



9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2021, AT 4:00 P.M. THE**
11 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**
12

- 13 **Present:** William McCarvill, Co-Chair
14 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair
15 Ed Marshall
16 Del Draper
17 Brian Hutchinson
18 Carl Fisher
19 Dennis Goreham
20 Jan Striefel
21 Kirk Nichols
22 Nate Furman
23 Paul Diegel
24 Mike Christensen
25 Maura Hahnenberger
26 Alex Porpora
27 Kelly Boardman
28 John Knoblock
29 Sarah Bennett
30 Dave Fields
31 Randy Doyle
32 Nathan Rafferty
33 Roger Borgenicht
34 Kurt Hegmann
35 Annalee Munsey
36 Michael Braun
37 Steve Issowits
38 Michael Marker
39 Mike Maughan
40
41 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
42 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
43 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
44 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
45
46 **Others:** Sandy Wingert

1
2 **1. Opening.**

3
4 **a. William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
5 **Council.**

6
7 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

8
9 **b. William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic**
10 **Meetings as Per Legislative Requirements.**

11
12 Chair McCarvill read the following statement:

13
14 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, I, as the Chair of the Stakeholders Council of the
15 Central Wasatch Commission ("CWC"), hereby determines that conducting Stakeholders
16 Council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a
17 substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.
18 Although the overall incidence of COVID-19 cases has diminished somewhat over the past
19 several months, the pandemic remains, and the recent rise of more infectious variants of
20 the
21 virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another surge in cases which could again threaten
22 to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’

23
24 **c. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council**
25 **Minutes of the October 20, 2021, Meeting of the Stakeholders Council.**

26
27 **MOTION:** Sarah Bennett moved to approve the October 20, 2021, Stakeholders Council Minutes.
28 Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

29
30 **2. Millcreek Canyon Committee Comments on FLAP Grant.**

31
32 **a. Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Introduce the**
33 **Committee’s Comments on the FLAP Grant.**

34
35 Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair, Paul Diegel shared information related to the Federal Lands
36 Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. He explained that the Millcreek Canyon Committee drafted
37 comments related to the proposal. The project value for the FLAP grant was approximately \$19
38 million and it would focus on improvements in the upper half of Millcreek Canyon, from the
39 Winter Gate to the top of Millcreek Canyon. The overarching goal was to harden and rebuild the
40 road, as the road was not well built in the first place. The road was coming apart, there were issues
41 with roadside parking, and the shoulders were slumping into the creek. The intent was to widen
42 the road, cut down vegetation to increase sightlines, straighten the road in a few places, add off-
43 road parking, formally ban roadside parking, and rebuild bridges and culverts.

44
45 The Millcreek Canyon Committee and the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) endorsed the
46 grant during the application phase. They had been monitoring the grant since it was approved.

1 The Millcreek Canyon Committee discussed the project and the design details released thus far.
2 The comment document stated that the Committee was in support of the project intention as well
3 as the design details that had been shared, with the exception of lane width and bicycle capacity.
4 Mr. Diegel explained that the current design showed 11-foot lanes, which was an increase over the
5 current conditions. The added width would likely increase vehicle speeds.
6

7 The current design did not show any bicycle lane or shoulder above Elbow Fork. The plan was to
8 add a five-foot bicycle lane between the Winter Gate and Elbow Fork. Above that, there would
9 be no shoulder and no lane for non-motorized users. The Committee believed that was a potential
10 problem and encouraged the designers to reconsider that decision. Mr. Diegel noted that there
11 hadn't been any discussions about speed limits in the upper canyon. The Committee recommended
12 that the speed limit be set at a maximum of 25 MPH, primarily to prioritize safety.
13

14 Del Draper pointed out that the U.S. Forest Service was strongly behind the FLAP grant. There
15 had been some discussion about leaving the top of Millcreek Canyon less developed, but the Forest
16 Service was strongly in support of the grant. The Committee comments considered that support
17 and tried to improve upon the road that the FLAP grant proposed. Mr. Diegel explained that if the
18 road was not improved, it would likely need to be closed. The Committee and sponsoring agencies
19 did not believe that was an appropriate option. Some sort of work would need to be done on the
20 road for it to continue to function.
21

