



9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2024, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST, MILLCREEK, UTAH.

- Present:** John Knoblock, Chair
Tom Diegel, Co-Chair
Adam Lenkowski
Amber Broadway
Breden Catt
Dan Zalles
Danny Richardson
Del Draper
Ed Marshall
Grace Tyler
Joanna Wheelton
John Adams
Jonny Vasic
Kelly Boardman
Kurt Hegmann
Linda Johnson
Maura Hahnenberger
Michael Marker
Mike Doyle
Morgan Mingle
Patrick Shea
Patrick Morrison
Roger Borgenicht
Sally Kaiser
Sarah Bennett
Stuart Derman
Chelsea Phillippe, U.S. Forest Service
Crystal Chen, CWC Youth Council
Dani Porier, CWC Youth Council
Izzy Chick, CWC Youth Council
Jeff Silvestrini, CWC Board Chair
- Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director

1 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
2 Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Intern
3

4 **Opening**
5

6 1. **Chair John Knoblock will Open the Public Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
7 **Council of the Central Wasatch Commission.**
8

9 Chair John Knoblock called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
10 Meeting to order at approximately 3:35 p.m. and welcomed those present.
11

12 2. **Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the January 17,**
13 **2024, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**
14

15 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the January 17, 2024,
16 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Adam Lenkowski seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
17 unanimous consent of the Council.
18

19 Following approval of the Meeting Minutes, it was requested that those present introduce themselves.
20 Jonny Vasic explained that he is the Executive Director of Utah Physicians for a Healthy
21 Environment. Del Draper stated that he represents the Alta community. Sarah Bennett is with Trails
22 Utah, Roger Borgenicht is with Utahns for Better Transportation, Linda Johnson lives in Sugar House,
23 Kelly Boardman is a Cottonwood Heights resident, and Patrick Shea represents Friends of Alta. Chair
24 Knoblock explained that he represents the Mount Olympus Community Council. Tom Diegel is the
25 Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council. He also represents the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance.
26

27 Brenden Catt explained that he is a Salt Lake City resident. Sally Kaiser is a Millcreek City resident,
28 Adam Lenkowski is a Sandy City resident, Stuart Derman represents Wasatch Mountain Arts, Ed
29 Marshall is a resident of Millcreek Canyon and represents Log Haven Restaurant, Mike Marker is a
30 Sandy City resident, Grace Tyler is with Save Our Canyons, Joanna Wheelton represents the
31 Cottonwood Canyons Foundation, Dan Zalles represents Olympus Cove, Patrick Morrison is a
32 resident of Millcreek but is representing the Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation, and Morgan Mingle
33 is with the Park City Chamber and Visitors Bureau. Maura Hahnenberger stated that she is an
34 Associate Professor at Salt Lake Community College. Amber Broadaway is from Solitude Mountain
35 Resort. CWC Staff introduced themselves. Staff includes Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen,
36 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, and Community Engagement Coordinator, Mia McNeil.
37

38 Co-Chair Diegel noted that he had a discussion with Chair Knoblock earlier that morning about the
39 Stakeholders Council. Stakeholders Council leadership recognizes that the Stakeholders Council is
40 a disparate group. As a result, everyone needs to be respectful and allow others to share comments.
41 He asked everyone to be conscientious of the time available during the Stakeholders Council Meeting.
42 More detailed discussions are most appropriate at the subcommittee level.
43

44 3. **Central Wasatch Commission Chair, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, will Address the**
45 **Stakeholders Council.**
46

47 Ms. Nielsen reported that CWC Chair, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, has to attend another meeting. When
48 that meeting ends, he will address the Stakeholders Council, so the agenda will be out of order.

1
2 Mayor Silvestrini addressed the Stakeholders Council at approximately 4:45 p.m. He introduced
3 himself as the Chair of the CWC and explained that he hopes to attend more Stakeholders Council
4 Meetings in the future. He discussed the Legislative Session and thanked those who assisted in
5 lobbying against the gravel mining bills. A number of Stakeholders Council Members and members
6 of the environmental community were active in that process. He explained that there were concerns
7 about air quality, water quality, and the preservation of the natural beauty of the Central Wasatch.

