



9
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
11 **COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING ON MONDAY, JULY 21,**
12 **2025, 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:** Sally Kaiser, Co-Chair
18 Maura Hahnenberger
19 Dan Zalles
20 Adam Lenkowski
21 Ed Marshall
22 Doug Tolman
23 Del Draper
24 John Knoblock
25

26 **Staff:** Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations
27

28 **Opening**
29

30 **1. Co-Chair Sally Kaiser will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon**
31 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

32 Co-Chair Sally Kaiser called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
33 Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to order at approximately 1:32 p.m. Ed Marshall informed
34 those present that he will likely need to leave the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting early.
35

36 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the April 21, 2025, Meeting.**
37

38 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the April 21, 2025,
39 Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Doug Tolman seconded the motion. The motion passed
40 with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
41

1 **Committee Updates**

2

3 **1. The CWC Board has Voted to Fund the Update to the 2012 Fehr & Peers Millcreek**

4 **Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study. The Update is Underway.**

5

6 Co-Chair Kaiser reported that the CWC Board has voted to fund an update to the Millcreek Canyon
7 Shuttle Feasibility Study that was conducted in 2012 by Fehr & Peers. Director of Operations,
8 Sam Kilpack, reported that the work started recently and is expected to be completed in the fall.
9 There is currently a public comment period open. Those interested in submitting a comment can
10 do so on the CWC website. She explained that comments can answer the following questions:

11

- 12 • What would encourage or discourage you from using a shuttle?
- 13 • What factors would influence your use of a shuttle?
- 14 • Would you be willing to pay more or less than the current toll booth fee or annual pass?

15

16 Co-Chair Kaiser heard there have already been approximately 100 comments submitted so far.
17 John Knoblock mentioned the document related to the study update and the scope of work. He
18 asked if that is what was included in the contract with Fehr & Peers and if it is possible to review
19 that contract. His concern is that some of the items appear to be general and nature and not as
20 specific as needed. Ms. Kilpack reported that someone had asked about the scope and she sent out
21 that information, but it is possible for her to send it to the Millcreek Canyon Committee as well.
22 Parking will be investigated and there will be several on-site visits conducted as part of that
23 process. There will also be work with Skyline High School to see if it is feasible to have parking
24 there. She offered to find out whether construction cost estimates will be included in the update.

25

26 Mr. Knoblock asked if the scope will be enough to identify the needs of the U.S. Forest Service
27 for the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). Ms. Kilpack reported that there was a
28 meeting with Jon Nepstad, Adam Shaw, and a few others. During that meeting, the Forest Service
29 was able to express the concerns that there is a desire to see addressed in the study update process.

30

31 Mr. Knoblock reviewed some of the bullet points in the document and noted that it does not seem
32 clear how dogs, bicycles, and ski equipment will be accommodated on a shuttle. The language
33 mentions gathering ideas, but he feels there should be some specificity. Ms. Kilpack reported that
34 there will be three scenarios presented, which will cover the fee structure, dogs, bicycles,
35 seasonality, and frequency of service. Based on her conversations with Mr. Nepstad, there is a
36 commitment to determine how all of that will work. The public comments will inform that as well.

37

38 Mr. Knoblock wanted to know if there will be a review of the draft document or if there will be an
39 opportunity for the Millcreek Canyon Committee to interface with Fehr & Peers. Ms. Kilpack
40 offered to reach out to Mr. Nepstad about attending a future Millcreek Canyon Committee
41 Meeting. Del Draper thought it would be useful to see the difference between the contract and the
42 scope of work proposal dated April 17, 2025. The contract might have more specificity.
43 Ms. Kilpack confirmed that she can send a copy of the contract to the Millcreek Canyon
44 Committee.

