



9  
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
11 **COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING ON THURSDAY,**  
12 **OCTOBER 9, 2025, AT 10:00 A.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-**  
13 **PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC**  
14 **OFFICES LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE**  
15 **STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**  
16

17 **Present:** Ed Marshall, Interim Chair  
18 Sally Kaiser  
19 John Knoblock  
20 Dan Zalles  
21 Del Draper  
22

23 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
24 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
25 Ben Kilbourne, Communications Director  
26

27 **Opening**  
28

29 **1. Interim Chair Ed Marshall will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek**  
30 **Canyon Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**  
31

32 Interim Chair Ed Marshall called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders  
33 Council Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to order at approximately 10:00 AM.  
34

35 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the September 15, 2025, Meeting.**  
36

37 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the September 15, 2025,  
38 Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Sally Kaiser seconded the motion. The motion passed  
39 with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
40

41 Interim Chair Marshall reviewed the current meeting agenda and reported that in addition to the  
42 Fehr & Peers study, there are several other items on the agenda related to previous Committee  
43 discussions. Adam Lenkowski was unable to attend the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting,  
44 which means the Trailhead Security Discussion item would be continued to a future meeting.  
45

## **Fehr & Peers Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study**

### **1. The Committee will Discuss the Draft Report of the Fehr & Peers Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study Update.**

The Millcreek Canyon Committee discussed the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study Update that was conducted. Del Draper was pleased with the document from Fehr & Peers and believed it addresses the core issues. It is a strong document overall and he expressed appreciation to Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, for her efforts related to the scope. Mr. Draper noted that the report looks at various parking options and states that Virginia Way is the best location.

John Knoblock was appreciative of the report, but believed it could be a stronger document. He pointed out that winter parking can be busy on the weekends, so he would like to see a recommendation that there be a year-round weekend program. In addition, he would like to see adjustments made to the document to remove references to operating the shuttle during the Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP") grant construction, because that is not possible at this point. As for the FLAP grant information provided, the cause and effect are not accurate. The reason the FLAP grant occurred was because of the Millcreek Canyon Committee's push to implement the Millcreek Canyon shuttle mentioned in the Mountain Accord. The U.S. Forest Service stated that the road was inadequate and it was not possible to run a shuttle on an inadequate road. That eventually resulted in the FLAP grant. He feels the report should be updated for clarity.

With respect to the fee structure, several calculations were included. Mr. Knoblock referenced the Fee Revenue Outcomes section of the document. He would leave some of the language broad. It could state that if a certain amount was lost in fees, it would need to be made up in some other way. It would not necessarily need to be made up from the shuttle fees.

Mr. Knoblock felt strongly that all of the transportation in the canyons should be free in order to incentivize use. He pointed out that the County budget is substantial and a small amount could be contributed to assist with the shuttle operations. Mr. Draper agreed with the comments shared about the fees. He believed it could have been modeled more thoroughly. He believes the study document needs to take into account fee modeling that would incentivize shuttle use. To incentivize the shuttle, the fee needs to be free or at least be much lower than the fee for personal vehicles. Mr. Draper asked if the season pass fee is correctly aligned with the day-use fee. He thought it was important to look at what an appropriate fee for vehicles would be. While he appreciates the modeling that has been done, he thinks that more on fees would be helpful.

Interim Chair Marshall asked the Millcreek Canyon Committee to review Page 25 of the document. There are two tables related to fares, but several Committee Members found them to be confusing. Interim Chair Marshall asked CWC Staff to explain the assumptions included in the models. For example, Model 3A talks about weekend visitors and lists 251,552. If 25 weekends were used, as previously discussed, that would be 10,000 visitors per weekend, which is twice as many as shown earlier in the report. There are a number of confusing elements and he asked for clarification. Ms. Nielsen suggested that these concerns be included in a public comment that is submitted during the public comment period. She did not know the exact formula that was used to create

1 this scenario. Interim Chair Marshall pointed out that it would be ideal for the document to explain  
2 how the various models were arrived at, so that the information presented is understandable.