8
9 Mayor Silvestrini stated that he is hopeful there will be more robust engagement between the CWC
10 Board and Stakeholders Council this year. He wants to attend Stakeholders Council Meetings and
11 will encourage other CWC Board Members to do so as well. Mayor Silvestrini expressed his
12 appreciation for everything the Stakeholders Council does to assist the organization. He added that
13 during the last session, the CWC received an appropriation from the Legislature for \$200,000. That
14 appropriation will help continue the work of the organization. At the CWC Board level, there have
15 been discussions about refocusing efforts on the Central Wasatch National Conservation and
16 Recreation Area (“CWNCR”) Act. There is a desire to move that work forward, but there are some
17 challenges. Work will need to be done with partners, as was done during the Mountain Accord.

18
19 During the previous Legislative and Land Tenure Committee Meeting, it was determined that there
20 should be discussions with members of the Congressional Delegation. Last week, Mayor Silvestrini
21 went to Washington and visited with members of the Congressional Delegation. He discussed the
22 CWNCR at that time. Representative John Curtis was the most supportive. Other members of the
23 delegation were not against the CWNCR but were not as supportive as Representative Curtis. What
24 he heard from members of the Congressional Delegation was that it is necessary to receive support
25 from State leadership. At the Legislative and Land Tenure Committee level, there have been
26 discussions about how to obtain that support. There are a few ideas that are currently being
27 considered. Mayor Silvestrini shared additional details about the recent CWNCR discussions.

28
29 After the Legislative and Land Tenure Committee Meeting, a call was received from former CWC
30 Executive Director, Ralph Becker. He shared information with Mayor Silvestrini about what was
31 done before in relation to the CWNCR. Something there is support for is a site visit in the canyons.
32 In order to receive support from the State, it is necessary to convince Legislators that this is
33 worthwhile. Mayor Silvestrini reiterated that there is still work to be done. He stressed the
34 importance of a field trip or site visit so the Legislators can understand the significance of the area.
35 Mayor Silvestrini welcomed other ideas about how to engage with the Federal Legislature. He
36 explained that lobbying needs to be done in a respectful manner in order to make positive progress.

37
38 In terms of the CWC budget, there have been discussions about trying to solidify the member
39 jurisdiction contributions. Mayor Silvestrini also reported that Representative Robert Spendlove will
40 be retiring. He reiterated that there is a desire to engage with the Stakeholders Council further.

41
42 Co-Chair Diegel asked about potentially reestablishing Salt Lake County as a member of the CWC.
43 Mayor Silvestrini stated that he has informed Mayor Jenny Wilson that the County is missed as a
44 member. He believed there were two reasons the County left the organization. One was the desire
45 to have separation on land use authority and the other was the amount of time spent learning about
46 and discussing the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon
47 Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). CWC Board Members spent a lot of time listening to

1 various presentations and it seemed Mayor Wilson felt the process took up a lot of time. Mayor
2 Silvestrini stated that Salt Lake County is a valuable partner and there is a desire to see them return.

3
4 Mayor Silvestrini explained that there is an Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting held on a
5 monthly basis and it is open to the public. He noted that Council Members are welcome to listen in
6 or participate in those meetings. Mayor Silvestrini discussed the CWC and noted that CWC Board
7 Members make time for the organization and attend regular meetings. There was a conversation at
8 the last Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting about allowing each CWC Board Member to
9 appoint a proxy to attend meetings when CWC Board Members are unable to do so. He supports that
10 idea, but he does not want there to be a scenario where alternates are sent regularly and there is less
11 engagement. There is value in the discussions that take place and in more active participation.

12
13 Council Members thanked Mayor Silvestrini for attending the meeting and sharing updates. Mayor
14 Silvestrini expressed his appreciation for the Stakeholders Council and all who choose to serve.

15
16 **4. The Chair and Co-Chair will Announce the New Members of the Stakeholders Council**
17 **and Ask for Brief Introductions from Each New Member.**

18
19 It was noted that introductions were handled earlier in the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Chair
20 Knoblock thanked all of the new Stakeholders Council Members. It will be wonderful to hear their
21 opinions and their ideas. Mr. Morrison expressed gratitude for being able to join the Stakeholders
22 Council. It was noted that John Adams was now present. He took a moment to introduce himself.

