

---

## Staff Report Summary and Recommendation for update to Wasatch Canyons General Plan

**Public Body: Salt Lake County Council**

**Meeting Date: June 9th, 2020**

**Planner: Jake Young /**

**Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval**

---

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

---

This report includes comments submitted as part of the May 19<sup>th</sup> report and additional comments since received through the email address provided at the project website <https://slco.org/planning-transportation/wasatch-canyons-general-plan-update/>. Additional comments were emailed to staff and or others at the County. If comments were sent directly to the Council and not provided to staff they may not be included.

#### **Previously received email comments include the following:**

Barbara Cameron/Big Cottonwood Community Council - Date 05.06.2020

Big Cottonwood Canyon Community Council is grateful to the staff and consultants who have included our community in this General Plan Update every step of the way. It is a comprehensive plan for our future, and we look forward to helping implement its suggestions and guidelines. Congratulations on a very impressive project.

Barbara Cameron  
Chair, BCCA"

Doug Hansen – 05.11.2020

Here is a link that gives a little history on the quarry in parleys canyon(<https://utahrails.net/industries/cement.php>). This quarry has been operating since the late 1800'S and has always been a key component to the growth of the Salt Lake Valley. The quarry is very important element to Utah's present and future economic growth. I believe it might be worthy to be added to the timeline.

P. Bruce Badger – 05.14.2020

I own a cabin in The Firs summer home tract in Millcreek Canyon. Please, please, please do not put a trash receptacle at the Alexander Basin trail head. My cabin is one of the closest to that trail head (nearly across the road) and a trash receptacle will attract bears and other animals. This would risk the safety of my children and grandchildren. Please don't do it.

**The Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission held two Public Hearings February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020 and March 5<sup>th</sup> 2020.**

At the February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting 10 speakers spoke regarding the General Plan.

## Request: General Plan Update

These comments are taken from the minutes.

<https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/580175.pdf>

Speaker # 1: Sierra Club Name: Will McCarvill Address: 3607 Golden Hills Avenue Comments: Mr. McCarvill said he likes the plan, forward looking, much better than the old plan. Definite engagement by the county in the hills, county stepped up and would be a good partner, including money. Users are Salt Lake County residents.

Speaker # 2: Big Cottonwood Community Council Name: Barbara Cameron Comments: Ms. Cameron said she agrees with Mr. McCarvill, outstanding plan and pleasure working with all involved. Accessory dwelling units and short-term rentals discussed. Read from her handout; can work on action items in ordinances.

Speaker # 3: Town of Brighton Council Name: Carolyn Keigley Address: Comments: Ms. Keigley read from her emails. Asked to limit density/number of short-term rentals, make affordable for locals to live.

Speaker # 4: Citizen Name: Norm Henderson Address: Comments: Mr. Henderson said he has appreciation for the plan. Transportation planning is a focus of the plan and a requirement to focus on that. Concerned the plan didn't hearken back to the state direction in the Wasatch canyons. Mountain accord was trying to find a solution. State came out with goals of what needed to be done and connection of the seven ski resorts between Summit and Salt Lake County. People getting trapped at dead ends because of catastrophe, and ski resorts concerned. Plan should have brought the goals of the state into the county plan and addressed. Suggestion Town of Brighton be brought into the process and get their thoughts as well. Concern with safety and transportation is a big concern.

Speaker # 5: Parley's Canyon Community Council Name: Shaun Hoggan Address: Mount Aire Comments: Mr. Hoggan thanked staff for the open hearing environment. Indicated demographics of Parley's is different, various stipulations in a blanket format may not apply. Moderate-income housing difficult for residents of the area. Appreciate Ms. Cameron's comments on suggestions and alternatives.

Speaker # 6: Citizen Name: Kirk Nichols Address: 12377 Camp Tuttle Road Comments: Mr. Nichols referred to three gap studies. Latent demand study indicates visitation will double tomorrow if it's easy to get up the canyon. Suggests a little more regional transportation planning for Wasatch front and back connection. Suggests a visitor use management study; similar to proposals with CWC.

