

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
2 **COUNCIL TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, THURSDAY, JULY 8, 2021, AT**
3 **2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**
4

5 **Present:** John Knoblock, Chair
6 Barbara Cameron
7 Benjamin Pellegrino
8 Dennis Goreham
9 Martin Jensen
10 BK
11 Kelly Boardman
12 James Hicks
13 Chelsea Phillippe
14 Will McCarvill
15 Pat Shea
16 Deborah Case
17 Dan Knopp
18 Sarah Bennett
19

20 **Staff:** Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
21 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
22 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
23

24 **1. Introductions.**
25

26 Chair John Knoblock called the meeting to order at approximately 2:00 p.m. He noted that the
27 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Trails Committee Meeting agenda
28 would proceed slightly out of order. He asked that the Committee start with item number three in
29 order to hear from the Mayor of Brighton, Dan Knopp, the Director of Salt Lake County Parks and
30 Recreation, Martin Jensen, and Forest Service Trails and Inventory Planner, Chelsea Phillippe.
31

32 **2. Review and Approve Past Meeting Minutes.**
33

34 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes from the June 10, 2021, Trails
35 Committee Meeting. Sarah Bennett seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
36 consent of the Committee.
37

38 **3. Discuss How the Big Cottonwood Trails Master Plan will Fit in with the USFS Trails**
39 **Plan and SLCo Trails Master Plan.**
40

41 **a. Dan Knopp, Martin Jensen and Chelsea Phillippe.**
42

43 Chair Knoblock wished to discuss the status of the Salt Lake County Natural Surface Trails Master
44 Plan as well as the potential Brighton Trails Master Plan to determine how those plans would work
45 with the U.S. Forest Service Salt Lake Ranger District trails inventory. Chair Knoblock reported

1 that one of the primary objectives included in the Mission and Vision Statement for the Trails
2 Committee was to provide input on various trail planning documents.

3
4 It was noted that at one point, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation wanted to be the lead agency
5 for the Salt Lake County Natural Surface Trails Master Plan. Chair Knoblock asked for an update
6 from Mr. Jensen with respect to funding. Mr. Jensen first discussed the Regional Trails Master
7 Plan. There was a draft of that plan that was nearly complete. Mr. Jensen explained that there
8 would be some final internal reviews and then the plan would be made available to the public.
9 Additionally, there would be a process where the Regional Trails Master Plan was presented to the
10 Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, the Mayor's Office, and the County Council.

11
12 Mr. Jensen clarified that the Regional Trails Master Plan was a broad document. The goal of the
13 plan was to try to get all of the trail pathways in one location. Salt Lake County Parks and
14 Recreation was not trying to plan trails for cities or for the federal government. They were trying
15 to be a partner and to bring everything together in a high-level document. Mr. Jensen explained
16 that during the planning process, there was a realization that a more detailed plan was also desired.
17 Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation was happy to work with cities and federal partners on a
18 more detailed plan. However, he corrected the statement made earlier that Salt Lake County Parks
19 and Recreation wanted to be the lead agency for the Salt Lake County Natural Surface Trails
20 Master Plan. They did not necessarily want to lead that process but the County would be a good
21 partner and may be able to bring the landowners together to try to create a more detailed plan.

22
23 Discussions were had about possible funding. Mr. Jensen explained that he had lost staff and was
24 having a difficult time hiring. In addition, the budget had been cut by \$3 million and he did not
25 have the funding to hire a consultant. The current focus was on completing the Regional Trails
26 Master Plan. The Natural Surface Trails Master Plan was on a list of items to do but that list would
27 need to be prioritized as resources were made available. While the 2022 budget preparations were
28 currently beginning, he was unable to guarantee that the plan would be included in the budget for
29 that year. It would depend on where everything else on the list prioritized.

30
31 Chair Knoblock reported that there had been support from several County Council Members.
32 However, it sounded like Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation had various competing needs.
33 Mr. Jensen confirmed this. He explained that over the next eight weeks, they would be looking at
34 the list of needs and prioritize them based on the current environment and feedback from the public
35 and stakeholders. The prioritized list would be submitted to the Mayor and County Council, who
36 would determine the funding level. That funding level would dictate whether the Natural Surface
37 Trails Master Plan could be started in 2022.

