



9  
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
11 **COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING ON MONDAY,**  
12 **OCTOBER 17, 2022, AT 1:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-**  
13 **PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC**  
14 **OFFICES, LOCATED AT THE GATEWAY AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET,**  
15 **SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**  
16

17 **Present:** Tom Diegel, Chair  
18 Paul Diegel  
19 Ed Marshall  
20 Del Draper  
21 John Knoblock  
22 Barbara Cameron  
23 William McCarvill  
24 Maura Hahnenberger  
25 Mike Christensen  
26 Brian Hutchinson  
27 Steve Van Maren  
28 Rusty Vetter  
29 Hilary Jacobs  
30 Jane Bowman  
31 Michael Jenkins  
32 David Parker  
33

34 **Staff:** Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration  
35 Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy  
36

37 **Opening**  
38

39 **1. Chair Tom Diegel will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Committee**  
40 **of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**  
41

42 Chair Tom Diegel called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. He reported that the Central Wasatch  
43 Commission (“CWC”) Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting would largely focus on the  
44 continued Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant discussions.  
45

1 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the September 19, 2022, Meeting.**

2  
3 **MOTION:** Paul Diegel moved to APPROVE the September 19, 2022, Millcreek Canyon  
4 Committee Minutes. John Knoblock seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  
5

6 **FLAP Grant Discussion**

7  
8 **1. Members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and the Commission will Discuss the**  
9 **FLAP Grant.**

10  
11 Chair Diegel reported that he originally wanted the Millcreek Canyon Committee and other  
12 interested parties to meet in the canyon and evaluate the current conditions. The intention was to  
13 discuss the various elements. For instance, lane widths and areas where the pavement is falling  
14 into the creek. However, he acknowledged that there had been difficulties trying to organize that  
15 type of meeting. While he still supported the idea of an in-person visit, it had not happened yet.  
16 Chair Diegel was glad that the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting was able to take place  
17 instead. In lieu of an on-site meeting where Committee Members could speak to consultants, he  
18 wanted to have a further discussion about the FLAP grant and better understand the perspectives.  
19

20 Chair Diegel noted that there was not a lot of action the Millcreek Canyon Committee could take  
21 on at the current time but he hoped the U.S. Forest Service and Salt Lake County would be  
22 interested in what the Committee Members had to say. He reiterated that he wanted to have a  
23 better sense of how the FLAP grant was viewed from a Committee perspective and asked for  
24 comments.  
25

26 Paul Diegel was cautiously optimistic about the FLAP grant. Based on feedback received, the  
27 environmental impacts were being considered and the Federal Emergency Management Agency  
28 (“FEMA”) requirements were taken seriously. The designers were also starting to recognize that  
29 bicyclists used the canyon and needed to be accommodated. Mr. Diegel felt there were some  
30 positive developments but it was difficult to know more until the second iteration of the design  
31 was released. He noted that there was public opposition to radically changing the nature of the  
32 road. Many did not want Millcreek to have a wider, faster, and straighter road. Mr. Diegel asked  
33 about a document that summarized the number of accidents in the canyon. Chair Diegel offered  
34 to share that data with Committee Members following the meeting.  
35

36 Ed Marshall shared clarifications relative to his position relative to Log Haven. In most instances,  
37 both he and Margo Provost agree. They believe that the character of the upper canyon is different  
38 from the lower canyon and that it should be preserved. From the standpoint of traffic, Log Haven  
39 is impacted all year. The traffic flow must be considered. Log Haven was in favor of a shuttle for  
40 the upper portion of the canyon. The focus should be on implementing the necessary infrastructure  
41 for a shuttle in that portion of the canyon.  
42

43 Mr. Marshall discussed cycling. He felt there should be some type of protection in place, such as  
44 a bicycle or advisory lane for cyclists traveling uphill. On the downhill, he pointed out that cyclists  
45 go as fast or faster than vehicles. It was important not to create a downhill raceway for vehicles  
46 or bicycles because this will endanger pedestrians and increase crash risks. Last month, the road

1 was smoothed out in the lower portion of the canyon and cyclists had already begun to increase  
2 their downhill speeds. As a result, he wanted to see downhill cyclists continue to flow with vehicle  
3 traffic in the upper portion of the canyon.  
4

