



9  
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
11 **COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING ON MONDAY,**  
12 **OCTOBER 16, 2023, AT 1:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-**  
13 **PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC**  
14 **OFFICES LOCATED AT GATEWAY AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE**  
15 **102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

16  
17 **Present:** Tom Diegel, Chair  
18 Del Draper  
19 Maura Hahnenberger  
20 Ed Marshall  
21 Rusty Vetter  
22 Mike Christensen  
23 Patrick Shea

24  
25 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
26 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

27  
28 **Opening**

- 29  
30 1. **Chair Tom Diegel will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon**  
31 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

32  
33 Chair Tom Diegel called the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

- 34  
35 2. **Review and Approval of the Minutes from the September 18, 2023 Meeting.**

36  
37 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to APPROVE the September 18, 2023, Millcreek Canyon  
38 Committee Minutes. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

39  
40 **Available Canyon Land Parcel Discussion**

- 41  
42 1. **Committee Members will Discuss Available Land Parcels in Millcreek Canyon.**

43  
44 Chair Diegel reported that John Knoblock knows the most about the available land parcels in  
45 Millcreek Canyon but was unable to attend the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. There was  
46 still a lot of uncertainty about whether there was water associated with the land. It seemed that

1 Salt Lake City was not sure and neither was Boundary Springs. Del Draper noted that  
2 Mr. Knoblock sent out a separate email related to the fee booth. In that email, he indicated that  
3 the fee booth is in the area where the available land parcels are located. Mr. Draper was not sure  
4 how a purchase of the property would impact the fee booth area. Chair Diegel pointed out that  
5 there was a desire to bring the trail down that way as well, which meant it would potentially cross  
6 the available land. There were a lot of unknowns associated with the available land parcels.

7  
8 Chair Diegel intended to reach out to Wendy Fisher from Utah Open Lands. Ms. Fisher expressed  
9 interest in the project and had a lot of useful knowledge. He offered to follow up with her later in  
10 the week to see what she had to say about the available land parcels in Millcreek Canyon.  
11 Additionally, he would reach out to Mr. Knoblock about any potential updates.

12  
13 Ed Marshall reported that at the last Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting, it was determined that  
14 information about the available land parcels would be presented to the CWC Board. He wondered  
15 if it had been presented and what the reaction was. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported  
16 that the Executive Directors Report was cut from the agenda at the last CWC Board Meeting, as  
17 requested by the Chair, due to time limitations. As a result, she did not share that informational  
18 update during the CWC Board Meeting. Chair Diegel reported that information was shared at the  
19 recent Stakeholders Council Meeting. There had been some acknowledgment that the available  
20 land parcels could result in potential issues. The matter had not been discussed by the CWC Board,  
21 but it had been discussed at a Stakeholders Council level.

22  
23 Mr. Draper suggested speaking to Mr. Knoblock following the Millcreek Canyon Committee  
24 Meeting. The next time Stakeholders Council leadership presents to the CWC Board, it would be  
25 ideal for the Millcreek Canyon land parcels to be included as an informational item.

26  
27 **FLAP Grant Update and Discussion**

- 28  
29 **1. Committee Members will Discuss the Ongoing FLAP Grant and Potential Parking**  
30 **Solutions for a Shuttle.**  
31  
32 **2. Chair Diegel will Discuss His Recent Comments to the County Council.**  
33

34 The Millcreek Canyon Committee discussed the ongoing Federal Lands Access Program  
35 (“FLAP”) grant work. Chair Diegel noted that at the last Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting,  
36 he mentioned that there would be a County Council Meeting shortly. He took it upon himself to  
37 attend the meeting and share comments. He spoke for a few minutes and shared a summary of the  
38 project. He also expressed concerns with the Millcreek Canyon Committee. It was concerning  
39 that the project appeared to be moving ahead in ways that did not reflect what the general public  
40 desires. Deputy Mayor, Catherine Kanter, stated that there had been some discussions about the  
41 FLAP grant. Council Member Bradley acknowledged that it was a complicated matter. It was  
42 determined that the FLAP grant would be discussed at a future meeting.

43  
44 Chair Diegel was encouraged by what he heard during the County Council Meeting but pointed  
45 out that October and November are the months when the County budget is discussed. Based on a  
46 follow-up conversation with Deputy Mayor Kanter, it was not likely that the County Council

1 would be able to discuss the FLAP grant until early December. That being said, Chair Diegel  
2 believed the County Council had appreciated receiving the update that had been shared.

3  
4 Mr. Draper watched the meeting and heard the comments shared by Chair Diegel. His impression  
5 was that some of the Council Members lacked knowledge about the canyon issues. It was  
6 beneficial that Chair Diegel had taken the time to attend the meeting and present information.

7  
8 Chair Diegel reported that he sent an email to Braden Peters recently. He explained that Mr. Peters  
9 is the Project Lead and works with the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”). The email  
10 exchanges so far have been unfulfilling. Chair Diegel had questions that he wanted answers to but  
11 they had not been received so far. He expressed frustration with the process. There had not been  
12 a recent response from Mr. Peters, so he was not sure what would happen in the future.