1 The sequence of events was reviewed with Committee Members. Ms. Kilpack reported that the
2 proposal was received in April and the plan was to bring that to the CWC Board in May. However,
3 the details of the contract were still being finalized, so it was introduced to the CWC Board in
4 June. The meeting with Mr. Nepstad, Mr. Shaw, Helen Peters, Rita Lund, and herself happened
5 last week. Mr. Marshall agreed with the comments made by Mr. Knoblock. He would like to
6 better understand what is envisioned before the study updates are finalized. It would be useful for
7 members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee to be able to comment on the study beforehand.
8 Ms. Kilpack reported that there will be a draft and final report. She will make sure they see the
9 draft.

10
11 Dan Zalles wanted to know if the study update will include formal recommendations. Ms. Kilpack
12 explained that three different scenarios will be shared based on the research conducted. She
13 reiterated that the scope of work document and contract can be sent out to Committee Members.

14
15 Mr. Knoblock wants to make sure the updated study will be able to answer the questions that the
16 Forest Service and Salt Lake County had about the Millcreek Canyon shuttle moving forward.
17 Ms. Kilpack reported that Fehr & Peers solicited feedback from Salt Lake County, Millcreek, and
18 the Forest Service. The concerns were clearly communicated to Fehr & Peers. Other Committee
19 Member questions can be submitted via email and a member of CWC Staff will respond.
20 Mr. Knoblock noted that there have been previous comments made that the parking-related costs
21 have not been identified. He wants to make sure parking is not mentioned in a general way, but
22 there are cost estimates included in the updated study. Ms. Kilpack offered to review the contract
23 details.

24
25 **2. Maura Hahnenberger will Step Down from Chairing the Committee and will Instead**
26 **Chair the Stakeholders Council.**

27
28 Co-Chair Kaiser reported that Maura Hahnenberger will step down as Chair of the Millcreek
29 Canyon Committee, because she will become the new Chair of the Stakeholders Council.

30
31 **Discussion Regarding the Future of the Millcreek Canyon Committee**

32
33 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Ongoing Work of the Committee:**

34
35 a. **Identification of Private Land Parcels for Conservation.**
36 b. **Millcreek Canyon Shuttle.**
37 c. **Toll Booth.**
38 d. **Advocate for Re-Allocating SLCo's Potential Match for Lower Canyon FLAP.**
39 e. **Other.**

40
41 Co-Chair Kaiser reported that there has been discussion about dissolving the Millcreek Canyon
42 Committee and allowing the shuttle to be covered by one of the other subcommittees. However,
43 there are also arguments to be made for the Millcreek Canyon Committee remaining. She pointed
44 out that Millcreek Canyon is a smaller canyon and can be overlooked when the focus is often on
45 Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. There is still work to be done in
46 Millcreek Canyon outside of the shuttle. Some examples are in the meeting agenda: identification

1 of private land parcels for conservation, the toll booth, and advocating for re-allocation of Salt
2 Lake County's potential match for the lower canyon Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP").
3

4 **2. The Committee will Discuss Whether that Work Could and Should be Allocated to**
5 **Other Committees, and Whether the Millcreek Canyon Committee Should Continue**
6 **to Meet.**

7
8 Mr. Marshall commented that the Millcreek Canyon Committee has been valuable and was the
9 first Stakeholders Council subcommittee formed. It has been active and has worked to address a
10 number of significant issues, such as the FLAP grant and shuttle. It is important for Millcreek
11 Canyon to have its own representation so the issues are not diffused over all of the other
12 subcommittees. The Millcreek Canyon Committee has been meaningful and productive. He is in
13 favor of continuing the Committee. Mr. Zalles agreed with the comments shared. Big Cottonwood
14 Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon tend to receive more attention on the other subcommittees.
15 It is nice that the Millcreek Canyon Committee does not only focus on transportation, but any issue
16 impacting the canyon. He expressed support for the Millcreek Canyon Committee continuing.
17

18 Mr. Draper pointed out that there are other issues to address in Millcreek Canyon, such as the lack
19 of cell phone service. There will be no FLAP grant in the lower portion of the canyon in the
20 foreseeable future, so certain issues need to be resolved. Those issues might fall by the wayside if
21 the Millcreek Canyon Committee is folded into the other Stakeholders Council subcommittees.
22

