



1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
4 **COUNCIL TRAILS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2023,**
5 **AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND**
6 **VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CENTRAL**
7 **WASATCH COMMISSION OFFICES LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE**
8 **STREET, SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**
9

10 **Present:** John Knoblock, Chair
11 Sarah Bennett, Vice-Chair
12 Dr. Jordan Smith, Utah State University
13 Dennis Goreham
14 Barbara Cameron
15 James Hicks
16 Tim Cromwell
17 Joanna Wheelton
18

19 **Staff:** Blake Perez, CWC Executive Director of Administration
20 Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Executive Director of Policy
21

22 **OPENING**
23

24 **1. Chair John Knoblock will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Trails Committee**
25 **of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**
26

27 Chair John Knoblock called the meeting to order at approximately 2:03 p.m. and welcomed those
28 present.
29

30 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the January 12, 2023, Meeting.**
31

32 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to APPROVE the CWC Stakeholders Council Trails
33 Committee Meeting Minutes from January 12, 2023. Dennis Goreham seconded the motion. The
34 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
35

1 **DISCUSSION**

2
3 **1. Visitor Use Study Trails Section.**

4
5 **a. Dr. Jordan Smith will Present the Trails Section of the CWC’s Visitor Use**
6 **Study for Discussion.**
7

8 Dr. Jordan Smith from Utah State University was present to share information about the Trails
9 Section of the CWC Visitor Use Study. CWC Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez,
10 stated that the report was available on the CWC website for additional review. Dr. Smith reported
11 that he presented the Trails Section of the Visitor Use Study to the CWC Board last month. He
12 was now sharing that information with the Trails Committee. The intention was to share the main
13 findings with those present and distill them into key points that can be integrated into the Tri-
14 Canyon Trails Master Plan. The data would also benefit other discussions related to visitor use
15 management within the canyons. The Visitor Use Study was not specifically meant to inform one
16 planning process but to support many discussions.
17

18 Dr. Smith reported that the Institute of Outdoor Recreation Tourism at Utah State University is an
19 extension and research program that does work on outdoor recreation, monitoring, and
20 management. The focus was almost exclusively on visitor use management monitoring questions.
21 Federal and State agencies were provided with information regarding where people choose to go,
22 how many people are visiting, the benefits of outdoor recreation, and strategic ways to manage
23 outdoor recreation resources in a manner that limits the environmental impacts of those activities
24 while still allowing for the current and projected levels of use.
25

26 The objectives of the Visitor Use Study were presented. Dr. Smith explained that the desire is to
27 understand the spatial and temporal dynamics of current outdoor recreation use within the canyons.
28 For instance, where recreational use is occurring. The use levels are high, which caused a number
29 of issues like user conflicts and perceptions of overuse. Previously, there was not a solid
30 understanding of the variation in use across the canyons or at a site-specific level.
31

32 Dr. Smith reported that there is a U.S. Forest Service National Visitor Use Monitoring Program.
33 It was designed at a Federal level to obtain use estimates. Utah State University collected that data
34 for the Forest Service. The purpose was to give the Unita-Wasatch-Cache National Forest
35 information about the number of forest visits received per year. It did not specify what the use
36 level was by a canyon or ranger district let alone by trail. The Visitor Use Study provided more
37 detailed information. The additional data could lead to more specific decisions about the
38 distribution of use, where infrastructure may or may not be needed, and areas that receive low
39 levels of use.
40

41 Dr. Smith reported that there are unique temporal trends of use within the Central Wasatch. Those
42 would be reviewed later on in the presentation. Another objective of the Visitor Use Study was to
43 understand how outdoor recreation affects specific ecological and physical resource conditions.
44 Data was collected for certain indicators over the course of 2022, with the goal of tying it to use
45 within the canyons. The relationship between the amount of use that was happening in the canyons

1 and the ecological conditions of trails was presented previously to the CWC Stakeholders Council.
2 That information was available online for review.