23
24 **Draft Trails Master Plan Presentation and Discussion**

25
26 **1. Chelsea Phillippe will Present the Draft Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan and Engage in**
27 **Discussion with Stakeholders.**

28
29 Chelsea Phillippe with the U.S. Forest Service was present to discuss the Draft Tri-Canyon Trails
30 Master Plan. She shared a PowerPoint presentation with the Stakeholders Council. Chair Knoblock
31 noted that Ms. Phillippe has been working on the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan for several years.
32 He expressed appreciation for the work she has done so far and noted that the plan was contemplated
33 in the Mountain Accord. It is wonderful to see the Trails Plan start to move forward. T

34
35 Ms. Phillippe explained that she works for the Forest Service in the Salt Lake Ranger District. One
36 of her tasks has been to work on the Draft Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. She clarified that the tri-
37 canyons include Millcreek Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, and Little Cottonwood Canyon. An
38 overview of the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan timeline was shared. The field data collection started
39 in 2020 and all of the trails were inventoried. This included system trails and user-created trails.

40
41 From there, the situation assessments took place. There were conversations with others to better
42 understand what recreation values and concerns existed in the valley. After that, there were listening
43 sessions and people were invited to participate in those either in person or online. All of the
44 qualitative and quantitative data was considered, along with the Forest Service guidelines and plans,
45 and the Draft Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan was created. The next steps are to receive public input
46 through May 2024. That input will be considered and the next year or so will be spent developing
47 the final plan. That will open for review and then the plan will be adopted and implemented.

1 Some of the main takeaways from the listening sessions are the guiding principles. Those are included
2 in the Draft Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. The guiding principles are as follows:

- 3
- 4 • Environment:
 - 5 ○ Protect watersheds and ecosystems by reducing impacts to water, wildlife, plants, and
 - 6 scenery. (Concentrate visitors at hardened destinations, and design sustainable trails).
- 7 • Visitor:
 - 8 ○ Offer diverse quality of recreation opportunities. (Examples: hike, bike, nature walk,
 - 9 dog walk, rock climb, and fish).
- 10 • Infrastructure:
 - 11 ○ Built or constructed developments that support visitor needs and protect resources.
 - 12 (Examples: parking, bathrooms, signage).
- 13

14 The guiding principles were then applied to three focus areas: trailheads, trail networks, and recreation
15 strategies. Ms. Phillippe explained that the trailheads were broken down into three different types,
16 which are major, minor, and primitive. There was a similar breakdown done with the trail network.
17 The draft plan includes different types of concentrated-use trails, connector trails, and user-created
18 trails. The third area of focus is recreation strategies. It is important to think about how to reduce
19 visitor conflicts, determine where e-bike opportunities might exist, how summer recreation might
20 look different at ski resorts, and what improvements might be made to winter recreation.

21
22 Ms. Phillippe noted that there is a longer PDF version of the plan that has more detail. There is also
23 an online version that is condensed. Both versions include opportunities to comment. There is one
24 more opportunity to comment in person, which is later that day at Wheeler Farm from 5:00 p.m. to
25 7:00 p.m. The opportunity to provide input online will remain open through May 2024. Ms. Phillippe
26 clarified that the proposed trails are not exact alignments or exact locations, but are more conceptual.
27 She also noted that there has not been work done with private landowners to discuss easements or
28 rights-of-way. The idea is to propose conceptual trails and see what support or momentum there is
29 before the more detailed work takes place. She offered to answer Council Member questions.

30
31 Mr. Shea wanted to know what budget planning there has been. He also wanted to know whether
32 budget contributions have been identified. Ms. Phillippe explained that the final version of the plan
33 will have information about a phased implementation process. As the final plan is drafted, there will
34 be discussions about the budget, funding, and partner support. Mr. Shea suggested that there be a
35 group created now that consists of the Forest Service and others to identify potential funding sources.

36
37 Co-Chair Diegel referenced a previous Master Plan for the Bonneville Shoreline Foothills. There
38 was controversy at the time and that controversy continued in the last few years as trails were put in.
39 It seemed that there was a discrepancy between the Master Plan and the execution of the trails. He
40 wanted to know if there is a strategy in place to ensure that does not happen with the Tri-Canyon
41 Trails Master Plan work. Ms. Phillippe reported that a lot of lessons have been learned from the
42 foothills plan. She also noted that there will be an Environmental Analysis beforehand. In addition,
43 open input sessions and discussions with partners will ensure there is support for what is proposed.

44
45 Co-Chair Diegel asked if the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) is needed for each mile
46 of the trail. Ms. Phillippe explained that the first phase will have items that are ready to move forward.
47 Those items will not need as much Environmental Analysis as a brand-new trail. There is a set

1 distance that trails can be rerouted without NEPA, but outside of that, the Forest Service will work
2 with specialists on the NEPA. The specialists are on board with what has been proposed so far.