38
39 Mr. Jensen wondered what Trails Committee Members envisioned as the scope for the Natural
40 Surface Trails Master Plan. Chair Knoblock noted that the Trails Committee was a subcommittee
41 of the CWC Stakeholders Council. Technically, the Committee only dealt with the CWC area,
42 which included Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, Millcreek Canyon, Parleys
43 Canyon, and areas like Alta and Brighton. Chair Knoblock explained that for the scope, it would
44 be ideal to have a GIS layer developed that would have all of the County-wide natural surface
45 trails. He noted that the Draper to Corner Canyon Trail System, Salt Lake City Foothills Trail

1 System, and the trails inventory that Ms. Phillippe was working on could all be incorporated and
2 the plan could build in any missing sections.

3
4 Chair Knoblock wondered if there was anything the Trails Committee could do to elevate the
5 Natural Surface Trails Master Plan on the priority list. Mr. Jensen noted that the Trails Committee
6 could send him something in writing that stated that the plan was a priority for the Trails
7 Committee. That would assist in the consideration and prioritization process.

8
9 Mr. Jensen believed it was important for all cities and organizations to work together to make sure
10 regional connections tie into local connections. Connectivity was important as was identifying
11 areas for future improvements and areas where there was demand and a need for growth. Pat Shea
12 asked if Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation ever used students and faculty from Salt Lake City
13 universities or colleges to help out. Mr. Jensen reported that they had not recently. There had
14 been limited success with those types of internships in the past.

15
16 Mr. Jensen informed the Trails Committee that Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation would be
17 sending out a County-wide needs assessment survey in August. The last two times the survey had
18 been conducted, trails and open space had been in the top three for County resident priorities. As
19 soon as the data was gathered from the latest survey, it would be shared with municipalities,
20 partners, and the CWC. Mr. Jensen anticipated that trails would still be a top priority.

21
22 Chair Knoblock noted that the next part of the discussion related to the Town of Brighton. Mayor
23 Knopp was interested in undertaking a Trails Plan as trails are important to the area. He asked
24 Mayor Knopp to describe his vision for a Brighton Trails Master Plan. Mayor Knopp reported
25 that discussions had taken place with the Council and there was a framework for the budget. They
26 were working with the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (“MSD”) to do the Brighton
27 Town Master Plan and he believed that would also include the Brighton Trails Master Plan.
28 Mr. Jensen believed it was appropriate for MSD to support Brighton in that effort.

29
30 Chair Knoblock noted that the U.S. Forest Service was working on a trails inventory and trails
31 planning on Forest Service-owned lands. He commented that two-thirds of Brighton land is Forest
32 Service owned and wondered if Ms. Phillippe would be working with MSD on the trails plan.
33 Ms. Phillippe confirmed this. She explained that Zinnia Wilson was trying to set up a phone call
34 to start coordinating that effort. There should be additional details following that conversation.
35 She believed the discussions would take place in the next couple of weeks.

36
37 Will McCarvill asked how the ski area trails plans would be integrated into the Brighton Trails
38 Master Plan. Mayor Knopp noted that the ski areas typically made their own plans. There was a
39 new manager at Solitude that he would try to meet with to discuss the issue further. Chair
40 Knoblock noted that the ski areas often struggled to have enough staff to do a lot of planning work.
41 He reported that Randy Doyle from Brighton Ski Resort had said many times that he would like
42 to do a comprehensive trail plan. He believed Mr. Doyle would want to be involved in the Brighton
43 Trails Master Plan process. Mayor Knopp commented that he would speak to the New Manager
44 at Solitude as well as Mr. Doyle in the next few weeks.

1 Chair Knoblock reported that trails planning in Brighton had been difficult in the past due to land
2 ownership. Some was ski resort-owned, some was private property, some was County property,
3 Forest Service property and Salt Lake City Public Utilities property. Chair Knoblock added that
4 Carl Fisher from Save Our Canyons believed that it would be beneficial to have a trail that
5 connected Brighton Ski Resort to Guardsman Pass. The Forest Service had also suggested that
6 connection in the past. Chair Knoblock noted that there seemed to be some agreement on that
7 connection, but communication would be necessary in order to make it happen.
8

9 Chair Knoblock wondered whether there was a potential timeline for the Brighton Trails Master
10 Plan. Mayor Knopp reported that they were working on getting a consultant to help with the plan
11 in addition to MSD. Barbara Cameron added that the Brighton General Plan process would begin
12 on July 22, 2021. She believed there would be discussions about trails during that time. The
13 General Plan would take approximately one year to 18 months to complete. Ms. Cameron stressed
14 the importance of trail connectivity.
15

16 Ms. Phillippe shared an update related to the Forest Service trails inventory process. The current
17 focus was on inventorying the system trails. At the end of the season, a data analysis would be
18 done, which could be shared in the winter. From there, a plan would build. However, the current
19 focus was trying to understand what was tangibly on the ground, the existing conditions, and the
20 kind of use that was taking place. Chair Knoblock wondered whether the Forest Service would
21 continue to move forward with color-coding the GIS layer of all the existing trails. Ms. Phillippe
22 confirmed this. They had already started some of the color coding but were still waiting for
23 different GIS lines from ski resorts and were making sure they had the correct data from different
24 landowners and municipalities so everything was represented correctly.
25