3
4 Utah State University was at the end of Phase II, which is the actual data collection phase. The
5 first phase was a scoping analysis where the legislation and policy that guided outdoor recreation
6 management in the canyons. The Phase I information was reported to the CWC at the end of 2021.
7 2022 was focused on data collection as well as information on the ecological characteristics that
8 were identified for the key indicators. Dr. Smith shared the Phase I report, which had the general
9 scoping analysis and legislative review.

10
11 Dr. Smith explained that some work was done regarding social conditions in the canyons with the
12 ecological conditions. For instance, looking at how use leads to the spread of informal trails. This
13 tends to occur in areas with a high concentration of visitors, such as the high elevation lakes.
14 Dr. Smith wanted to share information about the use numbers at the Trails Committee Meeting.
15 This included the amount of use that is actually happening on trails within the Central Wasatch.
16 The Utah State University team did not rely on traditional methods of collecting information on
17 trail use. Traditional methods included using research crews to intercept visitors coming off the
18 trails and asking questions about their use or putting out trail counters. That data was useful but
19 difficult and expensive to obtain. As a result, for the Visitor Use Study, mobile location data was
20 utilized. That included data for all cell phones traveling throughout the Central Wasatch. The data
21 was made publicly available by private companies that install location-based services on
22 applications downloaded to smartphones.

23
24 The data used in the Visitor Use Study did not come primarily from trail counters or individuals
25 being intercepted as they come off a trail. It was largely coming from cell phones that traveled
26 around the canyons. Dr. Smith explained that this provided a more consistent temporal span.
27 There would be far more data than sample data could provide. Dr. Smith reported that the mobile
28 location data was calibrated with a set of trail counters to ensure that it was consistent and accurate.
29 The trail counter data was useful as it provided accurate numbers of visitor use whereas the mobile
30 location data was more temporally consistent. 31 trail counters were set out. That data was
31 combined with the data from the 42 trail counters that the Forest Service and Wasatch Backcountry
32 Alliance had out in the canyons since 2017. All of the trail counter data was used to calibrate the
33 mobile location data. He clarified that there were discussions with the Forest Service to make sure
34 the trail counters were not placed in the same locations. It was important to collect information
35 that would complement all involved.

36
37 Dr. Smith reported that the trail counter locations were overlaid with geofenced areas, where the
38 cell phones traveling through the area were tracked. He shared an image of those areas with the
39 Committee. The orange boxes indicated that the mobile location data was being calibrated with
40 the trail counter data. The yellow areas were the out-of-sample estimates, where only the mobile
41 location data was examined. Data had been collected in a lot of the more heavily used areas as
42 well as a lot of areas where there was uncertainty about the level of use.

43
44 The mobile location estimates were shared. Dr. Smith explained that the estimates were broken
45 out by season. The individual bars shown on the bar charts were representative of the different
46 seasons. The trails were shown in descending order, from most used to least used. There was a

1 variance in use across the trails in the tri-canyon region. The areas that received the most use
2 included: Brighton Lakes in the summer, White Pine Trailhead in the summer, Cecret Lake in the
3 summer, and Catherine Pass in the summer. Those areas received an exceptional amount of use
4 during the summer. Chair Knoblock asked whether a trail counter was placed further up White
5 Pine. Dr. Smith reported that there was data related to that as well.

6
7 One noticeable trend related to the amount of use. The volume of use, particularly at the trails
8 above Brighton and Alta, was exceptional. With any recreation system, if there were more than
9 1,000 trips per day taking place, that was considered an exceptionally high level of use. Dr. Smith
10 reviewed some of the less-used trails. There was less use in certain areas, which was anywhere
11 from 20 to 150 average trips per day. As a result, there was variation in the amount of use
12 happening on each trail. Some trails did not receive much use. Primarily, those trails were the
13 ones leading to the central reaches of the wilderness areas. Use tended to be higher in the locations
14 that ended at a high-elevation lake or a notable overlook.