3
4 Co-Chair Diegel wanted to know about the public input received so far. Ms. Phillippe stated that
5 there has been a lot of excitement. Hearing people talk about local trails and various connections has
6 been exciting. There is a desire to hear more from the public, so comments will be taken until May
7 2024. Discussions were had about potential new trails. Ms. Phillippe clarified that a lot of the new
8 trails proposed might be new to the Forest Service, but not necessarily new to users. A lot of the
9 proposals relate to connections that already exist. The idea is to utilize those where they are
10 sustainable, make the most sense, and will not negatively impact the natural resources.

11
12 Mr. Shea asked who will determine whether there is a Categorical Exclusion. Ms. Phillippe reported
13 that the NEPA work is done through forest specialists who know the area. Chair Knoblock noted that
14 Ms. Phillippe worked with Dr. Jordan Smith at Utah State University. Something that is in the Draft
15 Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan that Dr. Smith highlighted in the Visitor Use Study was environmental
16 degradation around High Alpine Lakes. The plan referenced was the creation of one trail around the
17 High Alpine Lakes to prevent that kind of degradation from occurring in the future.

18
19 Mr. Morrison stated that he has spent a good amount of time reviewing the Draft Tri-Canyon Trails
20 Master Plan and applauds the efforts that have been made. He wanted to know how climbing access
21 trails fit into the plan. Many of the climbing access trails are social, as there are only a few that are
22 legitimate network trails. Ms. Phillippe reported that climbing trails will be included in more detail
23 in the final version. There has been work with partners on this matter, as it will be an important part
24 of the finished product. The Forest Service plans to work with the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance.

25
26 Mr. Morrison noted that the Salt Lake Ranger District is fortunate to have a lot of wonderful partners.
27 He wanted to know how the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan is anticipated to impact the work of those
28 partners. Ms. Phillippe reiterated that there has been work done with partners. As the implementation
29 phases are built out, the plan will need to make sense for the Forest Service and applicable partners.

30
31 Ms. Bennett asked what the Stakeholders Council can anticipate coming out of the next phase. She
32 wanted to better understand the deliverables. Ms. Phillippe explained that in the future, there will be
33 more details provided. The implementation phases will have more information about alignments as
34 well as ideas about the budget, maintenance schedule, signage plan, user-created trails that will be
35 closed and restored, and so on. She reiterated that a lot more details will be provided in the future.

36 37 **Central Wasatch Commission Board Updates**

38 39 **1. Staff will Discuss the Recent Meetings and Activities of the Central Wasatch** 40 **Commission Board.**

41
42 Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC Board met in March. She explained that budget season will begin
43 shortly. The CWC runs on a fiscal year, so there are early discussions taking place about how to build
44 the budget for the next fiscal year. Currently, the organization is in the fifth cycle of the Short-Term
45 Projects Grant Program. The application cycle closes in five days, so anyone with a project to submit
46 for consideration must do so before 5:00 p.m. on March 25, 2024. Ms. Nielsen informed those present
47 that the CWC offices will be moving. The current lease will end at the end of April and a new office
48 building has been found. It is located at 311 South State Street and is on the third floor of the building.

1
2 **Systems Committee Discussions**
3

4 **1. Environment Systems Committee.**
5

6 **a. February 13, 2024 and March 12, 2024.**

7 **b. Chair Kelly Boardman and Co-Chair Dan Zalles will Discuss the Recent**
8 **Activities of the Environment Systems Committee.**
9

10 Ms. Boardman reported that the Environment Systems Committee has continued to brainstorm ideas
11 to improve and update the Environmental Dashboard. The desire is to add winter recreation use data
12 to make the Environmental Dashboard more robust and representative of the year-round use in the
13 canyons. There have been suggestions to look at the fragmentation of habitat and how recreation can
14 influence wildlife patterns. Other suggestions are to add more water quality data and better
15 understand the number of visitors in the canyons year-round. The more information that is available,
16 the easier it will be to make decisions that will benefit the canyons. Ms. Boardman added that the
17 Environment Systems Committee is also looking into a future Human Impacts Workshop.
18

19 In addition, the Environment Systems Committee has been brainstorming ideas about how to
20 approach remnant lands for potential conservation. There have been some ideas put forward and Mr.
21 Zalles has done a lot of work looking at Natural Asset Companies that might be interested in
22 investment. The Committee determined that the approach is unlikely to move forward, but there is a
23 desire to look at a variety of ideas. Ms. Boardman noted that one possibility for a short-term project
24 is an inventory of the remnant lands. Additionally, the Committee is interested in any modeling that
25 was done for the canyons for transportation systems. Committee Members want to know whether
26 UDOT built out a robust GIS model. She explained that this is something that can be looked into
27 further. GIS modeling is also another possible short-term project that can be pursued.
28