26 Ms. Cameron wondered if there would be priorities related to which trails should be removed or
27 expanded. Ms. Phillippe explained that those types of discussions would come later. Once the
28 Forest Service had assessed what currently existed, they would be able to go through and prioritize
29 different trails based on what was causing the most resource impact, what should stay the same,
30 and any additional opportunities for connectivity. She believed that type of information would
31 come after the data had been mapped out and analyzed.
32

33 Chair Knoblock reported that he had made a Google Drive folder for the Trails Committee
34 Members to access. Several documents had been added to the folder, including the KMZ layer
35 that Ms. Phillippe had sent with the draft inventory of the user-created trails. Chair Knoblock
36 could resend the Google Drive link to those interested. Ms. Phillippe noted that the KMZ layer
37 was a draft. Changes could be made as discussions were had with different organizations.
38

39 Benjamin Pellegrino asked a question in the Zoom chatbox. He wondered what jurisdiction the
40 Donut Falls Mill D traffic light fell under and referenced the winter gridlock. Chair Knoblock
41 believed the light was controlled by the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). Ms.
42 Cameron confirmed this. She noted that based on the heat map from the Unified Police
43 Department (“UPD”) there were a lot of accidents and citations in the Donut Falls area each year.
44 Mayor Knopp noted that the gridlock issue in the area had improved throughout the season but it
45 was still a work in progress. Chair Knoblock commented that the traffic light was relatively new.
46 He believed that UDOT would likely study the issue to best utilize the new tool they had.

1
2 Mr. McCarvill shared an update related to the Visitor Use Study. He reported that Phase I of the
3 Visitor Use Study had been contracted by the CWC to Utah State University. That portion of the
4 study was currently underway. Mr. McCarvill noted that there were ongoing conversations related
5 to Phase II. Discussions were had about visitor use following the COVID-19 pandemic. Chair
6 Knoblock noted that he had seen fewer people while he was out but Mr. McCarvill commented
7 that he had seen more. The visitation levels seemed to vary based on location.
8

9 **4. Get Input on Ideas on Alternative Funding for the County-Wide Trails Master Plan.**
10

11 Chair Knoblock noted that funding was always an issue. Based on the conversation with Mr.
12 Jensen, it did not appear that funding for the Salt Lake County Natural Surface Trails Master Plan
13 would be readily available despite the fact that trails were a priority for county residents. Mr.
14 McCarvill stated that he had spoken to Jim Bradley from the Salt Lake County Council about the
15 plan being a higher priority as it related to county funding. Chair Knoblock reported that both Ann
16 Granato and Dea Theodore were also supportive of the plan being prioritized.
17

18 Discussions were had about the suggestion made by Mr. Jensen for the Trails Committee to put
19 something in writing that expressed support for the Salt Lake County Natural Surface Trails Master
20 Plan. Mr. McCarvill felt the letter would also need to be sent to the County Council.
21 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen explained that the letter would need to be sent to the
22 Stakeholders Council for approval and then to the CWC Board for approval. Mr. McCarvill noted
23 that the item could be added to the July 21, 2021 Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda. If
24 approved, the letter could then be discussed at the August 2021 CWC Board Meeting. Chair
25 Knoblock noted that the timing would be important. If the letter was approved and forwarded in
26 August, that would provide Mr. Jensen enough time to consider the letter with the budget priorities.
27

28 **MOTION:** Chair Knoblock moved that the Trails Committee write a letter asking that funding
29 for the Salt Lake County Natural Surface Trails Master Plan be prioritized. The letter would
30 require approval by the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. Will McCarvill seconded the
31 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
32

33 Chair Knoblock wondered whether there were other possible sources of funding or grants that
34 could be looked into. He noted that in the past it had been difficult to obtain grants to fund studies
35 or plans. Chair Knoblock believed it would cost approximately \$120,000 to hire a consultant to
36 help with the plan. Dennis Goreham suggested reaching out to organizations that were connected
37 to Stakeholders Council Members. Mr. McCarvill explained that there were a number of private
38 citizens on the Stakeholders Council. Not all of the members were associated with an organization.
39

40 Committee Members discussed possible organizations to reach out to. Mr. McCarvill suggested
41 the Mountainland Association of Governments. Sarah Bennett suggested the Wasatch Front
42 Regional Council. Mr. McCarvill noted that there would need to be further discussions with Mr.
43 Jensen to confirm the amount of funding needed and the deliverables. Then a package could be
44 put together to present to different organizations. Ms. Bennett agreed and commented that it would
45 be important to consider the verbiage used in the package. For instance, the plan was about

1 recreation but it also tied into watershed protection and the ability to plan for transportation
2 infrastructure. Mr. McCarvill added that there was an economic piece to consider as well.

