



8  
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
10 **COUNCIL RECREATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD THURSDAY,**  
11 **AUGUST 8, 2024, AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON**  
12 **AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES**  
13 **LOCATED AT 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY UTAH.**

14  
15 **Committee Members:** Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair  
16 Mark Baer  
17 Dennis Goreham  
18 Patrick Morrison  
19 John Knoblock

20  
21 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
22 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations  
23 Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Coordinator

24  
25 **Others:** Garritt Slatcoff, Utah Backcountry Hunters and Anglers

26  
27 **OPENING**

28  
29 **1. Chair Sarah Bennett will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Recreation Systems**  
30 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

31  
32 In the absence of Chair Sarah Bennett, Co-Chair Barbara Cameron called the Central Wasatch  
33 Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Recreation Systems Committee Meeting to order at  
34 2:05 p.m. and welcomed those present. It was noted that Mark Baer will not be an official member  
35 until he is formally added to the Recreation Systems Committee at the next Stakeholders Council  
36 Meeting.

37  
38 Co-Chair Cameron welcomed Mr. Baer and asked that he introduce himself to the Committee.  
39 Mr. Baer reported that he is an attorney in Salt Lake and also runs a historical trust. He has been  
40 involved in different organizations over the years, has a passion for the outdoors, and looks forward  
41 to participating. Co-Chair Cameron noted that Garritt Slatcoff is present at the meeting from the Utah  
42 Backcountry Hunters and Anglers. He is representing Caitlin Curry at the Recreation Systems  
43 Committee Meeting. Mr. Slatcoff stated that the Utah Backcountry Hunters and Anglers focuses on  
44 habitat conservation work, stewardship initiatives, access initiatives, and outdoor recreation in the  
45 area.

1 **2. Review and Approval of the June 13, 2024, Meeting Minutes.**

2  
3 There was not a quorum present, so the Meeting Minutes from June 13, 2024, were not approved.  
4

5 **WASATCH WILDFLOWER DAYS AND BRIGHTON DAYS REVIEW**

6  
7 **1. The Committee will Discuss and Debrief the Wasatch Wildflower Festival and Brighton**  
8 **Days.**  
9

10 Co-Chair Cameron reported that the Wasatch Wildflower Festival was successful. There were  
11 approximately 1,100 attendees at the Brighton event and 1,100 at the Solitude event. Dennis Goreham  
12 noted that he did not attend, but the Wasatch Mountain Club had a booth. He heard it was well  
13 attended. John Knoblock attended the event and thought it went well. It was organized and a lot of  
14 people were present. Many visited the Trails Utah tent and the CWC tent. The event is a good way  
15 to share information. Community Engagement Coordinator, Mia McNeil, stated that she represented  
16 the CWC at the event with a member of the CWC Youth Council. She noted that it was enjoyable.  
17

18 **SILVER LAKE TRAIL DISCUSSION**

19  
20 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Progress on the Silver Lake Trail Maintenance.**  
21

22 Mr. Knoblock discussed the Silver Lake trail maintenance. He believed the contractors have finished  
23 the boardwalk work, including the new section of the boardwalk that goes behind the restrooms to  
24 the picnic area. There was also work being done on the south side of Silver Lake. The trail was  
25 moved back from the lake to protect and preserve the riparian zone. As for the high point of the trail  
26 where the bench was located, the soil was moved down, so there is a more even grade. The intention  
27 is to better meet the U.S. Forest Service accessibility standards. He believes that section has been  
28 completed and the trail has been rerouted, but the final topping material still needs to be added. On  
29 the north side, he believes there will be a new access point cut in so the surfacing material can be  
30 brought into that area. The Silver Lake trail work is supposed to be done in the next two weeks.  
31

32 Co-Chair Cameron explained that the Town of Brighton will meet next Tuesday to discuss the last  
33 bit of funding needed for the area behind the restrooms. There is hope that it will be provided. Co-  
34 Chair Cameron shared information about the implementation of a fee at Silver Lake. Early reports  
35 indicate that this is going smoothly so far. The next fee area will be at Cardiff and that will come into  
36 effect on January 1, 2025. Mr. Knoblock asked whether the fee at Silver Lake is currently being  
37 collected, which was confirmed. Co-Chair Cameron reported that there is a ranger who checks  
38 vehicles. A ticket needs to be purchased and placed on the dashboard. Mr. Knoblock pointed out  
39 that a challenge with trails and trail parking lots is the fact that there are both private and public lands.  
40