29 Co-Chair Diegel asked for more information about the remnant lands. Mr. Shea explained that in Salt
30 Lake County, there are over 1,500 acres of remnant lands. He thought it was best to speak to the State
31 Director for BLM and Dave Whittekiend with the Forest Service. There is a map that shows those
32 lands. Chair Knoblock pointed out that there are also a lot of private parcels that are not yet built.
33

34 **2. Economy Systems Committee**
35

36 **a. February 8, 2024.**

37 **b. Chair Dave Fields and Co-Chair Morgan Mingle will Discuss the Recent**
38 **Activities of the Economy Systems Committee.**
39

40 Ms. Mingle explained that there are not a lot of updates for the Economy Systems Committee. CWC
41 Staff is looking into what the Economy Systems Group did during the Mountain Accord to see if that
42 can provide some structure and direction for the Economy Systems Committee moving forward.
43

44 Chair Knoblock asked about the SHRED Act, which would take ski resort fees and return them to the
45 local forest. Ms. Mingle explained that it was not passed during the Legislative Session, but it is
46 something that is still being discussed. It is possible that the SHRED Act will be elevated next year.
47

1 **3. Transportation Systems Committee**

2
3 a. **February 12, 2024 and March 11, 2024.**

4 b. **Chair Danny Richardson and Co-Chair Amber Broadaway will Discuss the**
5 **Recent Activities of the Transportation Systems Committee.**

6
7 Mr. Richardson was having technical difficulties and was unable to join the Stakeholders Council
8 Meeting. However, he shared information with Ms. Nielsen, who reported that the Committee
9 discussed priorities through a survey circulated by CWC Staff. Committee Members reached out to
10 establish a dialogue with the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) and reached out to the Forest Service.
11 It was noted that a representative was scheduled to address the Committee at the next meeting.
12

13 Chair Knoblock reported that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Phase 1 action is currently
14 on hold. That is an area of discussion for the Committee, as is the Federal Lands Access Program
15 (“FLAP”) grant in Millcreek Canyon and the potential for a shuttle bus in Millcreek Canyon. The
16 fact that the Forest Service does not seem to actively support the shuttle is an issue. Chair Knoblock
17 noted that there is hope that the \$190 million the Legislature approved for Big Cottonwood Canyon
18 and Little Cottonwood Canyon can be used for some of the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action
19 Plan (“BCC MAP”) related projects. Discussions were had about the lawsuits related to the UDOT
20 Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Mr. Shea noted that he has spoken to Devin Weder recently.
21

22 Ms. Johnson read an article in the New York Times earlier that day about how the national parks are
23 only allowing entry payment via credit card. Some people are very upset about that. Since the
24 Transportation Systems Committee has discussed various types of fees for transportation and entrance
25 into the canyons, she thought it was worth discussing this issue at a Committee level.
26

27 **4. Millcreek Canyon Committee**

28
29 a. **February 20, 2024 and March 18, 2024.**

30 b. **Chair Del Draper and Co-Chair Tom Diegel will Discuss the Recent Activities of**
31 **the Millcreek Canyon Committee.**

32
33 Mr. Draper shared information about the Millcreek Canyon Committee. There was a presentation by
34 the FLAP grant designers at the Salt Lake County Council Meeting on February 27, 2024. Mayor
35 Silvestrini spoke during the County Council Meeting. An Environmental Assessment for the FLAP
36 grant has also been released. Comments on the Environmental Assessment are due by April 5, 2024.
37 Some of the issues with the FLAP grant relate to the bicycle lane. He explained that the FLAP grant
38 is for the upper portion of the canyon. There is a proposed bicycle lane for a certain portion, but the
39 bicycle lane was proposed to end at Elbow Fork. He noted that there are concerns about the road
40 width, maintaining the character of the canyon, the bicycle lane, and user conflicts in the canyon.
41

42 Mr. Draper noted that when Mayor Silvestrini presented in front of the County Council, he stated that
43 there were past discussions with the Forest Service about a pilot program for a shuttle. At that time,
44 it was determined that there could not be a shuttle until there was a better road in place. However,
45 when reading through the Environmental Assessment, does not really address the possibility of a
46 future shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. There are a few areas where it mentions wider turnouts near
47 trailheads, which could potentially be used as shuttle locations, but the fact that the plan does clearly
48 take shuttles into account is an issue. Mr. Draper reported that the document mentions putting a

1 conduit in the road, which might be used for information systems or for cell service. He pointed out
2 that the lack of cell service in Millcreek Canyon is a safety issue, especially when there are accidents.
3 Certain issues are not adequately addressed in the Environmental Assessment.