23 Mr. Knoblock added that there are transportation items in Millcreek Canyon that are different than
24 those in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon, such as the toll booth. If that is
25 taken to the general Transportation System Committee, it is unlikely that it will be adequately
26 discussed. Doug Tolman stated that it seems the Millcreek Canyon Committee is the only
27 subcommittee actively considering which parcels are most at risk of development and could be
28 considered for conservation. There are two or three within Millcreek Canyon that might be worth
29 focusing on. He does not see work like that happening in any of the other Stakeholders Council
30 subcommittees.
31

32 Mr. Marshall asked who suggested the dissolution of the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Co-Chair
33 Kaiser clarified that there were a few people who wondered whether the work could be folded into
34 some of the existing Stakeholders Council subcommittees. Based on the comments received, there
35 is a desire to continue with the Millcreek Canyon Committee so there are focused discussions.
36

37 **Chair and Co-Chair Selection**
38

39 **1. If Applicable, the Committee will Elect a Chair/Co-Chair.**
40

41 Co-Chair Kaiser explained that there is no Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee at this time.
42 She asked if anyone was willing to volunteer to serve in that position. Mr. Draper reported that
43 several members have served in that role previously. He asked whether Mr. Zalles might be
44 interested, but he is currently Co-Chair of the Environment System Committee. Adam Lenkowski
45 asked if someone having served before would disqualify them from serving as Chair again. He
46 noted that there might be members of the Stakeholders Council interested in joining.

1
2 Ms. Kilpack reported that there can be outreach to the broader Stakeholders Council to see if there
3 is anyone else interested in joining the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Once that is determined,
4 there can be additional discussion about who might be best to serve in the Chair position.
5 Mr. Marshall volunteered to Chair the Committee, but is not certain about his long-term future, so
6 it might be an interim role. He feels strongly that the Millcreek Canyon Committee should
7 continue.
8

9 **MOTION:** Del Draper NOMINATED Ed Marshall to serve as Chair of the Millcreek Canyon
10 Committee and Sally Kaiser to serve as Co-Chair. Maura Hahnenberger seconded the motion.
11 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
12

13 Mr. Zalles suggested that there still be outreach conducted to the Stakeholders Council to see if
14 anyone else has interest in joining the Millcreek Canyon Committee. He is not opposed to serving
15 as the Chair in the future, but expressed concerns about the amount of time he has available.
16

Determination of Meeting Schedule

1. If Applicable, the Committee will Discuss Amending its Meeting Schedule to Better Accommodate Member Schedules.

22 It was determined that the current meeting schedule will remain, which is Monday at 1:30 p.m.
23

Other Items

1. The Committee May Discuss Other Items as Desired.

28 Mr. Tolman suggested that the Millcreek Canyon Committee discuss parcels that can be identified
29 for conservation. It seems there is at least one parcel that is in a risky situation as well as one or
30 two others that it would make sense to think about. Mr. Knoblock reported that he contacted the
31 owner of the 18-acre parcel at the bottom of the canyon. Based on that conversation, it is expected
32 that within the next year, it will be brought up for sale and subdivision again. Co-Chair Kaiser
33 asked if the intention is still to subdivide that into 5-acre lots for housing. Mr. Knoblock confirmed
34 that the original proposal envisioned that. There are some questions about how easily utilities
35 could be provided to those parcels, but it does not seem that a thorough analysis was conducted.
36

37 Mr. Knoblock stressed the importance of being proactive about the 18-acre parcel. The same is
38 true for the Boy Scouts parcels. It makes sense to be proactive about potential conservation
39 easements. Mr. Marshall asked if the parcel at the bottom of the canyon is now off the market.
40 Mr. Knoblock clarified that it has been off the market for approximately one year, but the owner
41 stated that it will be put back on the market in the future. Mr. Zalles asked if a conservation
42 easement has been proposed to the current owner. Mr. Knoblock explained that the owner wants
43 the money from development. Mr. Draper noted that the cost of a conservation easement on that
44 property would be roughly equivalent to whatever sales price the owner is envisioning.
45

