



9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2022, AT 1:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES LOCATED AT GATEWAY AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Present: Tom Diegel, Chair
Paul Diegel
Brian Hutchinson
Ed Marshall
John Knoblock

Staff: Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration
Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy
Madeline Pettit, Community Engagement Intern

Others: Jane Bowman
Steve Van Maren
Barbara Cameron
Will McCarvill
Patrick Shea
Jason Wolf
David Smith
Mike Christensen
Rusty Vetter
James Hicks
Catherine Kanter
Maura Hahnenberger

Opening

1. Chair Tom Diegel will Call the Meeting to Order and Welcome Committee Members and the Public.

Chair Tom Diegel called the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1 **2. Committee will Approve the Minutes from the October 17, 2022, Meeting.**

2
3 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to APPROVE the October 17, 2022, Millcreek Canyon
4 Committee Minutes. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
5 consent of the Committee.
6

7 Chair Diegel shared updates with the Committee. He reported that meetings related to trails will
8 take place on December 7 and 8, 2022. At least one Committee Member needed to attend. John
9 Knoblock stated that he would attend the meeting and Chair Diegel would likely attend the meeting
10 as well. Chair Diegel noted that he would reach out via email to see if anyone else was interested.
11 Barbara Cameron had additional details. Mr. Knoblock explained that no decisions would be made
12 at the meeting. It would be more of an introduction to inform the public that there is a website and
13 a map and public input is desired.
14

15 It was noted that Jason Wolf was present at the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Mr. Wolf
16 was the Canyons Management Program Director at the Salt Lake County Office of Regional
17 Development. He had been with the County for approximately two months. This was a new
18 position and a new program within the Office of Regional Development. Mr. Wolf shared
19 information about his background. He was with the Public Lands Office of the State of Utah for
20 approximately 12 years beforehand. Chair Diegel was grateful for his participation in the meeting.
21

22 **Millcreek FLAP Discussion**

23
24 **1. Members from the Stakeholders Council Millcreek Canyon Committee will Discuss**
25 **the FLAP Grant and Upcoming Actions.**
26

27 Chair Diegel reported that he sent an email to the Committee Members earlier in the day. The
28 intention was to summarize the discussions that had taken place over the last few months. Chair
29 Diegel also informed the Committee that he asked Helen Peters for a record of the public comments
30 received during the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) Grant public comment period.
31 However, she stated that those comments would not be released until closer to the next round of
32 design. He was frustrated by that and felt that there should be more transparency. A month after
33 the public comment period for the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little
34 Cottonwood Canyon Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”), all 13,000 public comments
35 had been released. He was not sure why the FLAP grant comments had not been.
36

37 Chair Diegel wanted to see the FLAP grant comments to determine whether the general public had
38 opinions similar to the Millcreek Canyon Committee. He believed that the Committee Members
39 needed to represent their respective constituents. This was true for those who are formally
40 associated with an organization and those who represent the larger community. Since the
41 Committee was unable to see the FLAP grant comments, it was not possible to know whether the
42 Millcreek Canyon Committee was representing the public appropriately.
43

44 Brian Hutchinson wondered if the public outreach was different for Millcreek Canyon as opposed
45 to the Cottonwood Canyons. Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen discussed public
46 outreach from the perspective of the CWC. The way outreach is conducted is not specific to each

1 canyon. The organization works with community groups and stakeholders. When fire mitigation
2 and fuels mitigation work was done in Millcreek Canyon last year and the year prior, there was
3 collaboration with the Homeowners Associations (“HOA”), Cabin Associations (“CA”), and
4 representatives from those organizations. As for releasing information, she had relationships with
5 all of the Communications Managers at the member jurisdictions. She shared e-kits, press releases,
6 and major updates with those Communications Managers. This type of communication had also
7 been done directly with Community Councils.

8
9 Mr. Hutchinson explained that the reason for his question was that there were issues with the I-15
10 corridor expansion. That was a \$1.7 billion project. Not all impacted parties were being reached
11 by the communication efforts. To avoid similar issues in Millcreek, it was important to have
12 expansive public outreach. Chair Diegel noted that the CWC was doing everything possible to
13 reach others. It was not possible to reach everyone, especially those who were not engaged.
14 Mr. Hutchinson felt that additional outreach was needed.

15
16 Patrick Shea suggested that the Stakeholders Council hold public debates in libraries throughout
17 the County, particularly on the west side of the valley. Proponents of the gondola could debate
18 those who are opposed to the gondola. This was not specifically related to Millcreek, but to
19 transportation overall. He noted that everything was segmented into smaller jurisdictions and there
20 was no unified proposal. The 13,000 comments related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon
21 EIS had been reviewed and 80% of the comments expressed opposition to the gondola.

