. Knoblock  
27 explained that Trails Utah had the project out for bid. There was currently a Request for Proposals  
28 (“RFP”) on the Professional Trailbuilders Association website. He reported that there had been  
29 inquiries about the project but only one or two bids. Mr. Draper asked if there was enough funding  
30 to complete the project. Mr. Knoblock stated that one of the bids was higher than the amount of  
31 funds. He hoped that additional bids would come in at a lower price point. Otherwise, an  
32 additional \$20,000 to \$30,000 would be needed to complete the project.

33  
34 **4. Update on CWC Alternatives for a Mountain Transportation System.**

35  
36 Mr. Perez updated the Millcreek Canyon Committee on the Mountain Transportation System  
37 (“MTS”). Over the next 90 days, the CWC would further explore each of the transportation modes  
38 and alternatives. There would be a bus discussion, rail discussion, aerial discussion, and a meeting  
39 with the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”)  
40 team. The goal was for the CWC Board to reach a transportation recommendation by mid-March.  
41 That recommendation would then be forwarded to UDOT for consideration.

42  
43 Mr. Knoblock mentioned an article in *The Deseret News* with comments from Governor Spencer  
44 Cox about transportation systems. He wondered if the State Legislature would make the final  
45 decision on a transportation system. Mr. Perez explained that the State Legislature could make  
46 decisions related to funding but would not have an influence on the Record of Decision. Mr. Tom

1 Diegel noted that UDOT was willing to listen to the CWC but ultimately, the final decision would  
2 be made by them. Mr. Perez commented that UDOT would provide the Record of Decision.  
3 However, it was important for the CWC to weigh in on a preferred transportation alternative. Mr.  
4 Perez stressed the importance of a preference that paired well with the lands bill and aligned with  
5 the objectives of the Mountain Accord.

6  
7 Mr. Perez reported that by the middle of the year, UDOT would have a Draft EIS that may include  
8 a recommended alternative. The Draft EIS would then go out for public comment. At the end of  
9 the year, there would be a final Record of Decision. Mr. Perez noted that it was important for the  
10 CWC to move quickly over the next several months to share a transportation recommendation with  
11 UDOT by April.

12  
13 Brian Hutchison asked Mr. Perez about tolling. Mr. Perez commented that tolling was still a few  
14 years away. UDOT was working with the Federal Highway Administration (“FHA”) on different  
15 tolling programs. They were looking to implement tolling in Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big  
16 Cottonwood Canyon. Committee Members asked about funding, but Mr. Perez was not certain  
17 about the funds. He reiterated that tolling was still a few years away.

18  
19 **5. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for Year from February 2021 to January**  
20 **2022.**

21  
22 Chair Marshall opened discussions related to the Chair and Vice-Chair positions. Office  
23 Administrator, Kaye Mickelson reported that new rules and procedures would come before the  
24 Stakeholders Council at the next meeting. Under subcommittees, it would state that the committee  
25 may appoint a Vice-Chair if desired. However, Ms. Mickelson reported that CWC Attorney,  
26 Shane Topham believed a Vice-Chair should always be appointed.

27  
28 Mr. Paul Diegel did not believe a Vice-Chair was needed but was not opposed to one.  
29 Ms. Mickelson explained that the reason for the Vice-Chair position was so that someone could  
30 take over a meeting in the event of an absence. Mr. Perez reported that the nominations for Chair  
31 and Vice-Chair would be recommendations made by the Millcreek Canyon Committee. The CWC  
32 Board would formally appoint the positions at the February 2021 Board Meeting.

33  
34 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to nominate Paul Diegel as Chairman of the Millcreek Canyon  
35 Committee from February 2021 to January 2022. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. The  
36 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

37  
38 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to nominate Del Draper as Vice-Chairman of the Millcreek  
39 Canyon Committee from February 2021 to January 2022. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion.  
40 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

41  
42 **6. Other Business Relating Directly to Millcreek Canyon.**

43  
44 No additional business was discussed.

45  
46 **7. Adjournment.**

1  
2 **MOTION:** Paul Diegel moved to adjourn. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion passed  
3 with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

4  
5 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Millcreek*  
2 *Canyon Committee Meeting held Tuesday, January 19, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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