22 Ed Marshall reported that Mr. Diegel prepared the points included in the comment document and
23 John Knoblock reviewed them in detail. During that process, Millcreek Canyon Committee
24 members shared input. The document was debated, and five members were in consensus as to the
25 points presented, including the desire to have a bicycle and pedestrian lane at the top of the canyon
26 above the Winter Gate.
27

28 Carl Fisher expressed frustrations with the FLAP grant process and the comment document. He
29 explained that he had been involved in a number of efforts over the years, including the Millcreek
30 Canyon Transportation Study and the Mountain Accord, which both recommended a shuttle
31 program for Millcreek Canyon. He believed the FLAP grant was a vehicle-centric proposal and
32 would make the canyon more accommodating to personal vehicles. That went against the efforts
33 of the previous planning processes. It seemed that the grant would accommodate more parking
34 rather than looking at turnarounds for shuttles. Mr. Fisher stated that he would feel more
35 comfortable supporting a letter that prioritized the importance of removing people from their
36 vehicles. He added that a bicycle lane would not necessarily be needed if the number of vehicles
37 on the road was reduced. In addition, the road widening may not be needed. Mr. Fisher felt a 20-
38 mph speed limit would be appropriate as well as potential closures for vehicles in the upper canyon,
39 beyond the winter season. He reiterated the importance of disincentivizing personal vehicle transit.
40

41 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee was initially intended to assist in the
42 implementation of a shuttle. However, Forest Service District Ranger, Bekee Hotze explained that
43 the Forest Service could not implement a shuttle with the road in its current condition. It had
44 substandard lane widths, was slumping into the creek, and was not built properly. The first step
45 towards a shuttle was to fix the road. That was how the FLAP grant process started. If there were
46 not legally acceptable lanes for the road, there was no way the shuttle could be implemented. Mr.

1 Knoblock noted that it would take time to implement a shuttle and as a result, it was worthwhile
2 to include a bicycle lane all the way up the canyon. He reported that the legal minimum rural
3 bicycle lane width was 4-feet and the minimum legal road width was 20-feet of travel lane. That
4 was where the 24-foot road improvement came from. Additionally, having a gravel shoulder
5 would catch and filter debris before it went into the creek.

6
7 Mr. Diegel clarified that the plan did not involve increased parking in the canyon. There would
8 be a net-zero change in parking. He explained that the parking would be moved from the roadside
9 to actual parking lots. They would be set up to accommodate vehicle turnarounds and shuttle
10 stops. The work was a prerequisite to shuttles, although it was not specifically being done for that
11 purpose. Mr. Fisher expressed concerns that the shuttle program may not come to fruition. He
12 believed the shuttle program needs should be understood first. It did not make sense to build for
13 vehicles in the hope that a shuttle program would be implemented in the future.

14
15 Brian Hutchinson explained that three years ago, he was the Chair of the Millcreek Canyon
16 Committee. There had been a meeting at the Forest Service office that included the County, the
17 City of Millcreek as well as Parks and Recreation. At the end of that meeting, Helen Peters from
18 the Salt Lake County Transportation Division suggested that a FLAP grant may be able to satisfy
19 the infrastructure concerns that Ms. Hotze had. From there, the Millcreek Canyon Committee
20 continued to discuss the FLAP grant, which was focused on the lower canyon. He stated that
21 communication went dark between the Committee and the County, City of Millcreek, and Forest
22 Service. Later it was announced that there was a plan for the upper canyon instead. He felt that
23 the Committee had been left out of the process.

24
25 Mr. Hutchinson reported that he was a dissenting vote on the comment document. He didn't feel
26 that the FLAP grant proposal reflected what the Committee had discussed previously. Mr.
27 Hutchinson also expressed concerns about the subcommittee. He believed the Millcreek Canyon
28 Committee did not adequately represent the concerns of the valley and suggested that the
29 Committee start over on the comment document with the help of an expanded Committee.

