

BOATING ADVISORY COUNCIL

DIVISION OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Final- Minutes Of The Meeting Held on **December 2nd, 2025, at 4:00PM**
Hybrid

Topic: Boating Advisory Council Introductory Meeting

Date: December 2nd, 2025 - **Time:** 4:00-5:00 PM - **Location:** Virtual/Soldier Hollow

Meeting Point:

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/aop-qcnw-dwb>

Or dial: (US) +1 240-734-0337 PIN: 231 950 419#

More phone numbers: <https://tel.meet/aop-qcnw-dwb?pin=8866395569951>

Meeting Attendees: Jeff Salt (Chair), Jason Taylor (Co-Chair), Adam Eakle, DeWitt Smith, Jenny Knudsen, George Sommer, John Laursen, Tim Herzog

Department Staff: Jason Curry, Patrick Morrison, Ty Hunter, Brian Kurta, Nicole Hanna, Jorge Vazquez

Agenda - Meeting Minutes

1. **Information (4:00PM) - Welcome**
 - a. **Introduction of the Attendees**
 - i. **Members - Respective Positions**
 - ii. **Department Staff**
 - iii. **Members of the Public**

(00:00) - Chair Jeff Salt opened the meeting, welcomed all attendees to the Boating Advisory Council meeting, and explained the roll-call style introductions. Council members

introduced themselves and their representation areas, followed by agency staff and other participants. Staff explained that members of the public could join and view by default and would need to use the virtual “raise hand” feature to be brought in as a contributor to support meeting decorum and prevent disruptions. Ty Hunter joined the meeting during introductions and was acknowledged as the Boating Program Manager/Coordinator.

Council Members:

- **Jenny Knudsen** – Water Sports Representative
- **George Sommer** – Boating Advisory Council Member
- **Jason Taylor** – Outfitters Representative
- **DeWitt Smith** – Sailing Representative
- **John Laursen** – At-Large Representative
- **Adam Eakle** – Motorboat Representative

Division Staff:

- **Brian Kurta** – Assistant Boating Law Administrator, Division of Law Enforcement
- **Criag Walker** - Assistant Chief for Fisheries, Division of Wildlife Resources
- **Jorge Vazquez** – Recreation Grant Analyst, Division of Outdoor Recreation
- **Patrick Morrison** – Recreation Program Director, Division of Recreation
- **Ty Hunter** – Boating Program Manager, Division of Outdoor Recreation
- **Jason Curry** - Director of the Division of Outdoor Recreation
- **Nicole Hanna** – Counsel for the Division of Outdoor Recreation

Members of the Public:

- Kent Singleton

Following introductions, staff explained the process for online public participation, including the hand-raise and contributor-designation system for those wishing to comment.

2. Action (4:10PM) – Approval of meeting minutes – Chair

(05:07) - Chair Salt provided time for the Council to review the previous meeting minutes and asked for a motion to accept the minutes as presented or propose amendments. No amendments were raised.

JOHN LAURSEN MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. DEWITT SMITH SECONDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Information (4:15PM) – Public Comments

During this time members of the public will be given 3 minutes to inform the Council about boating issues or topics not listed on the meeting agenda. No actions can be taken by the Council. Rules of decorum and respect will be adhered to.

During this time, members of the public were given three minutes to comment on boating issues not listed on the meeting agenda. Chair Salt explained how the public comment period works and opened the floor for comments. No actions were taken.

(00:06:50) – Chair Salt opened the public comment period, outlined the three-minute time limit, and clarified that the Council would not take action or engage in discussion during public comment. Chair Salt also clarified that comments must not be items already listed on the agenda. Mr. Kent Singleton provided public comment and requested that written materials be entered into the public record.

(00:07:55) – Kent Singleton, property owner in Taggart/Morgan County, provided remarks regarding his concerns about public access and property rights, including the following points:

- Allegations that Morgan County designated his driveway as a public recreation access point during a May 21, 2019 public meeting without notifying him as the landowner.
- Concerns that multiple agencies have, in his view, deferred responsibility regarding enforcement and access management.
- Reported frequent use of his property by commercial outfitters, floaters, and other users without his permission, insurance coverage, or compensation, and concerns about liability.
- Concerns regarding compliance with the Public Waters Access Act (PWAA), including his position that only incidental touching of private streambeds is allowed.

- A request for response to GRAMA requests related to navigability determinations and production of the state's navigability-for-title list.
- A request that the Council acknowledge the use of his driveway, recognize concerns about PWAA compliance, and call on relevant agencies to respond to GRAMA requests and provide required navigability documentation.
- A reference to a prior incident involving a criminal trespass citation.

At the conclusion of the three-minute period, Chair Salt confirmed the time limit and allowed Mr. Singleton to complete his final sentence. Mr. Singleton requested that his written materials be entered into the record; staff coordinated acceptance of the materials.