4
5 The Millcreek Canyon Committee determined that a comment will not be submitted about the
6 Environmental Assessment on behalf of the Committee. This is due to the fact that a comment from
7 the Committee needs to be approved by both the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board before
8 submission. There is not enough time for that to happen ahead of the comment deadline. As a result,
9 Committee Members were considering submitting comments on an individual basis instead.

10
11 Chair Knoblock asked if there is a link to the Environmental Assessment on the CWC website. Ms.
12 Nielsen denied this but noted that there is a link to the Environmental Assessment on the last Millcreek
13 Canyon Committee agenda. Additionally, the Environmental Assessment was on the County website.
14 It was noted that the full Environmental Assessment is approximately 80 pages, but there is a
15 simplified PowerPoint presentation as well. Co-Chair Diegel offered to distribute that.

16
17 Discussions were had about the 18-acre parcel at the mouth of Millcreek Canyon. Chair Knoblock
18 explained that the fee booth is near the parcel and the County is having discussions with the owner.

19
20 Co-Chair Draper asked CWC Staff to share an update on the discussions with the Forest Service. Ms.
21 Nielsen reported that part of the motivation behind the FLAP grant was a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon.
22 The FLAP grant construction is slated to start in the summer of 2025. At this time last year, the Forest
23 Service approached the CWC and requested that CWC Staff perform some background research to
24 determine what it would take to provide shuttle service to canyon users in Millcreek Canyon. CWC
25 Staff conducted research and that was shared with the Forest Service. Based on the research, the
26 Forest Service stated that there were too many unknown variables when it came to funding and
27 parking. The Millcreek Canyon Committee looked into different parking solutions and two viable
28 options were found. Chair Knoblock noted that the Forest Service did not seem supportive.

29
30 **5. Recreation Systems Committee**

31
32 **a. February 8, 2024 and March 14, 2024.**

33 **b. Chair Sarah Bennett and Co-Chair Barbara Cameron will Discuss the Recent**
34 **Activities of the Recreation Systems Committee.**

35
36 Ms. Bennett discussed the recent Recreation Systems Committee work. She reported that the
37 Committee has decided to rethink the vision, goals, and objectives. There were also conversations
38 about what will be pursued as far as small projects. The vision statement the Committee created is:

- 39
40
 - “People connecting to the landscape sustainably and enjoyably.”

41
42 Recreation needs to occur in a way that is sustainable for visitors, the land, and the watershed. Some
43 of the goals for the Committee are environmental and wildlife protection (watershed), safety in all
44 seasons (personal safety, personal responsibility, transit), communication (better signage), and
45 education (schools, social media, and press outlets). Some of the objectives are better access (more
46 dispersed access) and emphasizing nodes (primary, secondary, and tertiary nodes to disperse use and
47 address different types of recreational experiences). Another objective has to do with the diversity of

1 opportunities. Recreation encompasses a lot of different activities for different people. There are
2 active pursuits, but many people accessing the canyons are participating in more passive types of
3 recreation. For example, hiking and bicycling versus dining and picnicking.

4
5 Ms. Bennett reported that at the last Recreation Systems Committee Meeting, there were discussions
6 about whether dining should be considered a form of recreation. Mr. Marshall spoke to the
7 Committee and asked them to consider dining as a recreational activity. It was an interesting
8 discussion because it highlighted the bias some have that recreation is only physical and active. She
9 thought it was important to be mindful about including more passive types of activities in recreation.

10
11 Mr. Marshall shared comments about the suggestion to include dining in the definition of recreation.
12 There have been concerns over the years that dining has not been recognized as a legitimate form of
13 outdoor recreation. It is not just dining in the beauty of the forest canopy and the mountains, but also
14 special events in those areas. The people who enjoy nature in this way find it to be recreational. The
15 request is that recreation not just be viewed as athletic activities. People of all ages and abilities
16 recreate in the canyon. More passive forms of recreation are important to acknowledge as well.