13  
14 Mr. Draper wondered if comments had been received from Mayor Silvestrini about suggested  
15 parking locations for a Millcreek Canyon shuttle. Chair Diegel thanked Mr. Draper for doing  
16 research, counting the number of potential parking spaces, and reaching out to Skyline High  
17 School. He believed there had been a good start to the conversation. It would be possible to reach  
18 out to the U.S. Forest Service in the future with possible parking locations but he believed the  
19 parking locations needed to be confirmed with Mayor Silvestrini first. Chair Diegel believed it  
20 would be possible to add additional parking information to the Feasibility Proposal submitted by  
21 the CWC. Mr. Draper offered to reach out to Mayor Silvestrini for parking location confirmation.

22  
23 Rusty Vetter reported that before he was a member of the Stakeholders Council, he attended  
24 several Millcreek Canyon Committee Meetings. During that time, he thought a lot about a  
25 potential Millcreek Canyon shuttle. He thought the shuttle was an excellent idea in the past,  
26 especially during the drafting of the Mountain Accord process but had since cooled on the idea of  
27 a canyon shuttle. Mr. Vetter had concerns about logistics in addition to parking. When people  
28 start to find out what the shuttle may or may not be, it will likely become more complicated. While  
29 he would love to see a shuttle, he believed there were a lot of details to be finalized. He still had  
30 concerns about feasibility and how realistic a shuttle would be in terms of resources.

31  
32 Mr. Draper believed the intention was to discuss the shuttle before the FLAP grant work was done  
33 so certain considerations could be made. For instance, pull-offs being wide enough for a shuttle  
34 and there being turnaround spots. Thinking about these things beforehand meant it would be  
35 possible to design the road in a way that could accommodate a future shuttle service. Incorporating  
36 shuttle planning into the redevelopment of the road was important. Mr. Draper understood that  
37 there were a lot of issues to iron out but the basic idea was to include shuttle work in the FLAP  
38 grant planning as it moved forward. Mr. Vetter reported that at the last public meeting related to  
39 the FLAP grant, it seemed there was a desire to accommodate pullouts and shuttle locations. He  
40 was under the impression that planning was being done for shuttle stops at Elbow Fork, Alexander  
41 Basin, and the top of the canyon. Chair Diegel explained that the Feasibility Proposal  
42 acknowledged that infrastructure was being considered. As such, there was a desire for the Forest  
43 Service to move the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) forward.

44  
45 Ms. Nielsen reported that the infrastructure construction associated with the FLAP grant had an  
46 end goal of providing transit via a shuttle in the canyon. She acknowledged that there were a lot

1 of shuttle-related details to consider. In the CWC submitted research to the Forest Service, it stated  
2 that dogs would be allowed on the shuttle to allow for various uses of the canyon. However, dogs  
3 on the shuttle would need to be outfitted in a well-fitted muzzle. She explained that the suggestion  
4 was based on other models in place around the country.

5  
6 Chair Diegel believed the Forest Service had expressed support for the idea of a shuttle but was  
7 under-resourced. As a result, it had been determined that the Forest Service would consider  
8 information submitted by the CWC. He felt it was encouraging that the Forest Service had  
9 expressed interest in a shuttle but also that the Forest Service expressed a willingness to work with  
10 the CWC. The latter was something the Forest Service had been reluctant to do in the past. Chair  
11 Diegel reiterated that this was an encouraging shift and represented positive change.

12  
13 Patrick Shea wondered if anyone had asked the Forest Service if there was a willingness to contract  
14 out to a private party for some of the studies necessary for a canyon shuttle. Chair Diegel  
15 understood that someone else would do the study and it was a matter of having the financial  
16 resources to do so. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the Forest Service does not have the funds to  
17 contract for the NEPA analysis or the capital funds necessary to get a shuttle program off the  
18 ground. The Forest Service approached the CWC and asked the CWC to conduct some research  
19 related to the feasibility. If the research was encouraging enough for the Forest Service, then the  
20 Forest Service would have asked the CWC to fund a third party to conduct the NEPA analysis.

21  
22 Chair Diegel informed those present that Mr. Draper would reach out to Mayor Silvestrini about  
23 potential parking locations. At the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting, it would be  
24 possible for Committee Members to strategize and think about how to present the information to  
25 the Forest Service for consideration. He explained that the work would continue to move ahead.

## 26 27 **Camp Tracy Update and Discussion**

### 28 29 **1. Committee Members will Discuss Updates to Camp Tracy.**

30  
31 Mr. Draper shared information about Camp Tracy and reported that he submitted a letter to the  
32 Boy Scouts. In 2015, the Great Salt Lake Council sold an 18-acre parcel to a private individual.  
33 He shared that recently discovered information with the Boy Scouts and expressed a desire for  
34 there to be a Conservation Easement on Camp Tracy. It would still be possible for the Boy Scouts  
35 to continue to run the camp. The intention was to prevent the land from being developed in the  
36 future. Comments on the draft letter were received from Mr. Marshall and Chair Diegel and those  
37 were incorporated into the letter that was submitted. Shortly after the letter was sent, he received  
38 a call and was told that there was no interest in a Conservation Easement. There was a lot of  
39 pushback from the Boy Scouts about the idea. He believed the organization knew that if there was  
40 ever a desire to look into a Conservation Easement, it would be possible to reach out to the CWC  
41 for further discussion. Currently, the Boy Scouts were unwilling to move forward.