15
16 Chair Knoblock asked about the Guardsman Pass data. The daily counts seemed odd considering
17 the number of mountain bikers that utilize the trail. Dr. Smith explained that use on Guardsman
18 Pass Road was examined throughout the year. That data looked exclusively at pedestrian trail use,
19 which meant mountain bicycling or walking. There were a lot more people hiking across
20 Guardsman Pass in the winter, either going snowshoeing or backcountry skiing. Chair Knoblock
21 believed the data was at the winter gate. This was confirmed. Barbara Cameron was surprised
22 that there was any registration of use there in the summer as it was mostly a road.

23
24 Chair Knoblock wondered if the trail counters counted mountain bicycles and road bicycles as
25 well as pedestrians. Dr. Smith explained that the counts were based on speed. It was not
26 differentiated by activity type but the threshold was high enough that the data included all
27 mountain bicycles and road bicycles that went under 30 miles per hour.

28
29 The second trend in the data pertained to the higher levels of use for trails that terminated at high-
30 elevation lakes or an overlook. There were generally higher levels of use at Red Pine, Donut Falls,
31 Lake Blanche, and the Alpine Meadows area. These are areas where there is a notable attraction
32 or the trail terminated at a high-elevation lake. There are trails around the mouth of the canyons
33 that received moderate levels of use. Dr. Smith reiterated that there was a large variation of use
34 across the different trails. He noted that the use was exceptionally higher in the summer months
35 relative to any other season. This may have contributed to some of the concerns that the Central
36 Wasatch was becoming overused and was busy all the time. The data showed that use was
37 particularly high during the summer months but not nearly as notable the rest of the year. Summer
38 use was compared to the annual average amount of use. There were only a few trails where use
39 was higher in a season other than summer. July was the busiest month across the Central Wasatch.
40 For many of the trails, the majority of use occurred at that time.

41
42 Dr. Smith reported that use also peaked on the weekends as opposed to weekdays. This was not
43 surprising, but this was the first data to confirm that. The difference in weekday use compared to
44 weekend use was shared for the year as well as for the summer months. He explained that use was
45 generally higher in the summer and was also generally higher on the weekends. The areas that

1 received the most weekend use were the trails that terminated at a high-elevation lake or were
2 urban approximate. Dr. Smith shared an example graph with those present to highlight the trends.

3
4 Use was exceptionally high at a very specific time of day. Dr. Smith reported that 47% of use
5 throughout the year took place between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Use across the
6 Central Wasatch had a huge seasonal influx in the summer, peaks in July occurs largely on the
7 weekends, and peaks at mid-day. There were opportunities to move recreation use to different
8 times of the day, such as the early morning or late afternoon to alleviate congestion concerns.

9
10 Chair Knoblock wondered if the point of the data was to illustrate that there were plenty of times,
11 days, seasons, and trails where lower use levels could be experienced. Those concerned about
12 crowds could still enjoy solitude by shifting recreation habits. Dr. Smith believed that was an
13 important implication of the data that had been collected. It was not about increasing access to
14 recreational infrastructure or providing more recreational infrastructure. It was about being
15 responsive to where trails were being used and putting investments into those areas. Use was not
16 high everywhere, but rather, it was high at certain locations. This was especially true for the trails
17 that were around Brighton, Alta, and the trails that terminated at high-elevation lakes. There
18 needed to be some strategic investments to make those sites more resilient.

19
20 Ms. Cameron noted that there are often comments that the canyons have exceeded their carrying
21 capacity. She wondered if this was accurate. Dr. Smith clarified that the idea of carrying capacity
22 was dependent upon what managers determined was the appropriate level of use. It had to do with
23 the kind of recreation experiences those managers wanted to provide within the canyons. Carrying
24 capacity was a flexible topic. What the Visitor Use Study data showed was that certain areas in
25 the canyons are receiving high levels of use. The strategic focus should be on trying to concentrate
26 use to those areas. When use was dispersed across a landscape, it actually resulted in
27 environmental and ecological impacts. Concentrating use was something to consider, but there
28 needed to be adequate and appropriate infrastructure to meet that level of use. That infrastructure
29 and concentration would alleviate pressures on trails that received less use.