Chair Salt asked if there were any additional public comments. No additional comments were provided.

4. Information (4:20PM) - Overview of Clean Vessel Act (CVA) and Boating Access (BA) - Jorge/Criag

(00:12:30) – Chair Salt introduced the next item on the agenda and turned the time over to staff presenters Jorge Vazquez and Craig Walker to provide an overview of the Clean Vessel Act (CVA) and Boating Access (BA) programs. Jorge Vazquez provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting, noting the focus on upcoming January scoring and providing feedback on the process and scoring approach. Mr. Vazquez summarized the Clean Vessel Act (CVA) program, including that it is a federal grant program tied to boating-related conservation funding and focused on sewage/waste management and protecting water quality. He described eligible uses and emphasized deferred maintenance needs. Mr. Vazquez noted eligible project elements may include:

- Installation and maintenance of pumpout stations and related infrastructure (e.g., docks supporting pumpout stations)
- Waste management improvements (including floating restroom facilities where applicable)
- Education and outreach regarding environmental impacts and protection of waterways

(00:17:55) – Craig Walker provided an overview of the Boating Access grant program, noting it is administered by DWR and supported through federal funding sources associated with boating-related excise tax revenue and related contributions. He stated the

program supports a wide range of boating access improvements statewide and is inclusive of motorized and non-motorized boating access. Mr. Walker explained annual funding and match requirements, noting that Outdoor Recreation provides the required match to leverage the full allocation. He mentioned that there will be a total of 19 projects and we will not be able to fund all of them. He described eligible projects broadly, including boat ramps, parking, navigational aids, seasonal buoy placement/movement, and other boating access-related infrastructure; he noted certain limitations, including:

- Projects must provide public access; improvements on private lands without public access are not eligible.
- For public entities charging fees or generating revenue at funded sites, revenue is expected to support ongoing maintenance of access improvements.

(00:21:03) – Chair Salt asked clarifying questions regarding the inclusion of non-motorized boating access and whether funding could be applied across rivers/streams as well as flatwater and reservoirs, and whether funds could address navigational hazards or portages.

Mr. Walker confirmed eligibility for these categories, noting dredging is technically eligible but could consume multiple years of available funding. If it benefits boats whether it is motorized or non-motorized it will likely be eligible.

5. Information (4:30PM) – Pre-Scoring Matrix CVA/BA – Jorge

(00:23:15) – Jorge Vazquez introduced the pre-scoring rubrics and noted they would be available in shared folders for Council review. He described the Clean Vessel Act scoring approach using a 1–7 Likert scale (very poor to excellent) aligned to the application content. Mr. Vazquez summarized rubric categories for CVA, including:

- Environmental need / sewage risk (including deferred maintenance)
- Clean boating impact
- Budget and match (including strength where applicants provide their own match)
- Operation and maintenance (long-term maintenance planning and project longevity)
- Education and outreach
- Planning and partnerships
- Project narrative
- Attachments and completeness of supporting documentation

Mr. Vazquez introduced the Boating Access scoring rubric, also using a 1–7 Likert scale, and noted efforts were made to better align rubric criteria with application questions based on prior-year feedback. He summarized key rubric categories, including:

- Project need
- Benefit to existing fish and wildlife resources and/or the general public
- Project approach
- Budget
- Operation and maintenance
- Attachments/supporting documentation

(00:28:20) – Craig Walker noted that the rubric was developed with an emphasis on reducing subjectivity and stated it was a strong first draft that could be refined in future years. He identified potential future enhancements, including incorporating economic benefits to rural communities and addressing deferred maintenance more systematically as inventory data become available through the Boat Utah inventory tool.

Chair Salt asked whether the 19 Boating Access submissions had been pre-screened for eligibility before being presented to the Council. Mr. Walker stated the projects were being provided as submitted (no staff filtration prior to Council review) and explained that cleaned versions of Formstack submissions would be prepared and shared.

Chair Salt and Mr. Walker discussed the timeline for review and the impact of the holiday season on Council members' ability to complete scoring. Chair Salt expressed concern about scoring over the holidays and emphasized the importance of adequate review time. Mr. Vazquez mentioned that he would be more than willing to provide assistance if Mr. Walker felt that he needed additional support to get folders out on time to the council.

DeWitt Smith requested clarification regarding the rubric criterion "benefit to existing fish and wildlife resources," particularly how it would apply to non-motorized boating constituencies (paddling and sailing).

Mr. Walker explained that the rubric criterion reflects the Division of Wildlife Resources' responsibility to manage aquatic resources accessed by both motorized and non-motorized boating users. He stated the intent is to ensure funded projects do not negatively impact fish and wildlife resources or create conflicts among boating user groups. He noted the criterion also considers public users, including potential impacts related to shoreline erosion, safety, congestion, and user conflicts, and that similar considerations have arisen nationally.