17
18 Ms. Bennett explained that the Recreation Systems Committee has a list of action items. It was
19 determined that there is not enough time for the Committee to submit a proposal for the Short-Term
20 Projects Grant Program. The intention is to focus on road striping and a bicycle plan in the future.
21 There is also a desire to create an inventory of remnant lands as those could be important for access.
22 Chair Knoblock pointed out that there may be some overlap between Systems Committee projects.

23 24 **Committee Membership and Leadership**

25 26 **1. Stakeholders May Request to Join Systems Committees:**

- 27
28 a. **Millcreek Canyon Committee (Adam Lenkowski and Dan Zalles).**
- 29 b. **Environment Systems Committee (Kirk Nichols).**
- 30 c. **Transportation Systems Committee (Stuart Derman).**
- 31 d. **Recreation Systems Committee.**
- 32 e. **Economy Systems Committee**

33
34 Ms. Nielsen explained that Committee membership additions and removals need to be approved
35 during a public meeting. She shared a document that outlined some proposed additions to the
36 Committees. New Stakeholders Council Members can state which one they want to join. Other
37 Stakeholders Council Members interested in a particular Committee can also make that known.

38
39 Mr. Adams asked to join the Economy Systems Committee, Mr. Vasic asked to join the Environment
40 Systems Committee, Ms. Kaiser asked to join the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Mr. Morrison asked
41 to join the Recreation Systems Committee, Mr. Catt asked to join the Environment Systems
42 Committee, and Mr. Shea asked to join the Economy Systems Committee. Ms. Nielsen noted that
43 Mr. Lenkowski and Mr. Zalles will join the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Kirk Nichols will join the
44 Environment Systems Committee, Mr. Derman will join the Transportation Systems Committee, and
45 Ms. Tyler will be added to the Environment Systems Committee and Transportation Systems
46 Committee. It was stated that Bri Sullivan expressed a desire to be on the Millcreek Canyon
47 Committee and Recreation Systems Committee. No formal motion was needed for the appointments.

1 Chair Knoblock informed those present that Council Members can join in on any of the subcommittee
2 meetings, even if they are not formally on the committee. Co-Chair Diegel asked if there is a monthly
3 calendar with all of the subcommittee meetings. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this and explained that it is
4 located in a section of the website called the Community Events Calendar. That calendar lists all of
5 the Youth Council, Stakeholders Council, and CWC Board Meetings.

6
7 **2. Any Committee Leadership Changes.**

8
9 There were no Committee leadership changes proposed.

10
11 **March Discussion Prompt**

12
13 **1. Discussion Prompt:**

- 14
15 a. **Which Committees are Best Suited to Take on the Remaining Mountain Accord**
16 **Deliverables?**
17 b. **What Remaining Mountain Accord Deliverables Would Benefit Most from Inter-**
18 **Committee Collaboration?**
19

20 Chair Knoblock shared the Mountain Accord Deliverables Status document. The intended outcomes
21 in the Mountain Accord were pulled out as well as the agreed upon actions. He asked Council
22 Members to share comments about the document and submit them to CWC Staff. Chair Knoblock
23 reviewed some of the agreed-upon actions, including pursuing the Federal Designation, transportation
24 improvements, and transit and trailhead infrastructure. One item related to land exchanges between
25 the Forest Service and Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts, but that action is not moving forward.

26
27 Chair Knoblock referenced a land acquisition program. He noted that this is something a few of the
28 Systems Committees have discussed recently. It is an area of opportunity for the organization. Ms.
29 Nielsen reported that it was also discussed during the recent Legislative and Land Tenure Committee
30 Meeting. Chair Knoblock further reviewed the deliverables document. He referenced the Big
31 Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) that is moving forward. Ms. Nielsen
32 explained that the next steps for the BCC MAP are unclear, but that work is still a focus. Chair
33 Knoblock discussed parking fees and tolling. He explained that it is tied in with the UDOT Little
34 Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Something related to parking fees that is moving forward is that the Forest
35 Service will have fee areas for parking at certain trailheads. That will be phased in over a three-year
36 period. Additional action items from the Mountain Accord were reviewed with Council Members.

37
38 Ms. Johnson asked who made the decision for there not to be a bicycle lane up Millcreek Canyon.
39 Chair Knoblock explained that those types of decisions were made by the Federal Highway
40 Administration (“FHWA”) and the consultants handling the design work. Mayor Silvestrini
41 explained that the issue there relates to the width of the road. During the public comment period,
42 there was a lot of pushback about widening the road more than was absolutely necessary. Given the
43 constrictions in a few sections of the canyon, there will likely be parts where a shared road is needed.