30
31 Dr. Smith reported that there was a lot of variation in summer trail use. Many trails are not
32 receiving high levels of use but some are receiving an astonishing amount of use. The trails with
33 a lot of use are the ones that managers need to consider. It is important to provide opportunities
34 to recreate on those trails in sustainable ways. He noted that this is already starting to happen. For
35 instance, Alta has done a lot of the basic trail maintenance and management for Cecret Lake. That
36 was a good solution because it is important to create more resilient infrastructure to accommodate
37 the levels of use that are already taking place. What the data suggested was that more of that was
38 needed. It was important to meet the demand where it is.

39
40 Chair Knoblock wondered if the recommendation was that formal hardened loop trails be made
41 some distance away from the edge of the lakes. Dr. Smith noted that hardened loop trails could
42 be a solution. In a lot of areas, there are informal trail networks around the high-elevation lakes.
43 Management could think about ways to incorporate the informal trails into the formal trail network,
44 establish clear boundaries so it is clear where visitors should recreate around the high-elevation
45 lakes, provide the appropriate surfacing, and create clear visual boundaries on the edges of trails.
46 The idea was to concentrate visitors onto more resilient and clearly marked surfaces.

1
2 Ms. Cameron asked for clarification on the Brighton Lakes. She wanted to know if it included
3 Lake Mary. She believed it would include Lake Catherine and Lake Solitude. Dr. Smith explained
4 that it includes everything from the formal Brighton Lakes Trailhead to the Twin Lakes Reservoir
5 and over to Lake Mary. Lake Catherine was separated from that particular grouping.
6

7 One takeaway from the Visitor Use Study trail data was that the intention was to spatially
8 concentrate use to areas where use was already taking place. In this case, those areas included the
9 trails that terminated at high-elevation lakes and the trails that were already within the ski area
10 boundaries. Spatially concentrating use to those areas and providing adequate and appropriate
11 infrastructure would be a direct solution. This would ensure that the amount of use that was already
12 occurring would be accommodated. It would also limit any future environmental degradation
13 related to that use. Dr. Smith explained that the recommendation shared was based on decades of
14 work that had been done within recreation management literature.
15

16 Dennis Goreham liked what was presented. It was interesting to see the numbers and the data but
17 he had a question about the mobile location data. The last statistics he saw stated that
18 approximately 20% of Americans do not have a smartphone. He wondered if the calibration with
19 the trail counters accounted for that. Dr. Smith explained that this was the reason that data had
20 been collected from both trail counters and mobile locations. The calibration allowed there to be
21 an accurate count and accommodate those who did not have smartphones. For instance, children,
22 visitors without phones, or visitors without smartphones. That data would not have been captured
23 if only the mobile location data had been used.
24

25 Chair Knoblock asked if Dr. Smith had attended one of the Forest Service presentations related to
26 the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. Dr. Smith had not seen the presentation, but representatives
27 from the Forest Service had submitted feedback about the previous Visitor Use Study presentation.
28 There was support for the general principles that had come out of the work. There would be a
29 meeting to discuss the implications of the data and how it could be more directly relevant to the
30 Forest Service trail planning process. That meeting would take place next month.
31

32 Chair Knoblock noted that during the Mountain Accord process, the Recreation Committee agreed
33 that there should be focused use in ski resort areas, as there were parking lots, water, food, and
34 emergency medical services. He wondered whether the Visitor Use Study data supported that.
35 Dr. Smith confirmed this. The direct recommendation was to concentrate use as much as possible
36 to areas like the ski resorts because there was adequate infrastructure. Concentrating use where
37 there were already environmental impacts made sense. It would limit the environmental impacts
38 elsewhere. One of the solutions was to focus use within the boundaries of the ski areas.
39

40 The National Visitor Use Monitoring Program that the Forest Service used to collect data across
41 the entire Unita-Wasatch-Cache had been referenced earlier. As part of the CWC work, specific
42 monitoring had been done using the same criteria and protocols that were used for the Forest
43 Service sampling effort. That would allow the Utah State University team to obtain the total use
44 estimate for Millcreek Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, and Little Cottonwood Canyon. This
45 was important for the Forest Service as well, because when decisions were made about allocating
46 resources, there needed to be a defensible piece of data. The next Visitor Use Study report would