3
4 Mr. McCarvill noted that once a rough draft was completed, they could approach Salt Lake County
5 Mayor Jenny Wilson to look over the draft. It might be beneficial to have some sort of political
6 advice beforehand. Chair Knoblock liked the idea. Ms. Cameron wondered who would handle
7 the potential donations and contributions. Mr. McCarvill believed that some advice from CWC
8 Staff would be needed in order to determine the best approach.

9
10 Ms. Bennett expressed concerns about an earlier comment made by Mr. Jensen. He had stated that
11 Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation did not want to get into the business of telling
12 municipalities what they needed to do. She was concerned because a hands-off approach could be
13 problematic. The involvement of all of the municipalities would be critical to the success of the
14 Natural Surface Trails Master Plan, but it did not sound like Mr. Jensen and his staff would handle
15 the outreach to the various municipalities. That seemed to be a key piece.

16
17 Chair Knoblock commented that Mr. Jensen had said he wanted to take on the plan at one point.
18 However, it seemed that he was not certain that he had the staffing or resources to do so. It was
19 important that the Trails Committee kept their minds open to various options. For instance, the
20 General Manager of MSD, Bart Barker, or Salt Lake County Program Planning Manager, Jake
21 Young may be able to take on the project instead.

22
23 Patrick Nelson from Salt Lake City Public Utilities had informed Chair Knoblock that there was
24 no new update or identified timeline with respect to the Watershed Management Plan.

25
26 **5. Make Final Comments and Suggestions to Family-Friendly Hikes List Sent Out Last**
27 **Meeting.**
28

29 Chair Knoblock noted that he was not sure how family-friendly it was to reach Circle All Peak.
30 Ms. Bennett commented that Mill D trail and some of the other trails could use moderation of the
31 grade in certain places. Chair Knoblock did not believe those types of projects were high on the
32 list of priorities, but the Mill A trail up from Butler Fork could benefit from some grade reduction
33 in order to become family-friendly. Additionally, Chair Knoblock reported that Save Our Canyons
34 would be holding a volunteer trail maintenance project on the Butler Fork Trail on July 10, 2021.

35
36 **6. Updates for Ongoing 2021 Trail Projects**
37

38 Chair Knoblock shared updates related to ongoing trail projects. He reported that Mount Olympus
39 Trail was going to start getting redone. Mr. Pellegrino asked in the Zoom chat box about the
40 Bonneville Shoreline Trail between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon.
41 Chair Knoblock reported that there was action between Ferguson Canyon and Big Cottonwood
42 Canyon. The section of trail across the grassy hillside above the neighborhood homes had been
43 built. In the fall, there would be a connection to the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead.

44
45 It sounded like the Forest Service Regional Engineers were still trying to evaluate the bridge over
46 Big Cottonwood Creek to see if the trailhead could be opened. Knowing the Forest Service

1 Regional Engineer's heavy workload, Chair Knoblock did not expect to have the trailhead open as
2 soon as the trail was ready. Discussions were had about the location of the bridge.

3
4 Chair Knoblock reported that Trails Utah was working with Matt Malone, a contractor with Nature
5 Trails, LLC, to get the trail section built-in Millcreek Canyon that would connect down to Elbow
6 Fork. That work was almost done and there was approximately one-quarter mile left of trail to
7 complete. Following that project, Nature Trails, LCC, would move down to Rattlesnake Trail and
8 begin construction on a new lower grade trail. It would be parallel to Rattlesnake Trail but have a
9 9% grade. That would become part of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the future. Chair
10 Knoblock explained that this would help to disperse users that were on the Rattlesnake Trail.

11
12 The Utah Conservation Corps groups had spent 15 days doing trail maintenance work on the
13 section around Dog Lake to the East and West. Chair Knoblock also reported that the bridge
14 material for the reroute of the Desolation Trail had been flown in and was sitting on site. The work
15 for the footings was done and the bridges needed to be assembled so the trail could open.

16
17 Chair Knoblock noted that at Elbow Fork, there used to be a bridge over Millcreek that was
18 destroyed during the windstorm. Zinnia Wilson and Steve Brown from the Forest Service had
19 been working hard to get that bridge replaced. The bridge was critical to the new trail in Millcreek
20 Canyon becoming open to the public. Unfortunately, Forest Service Engineering Staff had many
21 different priorities and the bridge replacement was not highest on the list.

