

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
2 **COUNCIL TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9,**  
3 **2021, AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA**  
4 **ZOOM**  
5

6 **Present:** John Knoblock, Chair  
7 Barbara Cameron  
8 Ronna Cohen  
9 Will McCarvill  
10 Dennis Goreham  
11 Kyle Young  
12 Angelo Calacino  
13

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

19 **1. Introductions and Meeting Minutes Approval.**  
20

21 Chair John Knoblock called the meeting to order at approximately 2:00 p.m.  
22

23 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Committee to make a  
24 determination, which was as follows:  
25

26 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207(4), I, as the Chair of the Trails Committee of the  
27 Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission, hereby determine that  
28 conducting meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a  
29 substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.  
30 The World Health Organization, The President of the United States, The Governor of Utah  
31 and the Salt Lake County Mayor and Health Department, have all recognized that a global  
32 pandemic exists related to the new strain of the coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19).  
33

34 Due to the nature of emergency caused by the global pandemic, I find that conducting a  
35 meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes  
36 a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the location.  
37 According to information from state epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an  
38 acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the state’s healthcare system.’  
39

40 Chair Knoblock reviewed the agenda items for the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”)  
41 Stakeholders Council Trails Committee. He made note of those present at the Committee Meeting.  
42

43 The previous Trails Committee Meeting minutes were discussed. Chair Knoblock noted that he  
44 had not distributed a copy of the minutes to the Committee Members but they were available on  
45 the Utah Public Notice website. Since the document had not been reviewed by those present, it  
46 was suggested that the minutes be approved at the next meeting.

1  
2 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to table approval of the July 8, 2021 Trails Committee  
3 Meeting minutes until the following Trails Committee Meeting. Chair Knoblock seconded the  
4 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
5

6 **2. Salt Lake County Trails Plan Status.**  
7

8 Chair Knoblock shared an update related to Salt Lake County. Martin Jensen from Salt Lake  
9 County Parks and Recreation believed the request for funding for the County Wide Trails Plan  
10 would be approved as part of the 2022 budget. In fact, Salt Lake County may be able to find  
11 money in the 2021 budget to start the County Wide Trails Plan before 2022. Chair Knoblock noted  
12 that this was good news and would dovetail into the third and fourth items on the agenda.  
13

14 **3. USFS Trails Inventory Status and Next Steps.**  
15

16 Chair Knoblock discussed the U.S. Forest Service Trails Inventory status and next steps. He  
17 explained that U.S. Forest Service Trails and Inventory Planner, Chelsea Phillippe did a write up  
18 related to the inventory status highlighting where the Forest Service currently is in the process.  
19 Last year, the Forest Service created a map of all the user-created trails. Chair Knoblock noted  
20 that the map required additional clean up to clearly identify the user-created trails on Forest Service  
21 land as opposed to trails on private property, ski resort trails or ski resort service roads. The Forest  
22 Service was in the process of cleaning up that document.  
23

24 In addition, as part of the inventory process, the Forest Service was looking at all of the trails to  
25 identify the associated facilities. For instance, whether there were picnic tables, restrooms, or a  
26 parking lot nearby. The Forest Service was also looking at general trail conditions, maintenance  
27 needs, grades, and widths. That information would continue to come together.  
28

29 **4. Town of Brighton Trails Planning and Township General Plan.**  
30

31 Chair Knoblock reported that Kayla Mauldin from the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services  
32 District will be the primary Planner working on the Town of Brighton's General Plan.  
33 Transportation was a significant part of the General Plan. Ms. Mauldin believed that trails would  
34 be included under the Transportation section to better identify the needs with respect to trailhead  
35 parking. One goal of the Forest Service and the Town of Brighton was to eliminate roadside  
36 parking in the future. To do so, there needs to be data and information to ensure that the trailhead  
37 parking is the appropriate size.  
38

39 Chair Knoblock reported that he asked Ms. Mauldin if trails planning would fit into the General  
40 Plan. She confirmed that it would but indicated that it would not be her main focus. The trailhead  
41 amenities would be more of a priority. There had been further discussions and Chair Knoblock  
42 believed it may be possible for trail proposals to be included in the General Plan if it is drafted  
43 through the Big Cottonwood Canyon Association Trails Group. Some pre-work could be done to  
44 feed into the General Plan process. Barbara Cameron liked the suggestion. Chair Knoblock noted  
45 that a draft might meld with the Forest Service trails planning efforts.  
46

1 One of the things the Forest Service already had in their work plan was to do further trail  
2 development at ski resorts in Big Cottonwood Canyon. If Ms. Mauldin was working with Randy  
3 Doyle at Brighton and the new General Manager at Solitude, Amber Broadaway, the Trails  
4 Committee, via the Big Cottonwood Canyon Association, could do some pre-work that fed into  
5 the Brighton Trails Master Plan. This would then merge with the Forest Service Trails Plan that  
6 they were planning to work on in 2022. Chair Knoblock pointed out that this would also connect  
7 to the County Wide Trails Plan that Salt Lake County wanted to do.  
8