41 Mr. Knoblock suggested that the CWC work with Zinnia Wilson at the Forest Service on an  
42 educational component. It is possible to let visitors know that passes purchased at REI or through the  
43 Salt Lake Ranger District outlets will keep the funds in the Salt Lake Ranger District. On the other  
44 hand, if the pass is purchased at Arches National Park, that money goes into the Federal pot of money  
45 that is used for the entire Forest Service. The CWC can assist in the education efforts.  
46

47 Mr. Goreham noted that visitors can purchase their annual pass anywhere they choose, but it is  
48 important for visitors to understand where that money will go. Mr. Knoblock stressed the importance

1 of finding out what outlets will ensure that the money stays in the Salt Lake Ranger District. Once  
2 that information is known, the CWC can include it in the newsletter or on social media.

## 3 4 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING REVIEW**

### 5 6 **1. The Committee will Discuss Takeaways and Possible Action Items from the July** 7 **Stakeholders Council Meeting.**

8  
9 Co-Chair Cameron asked for feedback about the last Stakeholders Council Meeting format. Patrick  
10 Morrison appreciated the review of the Mountain Accord that took place as well as the overall level  
11 of interaction. The meeting format was excellent in terms of engagement. He would enjoy having  
12 those kinds of breakout sessions on a semi-regular basis and asked whether CWC Staff received what  
13 they were looking for from those sessions. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, explained that the  
14 idea behind the structure of the Stakeholders Council Meeting was to increase engagement. The plan  
15 is to have similar breakout sessions at future Stakeholders Council Meetings. She clarified that there  
16 will be different questions and discussion prompts provided at each meeting. However, if there is a  
17 need to focus on a specific action item rather than hold a breakout session, that can be done instead.

18  
19 Ms. Nielsen reported that the feedback received about the new Stakeholders Council Meeting format  
20 has been positive so far. The breakout sessions resulted in a lot of creative ideas. What came out of  
21 the breakout session was a list of items Council Members believed should be part of the Mountain  
22 Accord but are not. If there is no desire to hold breakout sessions at each meeting, it is possible to  
23 focus on that list at a subsequent meeting and brainstorm how to move the items forward. Ms. McNeil  
24 reminded those present that the purpose of the CWC is to convene. It was nice to see different interest  
25 groups interact during the breakout sessions. It seemed to make the meeting more enjoyable for all.

26  
27 Mr. Knoblock explained that in the past, there were a lot of presentations at the Stakeholders Council  
28 level and there were some people who simply stated their positions. There was not as much dialogue,  
29 discussion, or interaction. As a result, the breakout sessions were formed to encourage more dialogue.  
30 Ms. Nielsen noted that there will be months where presentations or updates will be shared with  
31 Council Members, but the intention is to include both informational items and interactive elements.

32  
33 Co-Chair Cameron asked about the Visitor Use Study update. She wondered whether there will be  
34 information shared about that at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. Ms. Nielsen reported that  
35 Dr. Jordan Smith presented to the CWC Board at their last meeting. She encouraged those interested  
36 to listen to the recording of that meeting, which is listed on the CWC website and Utah Public Notice  
37 website. At the Stakeholders Council Meeting in September, there will be an update from the Utah  
38 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) about the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental  
39 Assessment. From there, Council Members will break out into discussion groups. It is possible to  
40 ask Dr. Jordan Smith to share information about the Visitor Use Study as well if there is interest.

41  
42 Mr. Knoblock asked which Systems Committee is most closely tied to the Visitor Use Study and  
43 would be the best to focus on its continued improvement. Ms. Nielsen reminded Committee Members  
44 that the idea for the Visitor Use Study started during the Mountain Accord process but was later  
45 discussed at the Stakeholders Council level. The Capacity Committee wanted to see a capacity study  
46 conducted. That ultimately resulted in the Visitor Use Study. Ms. Nielsen reported that the Visitor  
47 Use Study took many years to complete. It reflects visitation for a specific period of time. Over time,  
48 that information will become less useful. There is no plan to update the data each year at this point.

1 If the Recreation Systems Committee wants to create a list of the data there is a desire to see included  
2 in the Visitor Use Study, that action can be pursued and potentially shared with the CWC Board.