5 John Knoblock noted that he refamiliarized himself with the current conditions of the canyon. The  
6 lower road is 26 feet wide for the most part, has four-foot bicycle lanes, and had been overlaid.  
7 Beyond the Winter Gate, the road is generally 22 feet wide. In some areas, it narrows to 20 feet  
8 wide. It narrows further at the Alexander Basin Trailhead to 19 or 20 feet wide. A few spots were  
9 slightly narrower. The last one-quarter of a mile or so of the canyon is the only area that is 15 feet  
10 wide. However, there are a few spots that were 12 feet. Generally, the upper road is close to 20  
11 feet with the exception of a few areas. Mr. Knoblock believed that the minimum 20-foot travel  
12 lanes and four-foot bicycle lanes would make the most sense. This would not increase the width  
13 of the lanes themselves but would ensure that there are safe bicycle lanes. He did not feel this  
14 would create raceway conditions in the upper portion of the canyon. For the most part, the roadway  
15 would not increase in overall width.  
16

17 Mr. Knoblock reported that there were approximately one dozen places where the roadway edge  
18 is breaking apart and dropping into the creek. While those are not sizable areas, the conditions  
19 exist for 10 to 20 feet in certain spots. Areas like that needed to be fixed. Additionally, in the  
20 middle of the road, there are sections with alligator cracking. Generally, when that occurs it means  
21 the section could not be roto-milled or overlaid with ease. He understood the position of the  
22 Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) and was in general agreement that work needed to  
23 be done in the canyon. The Forest Service had previously stated that road work was necessary in  
24 order for there to be a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon.  
25

26 Chair Diegel noted that Mr. Knoblock mentioned spot repairs at the last Millcreek Canyon  
27 Committee Meeting. He wondered if his opinion had changed after looking at the site conditions  
28 in person. Mr. Knoblock explained that spot repairs would prevent the upper portion of the road  
29 from being closed for a considerable amount of time. If spot repairs were possible, this could be  
30 beneficial but would prevent bicycle lanes from being added. He believed that bicycle lanes would  
31 be better for bicyclists and would increase user safety.  
32

33 Rusty Vetter reported that he spent time trying to understand the conditions and the FLAP grant.  
34 He was concerned about the long-range perspective. One of the questions at the last open house  
35 had to do with road speeds. The Forest Service representative explained that Salt Lake County  
36 and the Unified Police Department (“UPD”) would handle speeds. He did not believe that was the  
37 correct approach. There needed to be an appropriate focus on managing the canyon. The Millcreek  
38 Canyon Transportation Feasibility Study from 2012 presented many ideas, but virtually all of those  
39 suggestions had been ignored by the County. He felt it was necessary to look at canyon  
40 management with a broader perspective.  
41

42 Mr. Vetter explained that he spoke to Jim Bradley about the study and he was receptive to the idea  
43 of looking into how to best manage the canyon. For instance, reservation systems were commonly  
44 used in parks these days. Something like that could be used above the Winter Gate. He noted that  
45 Carl Fisher had previously expressed concerns that road widening would increase visitor levels.

1 A reservation system could alleviate concerns. Mr. Vetter was not convinced that safety and  
2 congestion levels were being addressed properly through the FLAP grant proposal.

3  
4 At the meeting with the FHWA representatives and the County, it was noted that traffic crash data  
5 had been examined and had informed the decision-making process. Mr. Vetter had since tracked  
6 down that data and had shared it with Chair Diegel. The crash data was not very specific and did  
7 not provide additional context. It was divided into categories of reportable incidents and other  
8 incidents. He had looked into the reportable incidents since those were more serious. On average,  
9 dating back to 2016, there were approximately 1.5 reportable accidents per year. In 2020, there  
10 were not any reportable accidents. The suggestion that safety concerns were dictating the decision  
11 to widen the roads did not make sense when the crash data was considered.

12  
13 The Mountain Accord stated that there should be a shuttle in place by 2017. Mr. Vetter always  
14 thought the shuttle was a good idea but as he thought more about it, he was not certain how the  
15 shuttle would work or how it would solve the existing problems. He did not know where visitors  
16 would park to utilize the shuttle. For the upper canyon, the primary congestion took place  
17 approximately 30 days a year. It might make sense to look into alternative solutions, such as a  
18 reservation system. Different measures could make it possible to control the traffic. Mr. Vetter  
19 was supportive of making improvements to the upper canyon. The original application that the  
20 County filed was specific about the various campgrounds and parking lots. That application was  
21 not what had been presented more recently. It was now a highway project instead.