22
23 Chair Diegel asked Mr. Wolf to speak about the outreach that the County had done on the FLAP
24 grant in Millcreek. Mr. Wolf did not have any comment at the current time. However, he noted
25 that Catherine Kanter would join the meeting shortly and may be able to answer that question.

26
27 Ed Marshall asked that inconsistency on the Committee be addressed. At the last meeting, it was
28 pointed out that the width of the road in the upper canyon is typically 22 feet and goes down to 20
29 feet at some points. Only at the very top of the canyon are there spots where the road is as narrow
30 as 15 feet. If a bicycle lane was added, this would only increase the width by four feet, changing
31 the width from 22 to 26 feet. That was only an 18% increase and not the significant increase that
32 had been referenced previously. Where the canyon is 15 feet wide, there will be a 73% increase.
33 That narrow section was only a few feet out of the entire 4.5-mile area. The primary focus for
34 most Committee Members seemed to be related to bicycle safety. As a result, he wondered why
35 there was no support for a four-foot uphill bicycle lane that would separate cyclists from drivers.
36 This would not add a lot of width but it would increase safety.

37
38 Mr. Marshall pointed out that there had been a lot of comments stating that road widening
39 decreases safety because it increases speeds. Widening the road to add a bicycle lane would
40 increase cyclist safety. The position of the Committee seemed to be contradictory. He wondered
41 if other Committee Members could speak to that. Mr. Knoblock agreed with the position shared
42 by Mr. Marshall. The four-foot bicycle lane was something that he supported. Adding four feet
43 of width, which was not a huge percentage, would improve safety. He reminded those present that
44 the FLAP grant came about because there was a desire to implement a shuttle bus. The Forest
45 Service stated that a legal-width road was needed.

1 If there was no opposition to the 26-foot width, with four feet of that being a dedicated bicycle
2 lane, Mr. Marshall suggested that the Committee clearly state their position. Chair Diegel was in
3 favor of a bicycle lane but stated that there was some nuance to the issue. There seemed to be a
4 desire to widen the lanes as well as add the four-foot bicycle lanes. Mr. Knoblock did not believe
5 that was accurate. He thought the idea was to have two 11-foot-wide traffic lanes and a four-foot
6 bicycle lane. That was what he supported and what he expected would be formally proposed.

7
8 Mr. Hutchinson noted that when vehicles are present, there tend to be conflicts between different
9 user groups. He did not see any reason to change the character of the upper canyon. The current
10 condition was not an issue in the upper portion of the road. He felt that the issues in the middle
11 section could be addressed by removing vehicles. The 2012 concept proposed that vehicles be
12 replaced with shuttle buses. Accommodating vehicles meant knocking trees down, compromising
13 the creek and wildlife. There were also air quality and noise impacts to consider as well as
14 outstanding safety concerns. Mr. Hutchinson was not in support of road widening and was
15 opposed to the four-foot bicycle lane, especially at the top of the canyon. Mr. Knoblock did not
16 feel the same. He rides his bicycle in the area regularly and there are dangerous conditions that
17 can be mitigated with appropriate planning.

18
19 Rusty Vetter addressed earlier comments from Chair Diegel. He was not sure it was appropriate
20 for the County to withhold public comments. A Government Records Access and Management
21 Act (“GRAMA”) request may be appropriate and could be filed by the CWC. The County should
22 at least disclose why the records are protected. The comments should be open and available for
23 public review. As far as outreach, he stressed the importance of diversity and inclusion. The gate
24 at the fee booth could have information about the FLAP grant posted or flyers could be shared
25 with visitors in the area.

26
27 Chair Diegel wondered if a GRAMA request would come from the Millcreek Canyon Committee
28 or the CWC. Ms. Nielsen noted that the CWC had never submitted a GRAMA request for
29 documents before. She was not sure it was appropriate for the organization to submit a GRAMA
30 request or if it would be more appropriate coming from an individual. CWC Legal Counsel, Shane
31 Topham, is an expert in GRAMA and she offered to check with him. Mr. Vetter explained that
32 GRAMA requests come from individuals and entities. Mr. Shea informed those present that there
33 is no restriction on who can submit the request. It depends on whether the agency responds. If
34 there is no response, there are other ways to pursue the information.

35
36 The Committee further discussed lane widths. Chair Diegel noted that the FLAP grant proposed
37 several configurations and comments were submitted about those configurations. Unfortunately,
38 the public comments were not available to review. He stressed the importance of reading the
39 comments so it would be possible to understand the desires of the general public.

40
41 Mike Christensen stated that the safest option was to have bicycle advisory lanes. There could be
42 one 10-foot travel lane in the middle with two five-foot shoulders on each side. He explained that
43 bicycle advisory lanes are set up so that vehicles travel in the middle. The vehicles slow down
44 naturally because it is a shared lane. If two vehicles need to pass each other, it is possible to pull
45 over to the right if there are no pedestrians or bicyclists present. Chair Diegel noted that one of

1 the proposed solutions was a single lane with no center stripe. Having no center stripe was unusual,
2 but that design could make people drive slower.