3  
4 There was additional discussion about the tables in the document. Interim Chair Marshall  
5 mentioned Models 1, 2, 3, and 3A. He asked how they are intended to differ from one another.  
6 Dan Zalles believed they are dependent on the different cost projections. For example, Model 3A  
7 is the most expensive for consumers. Before the scenarios are introduced, there is an explanation  
8 provided for them. Mr. Knoblock stated that it took him some time to figure out the numbers and  
9 understand what was shown in the models. As a result, he agreed that the information could be  
10 presented more clearly to readers. In addition, he questions some of the realism of the assumptions,  
11 especially the \$7 assumption in Model 3A. Mr. Draper asked what the fee would be for vehicles  
12 if the shuttle cost was \$7. Committee Members did not see that information included in the  
13 document. Mr. Draper pointed out that if the shuttle costs \$7 and the fee booth is left at the current  
14 cost for personal vehicles, no one will take the shuttle in the canyon.

15  
16 Ms. Nielsen summarized some of the comments shared by the Millcreek Canyon Committee so  
17 far. She believes Committee Members want a clearer explanation of the formula that the  
18 consultants used for each scenario. This was confirmed. Ms. Nielsen suggested that this be  
19 included in the public comments that Committee Members submit. Mr. Knoblock reiterated that  
20 it is important to use fares to incentivize shuttle use in Millcreek Canyon. Ms. Nielsen noted that  
21 Mr. Draper expressed a desire for clear incentives to be mapped out in the document to highlight  
22 how the shuttle will be incentivized. She suggested that this request be included in the public  
23 comments submitted because it is important feedback to provide to Fehr & Peers.

24  
25 The Committee discussed the restrictions that exist in National Parks where the entire road is  
26 owned and the road is used only for those visiting the park. It was noted that inside the park there  
27 are concessionaires. Interim Chair Marshall clarified that this is not the case in Millcreek Canyon,  
28 as it is a County road that is available to cabin owners and businesses. The U.S. Forest Service  
29 does not have the right to close a public County road to people, so the shuttle needs to be voluntary.  
30 Ms. Nielsen offered to look into the matter further to confirm, but based on the feedback she has  
31 received, she believes it is a Forest Service road and the County operates a use permit on it.

32  
33 Communications Director, Ben Kilbourne, asked to discuss the scenarios further. Many of the  
34 comments shared by the Committee are similar to the comments submitted during the first  
35 comment period. He summarized some of the comments received during the first comment period.  
36 Respondents stated that there was a willingness to pay more, but there was also a desire for there  
37 to be some sort of incentivization. In addition, there was support for combination passes. It would  
38 be helpful if that modeling were included in the scenarios. For instance, what it would look like  
39 if someone purchased a pass that allowed them to take the shuttle sometimes and use a personal  
40 vehicle sometimes. Mr. Kilbourne noted that vehicles pay per vehicle at the fee booth. The amount  
41 is not based on the number of people inside. It might be possible to pay per group on the shuttle  
42 instead of individually. This is something else that could be considered in the modeling.

43  
44 Mr. Knoblock reiterated that if there is a desire to incentivize transit use in the canyon, it will likely  
45 need to be a free service. Interim Chair Marshall did not agree with that and believed that as long

1 as money is saved, there would be a willingness to take the shuttle. The shuttle will also ensure  
2 that visitors do not have to worry about trying to find a parking space at the busier locations.

3  
4 Mr. Zalles thought the report was lacking in use cases. If that is not something that can be included  
5 in the report moving forward, it is something the Millcreek Canyon Committee can look into.  
6 Mr. Knoblock shared additional comments about the report. On Page 20, where the different  
7 parking options are listed, he did not understand why the Maintenance Yard, Olympus Cove  
8 Shopping Center, and Empty Yard were included on the list, as they are not realistic. Mr. Draper  
9 believed they were included in the 2012 version of the study, which is the reason for their inclusion  
10 in the updated document. Interim Chair Marshall noted that the inclusion of these locations is  
11 confusing because certain locations are not viable options. Mr. Draper added that the study does  
12 not look at parking on the east side of I-215. There is a lot of space there and that could be  
13 analyzed.

14  
15 Interim Chair Marshall asked to review Page 14 of the document. He tried to emphasize previously  
16 that the issue in Millcreek Canyon is not the traffic, but the amount of parking available. This  
17 section of the report has information about the average daily vehicle volumes in the summer versus  
18 the winter. It shows 1,333 vehicles per day in the summer and 850 in the winter. The bottom chart  
19 looks at summer and winter use as it relates to daily visitors per hour. The summer use flattens  
20 out at 7% while the winter flattens out at 9%. In the winter, the afternoon hours are the peak when  
21 it is a little bit warmer, and in the summer, the use is scattered throughout the day. Based on the  
22 information presented, the traffic is dispersed throughout both in the winter and summer. 1,333  
23 vehicles multiplied by 7% comes out to an average of 93 vehicles per hour. This indicates that no  
24 traffic problem needs to be solved in Millcreek Canyon. The same is true in the wintertime, as the  
25 850 vehicles multiplied by 9% is 76 vehicles per hour.