Speaker # 7: UDOT Name: John Thomas Address: 2060 South 2760 West Comments: Mr. Thomas said the County reached out to UDOT and did a really good job engaging meaningfully with the public. Taught and showed the importance of the canyons. Good overview of topics and issues and support different goals and policies and action items and very engaged. Working with Mr. Young was fantastic and engaged and recognized his meaning for being there. UDOT supports the general plan.

Speaker # 8: Town of Brighton Mayor Name: Dan Knopp Address: 11332 East Big Cottonwood Canyon Comments: Mr. Knopp said the council met prior to this meeting. Mr. Young was supposed to bring the general plan to the council meeting, little too much work to do in that meeting. Now some issues resolved, thinks town will be able to support but requests Commission to push off until after the town council meeting in March (Council ultimately recommended approval).

Speaker # 9: Save our Canyons Name: Carl Fisher Address: 3690 East Fort Union Blvd, #101 Comments: Mr. Fisher said he compared notes from October and January. Great work; doesn't know he's ever been to a meeting on the Wasatch mountains where everyone is saying the same thing. Likes the idea of parking garages outside of the canyons on approaches. Requests stronger language on ski area expansion and connect. Supported the legacy product environmental dashboard and funding. Need funding for plan implementation, including retaining revenues from canyon users and other innovative solutions. Advised the MRZ is not mountain recreation zone but mountain resort zone.

Speaker # 10: Citizen Name: Emily Gretsky Address: Brighton Comments: Ms. Gretsky said she loves the collaboration. When the projects are outlined, a lot of good ideas come from the locals to get involved. Echoes

**Request: General Plan Update**

keeping funds in the town and she operates a short-term rental and is honest. Concern over potential short-term rental ordinance limitations encouraging short-term rentals to fly under the radar and hurt the community. Supports reasonable regulations of short-term rentals, not everyone is as responsible.

The March 2020 Planning Commission meeting notes are unavailable. During that public hearing multiple comments were made regarding the need for emergency egress, water availability for ADUs, including housing data for building permits in the plan, and emergency planning.

The Town of Brighton and residents have concern over short term rentals. Currently the Planning Commission is working on an update to the County's short-term rental ordinance to address the concerns raised in the public comment to the General Plan, which it will share with the County Council and request that such update go through the public process.

**Salt Lake County Council conducted a Public Hearing May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 verbal public comments from that public hearing are available in the meeting minutes.**

**The following comments have been received since the last report was provided for the May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Public Hearing:**

Vaughn Cox – 5.14.2020

Please include the following goal in the Plan.

**GOALS AND STRATEGIES RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENT FOR BIG AND LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYONS**

**GOAL:** Prepare for potential Natural hazards and disasters in the canyons and foothills

All Canyon Strategies:

Salt Lake County Office of Regional Planning and Development will work with the US Forest Service, Utah's Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands, Salt Lake City Public Utilities, Municipal Services District (MSD), Town of Alta, Town of Brighton, FEMA, the general public, and private property owners in the canyons, etc. to develop an emergency (wildfire, avalanche, mud slide, etc) hazard mitigation strategy and action plan for the Wasatch Canyons. This plan will develop a clear management strategy and goals to provide for healthy stand density, proper species composition, the reduction of hazardous fuel loadings, insect infestation, etc. in the Wasatch Canyon forests. The plans are intended to improve forest health and reduce the fire hazard potential to residents and visitors. The plan will identify and set forth needed vehicular and machinery access in order to achieve the forest management goals specified. The plan will ensure and provide secondary access in the canyons and will be in compliance with existing Salt Lake County code, including but not limited to the International Fire Code (IFC). The plan will be completed by the end of 2021.

These same concepts and principles should also be applied to Millcreek Canyon.

Please include the goals and items listed below in the Plan. The goal includes reference to specific goals that have been made in the past and I do not believe that they have been changed. If the have please provide me with the details (when, where, how, who, etc.)