9 Ms. Cameron wondered if the Visitor Use Study would dovetail into these trails plans. Will  
10 McCarvill reported that it would be well over one year until the year-round Visitor Use Study is  
11 completed and there was not yet funding for the social aspects of the study. He believed that  
12 eventually, the Visitor Use Study would lead to different thinking about whether additional trails  
13 were needed, where those trails would go and what transportation system would be needed to  
14 support those additional trails. Mr. McCarvill felt that the study would also provide information  
15 about whether the mountains are below capacity, at capacity, or above capacity. He explained that  
16 this would be determined by various indicators outlined in Phase I. For instance, water quality  
17 and wildlife disruption. Mr. McCarvill noted that the next year would be spent looking at those  
18 indicators and measuring what is happening in the Wasatch. He was excited to see what data  
19 would come out of the study and what the visitor use levels were determined to be.  
20

21 CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker, reported that there would be interim reports on the Visitor  
22 Use Study before the end of the year. He would try to coordinate with Chair Knoblock as well as  
23 with Stakeholders Council leadership. That information could be factored into Trails Committee  
24 discussions, as needed. Kyle Young left a comment in the Zoom chat box and asked to see the  
25 full document that were shared by Chair Knoblock. The document was emailed to Mr. Young and  
26 would also be shared on the Utah Public Notice website.  
27

28 Chair Knoblock noted that it was wonderful to see that the Town of Brighton General Plan would  
29 include some trails work, that the Forest Service was moving forward with their Tri-Canyons Trail  
30 Plan, and that Salt Lake County was finally about to receive funding for the County Wide Trails  
31 Plan. These were all positive steps forward that align with the mission and vision of the Trails  
32 Committee. Chair Knoblock reminded those present that one of the main goals of the Committee  
33 was to push trails planning forward and comment on those plans.  
34

35 **5. Trails Projects Status Red Pine, Upper Pipeline, Wasatch Crest, Rattlesnake, Jacobs**  
36 **Ladder, BST, Desolation.**  
37

38 Chair Knoblock informed the Committee Members that he previously emailed a document related  
39 to the Trails Project Status for various projects in the area, such as Red Pine, Upper Pipeline,  
40 Wasatch Crest, Rattlesnake, Jacobs Ladder, Bonneville Shoreline Trail, and Desolation Trail. He  
41 asked for feedback related to that document. Mr. McCarvill asked about the land purchases for  
42 the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He wondered if those purchases meant there would not be  
43 wilderness adjustments needed to complete the section below Mount Olympus. Chair Knoblock  
44 noted that it would not affect wilderness adjustment needs but would allow the trail to get through.  
45

1 Discussions were had about land purchases and the wilderness boundary. Chair Knoblock noted  
2 that the State of Utah set aside \$5 million to tackle some of these issues. He reported that \$4  
3 million of that would go towards land purchases and the remaining \$1 million, with a match from  
4 Salt Lake City, would go toward redoing the Bonneville Shoreline Trail trailheads at Emigration  
5 Canyon. There would be trailhead parking, restrooms, and signage rather than on-street parking.  
6 Salt Lake City felt that was important for the community.

7  
8 Chair Knoblock hoped that once the \$5 million is spent that it would be possible for the State  
9 Legislature to appropriate additional funds in 2022 to purchase more parcels between Big  
10 Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. He hoped that one day it would be possible  
11 to complete the Bonneville Shoreline Trail between Ferguson and Little Cottonwood Canyons. He  
12 explained that it took a lot of money to acquire open space for public use.

13  
14 Ms. Cameron was impressed with the Trails Project Status document. It was good to see how  
15 much work was actually happening in the area. She suggested that the document be shared with  
16 the Stakeholders Council. Chair Knoblock supported sharing the document with the Stakeholders  
17 Council or a link could be sent out once the document was posted to the Utah Public Notice  
18 website. At the next Stakeholders Council Meeting, there could be discussions about the  
19 document. Dennis Goreham felt it was important to send the document out for possible additions  
20 or edits before it was shared with the Stakeholders Council. For instance, there were certain service  
21 projects sponsored by the Wasatch Mountain Club and Save Our Canyons that were not included  
22 on the current Trails Project Status document.

23  
24 Chair Knoblock asked what they should do to capture those additional items. He pointed out that  
25 the document only included the Salt Lake County side. In Summit County, there is an aggressive  
26 trails program and the projects could be included on the list. Mr. McCarvill believed Summit  
27 County projects should be added as well as Snyderville Basin projects. Chair Knoblock noted that  
28 these would be good additions for future versions of the document. The current version could be  
29 shared with Stakeholders Council Members and the Trails Committee could start to work on a  
30 future version that is more robust. Mr. Goreham noted that if the document was shared, it would  
31 be important to let the Stakeholders Council Members know that it is incomplete.