1 Mr. Knoblock shared information about conditional uses and zoning. He explained that unless
2 there are negative impacts that cannot be mitigated by the conditions, then the use must be
3 approved if it is allowed conditionally under the zone. It is not easy to block those potential uses.
4 It could also be possible for someone to pursue a rezone so there could be additional development
5 permitted. Mr. Zalles asked if this is something that could happen in the future. Mr. Knoblock
6 explained that there are permitted and conditional uses based on the current zoning on the land.
7 He believes the Committee should look at different ways to push for conservation easements.
8

9 Mr. Draper reported that he has reached out to the Boy Scouts several times and there has been a
10 lack of success. The Boy Scouts have stated that they are satisfied running the camp the way it is.
11 He wondered who else could be involved in the outreach. Someone new approaching them might
12 make sense. For example, the new Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee could reach out
13 about the possibility of a conservation easement. Mr. Marshall explained that the camp was
14 granted by a trust and the trust is for a particular purpose. As a result, he is not sure how to legally
15 go about changing the use of the Boy Scout camp. Mr. Draper stated that if this is accurate, then
16 there might be less risk of development than previously believed. He asked if there is certainty
17 about the trust and the limit of the use. Mr. Marshall recalled reading that in a book about Millcreek
18 Canyon, but it is not something that he has researched. This is something that could be done.
19

20 Mr. Zalles asked what a potential conservation easement could look like on the Boy Scouts'
21 property. Mr. Draper explained that during past conversations with the Boy Scouts, he has
22 informed them that a conservation easement can take many forms. The general idea is that some
23 money will be paid now, and in exchange for that money, there will be a Conservation Easement
24 that would preclude the future development of that land. The conservation easement would be
25 subject to all of the existing uses. The actual conservation easement could include a sale of the
26 land, subject to continued use. Alternatively, the Boy Scouts could continue to own the land, but
27 an easement is filed on the land that would prevent any future development. There are different
28 options that could be pursued depending on what the Boy Scouts are interested in.
29

30 Mr. Tolman reported that a lot of easements have an area of disturbance that is permitted.
31 Mr. Zalles asked what an example of a disturbance would be. Mr. Tolman explained that an
32 example would be something like a house, shed, or driveway. Mr. Knoblock referenced the earlier
33 comment made by Mr. Marshall about a trust that prevents residential development on the Boy
34 Scouts' land. Mr. Marshall clarified that he does not have certainty about that information, but it
35 is something that can be explored further. Mr. Knoblock volunteered to take on that action item.
36 He offered to find out to review the files on those properties to see whether that information can
37 be verified.
38

39 Mr. Marshall asked if Mr. Tolman might be willing to contact the Boy Scouts about this matter,
40 which was confirmed. He would like to hear the outcomes of the research conducted by
41 Mr. Knoblock before he does so. It would be meaningful to know what agreements are already in
42 place. Mr. Tolman asked how it is appropriate to identify himself during outreach. Ms. Kilpack
43 explained that Committee Members can identify themselves as member of the Stakeholders
44 Council. Mr. Draper reported that in the past, he has stated that he is a members of the Stakeholders
45 Council of the CWC. He has also asked the Boy Scouts if there is interest in selling a Conservation
46 Easement on the land. If so, the CWC would be a logical party to pursue that.

1
2 Mr. Tolman mentioned the 18-acre parcel at the base of the canyon. Section 3.8 – Land
3 Acquisition Program in the Mountain Accord was mentioned. 3.8.1 states the following:

4

- 5 • The Executive Board will create a coordinated, comprehensive program for the acquisition
6 of private lands with environmental and recreational values within the study area. It is the
7 intent of Mountain Accord to work with willing sellers. Where appropriate, the Executive
8 Board will work with and provide support to coordinate funding for local land trusts to
9 acquire and preserve private lands.