44
45 Chair Knoblock referenced a Millcreek Canyon shuttle bus. It is something the Millcreek Canyon
46 Committee and the CWC have been pushing for over the last few years. There is also a reference to
47 developing and implementing a comprehensive trail and cycling plan in the Mountain Accord. That
48 work is moving forward, as was discussed by Ms. Phillippe earlier in the Stakeholders Council

1 Meeting. Another item listed in the document was the Environmental Dashboard to measure
2 environmental conditions, which is something the organization has done. As for an adaptive
3 management plan to address measured changes, he was not exactly sure what that would entail. Based
4 on the review of the intended actions in the Mountain Accord, there are not a lot of gaps, as the
5 organization has touched on almost everything in some manner. Co-Chair Diegel suggested the items
6 be reviewed again to determine what is completed, what is pending, and what is not moving ahead.
7

8 Ms. Nielsen reminded Council Members that in the 2023 Annual Report, the main action items were
9 shared along with their status. The 2023 Annual Report has been emailed to all Council Members
10 and is also on the CWC website for review. Chair Knoblock explained that the intention of the
11 discussion prompt is to start a dialogue between Council Members. Ms. Nielsen suggested that the
12 conversation around this item be continued to the next Stakeholders Council Meeting due to the time.
13

14 **Staff Announcements**

16 **1. The Short-Term Projects Call for Ideas is Open through March 25, 2024.**

17
18 Ms. Nielsen reminded Council Members that the call for project ideas is open through March 25.
19

20 **2. Youth Council Announcements:**

21 **a. Tabling Opportunities.**

22
23
24 Ms. Kilpack shared Youth Council updates. There was a meeting earlier in the month. Two
25 additional members have joined the Youth Council. Anyone between the ages of 16 and 30 interested
26 in joining the Council can apply. She noted that the Council is looking for tabling opportunities.
27

28 **b. Call for Youth Council Liaison Volunteers.**

29
30 Ms. Kilpack explained that there is a desire to have Youth Council liaisons and Stakeholders Council
31 liaisons. Two liaisons for the Stakeholders Council have been selected from the Youth Council: Dani
32 Porier and Izzy Chick. Ms. Kilpack has reached out to some Council Members about potentially
33 acting as a Youth Council liaison. Anyone else interested in attending Youth Council Meetings or
34 interacting with the Youth Council can communicate that with her. There is a desire to have more
35 collaboration between the Youth Council and the Stakeholders Council Members.
36

37 Mr. Shea asked about the geographic breakout of the Youth Council Members. Ms. Kilpack
38 explained that she originally reached out to schools, local clubs, and different organizations. There
39 are students from different schools, such as the University of Utah, but no geographic analysis has
40 been done. She has spoken to a lot of different high schools and universities in the area. Chair of the
41 Youth Council, Izzy Chick, explained that she is a student at the University of Utah. She is there for
42 environmental and sustainability studies and political science. Ms. Chick is interested in all of the
43 CWC work and looks forward to speaking to the Stakeholders Council more in the future.
44

45 Discussions were had about how to apply to the Youth Council. Ms. Nielsen explained that the
46 application information is on the CWC website. Ms. Johnson noted that she spent approximately 15
47 years lobbying and visiting the Legislature. She suggested taking a group of young people to some
48 of the environment-related meetings. She believed it would be a meaningful experience for them.

1
2 **3. Missing Conflict Disclosure and Open & Public Meeting Training Forms.**

3
4 Ms. Nielsen asked that Conflict Disclosure and Open and Public Meeting Training forms be
5 submitted. It was noted that Ms. Kilpack has copies of the forms for those who still need them.

6
7 **4. Thank You to Millcreek for Continuing to Host our Meetings.**

8
9 Ms. Nielsen thanked Millcreek City for hosting the Stakeholders Council Meeting.

10
11 **Stakeholders Open Comment**

12
13 Ms. Nielsen informed the Stakeholders Council that the next meeting will be a Stakeholders Council
14 Retreat. The retreat is scheduled to take place on May 15, 2024, and has been added to the calendar.

15
16 **Closing**

17
18 **1. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders' Council Meeting.**

19
20 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. There was no
21 second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

22
23 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held on Wednesday, March 20, 2024.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____