22  
23 Mr. Vetter expressed concerns with the FLAP grant process to Salt Lake City Mayor, Erin  
24 Mendenhall. He would also speak during the public comment period at the next CWC  
25 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting. He wanted the CWC to be involved and study the  
26 overall management of the canyon. Some proposals could be drafted from a CWC perspective so  
27 that the FLAP grant did not move forward in a way that was not beneficial. He reminded those  
28 present that there would be a County match for the FLAP grant. As a result, the County had a say  
29 in how the work would be handled. It was important to approach the process with that in mind.

30  
31 Del Draper asked about the crash data that was mentioned. He wondered if it was for the entire  
32 canyon or only above the Winter Gate. Mr. Vetter clarified that the data was for the upper canyon.  
33 There were a lot more accidents in the lower canyon. Mr. Draper felt that made sense since there  
34 was more traffic in the lower portion of the canyon. It was noted that the Millcreek Canyon  
35 Transportation Feasibility Study had studied the crash data and came to valuable conclusions.  
36 Mr. Vetter did not understand why nothing had been done with the study.

37  
38 Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen reported that there was a special CWC Board  
39 Meeting scheduled for later that afternoon. Public comments could be offered at that time.  
40 Ms. Nielsen explained that the Millcreek Canyon Committee originally began as the Millcreek  
41 Canyon Shuttle Committee, where members of the Committee investigated the feasibility of a  
42 shuttle within the canyon. For many reasons, the shuttle was deemed not possible with the current  
43 conditions. Chair Diegel shared additional information about the FLAP grant process. Out of all  
44 the possible projects, the FLAP grant ultimately focused on the road in the upper canyon.

1 Brian Hutchinson reported that he had been working with Salt Lake City on a traffic calming  
2 program. Addressing traffic issues required education, engineering, and enforcement. Right now,  
3 there was engineering being put in place, but it was not addressing traffic calming needs, the  
4 protection of the environment, or the visitors. He wondered if Helen Peters had taken a back seat  
5 in the FLAP grant work. Additionally, he asked if it was possible to reset the project with different  
6 consultants. Chair Diegel did not believe that Ms. Peters had taken a back seat.

7  
8 Mr. Hutchison felt it was necessary to reset. Since the County needed to match the FLAP grant  
9 funds, it would be worthwhile for them to align the project with the desires of the general public.  
10 Further work could be done to set the purpose and need. Millcreek Canyon did not necessarily  
11 need to be treated the same way that Little Cottonwood Canyon had been treated so far. However,  
12 he felt that the CWC needed to discuss Millcreek and participate in some of the conversations. It  
13 may be worthwhile for the Millcreek Canyon Committee to involve the Transportation Committee  
14 as well. Chair Diegel noted that Executive Director of Policy, Blake Perez had suggested that  
15 previously. He offered to follow up and reach out to the Transportation Committee Members.

16  
17 Mike Christensen stressed the need for a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. One of the issues he runs  
18 into with recreation is the fact that money is being spent on recreation opportunities, but only  
19 visitors with vehicles can access them. There was a tremendous equity issue without the shuttle  
20 in place. In terms of parking, it was important to have the shuttle connect at the bottom of the  
21 canyon with other bus routes. This would provide maximum transit connectivity. Mr. Christensen  
22 was knowledgeable about bicycle infrastructure and a member of the Association of Pedestrian  
23 and Bicycle Professionals. The best option in his opinion was the bicycle advisory lane. There  
24 was no need to have a road in the upper canyon that was wider than 20 feet. A wider road would  
25 encourage drivers and bicyclists to speed.

26  
27 Mr. Marshall agreed with Mr. Knoblock about the need for an uphill bicycle path. It had worked  
28 well in the lower canyon and he was surprised that there was no greater support for that. For the  
29 upper canyon, there would need to be a wider roadway unless the advisory approach was selected.  
30 For instance, at least two 10-foot lanes and a one-foot shoulder downhill, which totaled 21 feet. A  
31 four-foot bicycle lane uphill would result in a 25-foot roadway. That was very similar to the lower  
32 canyon and he felt it would work in the upper canyon as well. It would change the character of  
33 the upper canyon slightly, which was where the issue that came in. Mr. Marshall felt that there  
34 should be a designated bicycle lane uphill. His concern with the advisory approach was that there  
35 still might be drivers attempting to pass bicycles on the shoulder. That created the potential for  
36 conflicts. He was also concerned about a 20-foot width rather than a 25-foot width. It made sense  
37 to him that there be a designated four-foot bicycle lane hill uphill and no bicycle lane downhill,  
38 for the reasons that he shared earlier in the Millcreek Canyon Meeting.