Mr. Walker acknowledged the concern and stated the criterion was included because it is part of the application content. He suggested that reviewing the submitted applications may help clarify its application and noted staff could provide additional context if needed.

Mr. Vazquez added that the rubric represents an initial draft and that staff anticipate refining it in future years based on Council feedback to ensure equitable treatment of all boating constituencies.

Mr. Sommer added comments regarding the scoring process, noting that while there were concerns about timing, he believed scoring would become more efficient once Council members became familiar with the rubric. He stated that based on prior experience with similar scoring processes, projects can be evaluated more quickly as reviewers gain comfort with the criteria. Mr. Sommer noted that overall scoring time would likely vary depending on project complexity but should not be overly burdensome.

Mr. Hunter added context that the benefit criterion has historically included improvements for anglers and broader public access and suggested the benefit category could be split into separate tracks in future rubric refinements (benefit to fish/wildlife resources vs. benefit to the general public). Mr. Walker discussed examples of public benefit, including:

- Separating non-motorized launch areas from motorized ramps to reduce conflict and improve safety
- Removing navigational hazards on rivers for paddlecraft
- Infrastructure changes that reduce ramp congestion and user conflicts

Chair Jeff Salt added that “benefit to the public” could be interpreted broadly. He noted that projects separating motorized and non-motorized access at flatwater ramps can reduce user conflicts and improve safety, and that river projects such as removing navigational hazards (e.g., on the Jordan River) also provide public safety benefits. He suggested the definition of public benefit could be expanded in future rubric refinements.

6. Information (4:40PM) – Scoring Instructions - Jorge

(00:44:35) – Mr. Vazquez reviewed the shared folder structure and explained that Council members would have access to:

- Separate folders for CVA and Boating Access applications
- Application materials organized both as individual components (letters of support, maps, photos, site plans, W-9, etc.) and as full application packets

- Scoring links and a tracking sheet to help members monitor which applications they had completed (optional tool)

Mr. Vazquez explained scoring submission procedures, including:

- One Google Form submission per application (two submissions for CVA; nineteen submissions for Boating Access)
- Required scoring fields aligned to the rubric
- Optional comment fields per criterion to support scoring rationale
- Required narrative fields at the bottom of each form (project strengths, weaknesses, funding priority ranking, and rationale)

Mr. Morrison noted a configuration allowing members to receive an emailed copy of their form responses to support self-review and potential edits prior to the scoring meeting. He advised members that the volume of scoring forms would result in multiple emails but would provide flexibility to revisit and adjust scoring if needed before forms close.

Mr. Eakle provided suggestions for effective scoring practice, including reading all applications before assigning final scores to ensure consistency and fairness. Chair Salt encouraged members to budget time for review during the holiday season, noting that thorough review may require spreading work across multiple days.

7. Information (4:50PM) – Next Meeting/Other Business/Committee Scoring Requests – Chair

(00:53:50) – Chair Salt asked how staff anticipated handling the funding limitations given that not all projects could be funded. Mr. Walker described a process of reviewing objective scores and using the scoring meeting to discuss tiering, equity across boating constituencies, and potential adjustments where warranted. He also noted staff may need to prioritize certain ongoing administrative requirements and program needs in final decisions.

Zack Williams asked whether there is a closeout or summary process to evaluate the impact of prior funded projects and whether that information could inform future scoring. Mr. Walker explained that annual reporting occurs through a federal system and that project completion and reporting currently experience delays, resulting in a two- to three-year lag before outcomes can be fully documented. He provided Strawberry Reservoir as an example where the public may observe near-term benefits due to concentrated investment in multiple access projects.

Chair Salt clarified a prior-year funding discussion and asked how the Council would be informed of ineligible project elements during review. Mr. Walker stated eligibility considerations would be addressed during the scoring process and discussion meeting, with staff acting as a resource to identify ineligible elements and potential ways to phase or revise projects to maximize eligibility and geographic distribution of benefits.

Jorge Vazquez noted an additional transparency item related to a potential third CVA submission for administrative funding to support program administration, explaining that CVA includes an opportunity to apply for administrative allowances. Staff asked for Council input on the preferred format for reviewing/approving such an administrative request.

8. Adjourn - Close (5:00PM)

(01:03:20) – Chair Salt requested a motion to adjourn. Director Curry expressed appreciation to the Council for their time and anticipated effort to review and score applications.

**JOHN LAURSEN MADE THE MOTION TO ADJOURN.
ZACK WILLIAMS SECONDED. THE MOTION PASSED
UNANIMOUSLY.**