30
31 Michael Braun suggested that a line be added to the comment document to state:

- 32
33
- 34 • We support efforts to make the road safer for canyon users and more sustainable by making
35 it inclusive to the pact set by the Mountain Accord and the need to remove more vehicles
36 from the road. Following the Mountain Accord, having the road at 24-feet for the future
37 use and implementation of a shuttle system.

38 Chair McCarvill reminded Stakeholders Council Members that there was a sense of urgency to
39 respond to the comment document. One of the reasons for the current meeting was to review the
40 document and make a recommendation to the CWC Board ahead of the December 6, 2021, CWC
41 Board Meeting. This was the Stakeholders Council opportunity to decide whether or not to take
42 action on the recommended comments from the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

43
44 Mr. Marshall wanted to clarify some of the comments made by Mr. Fisher. He explained that the
45 reason the shuttle had stalled was due to infrastructure. Ms. Hotze was adamantly opposed to
46 initiating a shuttle until the proper infrastructure was put in place. National parks and forests that

1 implemented a shuttle service without the necessary infrastructure had seen a deterioration of the
2 forest. There were also other issues to consider, such as parking at the base of the canyon or a
3 transit system that would move people to the base of the canyon to use a shuttle. The County and
4 the Forest Service saw the FLAP grant as a way to start on the infrastructure improvements. He
5 did not believe the Committee had been hoodwinked at any point in the process.

6
7 The original intention was to have a roadway from the bottom of the canyon to the top of the
8 canyon with two, 11-foot lanes, a 1-foot downhill shoulder, and a 5-foot bicycle and pedestrian
9 lane, which would total 29-feet. Mr. Marshall explained that the estimates for that work had totaled
10 approximately \$40 million. The FLAP grant was initially supposed to be \$12 million and so the
11 focus shifted to the upper part of the canyon instead. This was partly because it needed the
12 improvements more and partly because they did not want to improve the lower part of the canyon
13 only to have construction equipment drive up and down for upper canyon improvements at a later
14 date. It made sense to start at the top and work down. Mr. Marshall reported that there would be
15 an additional FLAP grant application in 2026 to improve the lower portion of the canyon.

16
17 Mr. Fisher believed there needed to be a vision for the canyon. It would be better to pursue a
18 specific vision rather than chase whatever dollars may be available. He did not believe the
19 proposed FLAP grant projects would result in positive experiences. While he applauded some of
20 the efforts of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, he felt that they were headed down a difficult road.
21 The visitor capacity in Millcreek Canyon was greater than the vehicular capacity. That was the
22 reason to look at shuttles. Mr. Hutchinson felt that the environment would be compromised by
23 building parking lots. There were other ways to manage traffic and establish capacity. He noted
24 that they could ask the County not to spend the \$4.3 million they proposed to spend and instead
25 look at infrastructure projects that had been discussed previously.

26
27 Co-Chair Barbara Cameron referenced the earlier comment from Mr. Braun and suggested that
28 language be added to express support for more efficient roads for a future Millcreek Canyon
29 shuttle. Mr. Hutchinson felt that some of the language in the comment document should be
30 replaced. Wider roads would invite more vehicles. Mr. Knoblock supported the suggested
31 language from Mr. Braun and Co-Chair Cameron. He explained that the FLAP grant was a
32 necessary step in order to get the shuttle in place. While he understood that adding parking lots
33 was not ideal, it would prohibit roadside parking. He felt that was a fair tradeoff and would also
34 meet the 2003 Forest Plan. Mr. Diegel reported that the reason it was important to move away
35 from roadside parking was to better protect the creek from runoff.

36
37 Chair McCarvill wondered if the Millcreek Canyon Committee would entertain the addition of
38 language that emphasized the shuttle. Mr. Diegel supported the addition. Mr. Fisher appreciated
39 the intention of the addition but believed the bullet points that followed the sentence would erode
40 the sentiment. The Stakeholders Council and Millcreek Canyon Committee needed to state that
41 they wanted a shuttle system and they wanted to focus on the infrastructure necessary to implement
42 that shuttle system. He believed the comment document should lead with a vision.