32  
33 Mr. McCarvill stated that there were interesting things happening in Summit County. For example,  
34 the Transit to Trails program. This program used shuttles to take people to the Guardsman Pass  
35 area to access various trails there. Mr. McCarvill believed it was a great program and something  
36 that needs more visibility. There were a lot of interesting transportation-related things happening  
37 that could be templates for CWC discussions. CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez, explained that  
38 the Transit to Trails program was funded in part by the CWC. It was successful, but there were  
39 still a lot of tourists and others who are driving to the area. Chair Knoblock noted that it would be  
40 interesting to see what lessons are learned from the program as it relates to transit and trails.

41  
42 Chair Knoblock commented that the Forest Service concept from their 2003 Forest Plan was to  
43 limit the use of various trail facilities by limiting parking. However, that process was undermined  
44 by not having any prohibition on roadside parking. That allowed more people than could park in  
45 the parking lots to utilize trailheads. If transit is introduced, it would be even more difficult to

1 manage the number of people visiting trailheads. Mr. McCarvill believed that mass transportation  
2 has the ability to meter use in the canyons and mentioned the Zion Canyon shuttle as an example.

3  
4 **6. Trails and Toilets Operations and Maintenance Funding Needs, Strategies and**  
5 **Budgeting.**  
6

7 Chair Knoblock reported that Patrick Nelson from Salt Lake City Public Utilities was concerned  
8 about funding for ongoing operations maintenance. He shared comments from the Forest Service  
9 Trails Manager, Zinnia Wilson, with the Trails Committee, which were as follows:

- 10  
11 • We need an organization that can collect funds from various partners and then be able to  
12 disseminate that funding back out to various organizations that are doing the maintenance.  
13

14 Chair Knoblock noted that Ms. Wilson was thinking from a trails perspective but this statement  
15 also pertained to toilet operations and parking areas (parking lot maintenance and winter plowing).  
16 One possible option related to ongoing operations maintenance was for the money to be collected  
17 through an organization and funneled back out to the necessary organizations.  
18

19 It was reported that an organization, Friends of the Salt Lake Ranger District, had been put  
20 together. The organization included Chair Knoblock, Mary Young, and Sarah Bennett. The  
21 website had been put together but they had not built a broader Board of Directors or reached out  
22 for funding. However, the organization existed and could be used to try to collect funds for the  
23 trail and restroom maintenance. Chair Knoblock had heard that the financial needs were between  
24 \$2 million and \$3 million per year. Alternatively, the funding could be funneled through the CWC.  
25 The CWC could reach out to municipalities and attempt to pull together the funding needed for  
26 trail and restroom maintenance in the Central Wasatch area.  
27

28 Chair Knoblock explained that there was one other possible option to consider. He had spoken to  
29 Salt Lake District Ranger, Bekee Hotze. She indicated that they cannot legally ask municipalities  
30 for money but it may be within her purview to charge for use at facilities that have the appropriate  
31 Forest Service infrastructure. In order for an area to have appropriate infrastructure, there needs  
32 to be a paved parking lot, restroom, at least one picnic table, and trash cans. If those four items  
33 are present she could legally charge people for use. Ms. Hotze mentioned that this was something  
34 she was working toward at various trailheads. Once there are trailheads that meet those  
35 requirements, the Forest Service could start charging people to use them. The fees could go toward  
36 the necessary maintenance costs.  
37

38 Mr. Goreham wondered why Ms. Hotze needed many different trailheads to meet the requirements  
39 before charging use fees. He felt it would make sense to do it on a one-by-one basis as the various  
40 trailheads meet the requirements. Chair Knoblock noted they could charge on a one-by-one basis,  
41 but he believed Ms. Hotze wanted to have a full program in place. Enforcement would be a critical  
42 part of the solution. He asked if the Trails Committee Members had a preference between the two  
43 possible options outlined. Mr. Becker did not know which option was best but stated that the CWC  
44 had served as a gathering and leveraging location for multiple jurisdictions and private entities. It  
45 was possible for the CWC to serve in that kind of role in future as it related to maintenance funds.  
46

1 Mr. Becker noted that Mr. Perez had been working with multiple agencies on a bus bypass service.  
2 Mr. Perez reported that the bus bypass service included the cities of Cottonwood Heights and  
3 Sandy. The service would have the local Police Department escort buses where appropriate. It  
4 was something that they hoped would be implemented in the current year. However, there were  
5 certain challenges associated with the service. He noted that between Big Cottonwood and Little  
6 Cottonwood Canyons, the road was very inconsistent. It was uncertain whether the bus bypass  
7 service would be able to be implemented in the bottleneck on Wasatch Boulevard. Chair Knoblock  
8 thanked Mr. Becker for his efforts.

