



9  
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
11 **COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING ON MONDAY, AUGUST**  
12 **19, 2024, AT 1:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND**  
13 **VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES**  
14 **LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE STREET,**  
15 **SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**  
16

17 **Present:** Del Draper, Chair  
18 Adam Lenkowski  
19 Ed Marshall  
20 Dan Zalles  
21 John Knoblock  
22 Sally Kaiser  
23 Danny Richardson  
24

25 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
26 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
27

28 **Opening**  
29

- 30 1. **Chair Del Draper will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon**  
31 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**  
32

33 Chair Del Draper called the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.  
34

- 35 2. **Review and Approval of the Minutes from the July 15, 2024, Meeting.**  
36

37 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from July 15, 2024. Sally  
38 Kaiser seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
39

40 **Millcreek Canyon FLAP Grant and Shuttle Discussion**  
41

- 42 1. **Committee Members will Discuss the Ongoing FLAP Grant and a Potential Millcreek**  
43 **Canyon Shuttle.**  
44

45 Chair Draper explained that the original intention was to have someone from the U.S. Forest  
46 Service present at the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to share comments about a potential

1 shuttle in the canyon and the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant work. However, he  
2 reported that Zinnia Wilson had pressing other business and was unable to attend. John Knoblock  
3 stated that he spoke to Ms. Wilson earlier that morning. At that time, she communicated that she  
4 would not be able to attend the meeting, as she is currently serving as Acting District Ranger.

5  
6 The Forest Service recognizes that the 2003 Forest Management Plan states that it is expected the  
7 public will use transit more frequently to access the forest. The Forest Service will move forward  
8 with that in mind, but nothing will move quickly and changes will occur at a measured pace. Based  
9 on the discussion with Ms. Wildon, the Forest Service recognizes that transit is part of the 2003  
10 Forest Management Plan and will be receptive to reasonable transit-related proposals.

11  
12 According to Ms. Wilson, the initial proposal for the Millcreek Canyon shuttle was something they  
13 felt was lacking details about parking and funding. That being said, the Forest Service is receptive  
14 to hearing about how those issues can be resolved. Mr. Knoblock informed Ms. Wilson during  
15 the discussion that between the City of Millcreek and the Utah Department of Transportation  
16 (“UDOT”) there were locations for shuttle parking generally determined. Ms. Wilson stated that  
17 if the funding and the maintenance and operation costs are fleshed out further, it will be possible  
18 for the Forest Service to make a judgment about the practicalities of what is ultimately proposed.

19  
20 Ms. Wilson previously stated that the Forest Service has researched some of the shuttle operations  
21 in national forests. She also said it was not clear where the comments made by Dave Whittekiend  
22 to the CWC came from as it relates to Zion National Park. Mr. Knoblock reminded those present  
23 that Mr. Whittekiend previously stated that it appeared Zion may abandon their shuttle efforts. Mr.  
24 Knoblock noted that it would be worthwhile to have specifics about other shuttles written down  
25 and organized so the Forest Service can review that information. Chair Draper thanked Mr.  
26 Knoblock for sharing details about his conversation with Ms. Wilson. It was a favorable report,  
27 especially the fact that the Forest Service is willing to look at more information.

28  
29 At the last Millcreek Canyon Committee, Jon Nepstad of Fehr & Peers explained that there needs  
30 to be a champion to push this project forward. Chair Draper is still wondering who that could be  
31 and if it could possibly be the CWC. Though the members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee  
32 have a lot of passion, it has been difficult to move this work ahead. Mr. Knoblock tends to think  
33 that since it is a County road, Salt Lake County would be the ideal advocate for a shuttle system.

34  
35 Chair Draper noted that there might be some State funding available. He asked whether the CWC  
36 can apply for those funds or if the County is a more likely applicant. Executive Director, Lindsey  
37 Nielsen, explained that the Millcreek Canyon shuttle program was identified under the Mountain  
38 Accord as a program the CWC could find a feasible way to implement. It is important to have the  
39 County on board and champion the project. That being said, she also believes the CWC is an  
40 appropriate organization for this work. It is understood that CWC Staff will dedicate time to a  
41 potential plan for the implementation of a shuttle. Ms. Nielsen reported that a new grant program  
42 has been created out of the Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation. There have been discussions about  
43 applying to the grant program with this project. It is also possible to bring this matter to the State  
44 as an appropriation request in the future. Some potential funding sources have been identified.