10
11 As far as he knows, that work has been tabled because there is concern about creating a list that
12 could artificially inflate property values. However, in order to stick to the Mountain Accord
13 charter, this seems like an important item for the organization to focus on. It is possible for the
14 Millcreek Canyon Committee to consider making a recommendation to the Stakeholders Council.

15
16 Mr. Knoblock noted that there was a discussion about land conservation at a previous Stakeholders
17 Council Meeting. He supports continued discussion and moving forward with this Mountain
18 Accord item. It was noted that there was discussion about potentially forming a subcommittee for
19 that specific task, but that ultimately did not move forward. Ms. Kilpack stated that there has been
20 discouragement in identifying a list of parcels for conservation based on the reasons mentioned
21 earlier. As a result, she is not certain that forming a subcommittee would be advisable. She has
22 been thinking about the best way to approach this matter, because there is clear interest from the
23 Council.

24
25 Mr. Tolman pointed out that the CWC Board might be worried about having a list of parcels,
26 because the costs could increase as a result of that list. However, if there is one specific parcel
27 that will come back on the market in the near future, it makes sense to look into the options. That
28 specificity could address the concerns expressed by others. Mr. Zalles believes it would be
29 beneficial to have continued discussions about the process and how to move forward. Ms. Kilpack
30 offered to speak to Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, and report back.

31
32 Mr. Knoblock asked to discuss the Millcreek Canyon toll booth. He explained that this was going
33 to be addressed in the second phase of the FLAP grant. Now that the second phase of the FLAP
34 grant is not going to happen, this is an actionable topic. The toll booth needs some improvements.
35 Mr. Draper wondered whether the Fehr & Peers study update would touch on that at all. It talks
36 about revenue replacement with a shuttle and how that would impact the revenue the toll booth
37 collects. However, there are a lot of other toll booth-related issues that need to be discussed.

38
39 Mr. Marshall suggested that there be outreach to Ms. Lund about the toll booth. It has been several
40 months since he last spoke with her, but that would be the person to reach out to. Mr. Knoblock
41 offered to speak to Ms. Lund about the toll booth, but noted that it is Salt Lake County Parks and
42 Recreation that owns and operates the toll booth. Mr. Marshall needed to leave the meeting soon,
43 but shared a comment about the meeting schedule. Holding the Millcreek Canyon Committee
44 Meetings on Monday seems to work well for most Committee Members.

1 Mr. Draper noted that most places collect a fee as you enter and then it is possible to exit without
2 an issue. When that happens, it is possible to hand out brochures and share information with those
3 entering. Discussions were had about vehicle backups in the canyon and the potential causes. Co-
4 Chair Kaiser offered to reach out to Patrick Leary with Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation.

5
6 Mr. Draper reported that a count is taken of the vehicles that go through the toll booth, so there is
7 an awareness of the number of vehicles during the hours the toll booth is open. Several times a
8 year, it would make sense to have someone there at 4:00 a.m. to see how many vehicles pass
9 through before the toll booth opens. This would determine the revenue that is being lost.

10
11 Mr. Zalles thought it would be worth widening the path so two vehicles could safely pass through.
12 During periods of congestion, there could be someone standing there, so vehicles with passes could
13 simply show them and pass around on the right rather than contribute to the congestion. Co-Chair
14 Kaiser noted that a lot of action items have been determined during the Millcreek Canyon
15 Committee Meeting. There is a lot that Committee Members can do before the next scheduled
16 meeting. She recapped the action items that were discussed. Mr. Draper also offered to send his
17 previous correspondence with the Boy Scouts to Mr. Marshall and Mr. Tolman for reference.

18
19 **Public Comment**

20
21 There were no public comments.

22
23 **Closing**

24
25 1. **Co-Chair Kaiser will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Millcreek Canyon Committee**
26 **Meeting.**

27
28 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN. There was no second. The motion passed
29 with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

30
31 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:37 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, July 21, 2025.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes
6 T Forbes Group
7 Minutes Secretary
8
9 Minutes Approved: _____