42  
43 Mr. Shea wondered if the Steiner Family had any residual interest in Camp Steiner. Mr. Draper  
44 had not been able to determine whether the Steiners were in the chain of title or retained any  
45 individual interest. When he went to the County Recorder's Office, he was unable to find them  
46 anywhere in the chain of title, but it was still possible that there was some residual interest.

1  
2 Mr. Marshall looked into the history of Camp Tracy. It was granted to the Boy Scouts by a deed  
3 in 1918 or 1919 by Alvin Taylor, who was the sole remaining trustee of the Salt Lake City Southern  
4 Railway Company. He had been allowing it to be used by the Boy Scouts and the YMCA and it  
5 was previously called Taylor Flats. It was deeded to the Boy Scouts in 1919, but there was no  
6 reference to the Steiners. In 1923, Russel Taylor, who was a local banker and philanthropist,  
7 donated \$10,000 to create a lodge there, which was called the Tracy Wigwam at Camp Taylor.  
8 Ultimately, the name became Camp Tracy. That was all the legal history he had been able to find.  
9

## 10 **Fire Prevention Discussion**

### 11 12 **1. Committee Members will Discuss and Vote on Encouraging the Forest Service to Use** 13 **Funding to Clean Up Debris Along Millcreek Road.**

14  
15 Mr. Marshall reported that there was a desire for the Forest Service to clean up the debris that had  
16 been accumulating for decades along Millcreek Road. It was more dangerous than the rest of the  
17 forest because that debris serves as tinder. It ignites more easily, burns hotter, and spreads faster.  
18 Bekee Hotze responded to his request with a number of reasons why the Forest Service would not  
19 clean the debris. She stated that there was not enough staff or money to do so. However, in the  
20 last few years, the Forest Service received funding for fire prevention and had made an effort in  
21 other areas, which included upper Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Marshall reported that Scott Frost was  
22 currently filling in for Ms. Hotze and he reached out to him. Mr. Frost was encouraging on the  
23 call and saw the clean-up along the road as something that was possible. It would involve  
24 removing debris 10 feet in width on each side of the road, without piling and burning. Mr. Frost  
25 agreed to look into the matter further. Mr. Marshall sent the Forest Service a copy of the Road  
26 Easement that the Forest Service granted to the County. It allowed road maintenance to occur on  
27 each side of the road. He reiterated that Mr. Frost was looking into this.  
28

29 Mr. Marshall asked that a motion be made by the Millcreek Canyon Committee to indicate that  
30 there was support for the Forest Service to clean the debris along Millcreek Road. If the matter  
31 needed to go further, such as a letter and possible motion at the Stakeholders Council level and  
32 then a letter from the CWC to the Forest Service, that could be prepared in the next month or so.  
33 He stated that in that instance, the letter would be presented to the Millcreek Canyon Committee  
34 before it went to the Stakeholders Council for consideration and a recommendation.  
35

36 Chair Diegel thought this was an important issue and thanked Mr. Marshall for bringing it to the  
37 Committee. It was time that more aggressive fire suppression measures were taken in the canyon.  
38 He appreciated that Mr. Marshall had taken the lead on this and had reached out to Mr. Frost.  
39

40 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved that the Millcreek Canyon Committee issue SUPPORT for fire  
41 prevention in Millcreek Canyon by requesting that the Forest Service remove the debris from a  
42 strip along both sides of Millcreek Road, in both the upper and lower canyon. Del Draper seconded  
43 the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
44

1 **Other Items**

2  
3 Mr. Draper noted that there had been some email discussions about whether to hold the Millcreek  
4 Canyon Committee Meetings monthly or every other month. It was determined that monthly was  
5 ideal. He wondered if the next meeting should be set earlier to account for Chair Diegel, who was  
6 currently traveling. Chair Diegel clarified that the regular meeting time was suitable.  
7

8 Ms. Nielsen reminded those present that the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meetings are anchored  
9 in person at the CWC offices. Anyone who wants to join in person could do so as there is always  
10 at least one member of CWC Staff present in person for Committee Meetings. In terms of the  
11 meeting schedule, consistency is what matters most. The next Millcreek Canyon Committee  
12 Meeting was scheduled to take place on Monday, November 20, 2023, at 1:30 p.m.  
13

14 **Closing**

15  
16 1. **Chair Tom Diegel will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Millcreek Canyon Committee**  
17 **Meeting.**

18  
19 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to ADJOURN. Maura Hahnenberger seconded the motion. The  
20 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
21

22 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:20 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*  
2 *Stakeholders Council Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting held Monday, October 16, 2023.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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