1 Mr. Knoblock referenced the Tourism, Recreation, Culture, and Convention (“TRCC”) funds. It  
2 is collected from all of the counties in the State, goes into the State fund, and the State then  
3 redistributes it back. The counties then spend the money on relevant work. In Salt Lake County,  
4 the amount received varies greatly depending on the year, but a significant amount is received.  
5 Approximately half of that budget goes toward funding Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation.  
6 The other half is given out to various entities for projects. It is not unthinkable that a certain  
7 amount of the TRCC funding received could be used to operate a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon.  
8

9 Dan Zalles asked if there has been any discussion about whether the shuttle will pay for itself  
10 through fees or if it will be free to use. Mr. Knoblock explained that those are the kinds of details  
11 that need to be worked out. He believes it is important to incentivize the use of the shuttle as much  
12 as possible. Ed Marshall noted that he joined the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting a few  
13 minutes late and wondered whether parking at the base of the canyon has been discussed. Chair  
14 Draper denied this but believes there is a solution. It will either be on the west or east side of I-  
15 215. The west side seems ideal, which is adjacent to Skyline High School. There has been a  
16 favorable reaction to that parking location by the Mayor of Millcreek as well as the Skyline High  
17 School administrators. He noted that there are still some steps to take to ensure it is appropriately  
18 paved, striped, and ready to use, but he believes that location is ideal for canyon shuttle parking.  
19

20 Mr. Knoblock explained that there needs to be clarity about what it will take to complete the  
21 parking. On the west side, there needs to be a drain pipe installed and then that needs to be covered  
22 with gravel and road base. It would next need to be paved and there would need to be signage and  
23 striping completed in the parking area. Determining the dollar amount for that work is essential.  
24 Chair Draper reported that Skyline High School is undergoing remodeling and is relying on that  
25 parking area at this time. Once the additional parking lot is built to the west, it should take a lot  
26 of pressure off of the site. The canyon shuttle is likely to be available on weekends and holidays  
27

28 Mr. Knoblock discussed the list of issues related to a Millcreek Canyon shuttle that was created.  
29 It was added to the Google Drive for the Stakeholders Council. In that Google Drive, there is a  
30 Millcreek Canyon Committee folder that can be accessed. The document is located there.  
31

32 Chair Draper reminded Committee Members that at the last Millcreek Canyon Committee  
33 Meeting, there was a question about whether more study is needed. The consensus was that it  
34 likely is not. It is possible to move forward with plans for a shuttle without additional study. There  
35 was also a suggestion made to reach out to the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”). As for next steps,  
36 it might be worthwhile for a few members of the Committee to sit down with Mayor Jenny Wilson  
37 to see if there is someone within the organization who might want to focus on this project. Ms.  
38 Nielsen stressed the importance of having County support but noted that it might not be ideal at  
39 this phase. The Millcreek Canyon Committee and CWC Staff will likely be the ones to figure out  
40 the details and then provide a proposal to the County, Forest Service, and other relevant parties.  
41

42 Chair Draper believed the recommendation is to create a document that outlines how the shuttle  
43 could work and the costs. After that document has been created, it will then be possible to focus  
44 on obtaining support from others. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. In theory, there is support for a  
45 shuttle, but once the details are known, it will be possible for others to offer feedback and support.  
46 Mr. Knoblock thought it would be better to involve the County at an earlier phase. Someone like

1 Catherine Kanter might be appropriate to reach out to. It would be beneficial if she was  
2 knowledgeable and supportive about the work being done before anything moves ahead.

3  
4 Chair Draper asked how the Committee could best start looking into the details. For example, the  
5 type of shuttle buses that will be used, the shuttle bus costs, and the cost of operations. Ms. Nielsen  
6 shared information about the proposal that was created for the Forest Service last year. During the  
7 initial feasibility research, she looked at how many vehicles per day are in the canyon based on the  
8 number of parking spaces. That was used as a rough estimate. Mr. Knoblock discussed the Salt  
9 Lake County organizational chart and pointed out some of the key contacts. Chair Draper wanted  
10 to better understand how to take the initial feasibility work and move that forward into something  
11 more detailed. He asked if there is expertise on the Transportation Systems Committee that could  
12 be of use. Danny Richardson offered to reach out to Committee Members and report back.

13  
14 Ms. Nielsen reported that during the feasibility work, she spoke with shuttle companies and the  
15 estimate was that 10 shuttle vans would be needed for Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Marshall referenced  
16 Canyon Transportation and noted that they have quite a few shuttles. It would be possible to reach  
17 out to them as well. Ms. Nielsen reminded Committee Members that the main issues related to  
18 the shuttle have to do with parking and funding. The programming can be addressed at a later  
19 date. It is possible to reach out to UDOT to discuss the potential parking locations. Mr. Knoblock  
20 pointed out that there needs to be a decision made about whether a third party will own and house  
21 the shuttles. That item is on the list of shuttle-related issues previously drafted by the Committee.