1 include the total use estimates. This would be released in May 2023. The report would also include
2 information about the economic benefits of forest recreation as well as travel patterns. Dr. Smith
3 stated that the data in the report would be included in the Environmental Dashboard in the future.
4

5 Ms. Cameron shared information related to the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan presentations that
6 had taken place recently. She attended the first meeting and noticed that a lot of the bicyclist
7 community was present. At the second meeting, there were a lot of people from the hiking
8 community. There had been some pushback about the idea of hardening trails during that public
9 meeting. Some were concerned that hardening the trails would lead to more visitation. However,
10 Will McCarvill praised the work done by Dr. Smith and expressed interest in the data.
11

12 Chair Knoblock asked Dr. Smith about visitor capacity. Dr. Smith explained that he approached
13 visitor capacity with a lot of caveats. Visitor capacity was something that was heavily used in the
14 1970s through the 1990s. It came out of the idea that only a certain amount of people would
15 recreate in an area. Once there were too many people, that use would disperse elsewhere. The
16 data seen over the past several decades showed that people tended to acclimate to the conditions
17 at the site that they were visiting. There were tradeoffs, but people were generally satisfied with
18 their recreation decisions. As a result, the idea of capacity was flexible. Discussions were had
19 about capacity in other areas. Mr. Perez noted that expectations and perceptions tended to change
20 over time. Mr. Goreham felt that temporal flexibility was important to consider.
21

22 Mr. Goreham asked for additional information about the data collection. For instance, how far the
23 data was collected past the normal spots where people stopped. Dr. Smith explained that this had
24 been done for a few trails. Generally, there was a lot less use beyond the lakes. The areas off of
25 the formal trail network had been explored and the data was negligible. The spots that were at the
26 heart of the wilderness areas received very little use relative to the trailheads and built
27 infrastructure. Chair Knoblock shared some examples and referenced Red Pine Lake, Maybird
28 Lake, and White Pine Lake. In his experience, there had not been many people there.
29

30 Dr. Smith reported that the data looked at the trip length and the amount of time that visitors were
31 spending on a trail before returning back to a trailhead. The average trip length for a pedestrian in
32 the tri-canyon area was 49 minutes. That was relatively short. It was important to consider that
33 when attempting to manage outdoor recreation infrastructure within the canyons.
34

35 Ms. Cameron asked what should be done about the wilderness areas. For instance, Lake Blanche
36 and Butler Fork went up into wilderness areas. She wondered if use there should be discouraged.
37 Dr. Smith reiterated that it was important to concentrate use at the areas that were already popular,
38 such as the areas around Alta and Brighton. If those areas were marketed, that would likely make
39 a difference in the future. That might be a conversation to have with the Utah Office of Tourism.
40 Marketing locations that were closer to the ski resorts, as opposed to other areas in the canyons
41 with limited infrastructure, might be a good way to achieve concentrated use.
42

43 Chair Knoblock asked about the S-Curves in Big Cottonwood Canyon. There was one parking lot
44 that served three different trails. He wondered whether it would be best to segregate those
45 trailheads or if it would be better to leave the area alone. Alternatively, there could be a loop trail
46 at Lake Blanche so everyone was not coming up and down the same trail. Dr. Smith noted that

1 trailheads and parking facilities were dependent upon the extent to which the Forest Service was
2 able to build out those areas. There were areas like Lake Blanche, White Pine, and Red Pine that
3 had some capacity needs with regard to parking. However, he did not want to make specific
4 recommendations for those areas. It was important to focus on concentrating use where possible.
5

6 Ms. Cameron asked about the Willow Heights Trail. She wanted to know if there were any
7 counters in that area. Dr. Smith did not believe so, but he offered to double-check that for her.
8 Ms. Cameron noted that it was Salt Lake City Public Utilities property with some Forest Service
9 ownership higher up. That was being used more often, but there was no parking outside of roadside
10 parking. Mr. Perez believed that area would continue to increase in popularity.
11