9  
10 Chair Knoblock asked if the CWC might be a venue for collecting monies from various  
11 municipalities for maintenance. Mr. Becker noted that the CWC already serves as a funneling  
12 forum all short-term projects. They were set up to handle that type of work currently and he felt  
13 the CWC had the capacity to do more of that if needed. Chair Knoblock asked about the best way  
14 to move the conversation forward to ensure that all trails and trailheads are adequately funded and  
15 maintained. Mr. Becker stated that the issue could be brought forward to the full CWC Board once  
16 it is fleshed out.

17  
18 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen believed that the CWC could serve as a warehouse to  
19 fund projects that span multiple jurisdictions. That was essentially what the CWC was.  
20 Ms. Nielsen explained that the CWC is set up to house money from various jurisdictions that would  
21 go towards one specific goal. Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson stated that it was not a  
22 question of whether the CWC was structured to do this. It was a question of how to implement it.  
23 She noted that there would need to be a collaborative effort between jurisdictions to ensure that  
24 maintenance is a priority.

25  
26 Chair Knoblock believed the Forest Service should be integral to the CWC process to ensure that  
27 they are on the right path. Ms. Hotze had floated the idea of a fee system several years ago but the  
28 Forest Service did not think there was enough public support to implement the system. The Forest  
29 Service felt they needed broad community support to implement a fee system. Mr. Becker noted  
30 that the Forest Service informed the CWC that they did not have the ability to charge fees in the  
31 area. Giving them the authority to charge fees was one of the things that was built into the Federal  
32 Legislation. This was one of the reasons the Forest Service had been supportive of the Federal  
33 Legislation. Chair Knoblock stated that once the Central Wasatch National Conservation and  
34 Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”) Legislation goes through, this may become a non-issue. The  
35 timeline was currently unknown.

36  
37 Chair Knoblock wondered if the issue could be added to a future CWC Board Meeting agenda.  
38 Mr. Becker reported that the recent CWC Board Meeting was cancelled due to scheduling  
39 conflicts. The next meeting was not until October with meetings scheduled for October and  
40 December. In November, the CWC Board would hold their annual retreat. He believed this issue  
41 could be shared with the CWC Board in December. In the meantime, it would be worth having a  
42 Stakeholders Council discussion. He suggested that someone from the Forest Service be present  
43 to participate.

44  
45 Mr. McCarvill wondered if Chair Knoblock could write an issue statement, problem statement, or  
46 paragraph overviewing the issue. This would make it easier to frame the Stakeholders Council

1 discussion. He wanted to ensure that those conversations are focused on problem solving. Chair  
2 Knoblock stated that he could create a problem statement and a diagram that outlined the various  
3 options. The diagram could include pros and cons for the options as well as information about  
4 potential solutions. Chair Knoblock stated that he would speak to Mr. Nelson and Ms. Hotze to  
5 gather more information. He believed the current needs were between \$2 million and \$3 million  
6 for operational costs (toilets, trailheads and trails) and the capital reserve piece (to replace facilities  
7 as they become antiquated). A breakdown of the numbers could make it easier for people to better  
8 understand the needs.

9  
10 Chair Knoblock noted that he would try to draft a document with input from the Trails Committee,  
11 Mr. Nelson, Ms. Hotze, and CWC Staff. The document could serve as a discussion point. Further  
12 discussions were had about the Visitor Use Study and the Forest Service vision.

13  
14 **7. 2022 Projects Planning.**

15  
16 Chair Knoblock overviewed the 2022 Projects Planning Document from Ms. Wilson. From  
17 Millcreek Canyon to Elbow Fork, the Forest Service still needed to replace the bridge. The Forest  
18 Service engineers were overwhelmed with various other projects and may not be able to get the  
19 bridge replaced in 2022. In that case, it may be worth asking partners like Trails Utah to determine  
20 how much it would cost to fund the project and look into a contractor to do the work.

21  
22 Another item included on the document was the Cardiff Bridge and Boardwalk. The hope was  
23 that Salt Lake County would have it done next year. Grooming was also planned to take place at  
24 Spruces Campground to improve winter recreational opportunities. Chair Knoblock noted that  
25 one project he hoped would become a reality pertained to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. If two  
26 of the needed parcels are acquired along Grandeur Peak, Trails Utah may be able to hire a  
27 professional Trail Building Contractor to complete the Bonneville Shoreline Trail between  
28 Millcreek and Parleys Canyons. Chair Knoblock noted that this was a goal for 2022.

29  
30 **8. Adjourn.**

31  
32 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to adjourn. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The  
33 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

34  
35 The Central Wasatch Commission Trails Committee Meeting adjourned at 3:40 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, September 9, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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