22  
23 Chair Draper suggested that a few Committee Members sit down with someone at the County and  
24 see if it is possible to find a champion there. He feels the Millcreek Canyon Committee is well  
25 equipped to move forward on the parking issues, but to have someone look into the actual operation  
26 of a shuttle would be worthwhile. The parking can be pushed forward independently. When the  
27 construction of the FLAP grant is finished, there could be a shuttle launched in the canyon. That  
28 is a timeline the Committee can continue to aim for and work toward. With the population growth  
29 and increased use of the canyon, it is important to think about different transportation options.

30  
31 Mr. Knoblock wondered whether the Millcreek Canyon Committee has ever written out a problem  
32 statement to clearly define the problems in the canyon. At the last meeting, he recalled that Mr.  
33 Marshall stated that traffic is not the issue in Millcreek Canyon, but peak period parking is the  
34 issue. Chair Draper asked if there is clarity about how severe the parking situation is. He knows  
35 there is a desire to move some of the parking off the road and into parking lots. The FLAP grant  
36 work will move towards that through the parking lot construction. However, he does not have a  
37 real sense of how severe the situation actually is. He wants to better understand the demand  
38 compared to the capacity. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that if there is a desire for the County or State  
39 to assist with funding, a clear definition of the problem and some data will likely be necessary.

40  
41 Mr. Zalles shared information about his experience in the canyon. He agrees with the statement  
42 that this is a peak period issue. During the week, it is not a problem to find parking, but it is on  
43 the weekends in certain areas. It can be difficult to find picnic locations at lunch and dinner hours.  
44 It seems that there could be a solution selected that is responsive to the peak hours in Millcreek  
45 Canyon. One suggestion is to have rideshare drivers at the bottom of the canyon shuttle visitors  
46 during peak hours. That might be simpler than a full-blown shuttle service. Chair Draper pointed

1 out that there would need to be some administrative changes so those rideshare drivers were not  
2 paying the fee to come in and out of the canyon. He added that the picnicking crowd is not a  
3 candidate for the shuttle, because those visitors will have coolers, tents, and food with them.  
4

5 Chair Draper wanted to discuss some of the next steps. It is important to flesh out the shuttle  
6 proposal. It should address questions about whether this is the best way to handle the existing  
7 problems, outline what problems currently exist, and share what data currently exists. He does not  
8 feel the data about the number of users in the canyon is particularly strong. He pointed out that  
9 the toll booth is closed at least 60% of the time that he comes in and out of the canyon. As a result,  
10 he is not sure the use is being fully captured. Mr. Marshall stated that the booth opens at 9:30 a.m.  
11

12 Mr. Knoblock noted that in previous meetings, there were discussions about the fee booth station.  
13 He referenced exit lanes and modernization of the booth. The County has discussed moving the  
14 fee booth, but there has not been an update shared about that more recently. It might be worth  
15 recognizing that the fee booth operating hours are inadequate. If it was an automated system, then  
16 it would be possible to collect more of the fees. Discussions were had about automated systems.  
17

18 Chair Draper believed the Committee needs to create a document that captures what must happen  
19 in order for a shuttle to exist. The current brainstorming document can be further revised. It seems  
20 that a shuttle is a long-term project that will involve concrete numbers, grant applications, and so  
21 on. The shuttle is a goal that is worth continuing to work towards. Adam Lenkowski asked  
22 whether the Visitor Use Study data covers Millcreek Canyon. This was confirmed. There is data  
23 there that can be used by the Millcreek Canyon Committee as these conversations move ahead.  
24

25 Mr. Knoblock shared additional information about the FLAP grant work. He reported that there  
26 will be a better parking arrangement and roundabout. When it comes to the shuttle, he believes  
27 the Forest Service and County will want to wait until after the FLAP grant work is completed to  
28 see what changes occur. From there, it will be possible to reevaluate the needs. It is conceivable  
29 that parking issues will be addressed with the parking lot changes. While he does not suspect that  
30 will occur, it is likely that the County and Forest Service will want to see what happens as a result  
31 of the FLAP grant work. Mr. Lenkowski pointed out that no capacity is being added to the canyon.  
32

33 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, noted that a lot of different problems are being discussed but  
34 all relate to one larger issue. It might be a useful exercise to clearly lay out the nature of the  
35 problem the Committee is trying to solve. She reminded Committee Members that there is some  
36 data in the Environmental Dashboard that might help to frame the discussion. The Millcreek  
37 Canyon Committee could clearly describe what problem there is an intention to solve, what data  
38 there is to support the problem, and what solutions would work best. Bringing that kind of  
39 information to the County would likely be helpful. Committee Members supported that approach.  
40