39  
40 Mr. Marshall pointed out that the accident figures for the upper canyon that had been presented  
41 were skewed. There was a lack of communication in the upper canyon. It was difficult to report  
42 from that area, so people came down to Log Haven and filed the report from there. The dispatcher  
43 would then state where the report came in from rather than where the accident occurred. Accidents  
44 had been attributed to Log Haven that had not occurred on the property. He explained that it was  
45 difficult to obtain accurate traffic information above the Winter Gate. Mr. Marshall did not feel  
46 that the engineers in charge of the FLAP grant project had ignored suggestions. He believed all

1 suggestions had been heard, but the comments coming from the majority of the Committee focused  
2 on cycling needs and safety. Their view was much broader and focused on the needs of all users.

3  
4 Maura Hahnenberger believed that a lot of people have a vision for what they thought Millcreek  
5 Canyon should look like in the future. With the FLAP grant, there was some fear that the canyon  
6 would move in a direction that did not align with that vision. Ms. Hahnenberger suggested that  
7 the Millcreek Canyon Committee create a vision document that could be referred to. This would  
8 outline what Committee Members wanted to see in the canyon. The Committee could then explore  
9 whether the FLAP grant proposals fit into that vision. There may not be consensus on all of the  
10 specific details, but there would likely be a shared vision related to equity and safety.

11  
12 Chair Diegel reported that there was some nuance between an Advisory Committee and a  
13 Collaborative Group. The Millcreek Canyon Committee tried to clarify its role with the Forest  
14 Service, but there had been some challenges. He felt that Bekee Hotze from the Forest Service  
15 had been grateful for previous Millcreek Canyon Committee suggestions but had also been  
16 defensive. Before the Committee created a document that outlined their vision for the canyon,  
17 there would need to be additional clarifications with the Forest Service. Now that Ms. Hotze was  
18 back from her assignment, that was something that he wanted to look into further.

19  
20 Del Draper felt there was a range of possible options. At the low end, there could be some  
21 patchwork and repaving of the upper canyon in the same way the lower canyon had been repaved.  
22 At the other end of the spectrum, a larger roadway could be built. Mr. Draper believed that  
23 something in between would make the most sense. He did not necessarily think it would cost \$19  
24 million to fix the road in the upper portion of the canyon. With respect to the advisory lane, he  
25 did not think that was a bad idea. Mr. Draper did not feel a full reset on the FLAP grant process  
26 was possible. It seemed that work was moving forward and it was a matter of making adjustments  
27 as necessary.

28  
29 Hilary Jacobs noted that there had been a lot of comparisons between Millcreek and City Creek.  
30 While the model in City Creek was excellent and worked well there, she was not certain that it  
31 would work for Millcreek. There was a greater population use in Millcreek. She explained that  
32 the needs in Millcreek were not necessarily transferable to City Creek and vice versa. Chair Diegel  
33 asked about the City Creek usage compared to Millcreek. Ms. Jacobs noted that she could look  
34 for statistics. She shared additional information about City Creek with members of the Committee.  
35 Chair Diegel felt it would be interesting to generate some statistics to see the comparisons.

36  
37 William McCarvill liked the suggestion from Ms. Hahnenberger about a vision document for the  
38 canyon. The MTS Pillars Document that had been created by the CWC Board was something to  
39 look at for inspiration. Something similar could ensure that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had  
40 a clear vision. That vision would make it easier to view the proposals and possible solutions  
41 through a specific lens. Mr. McCarvill also supported the idea of collaboration between the  
42 Millcreek Canyon Committee and the Transportation Committee.

43  
44 Chair Diegel reported that 1 ½ years ago, a lot of work had been put into a document, which was  
45 essentially a vision list for the canyon. That had been submitted to the Forest Service, but not  
46 much came of it. It might be worth revisiting that and trying to determine how to best collaborate

1 with the Forest Service. The latter had proven to be a bit of a challenge. Mr. McCarvill believed  
2 the next steps would be to interface with the Transportation Committee and share a  
3 recommendation with the Stakeholders Council that the CWC Board could approve. For instance,  
4 a list of the criteria that should be used to judge improvements in Millcreek Canyon.  
5