22
23 Ms. Wilson hoped that the bridge would be installed before the end of 2022. Alternatively, the
24 Nature Trails, LCC contractor had a civil engineering license and believed a bridge could be
25 ordered an installed in approximately one month. Ms. Wilson noted that the Forest Service
26 procurement rules would allow the Forest Service to pay for 50% of the bridge cost in that instance.
27 Ms. Wilson believed the cost would be \$80,000 but the contractor believed the total cost would be
28 \$40,000. Ms. Bennett was concerned that a new trail had been built but it was unable to be used
29 until the bridge was constructed. The preferred timeline to have the work completed was the
30 current season rather than the end of 2022. Ms. Nielsen suggested reaching out to Salt Lake
31 County. Chair Knoblock noted that he would phone Helen Peters.

32
33 Ms. Bennett reported that there were two other trail projects on the horizon. One was a new section
34 of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that would start at the mouth of Parleys Canyon. It was almost
35 a four-mile section of trail. Additionally, there would be a reroute on Rattlesnake Trail that would
36 begin work shortly. Ms. Bennett noted that there had been some misinformation and
37 misrepresentation about trail-building projects in the foothills. It had been unfortunate to see some
38 of the comments that had come out against trails and trail planning. She felt that the Trails
39 Committee could put thought into how to further the discussion at a community level. While it
40 was good that people had expressed concerns, it was also important to articulate the needs related
41 to trails, such as the need for proper design and maintenance.

42
43 Ms. Bennett explained that she had reached out to Save Our Canyons to state that certain projects
44 would be starting. She reported that Trails Utah was working with the Forest Service and land
45 managers and had done everything that had been required. They were working within the
46 parameters that had been given. Ms. Bennett commented that everyone cared about the resource

1 and it was frustrating as a long-time trail advocate to hear people suggest that the foothills were
2 being ripped up. She encouraged Trails Committee Members to contribute in a positive way to
3 the discussions related to this topic if it was at all possible to do so.
4

5 Mr. McCarvill commented that he had been having discussions with Salt Lake City Trails and
6 Natural Lands Division Director, Lewis Kogan on the subject. Mr. McCarvill also noted that he
7 was now the Trails Planning Coordinator for the Wasatch Mountain Club. He had been reaching
8 out to members to hear their opinions and have a better understanding of their viewpoints. The
9 members he had spoken to had been measured and reasonable. He was continuing to monitor the
10 situation and was interested to see what Salt Lake City would come up with. Chair Knoblock
11 noted that it was hard to please everyone. He believed it would have been disappointing for Mr.
12 Kogan to receive 3,500 public comments on the trails plan as it was being developed only to have
13 a few dissatisfied voices pause the plan.
14

15 Ms. Bennett felt this was an opportunity for the broader community to have a discussion about
16 trails, trail implementation, and trail planning. More and more people were going to the foothills.
17 In addition, throughout the development of the Mountain Accord, there had been discussions about
18 putting more people on trails in the foothills to lessen impacts to the watershed and the more
19 sensitive higher alpine areas. She noted that residents needed more access to local trail experiences
20 and that would likely require some trail development. The Trails Committee needed to be aware
21 of the conversations that were happening within the community and find opportunities to
22 contribute information in a productive manner.
23

24 **7. Review of How SLRD is Partnering with the UCC and RRI Grants.**

25
26 **a. Discuss Other Ideas to Improve Funding for Trail and Other Infrastructure**
27 **Maintenance within the CWC Area.**
28

29 Chair Knoblock reported that the Salt Lake Ranger District was partnering with the Utah
30 Conservation Corps and the Recreation Restoration Infrastructure (“RRI”) grant from the Utah
31 Office of Outdoor Recreation. This would allow there to be some assistance with the Salt Lake
32 Ranger District’s workload. Chair Knoblock stressed the importance of trail maintenance and
33 discussed the Adopt-A-Trail program. Mount Olympus Community Council, Wasatch Mountain
34 Club, and Big Cottonwood Community Council had all adopted trails. He hoped that in the future
35 there would be more businesses adopting trails by choosing the financing method. That could
36 cover a lot of different trail work that needed to be done.
37

38 **8. Adjourn.**

39
40 **MOTION:** Chair Knoblock moved to adjourn. Will McCarvill seconded the motion. The motion
41 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
42

43 The Central Wasatch Commission Trails Committee Meeting adjourned at 3:42 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, July 8, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____