3
4 Mr. Shea pointed out that speed bumps could also be placed in areas where there are blind corners.
5 This would also slow the traffic down in dangerous areas. If road widening takes place, he was
6 afraid that there will be speeding and additional accidents. Mr. Marshall was supportive of speed
7 bumps but the engineers rejected them because they would be dangerous for downhill bicyclists.
8 Mr. Christensen reported that speed bumps do not generally make much of a difference. They
9 slow drivers down temporarily as they drive over the speed bump itself but narrowing the lanes
10 will slow drivers down more than speed bumps.

11
12 Chair Diegel asked that the Committee discuss the email he sent out earlier in the day. He
13 wondered if anything had been missed or should be clarified. Mr. Knoblock read from the email.
14 “Two years ago, Salt Lake County presented improvements to be made and the application is
15 focused on improvements to picnic sites, parking lots, and trailheads.” However, he noted that the
16 work was focused on the road. He believed the road had always been the primary focus. Chair
17 Diegel pointed out that two years ago, there was a meeting where Helen Peters presented a slide
18 deck. It looked at what could be done to improve the canyon with unlimited funds. At the time,
19 the Committee was impressed with the comprehensive nature of the potential improvements made
20 and felt excited about the potential. Over time, the improvements became solely focused on the
21 road. Road improvement was a major part of the original slide deck, but it was not the only part.
22 Mr. Knoblock suggested that the language in the email be further clarified.

23
24 There was discussion regarding past meetings. Mr. Hutchinson believed the original discussions
25 related to a shuttle pilot project. The Committee was informed that more infrastructure was needed
26 to implement a shuttle. As the meeting closed, Ms. Peters suggested that there may be Federal
27 funds that could address the issue. It was noted that Ms. Kanter joined the meeting. Chair Diegel
28 explained that there had been some simmering discontent about the FLAP grant process. The
29 original proposal two years ago was not only focused on roads. Road improvements had since
30 been proposed to preserve the riparian corridor and improve the safety of the upper canyon. There
31 was a desire to widen the road, straighten it, and reinforce it in areas where the road surface is
32 falling into the creek.

33
34 Members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee were initially excited about the potential the FLAP
35 grant represented. Since then, there had been concerns. Chair Diegel noted that fears about safety
36 in the upper canyon were not supported by data. There had not been enough incidents in the upper
37 canyon to warrant the need for safety improvements. The Committee was also concerned that the
38 public was being ignored during the process. Millcreek is unique, especially in the upper canyon.
39 The width of the road creates a more intimate environment. There were concerns that the nature
40 of the canyon above the winter gate will change. Committee Members felt strongly that the
41 character of the canyon should be preserved to the extent possible.

42
43 There had been open houses and public comment periods but the Committee found it difficult to
44 convey thoughts and receive updates from the County. It was a frustrating process. Ms. Kanter
45 clarified that she was not as deeply involved in the FLAP grant conversations as she was in other
46 areas of work. One of the reasons she wanted to attend the meeting was to find out more. She

1 thanked Chair Diegel for providing the framework of the Committee's concerns. Ms. Kanter
2 wondered if the main concerns related to the process of the outcomes. Mr. Hutchinson felt that
3 the concern had to do with the process. Without a good process, it would not be possible for there
4 to be a good result. The outreach process was flawed because County money was being used
5 without soliciting comments from the entire County tax base.
6

7 Ms. Kanter explained that the intention was to hold open houses and public comment periods to
8 receive input from all. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that many people were not even aware of the
9 FLAP grant process. That was the reason outreach was vital. Chair Diegel felt there were issues
10 with the process and the potential outcome. The Committee did not feel there was
11 acknowledgment that the comments were even being taken into account. The feelings and desires
12 of the public did not seem to be considered. Chair Diegel explained that the fundamental problem
13 with Millcreek Canyon was not related to the road but to the popularity of the canyon. There are
14 too many vehicles and too much traffic. There had already been a noticeable increase over the last
15 several years. The FLAP grant work would address the movement of personal vehicles through
16 the canyon rather than consider transportation solutions.
17

18 Mr. Knoblock reported that in May 2022, the County provided generalized responses to the
19 comments from the first open house that was held in January 2022. There was a second open
20 house for additional comments but those comments had not been made public. Ms. Kanter
21 wondered how much time passed between the first open house and the comment responses. Chair
22 Diegel stated that the first open house was held one year ago. The 33% design was shared in May
23 2022. The comments from the first open house were released the first week in May. He had asked
24 for the comments from the second open house several times but had not been able to see them.
25 The Committee Members wanted to read the comments to ensure that the desires of the community
26 are represented through the Millcreek Canyon Committee work moving forward.
27