26  
27 Instead of the focus being on the number of vehicles coming through the fee booth, the focus  
28 should be on the parking. For example, when people park in the bicycle lane at Rattlesnake Gulch  
29 or park along the road in the winter months. The parking is the real problem and that is what the  
30 shuttle needs to resolve. A shuttle can address the parking issue, but it is an expensive way to do  
31 so when the Forest Service could charge for parking at anticipated peak times and require a  
32 reservation. Interim Chair Marshall explained that one of his concerns about the study is that it  
33 does not seem to understand the actual problem. The report focuses on traffic rather than parking.  
34 Mr. Knoblock believed this could be clarified in the Executive Summary. He noted that the  
35 Executive Summary mentions traffic congestion but the real issue has to do with parking capacity.

36  
37 Interim Chair Marshall pointed out that it is critical that the consultants understand the real problem  
38 in Millcreek Canyon. He tried to communicate that during the previous comments submitted. It  
39 was suggested that the points made during the current Millcreek Canyon Committee discussion be  
40 emphasized in the public comments that are submitted as part of the latest public comment period.  
41 Mr. Zalles agreed that there needs to be a reframe so that the focus is on the parking issue. From  
42 there, it would be possible to look at different options, such as parking reservations or a parking  
43 fee.

44  
45 Ms. Nielsen reminded those present that the study update was related to the shuttle portion of the  
46 2012 Millcreek Canyon Transportation Study. It did not look at what could be done in Millcreek

1 Canyon, but was focused on updating the information related to the feasibility of a shuttle.  
2 Reservation systems and parking fees are excellent ideas, but that was not what the update was  
3 about. She suggested that all comments submitted to the consultants be related to the feasibility.  
4

5 Interim Chair Marshall clarified that he is not in opposition to the shuttle and is in favor of the  
6 Millcreek Canyon shuttle, as it would be convenient and improve the user experience. However,  
7 it is important to recognize that parking is the issue in the canyon rather than traffic. Mr. Knoblock  
8 asked if someone had looked at other shuttles around the country for comparison, which was  
9 denied. Ms. Nielsen noted that this could be a task the Millcreek Canyon Committee takes on in  
10 the future.  
11

12 Mr. Draper commented that the report mentioned other shuttle systems that were looked at, as far  
13 as how dogs are handled. Early on in the Millcreek Canyon Committee work, there were numerous  
14 discussions about addressing dog rules in the canyon. A Committee letter was presented to the  
15 Stakeholders Council and CWC Board for approval. After that time, it was shared with the U.S.  
16 Forest Service. The feedback from the Forest Service was brief and there was no interest in making  
17 changes. During the process, the Committee learned that it is much easier to submit comments  
18 individually rather than have comments be approved by both the Stakeholders Council and the  
19 CWC Board. There was discussion about the process that took place back in 2020.  
20

21 Interim Chair Marshall commented that the report does not accurately highlight the presence of  
22 dogs in the canyon. This study needs to acknowledge the importance of dog walking in Millcreek  
23 Canyon since it will impact the way a future shuttle is designed. For dog walkers to use the shuttle,  
24 whatever is implemented will need to be compatible and accessible for dogs. If dogs are not taken  
25 into account, there will not be a properly designed shuttle running in the canyon.  
26

27 Mr. Draper noted that the document mentions the need for the National Environmental Policy Act  
28 (“NEPA”). It states that “Due to the potential impacts at trailheads and trails due to a potential  
29 increase in visitation, a NEPA Environmental Assessment would need to be completed. An  
30 Environmental Assessment for a project of this scale would likely cost between \$150,000 and  
31 \$200,000.” Later on in the document, it states that there would likely be a Categorical Exclusion.  
32 Mr. Draper thought it made sense to consider the number of visitors a shuttle would carry and the  
33 number of stops the shuttle would make. Assumptions could likely be made about how many  
34 people the shuttle would drop off. That can be compared with vehicle use. For example, if the  
35 average vehicle has two people in it, then four vehicles would result in the same number of visitors  
36 as a shuttle. He did not believe a shuttle would necessarily need to have a NEPA analysis.  
37