3  
4 Ms. Nielsen shared information about the CWC outreach channels. She reported that there is a media  
5 list for every press release. Additionally, information is sent to the Communication Manager for each  
6 member jurisdiction. There is also the CWC newsletter as well as the CWC social media accounts.

7  
8 Co-Chair Cameron noted that the Visitor Use Study came out of a need for management of the visitors  
9 to the canyons. The Forest Service has never wanted to provide capacity numbers, so their approach  
10 has been to focus on management through parking spaces and fees. It will be interesting in the next  
11 few years to see whether that approach is effective. She is not sure there needs to be an update to the  
12 Visitor Use Study at this time. An update five years from now might be something to consider.

13  
14 Though there is no interest in requesting an update to the Visitor Use Study right now, it was noted  
15 that additional information can be included. Co-Chair Cameron would like to see information about  
16 bicycling added to the Visitor Use Study. Mr. Knoblock noted that before more data is obtained, it  
17 is necessary to think about how the data will be used and what the purpose of the data is. From an  
18 intellectual curiosity standpoint, he would like to see data on backcountry skiing, cross-country  
19 skiing, mountain bicycling, road bicycling, and rock climbing. More information about other uses  
20 could be interesting. That being said, it is important to consider how that data would be used in the  
21 future.

22  
23 Ms. Nielsen explained that the goal of the Environmental Dashboard is to provide information to  
24 anyone interested and let users draw their own conclusions. It was always intended to be an  
25 educational tool. She believes the same is true with the Visitor Use Study information. Mr. Knoblock  
26 referenced the Executive Summary from Dr. Smith. It stated that visitors are satisfied with the level  
27 of crowds and there is not a feeling that the canyons are too crowded. The most heavily used trails  
28 should be hardened to the extent necessary to prevent degradation. In addition, loops can be put  
29 around lakes to prevent riparian habitat zone disturbance. As for ski resorts, the capacity is unknown.

30  
31 Mr. Morrison shared information about studies done on recreation in the state. At a state level, these  
32 studies inform where the funding goes. Having the data available makes it possible to highlight  
33 certain needs. Mr. Knoblock asked if he believed data on other recreational uses would be valuable  
34 to the state. This was confirmed. Mr. Morrison noted that the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance would  
35 love more data on climbing because it then becomes possible to show the economic impacts and the  
36 need for more infrastructure. Mr. Knoblock agrees that data is important, as it can be used to address  
37 planning and infrastructure needs. Co-Chair Cameron informed those present that Mr. Morrison  
38 represents the Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation. She thanked him for sharing his perspective.

39  
40 There was additional discussion about the Stakeholders Council. Co-Chair Cameron pointed out that  
41 there will be an opportunity to ask UDOT to require snow tires from November 1 to May 1. She  
42 wondered whether that is something there is interest in. Mr. Knoblock believes that would fall to the  
43 Transportation Systems Committee. Mr. Morrison suggested that there be more nuance in the request,  
44 as snow tires are not necessarily needed on days when the roads are dry. More enforcement on  
45 difficult days makes sense, but he would have trouble wanting someone without snow tires to be  
46 denied entry on a clear day. Co-Chair Cameron clarified that there would not be enforcement on days  
47 when there was no snow. She agreed that there would need to be some level of nuance.

1 **49-MINUTE HIKE PAMPHLET PROJECT**

2  
3 1. **The Committee will Discuss Creating a “49-Minute Hike” Pamphlet Containing Shorter,**  
4 **Family-Friendly Trails.**

5  
6 Co-Chair Cameron informed Committee Members that she sent out an email with some ideas for a  
7 49-Minute Hike pamphlet. She asked if there was support for this kind of pamphlet. Mr. Morrison  
8 requested some additional background information. Co-Chair Cameron explained that in the goals  
9 and objectives, it was determined that there is interest in creating a pamphlet that outlines shorter  
10 hikes. Based on the data from the Visitor Use Study, that is the most common kind of hike that  
11 families take. The Recreation Systems Committee can provide details about those hikes as well as  
12 hiking etiquette and stewardship information. Mr. Goreham noted that when it was the Trails  
13 Committee rather than the Recreation Systems Committee, a list was created to outline shorter hikes.