12 Chair Knoblock expressed his appreciation for Dr. Smith and his presentation at the Trails
13 Committee Meeting. He noted that Bekee Hotze from the Forest Service believed a National
14 Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) study would be needed before transit service to trailheads
15 would be permitted. Chair Knoblock wondered what Dr. Smith thought about that. Dr. Smith
16 noted that transit to trailheads intersected with a lot of recommendations the Utah State University
17 team had made. If transit service was provided directly to trailheads, it would effectively increase
18 the amount of use that those trailheads would receive. That was not an ideal solution for areas
19 where there was a desire to minimize use. It would depend on the trails that the transit service was
20 providing access to and whether or not there was a desire to increase trail use in those areas. For
21 instance, if transit access was provided to the ski resorts, where there was a desire to spatially
22 concentrate visitors, then it would be a win-win situation.
23

24 Ms. Cameron wondered whether Dr. Smith viewed Cardiff as a mid-canyon area or a destination.
25 Dr. Smith explained that it was an area where there were medium-use levels. It may be best to
26 preserve wilderness or backcountry experiences and concentrate use elsewhere. Mr. Perez noted
27 that the current Forest Management Plan was not planning to add any parking or take away any
28 parking. He wondered what would happen if parking was removed and transit was provided to
29 certain destinations. Dr. Smith noted that transit in a lot of recreation systems across the county
30 was being used to control access. For instance, the shuttle system in Zion. It was a worthwhile
31 solution if it was the only way people were able to access the trailheads. When both automobile
32 access and transit were permitted, there were a lot of variables. If transit was the only way that
33 people were able to access recreation areas, there would be more control. Dr. Smith noted that
34 there was not a lot of precedent of that happening on Forest Service lands. Committee Members
35 thanked Dr. Smith for attending the Trails Committee Meeting and sharing trails-related data.
36

37 **2. USFS Trails Master Plan.**

38
39 a. **Compare the Master Plan Website Map with the Previous Mountain Accord**
40 **Trails Plan Map. <http://www.tricanyontrails.org/engage.html>.**

41
42 b. **The Committee will Discuss Any Trails Master Plan Updates.**
43

44 Chair Knoblock reported that the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan was discussed during the previous
45 item. Ms. Cameron wondered if any of the Trails Committee Members attended the Tri-Canyon
46 Trails Master Plan presentations. Some had not. Ms. Cameron reported that there was good digital

1 outreach and the website had a lot of information. There was an interactive map where input could
2 be added. Mr. Goreham pointed out that the interactive map would come down on February 21,
3 2023, so there were only a few more weeks to add information.

4
5 Chair Knoblock reported that the input received from the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan public
6 meetings, as well as the data from the interactive map, would be reviewed. The Forest Service
7 would use that information to put together a draft plan. He believed the intention was to have a
8 draft plan ready by July or August 2023. There would be a round of public comments at that time.
9 The goal was that in a year or so, the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan would be finalized.

10
11 Chair Knoblock felt the public meetings were beneficial and there was a lot of interaction. It
12 seemed that participants were trying to understand what the plan was and what the process would
13 look like moving forward. Mr. Perez explained that he had not attended the presentations, but he
14 had spoken to Zinnia Wilson with the Forest Service and Ms. Hotze to make sure they were taking
15 advantage of the data from the Visitor Use Study. He was happy to see that work moving ahead.
16 Ms. Cameron believed the Forest Service was receptive to the data from the Visitor Use Study.

17
18 **3. Other Trail Planning Updates.**

19
20 The Committee discussed how the information from Dr. Smith would be presented to the full
21 Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez believed it was important to inform the Council that both the
22 CWC Board and Trails Committee had been briefed on the trails component of the Visitor Use
23 Study. Chair Knoblock wondered whether any information had been distributed to the
24 Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez noted that information had been distributed in January 2023
25 before the presentation from Dr. Smith. In addition, information was available on the CWC
26 website. If there was support from the Trails Committee, another email could be sent out to
27 Stakeholders Council Members for review. The Committee Members expressed their support.