38 Sally Kaiser explained that she is an Environmental Engineer. She asked for an Environmental  
39 Impact Statement (“EIS”) on the FLAP grant and was only able to get an Environmental  
40 Assessment. She cannot imagine a NEPA analysis being triggered by the number of shuttle users  
41 in the canyon. Other members of the Committee were uncertain as to why a NEPA analysis would  
42 be needed. Ms. Kaiser reported that NEPA is expensive and time-consuming, which is the reason  
43 it takes a lot to trigger that kind of analysis. Mr. Draper explained that Bekee Hotze with the Forest  
44 Service previously stated that there could not be a Millcreek Canyon shuttle because it would  
45 trigger a NEPA analysis. Then the FLAP grant process moved forward, which was a \$19 million  
46 construction project involving large trucks, disturbance, and road widening, and she expressed a

1 belief that there could be a Categorical Exclusion. There was eventually an Environmental  
2 Assessment. Mr. Draper agreed with Ms. Kaiser that the impact of the shuttle would be minor.

3  
4 Mr. Knoblock explained that in the past, Ms. Hotze often denied whatever proposal was shared.  
5 Her rationale was that the shuttle would be a change in the operation of the Federal lands  
6 significant enough to need a review. Her concern was that the road was unsafe and not up to  
7 standard. Even if the new District Ranger agreed, it is likely there would be a Categorical  
8 Exclusion. Mr. Knoblock shared a comment about the winter operation information. When  
9 looking at the data about the number of people using the canyon in the winter, there was zero data  
10 shown in March. That is clearly incorrect. In addition, February was relatively low compared to  
11 January, which is also inaccurate. He assumed that the counters were not working. It is not  
12 appropriate to draw conclusions from erroneous data. This is something that can be included in a  
13 comment.

14  
15 Interim Chair Marshall stated that there has been a meaningful discussion. He thanked CWC Staff  
16 for sharing the draft report so it could be reviewed by the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Though  
17 there have been some critical comments shared, he believes the comments will improve the final  
18 product. Interim Chair Marshall reminded Committee Members to submit a public comment.

## 19 20 **Land Conservation Discussion**

### 21 22 **1. The Committee will Discuss Private Land Parcels Available for Potential** 23 **Conservation Easements.**

24  
25 Mr. Knoblock reported that he went to the County Recorder's Office and looked at the records on  
26 the Boy Scouts parcels. He could not find any reference to an easement or some sort of protection  
27 that would prevent selling the land for future development in the canyon. The records went all the  
28 way back to 1920 when the properties were acquired. Mr. Draper asked who owned the parcels  
29 before the Boy Scouts. Mr. Knoblock clarified that there were a few different owners beforehand.  
30 Mr. Draper asked if it would be possible for Mr. Knoblock to type out his research notes. It was  
31 confirmed that this can be done and then shared with Committee Members.

## 32 33 **Trailhead Security Discussion**

### 34 35 **1. The Committee will Discuss Trailhead Security in the Tri-Canyons.**

36  
37 It was determined that trailhead security will be discussed at a future meeting.

## 38 39 **Millcreek Canyon Discussions in Other Communities**

### 40 41 **1. The Committee will Report on Discussions in Other System Committees Related to** 42 **Millcreek Canyon.**

43  
44 Mr. Zalles discussed the Environment System Committee work that is related to Millcreek Canyon.  
45 He reported that the Committee is looking at the Central Wasatch Dashboard to see if  
46 improvements could be made to show change over time more clearly. That will be discussed more

1 at the next Environment System Committee Meeting. If members of the Millcreek Canyon  
2 Committee are interested in that discussion, it is possible for them to attend. Mr. Zalles explained  
3 that he has focused on water quality data that does not currently show a change over time.  
4

5 Mr. Knoblock shared information about the Economy System Committee. He reported that the  
6 Committee is looking at what funding is needed to address canyon needs, as well as the revenues  
7 from the canyons overall. Something that could be considered as a funding need is the shuttle.  
8

#### 9 **Other Items**

##### 10 11 **1. The Committee May Discuss Other Items as Desired.**

12  
13 There were no additional discussions.  
14

#### 15 **Closing**

##### 16 17 **1. Interim Chair Marshall will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Millcreek Canyon** 18 **Committee Meeting.**

19  
20 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN. Dan Zalles seconded the motion. The motion  
21 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
22

23 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:02 AM.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*  
2 *Stakeholders Council Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting held on Thursday, October 9, 2025.*  
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8  
9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_