14  
15 Mr. Knoblock suggested that the Committee speak to representatives from the Forest Service about a  
16 possible pamphlet and make sure that there is support for this approach. Mr. Morrison asked about  
17 the ideal geographical scope that will be considered for this. Co-Chair Cameron believes it would be  
18 appropriate to include family hikes in the West Valley as well as urban hikes, since during the  
19 Mountain Accord, there were discussions about reducing pressures on the Wasatch. She asked  
20 whether there were any Committee Members interested in reaching out to the land managers or  
21 identifying potential hiking areas to include in a pamphlet. Mr. Goreham believed there is support to  
22 look into this, but stressed the importance of prioritizing projects that the Committee is working on.

23  
24 Mr. Knoblock believes the pamphlet is something the Recreation Systems Committee can work on.  
25 He recommended that Committee Members start to do research and bring relevant information to the  
26 next meeting. Mr. Morrison wondered whether this kind of project would be eligible for a Short-  
27 Term Projects Grant. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this but pointed out that the geographic focus needs to  
28 be the geographic focus of the CWC. She explained that a jurisdictional map for the CWC is in the  
29 works. CWC Staff is thinking about how best to include a map on the CWC website, but there is  
30 currently the story map for the legislation, the Environmental Dashboard jurisdictional boundary map,  
31 and the transit map. All of those are on the website now, but there have been discussions about adding  
32 a map to the home page. Ms. Nielsen noted that once a list of hikes has been created, it will be  
33 possible to think about how to translate that into a GIS map that can be added to the CWC website.

34  
35 Mr. Knoblock reiterated that one of the goals and objectives discussed during the Mountain Accord  
36 process was spreading users out beyond the Central Wasatch. The hope was to reduce pressure on  
37 the Central Wasatch in order to protect the environment and reduce the traffic load on the roads. It  
38 might be worthwhile to consider a third party for the pamphlet because if it is not a CWC-produced  
39 document, it can be expanded beyond the CWC study area. Co-Chair Cameron asked Committee  
40 Members to think about what has been discussed so far. There can be further discussion in the future.

41  
42 **COMMITTEE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

43  
44 1. **The Committee Members will Review, Discuss, and Refine the Vision and Goals of the**  
45 **Recreation Systems Committee.**

46  
47 Co-Chair Cameron noted that any additional suggestions can be sent to Recreation Systems  
48 Committee leadership and be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Knoblock asked whether the

1 Committee document is available on the CWC website. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack,  
2 reported that the vision and goals document for the Recreation Systems Committee is in the Google  
3 Drive folder that all Stakeholders Council Members can access. She explained that there are folders  
4 for each of the different subcommittees. Ms. Nielsen added that at the bottom of the last CWC and  
5 Stakeholders Council Digest that was distributed, there is a link to the resource hub included.

6  
7 **OTHER ITEMS**

8  
9 Mr. Morrison noted that there were previous discussions about Zion National Park and the shuttle  
10 system. There was talk about Zion National Park abandoning its shuttle system for timed entry, but  
11 the shuttle service is doing very well. The petrol buses will be swapped for electric buses, as a full  
12 switch to electric is being made. He reiterated that the shuttle service at Zion is doing well.  
13 Mr. Knoblock thanked him for looking into that matter further and clarifying the information.  
14 Mr. Morrison reported that he has a positive relationship with those at Zion National Park. If there is  
15 a desire to have a Stakeholders Council presentation about the shuttle system, that can be arranged.

16  
17 Mr. Knoblock shared information about the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. He reported that this is  
18 continuing to move forward. The intention is to have that out at the end of the first quarter of 2025.

19  
20 Ms. Kilpack reported that the next Recreation Systems Committee Meeting is scheduled for  
21 September 10, 2024. However, members of CWC Staff will be taking an environmental collaboration  
22 course on that date. There will not be anyone available to anchor the meeting. As a result, another  
23 time will need to be scheduled. She offered to reach out to Committee Members with alternate dates.

24  
25 **CLOSING**

26  
27 **1. Chair Bennett will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Recreation Systems Committee**  
28 **Meeting.**

29  
30 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to ADJOURN the Recreation Systems Committee Meeting.  
31 There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

32  
33 The meeting adjourned at 3:11 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Recreation Systems Committee Meeting held Thursday,*  
3 *August 8, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_