43
44 Chair McCarvill wanted to get a sense of whether Stakeholders Council Members would be
45 supportive of the added language. Mr. Diegel suggested that they do a straw poll to determine
46 whether anyone present would be in opposition to the comments document with the added

1 language. Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the comment document be rewritten over the next couple
2 of weeks to incorporate the original vision of the Mountain Accord and FLAP grant. Chair
3 McCarvill explained that there was a deadline to submit comments.

4
5 Mr. Marshall noted that Mr. Hutchinson had not attended the previous Millcreek Canyon
6 Committee meeting until just before adjournment. His comments had not been received and as a
7 result, were not written into the comment document. The Millcreek Canyon Committee needed
8 the Stakeholders Council approval to move the letter forward to the full CWC Board. Mr. Marshall
9 supported the addition of language related to the shuttle. Mr. Hutchinson did not believe the
10 comments should be thrown together and felt the document needed to be revisited. It may be
11 possible to draft something more comprehensive and satisfactory to all involved.

12
13 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to accept the recommendation of the Millcreek Canyon
14 Committee regarding the FLAP grant, with the addition of language to reaffirm that the ultimate
15 goal was a shuttle system. Del Draper seconded the motion.

16
17 Chair McCarvill asked for Council Member discussion on the motion. Mr. Hutchinson believed
18 the motion sounded too casual. He did not think the language reflected the problems with the
19 County spending \$4.3 million in the upper canyon to create a straighter and winder highway. Mr.
20 Fisher urged those present to consider what the vote would support. Mr. Braun noted that Item 5
21 in the comment document mentioned shuttles specifically:

- 22
23 • Designing infrastructure (roadway, parking, stop points, restrooms, signage, etc.) capable
24 of supporting future shuttle service with minimal modification to reduce private vehicle
25 traffic and congestion in the canyon.

26
27 Since there was already language in the comment document that supported and referenced a future
28 shuttle service, Chair McCarvill made an alternate motion.

29
30 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to accept the recommendation of the Millcreek Canyon
31 Committee regarding the FLAP grant. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. Vote on motion:
32 Michael Braun-Aye; Maura Hahnenberger-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-Aye; Barbara Cameron-Aye; Kirk
33 Nichols-Aye; Paul Diegel-Aye; John Knoblock-Aye; Jan Striefel-Aye; Del Draper-Aye; Michael
34 Marker-Nay; Will McCarvill-Aye; Brian Hutchinson-Nay; Carl Fisher-Nay; Sarah Bennett-Aye;
35 Roger Borgenicht-Nay; Ed Marshall-Aye; Mike Christensen-Nay; Steve Issowits-Abstain; Dennis
36 Goreham-Nay; Alex Porpora-Nay; Kelly Boardman-Aye; Dave Fields-Aye; Randy Doyle-Aye;
37 Mike Maughan-Aye; Annalee Munsey-Abstain. The vote was 16-to-7 with two abstentions.

38
39 It was noted that there were 35 total Stakeholders, though not all were present at the meeting.
40 CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker read language related to the Stakeholders Council rules
41 and guidelines. Mr. Braun also read language that stated:

- 42
43 • The majority of a Committee's members shall constitute a quorum and actions of the
44 Committee can be approved by the majority of a quorum.

1 Discussions were had about whether the votes in favor constituted a majority. Mr. Becker read
2 language from the Stakeholders Council rules, which stated that an agenda item must receive the
3 affirmative vote of the majority of the Council for approval or recommendation to the CWC Board.
4 The votes in favor did not constitute a majority. However, similar to what was done with the
5 Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) recommendations, the information could be forwarded
6 to the CWC Board for consideration. It would simply need to reflect that the vote did not meet the
7 full majority requirements to be considered a full recommendation from the Stakeholders Council.
8

9 Mr. Becker noted that the motion was neither approved nor denied. Mr. Fisher requested that a
10 Minority Report be submitted. Mr. Hutchinson asked for the contact information from those who
11 voted against the motion to communicate further about a Minority Report. Chair McCarvill
12 explained that the information could be shared following the meeting. Mr. Becker commented
13 that the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes would be available to review shortly. CWC
14 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen noted that the recording of the Stakeholders Council
15 Meeting would be added to the Utah Public Notice website later that evening.
16