6 Mr. Diegel noted that it would be wise to determine whether the Forest Service and CWC Board  
7 would be willing to look at that type of document. Ms. Hotze had made it clear that the Forest  
8 Service had no interest in the vision that the Committee had. She was charged with dealing with  
9 existing conditions and solving existing problems. That seemed to be the reason the Forest Service  
10 was resistant to a Visitor Use Study. The Forest Service did not want to make judgment calls on  
11 future use. If a vision document was created, there would need to be some communication with  
12 the Forest Service and CWC Board to determine whether the document would be beneficial to  
13 them. Alternatively, the Committee could create the document as a way to clarify their suggestions  
14 in the future. Recommendations could be viewed through that lens.  
15

16 Mr. McCarvill reported that the Forest Service had not been receptive to a Visitor Use Study until  
17 the CWC had funded an effort to seriously look into the issue of visitor use management. The  
18 Forest Service had since become more amenable to the process. A policy document related to  
19 Millcreek Canyon would carry some weight in a number of areas. He felt it would be worthwhile  
20 to create the vision document and move that through the CWC approval process.  
21

22 Chair Diegel explained that when the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Committee first started, there had  
23 been some tension with Ms. Hotze over the shuttle proposal. At that time, she stated that the Forest  
24 Service would not entertain anything like that. Now, the FLAP grant consultants were looking  
25 into work that would make a shuttle system possible in the future. Progress had been made. It  
26 may be a slower process than Committee Members would like but there had been notable progress.  
27

28 Mr. Marshall reminded those present that the character of the upper canyon is more intimate than  
29 the lower canyon. It was important to distinguish the difference between the two. The vision  
30 document would need to differentiate between the upper and lower canyon. Mr. Diegel noted that  
31 every time the Committee asked to speak to the FLAP grant consultants or meet with them, they  
32 have been told that there was a public comment period. The level of influence that the Committee  
33 had seemed to be uncertain. Chair Diegel noted that the consultants seemed willing to inform the  
34 Committee about the work that was being done, but was not all that willing to listen to the  
35 Committee outside of the public comment process. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that the consultants  
36 may have some concerns about following the appropriate steps. With the NEPA process, there  
37 were comment period protocols that needed to be met.  
38

39 Chair Diegel reported that he asked Ms. Peters for the public comments that had been submitted  
40 during the last comment period. She had previously sent a consolidated version of the comments.  
41 However, this time she explained that the consolidated comments would not be released until right  
42 before the next public comment period. He was not sure that was appropriate and had debated  
43 putting together a FOIA request to receive the raw comment data prior to December. It may be  
44 worthwhile to take those comments into account during future discussions.  
45

1 Ms. Jacobs suggested that the Committee prepare another letter similar to what had been done  
2 before, and outline the Millcreek Canyon Committee vision for the upper canyon and lower  
3 canyon. The letter could also include some recommended steps to meet that vision. Having a  
4 solid document in place that could be submitted to the consultants would be worthwhile. If that  
5 document was approved by the CWC, the letter would likely have more weight. Chair Diegel  
6 explained that the Committee had discussed drafting a formal comment for the public comment  
7 period in May, but decided not to pursue that, because of the CWC process and the difficulty  
8 reaching a consensus. There were some agreements and disagreements about the FLAP grant. It  
9 might be time to look into a vision document for Millcreek Canyon instead. Mr. Draper liked the  
10 idea of the Millcreek Canyon Committee creating a standalone vision document.

11  
12 Chair Diegel felt that the meeting had been worthwhile because it laid the groundwork for the next  
13 FLAP grant public comment period. He appreciated everyone who had participated. Catherine  
14 Kanter from Salt Lake County had expressed an interest in discussing Millcreek Canyon with the  
15 Committee sometime in November. The vision document would assist in that discussion as well  
16 as other future discussions. It would be worthwhile to have those conversations.

17  
18 **Other Business and Updates Relating to Millcreek Canyon.**

19  
20 Mr. Perez did not see a Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting scheduled for November. He  
21 assumed one would be scheduled for the third Monday of the month, which was November 21,  
22 2022. He wanted a date set so members of the Transportation Committee could be invited. It was  
23 determined that the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting would take place on November 21,  
24 2022. Mr. Marshall asked if the Committee could host a field trip since there may be quorum  
25 issues. Mr. Perez explained that site tours had been hosted previously with public notices and a  
26 quorum of the committee. That was acceptable according to the Open and Public Meetings Act.  
27 Those meetings could be recorded with handheld recorders if desired.

28  
29 **Adjourn.**

30  
31 **1. Chair Tom Diegel will Close the Public Meeting as Chair of the Millcreek Committee**  
32 **of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

33  
34 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to ADJOURN. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion  
35 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

36  
37 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:28 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, October 17, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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