41 Chair Draper does not view the shuttle as a summer-only shuttle. It would be easy to capture some  
42 of the winter market as well because it can be crowded at the winter gate at that time of year. The  
43 shuttle raises the question of dog owners and how animals would be accommodated on a shuttle.  
44 That is another issue to address. Ms. Nielsen reported that some of these issues were contemplated  
45 in the original proposal. She suggested that it be distributed to Committee Members for review.  
46

1 **Other Updates**

2  
3 1. **Committee Members May Hear Updates on Other Matters Impacting Millcreek**  
4 **Canyon.**

5  
6 Mr. Knoblock reported that Ms. Wilson shared other information related to Millcreek Canyon as  
7 well. He shared some of that information with the Committee. The work is mostly done with  
8 fuels management. A lot of trees were cut and stacked. For the most part, all of the trail closure  
9 issues in that area are resolved, but all of those piles need to be burned in the fall after the first  
10 snow. As a result, there will be some intermittent closures when it is time to actually burn the  
11 piles. The Forest Service is happy with the way that the clearing work went. He explained that  
12 the lower branches in the trees have been trimmed to prevent fire from climbing up into the crowns.  
13

14 Mr. Marshall confirmed that the Forest Service has done a good job of thinning, but noted that  
15 some debris was left on the roadside. He hoped that cleanup would be done to address what  
16 remains. Mr. Knoblock believes the roadside work was a different project than the thinning project  
17 at the top of the canyon. Mr. Marshall reported that a lot of thinning has been done at the bottom  
18 of the canyon. On the south side of the road, many stacks have been set out to be burned.  
19

20 Mr. Knoblock asked Ms. Wilson whether there are plans for the road closures. He also asked what  
21 work will take place at what time for the FLAP grant. He wanted to know if the work would be  
22 done above Elbow Fork the first year so the road could remain open until that point. She denied  
23 this. Ms. Wilson informed him that once the FLAP grant work starts, the entire road from the  
24 winter gate will be closed to vehicle traffic for the full two years. He believes the trails will still  
25 be open and can be used in the winter, but since there will be a lot of materials being moved and  
26 trucks coming through, the road will be closed off for the full two years of the FLAP grant work.  
27

28 Mr. Zalles asked about the spot at Elbow Fork where visitors need to cross the road to get from  
29 the Pipeline Trail over to the trail. In order to move from the Lower Pipeline to the Upper Pipeline  
30 area, visitors need to cross the road. Mr. Knoblock reported that the hope is that in the fall, the  
31 Pipeline Trail will be extended out and around the outside perimeter of the elbow of the road at  
32 the bend. The trail will cross onto the new bridge over Millcreek, perpendicular to the road. This  
33 will ensure there is a straight crossing. The intention is to have that opened for trail use for the  
34 full two years of the FLAP grant work. Work is being done with a contractor who will handle the  
35 natural surface trail and bridge. Some bridge design details are currently being finalized. The idea  
36 is to have the bridge ordered and in place before the snow starts to fall. There is a possibility that  
37 it might not arrive in time, depending on the availability. If it cannot be done this fall, that work  
38 will happen in the first part of the spring as part of the FLAP grant work that is already planned.  
39

40 Chair Draper asked what the funding source is for the bridge. Mr. Knoblock reported that \$15,000  
41 for the natural surface trail is coming from the CWC Short-Term Projects Grant Program. The  
42 bridge itself will come from the Forest Service. He believes the bridge will be over \$100,000.  
43

44 Discussions were had about the work happening at the mouth of the canyon. Chair Draper believed  
45 the work was being paid for by Rocky Mountain Power and the intention is to bury powerlines  
46 underground to reduce their liability as it relates to forest fires. Mr. Marshall believed conduit is

1 being put in to underground the power, but expressed frustration that this work has gone on for  
2 such a long period of time. Chair Draper agreed that the work has been going on for some time.

3  
4 Mr. Knoblock reported that Trails Utah recently did a project on the Big Water Trail. A contractor  
5 re-graded the Big Water Trail from the Lower Big Water parking lot to Dog Lake. The obstacles  
6 that made the trail too narrow were removed, such as large rocks and stumps. It is now possible  
7 for adaptive handcycle visitors to use that trail. It is the first significant trail in the Central Wasatch  
8 that is now an adaptive trail. Construction is complete and the trail is open for use. Trails Utah  
9 received funds from two sources including private donations and the Utah Division of Outdoor  
10 Recreation. It was a \$30,000 project. Chair Draper thanked Mr. Knoblock for sharing updates.

11  
12 **Closing**

13  
14 **1. Chair Draper will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Millcreek Committee Meeting.**

15  
16 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to ADJOURN. Sally Kaiser seconded the motion. The motion  
17 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

18  
19 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:32 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, August 19, 2024.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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