17 **3. CWC Board Retreat Discussion.**

18 **a. Stakeholders Council Leadership will Lead a Discussion Regarding the** 19 **Stakeholders Council Comments During the CWC Board Retreat.** 20

21
22 Chair McCarvill reported that Co-Chair Cameron made a presentation during the recent CWC
23 Board Retreat. Co-Chair Cameron shared information about the Retreat with those present. She
24 stated that Councilor Jim Bradley described the CWC as a group that shows up and cares about
25 the canyons. It is a congregation of people who share a common interest. Co-Chair Cameron
26 explained that concerns were expressed about the lack of State Officials being involved with the
27 organization. Additionally, during the CWC Board Retreat, there was a lot of praise for the short-
28 term projects. There was also gratitude expressed for the time and effort spent by Stakeholders
29 Council Members. Co-Chair Cameron explained that during the Retreat there was a
30 recommendation that the CWC undertake a third-party situational assessment to refocus on the
31 purpose and process of the organization. Four action items were shared that included:
32

- 33 • Refine and recertify the Mountain Accord as the CWC charter;
- 34 • Recommit to the Mountain Accord;
- 35 • Review the CWC organizational structure; and
- 36 • Review the CWC management structure.
37

38 CWC Staff would present a draft request for proposal (“RFP”) to the Executive Committee and
39 the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee for the situational assessment. The RFP would be presented
40 to the CWC Board during the December 6, 2021, CWC Board Meeting. Co-Chair Cameron noted
41 that the CWC Board would also consider Board Committee memberships and officers at that
42 meeting. Chair McCarvill noted that the Stakeholders Council surveys were discussed during the
43 CWC Board Retreat. He reported that there were some key survey results:
44

- 45 • Lack of direction:
 - 46 ○ What does the CWC expect from the Stakeholders Council?

- 1 ○ Does the CWC want the Stakeholders Council to advise and offer opinions or
- 2 should the Stakeholders Council present topics of concern to the Commission?
- 3 • Roles and responsibilities:
- 4 ○ What is the role of the Stakeholders Council?
- 5 ○ What are the Stakeholders Council responsibilities?
- 6 • Consensus-Based Votes:
- 7 ○ There was a sense that the Stakeholders Council would be unlikely to operate on a
- 8 consensus basis. There would likely be majority and minority opinions that would
- 9 reflect the diverse representation on the Council.

10
11 Co-Chair Cameron shared membership priorities. She explained that there had been 17 responses
12 from members of the Stakeholders Council. Most of the responses noted that transit was a priority,
13 that the Visitor Use Study was an exciting project, that trails and trailhead infrastructure needed to
14 be prioritized, that public education and outreach were important, and that short-term projects were
15 beneficial. Co-Chair Cameron noted that a map had been sent out by Mike Christensen. She
16 would share that with Stakeholders Council Members. While Stakeholders Council leadership had
17 been present at the CWC Board Retreat, Chair McCarvill still wanted to hear more from the CWC
18 Board as it related to the roles and responsibilities of the Council.

19
20 **4. Stakeholders Council 2022 Meeting Schedule and Location Discussion.**

21
22 **a. William McCarvill will Lead a Discussion on Setting a 2022 Meeting Schedule**
23 **for the CWC Stakeholders Council.**

24
25 Chair McCarvill recommended that the Stakeholders Council meetings for 2022 remain virtual.
26 There would be a quarterly schedule and meetings would take place on the third Wednesday of the
27 month in January, April, July, and October from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. Special sessions would be
28 held as needed. Chair McCarvill noted that he did not know what would come out of the third-
29 party situational assessment or what the participation level would be for the Council, but sessions
30 could be added whenever necessary to participate in that process.

31
32 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved that the Stakeholders Council meet the third Wednesday of
33 the month on a quarterly basis, in January, April, July, and October 2022, from 4:00 p.m. to
34 5:30 p.m. with special meetings added as needed. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The
35 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

36
37 **5. Additional Discussion.**

38
39 There was no additional discussion.
40

- 1 **6. Adjournment.**
2
3 **a. William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
4 **Council.**

5
6 **MOTION:** Michael Braun moved to adjourn. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion
7 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

8
9 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:30 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 Tuesday, November 16, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____