28 Mr. Kanter asked how transparency could be improved. Chair Diegel believed the first step was
29 making the comments publicly available. Another issue was the fact that the comments, concerns,
30 and discussions that the Committee had about the FLAP grant were not being taken seriously.
31 Ms. Kanter explained that the opinions voiced by the Committee were important. However, there
32 was a question about whether the Committee was asking to be promoted to an advisory position.
33 If so, she wondered if that would create issues for all involved.
34

35 Mr. Vetter clarified that he is not a member of the Millcreek Canyon Committee but he has an
36 interest in the FLAP grant and dedicated a lot of time to the issue. In the past, Mayor Jeff
37 Silvestrini stated that the FLAP grant was about a shuttle bus. Mr. Vetter had asked the Forest
38 Service about that statement but they explained that there was no money for the shuttle. It seemed
39 that the intention was to widen the road enough to accommodate a shuttle but there was no shuttle
40 plan actually in place. He had followed the shuttle discussions for years and always thought it was
41 a great idea, but there were some tradeoffs to consider. The upper canyon was only busy for 30
42 days a year because it is not open that long. Additionally, there may not be support for a shuttle.
43 If the shuttle is unlikely to happen, it did not make sense to alter the canyon to accommodate one.
44

45 Paul Diegel explained that the CWC was established to further the goals of the Mountain Accord
46 and to speak to development occurring within the Central Wasatch. The Millcreek Canyon

1 Committee was encouraged to share comments during the FLAP grant public comment period but
2 the position of the Committee did not seem to be considered. He wondered if the organization was
3 helping to guide development or if the Millcreek Canyon Committee Members were simply
4 interested bystanders. There was not enough clarity about the role of the Committee or the CWC.
5 The managing entities, such as Millcreek City, Salt Lake County, and the Forest Service, seemed
6 to view the organization as a nuisance.

7
8 Ms. Kanter clarified that no one considered the CWC or the Millcreek Canyon Committee a
9 nuisance. There seemed to be a disconnect but that was not the intention. The National
10 Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process was intended to determine the opinions of the
11 community. It would be inappropriate for the concerns of the public to be dismissed. Ms. Kanter
12 noted that the CWC was formed to implement the Mountain Accord. Salt Lake County respected
13 the CWC, but unfortunately, was no longer a member of the organization. The Millcreek Canyon
14 Committee was an offshoot of the CWC and the collective voice of the Committee has weight.

15
16 Ms. Kanter believed the issues mentioned by the Committee Members were reflective of a
17 communication breakdown. She offered to process the discussion, speak to her team, and bring
18 something back to the Committee at the beginning of the new year. Chair Diegel expressed his
19 gratitude for her participation. It was noted that at this point Ms. Kanter was excused from the
20 meeting.

21
22 Chair Diegel thought it might be worthwhile to share the contents of the email he had written with
23 Ms. Kanter so she knew some of the FLAP grant history. He offered to submit that as a concerned
24 individual rather than on behalf of the Committee. Mr. Marshall noted that Chair Diegel was
25 entitled to do so. If other members want to add their support to the email as individuals, that could
26 also be done. The Committee Members could act on an individual basis. Mr. Shea believed that
27 as a group, it could be submitted to the County as long as there is a disclaimer at the bottom of the
28 email to clarify that it does not reflect the position of the CWC. Mr. Shea suggested that in the
29 future, the Committee create a basic budget with a timetable. It could outline how the Committee
30 felt the funds should be allocated in the canyon, should it become available.

31
32 Mr. Marshall asked Mr. Christensen about the advisory lane approach. He thought it was an
33 appealing concept but could be unsafe for bicyclists if vehicles tried to pass where they should not.
34 As far as he knew, there was only one place in the country where those lanes had been
35 implemented. He wondered what his background was and if he had seen that approach before.
36 Mr. Christensen stated that the advisory lane approach followed the neighborhood street concept.
37 Any street that is narrow and requires drivers to yield to one another increases safety. He offered
38 to look into the specifics and bring that information back to the Committee. Mr. Christensen
39 informed the Committee Members that he is a Transportation Planner.

40
41 **2. Engagement with the U.S. Forest Service and Salt Lake County Regarding Matters**
42 **Related to Millcreek Canyon.**
43

44 Ms. Cameron referenced the trails related public outreach meetings. There were meetings
45 scheduled for December 7, 2022, at 5:00 p.m. and December 8, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. on Zoom. She
46 offered to send additional information to interested Committee Members.

1
2 There were no further discussions.

3
4 **Adjourn.**

5
6 1. **Following Motion and Affirmative Vote, Chair Tom Diegel will Close the Public**
7 **Meeting.**

8
9 **MOTION:** Paul Diegel moved to adjourn. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. The motion
10 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

11
12 The Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 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, November 21, 2022.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____