28
29 Ms. Cameron wondered if it would be possible to meet with Chair Knoblock and write a brief
30 summary. That summary could be distributed to the Stakeholders Council Members. Mr. Perez
31 noted that there was an Executive Summary in the Visitor Use Study report. That could be
32 highlighted for Council Members. Ms. Cameron offered to review the summary again. She felt it
33 was important for Council Members to know that a recommendation had been made to harden
34 certain trails. If that was done, there would need to be restrooms, signs, and information kiosks.
35 As for transit, that was another issue that needed to be discussed. The data had a lot of impacts.
36 Mr. Perez noted that there was nothing in the report against transit. He cautioned that the
37 Committee needed to be mindful of the information shared. Ms. Cameron wondered whether the
38 statement about not prioritizing mid-canyon trails was something that should be stated. Chair
39 Knoblock believed that might be premature. There were a lot of moving parts and it was important
40 not to speculate. There was an Executive Summary already prepared by the Utah State University
41 team. It was appropriate to distribute that to the Stakeholders Council Members for review. The
42 Committee further discussed how to best share information with the Stakeholders Council.

43
44 Mr. Perez shared the Executive Summary with the Trails Committee. It was on Page 3 of the
45 report document. The summary was concise and should be easy for Council Members to read.
46 Ms. Cameron felt that the average trip length of 49 minutes should be taken into account. She

1 noted that the document did not list the highest-used trails. There were a lot of data points that she
2 felt should be the focus of the summary. As a result, she felt it would be best to write a separate
3 summary with bullet points. She noted that the Executive Summary was not as approachable.
4 Chair Knoblock believed that the Executive Summary and appropriate links to the Visitor Use
5 Study information should be shared with the Stakeholders' Council Members first. After that,
6 Chair Knoblock and Ms. Cameron could meet and create a presentation summary.

7
8 Chair Knoblock discussed the information that had been shared during the presentation from Dr.
9 Smith. He pointed out that White Pine Trailhead and Cardiff Trailhead had been referenced as
10 recreation nodes, in addition to the ski resort areas, by the Recreation Committee during the
11 Mountain Accord process. Ms. Cameron confirmed this. There were seven recreation nodes in
12 Big Cottonwood Canyon and four in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Chair Knoblock spoke further
13 about Stakeholders Council outreach. He asked that CWC Staff share the Executive Summary and
14 informational links for the Visitor Use Study as well as information related to the Tri-Canyon
15 Trails Master Plan. He reiterated that a short presentation summary would be drafted as well. Mr.
16 Goreham was supportive of that approach and felt it was important to share the information.

17
18 Mr. Perez explained that he intended to have the packet sent out on February 22, 2023. He asked
19 that any summary information be submitted before that date. Chair Knoblock believed a
20 presentation summary could be completed within that timeframe. Mr. Perez informed those
21 present that a portion of the next Stakeholders Council Meeting would be focused on the Big
22 Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”). Another portion of the meeting would
23 be on the presentation from Dr. Smith and the Visitor Use Study. Ms. Cameron suggested that
24 Chair Knoblock present the summary at the Stakeholders Council Meeting and that there be a
25 question-and-answer portion as well. She was not sure that any recommendations would come out
26 of that meeting. Mr. Goreham agreed it was premature for recommendations.

27
28 Ms. Cameron wondered whether the BCC MAP would be discussed during a future Transportation
29 Committee Meeting. Mr. Perez reported that there was a Transportation Committee Meeting
30 scheduled for February 16, 2023. The BCC MAP would also be discussed at the next Stakeholders
31 Council Meeting. There were a lot of opportunities to ask questions about the BCC MAP.

32 ADJOURN

33 **1. Chair John Knoblock will Close the Public Meeting as Chair of the Trails Committee** 34 **of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

35
36 **MOTION:** Dennis Goreham moved to ADJOURN the Trails Committee Meeting. Barbara
37 Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

38
39
40
41 The Central Wasatch Commission Trails Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Trails Committee Meeting held Thursday, February 9, 2023.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____