**1. GOALS AND STRATEGIES RELATED TO TRANSPORTATION FOR BIG AND LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYONS**

**GOAL:** Support enhanced year-round transit service to and within the Wasatch canyons.

All-Canyon Policies:

- The goals of any year-round transportation system in the Wasatch canyons are consistent with Utah Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 (SCR10) passed in 2012 and also identified by then Utah's Environmental Advisor Ted Wilson, which specifies as follows:
  - o Provide for emergency/secondary egress for residents and visitors of Big and little Cottonwood canyons
  - o Reduce air and water pollution in the Wasatch Canyons by reducing automobile traffic
  - o Improve access for local skiers by decreasing congestion and increasing mobility on canyon roads and at canyon entry points
  - o Connect the seven ski resorts

**Request: General Plan Update**

- o Facilitate a skiing experience found nowhere else in North America

Jason Schnaitter – 5.18.2020

Dear Planners,

Regarding the Wasatch Canyons General plan draft. I have a comment regarding the Destination Nodes map (page 42) and notation regarding the inclusion of trash receptacles at the Alexander Basin trailhead. I would be against the inclusion of trash receptacles as I believe it would have the unintended consequence/encouragement of dumping of trash. This could encourage native wildlife to linger/depend upon the trash cans as a food source which would not be good for anyone. While I'm in favor of improving the parking area I would not be in favor of trash receptacles at this parking area or the Elbow fork parking area.

Steven Jackson – 5.16.2020

For Millcreek Canyon, I think bikers should also pay a fee for use of the canyon, especially since most of the fees collected are going toward constructing more uphill bike lanes and because so many bikers use the canyon road and trails.

Diane Soule – 5.16.2020

We live across from the Mt. Olympus trailhead and are VERY interested in what is being done there. We built our home 3 years ago (moved from the midwest) and had a huge lack of knowledge of the area. It appears this week that there is a SWPPP project going on. Are they improving the parking? Is ANYONE going to improve the trailhead, parking and signage? We pick up about 2 large black garbage bags a month of broken bottles, fast food trash and other extraneous things like condoms. A lot of young people use this trail and the west side of Wasatch Blvd. to hike then party. The signage is AWFUL, the police never come unless you call them and the trail parking is far too small for the number of people who hike here.

Kyle Maynard Friends of Alta – 5.18.2020

Friends of Alta has been Alta's only environment non-profit and land trust since 1982. Our mission has been to protect Alta, the Albion Basin, and the watershed from overdevelopment and degradation. We write you today to comment on the Wasatch Canyon General Plan Update.

Overall, Friends of Alta [FOA] approves of the intent and message in this plan. The emphasis on preservation of our natural resources is a must, as our communities continue to grow. The use of science-based resources to inform decision making is essential to the future of our canyons. FOA encourages Salt Lake County to fund and utilize the Environmental Dashboard – a Central Wasatch Commission project through the University of Utah – as well as the Wildlife Camera project through the UofU Biodiversity and Conservation Ecology Lab and Wild Utah Project. These science-based programs and other should be used to provided 'real-time' data to help inform decision-makers of best practices in our canyon. We, as a community, should be emphasizing the protection and revitalization of our natural resource, not the assurance of protection against increased development.

Closely tied to the use of science to inform decision-making is the use of a Visitor Use Management [VUM] study and strategy. While hotly debated, VUM is a tool for citizens, local government, and the Forest Service to prevent degradation of the Wasatch Front in the face of increasing pressures. We must start taking proactive steps to protect our canyons. VUM is erroneously believed to be a call to ban entrance to the canyons. On the contrary, VUM are strategies, informed by science, to use space efficiently while mitigating our human impact. As the General Plan states, the Forest Service is resistant to VUM. This is because it costs money, time, and would require a potential revision. The Forest Service has stated the existing management mechanisms are sufficient to control demands on our canyon. We fear that in the long term, the Forest Service's means of managing visitation and manpower to implement said means will not be enough as the Salt Lake Valley's population and outdoor industries continue to explode.

## Request: General Plan Update

Similarly, throughout the document, the General Plan has an action item of future watershed management. Salt Lake County, being the home of a large portion of the Wasatch Front, should take ownership of future status of our mountains by adding particular action items to work with the Forest Service for preserving the environmental resources of the Wasatch Front.

An endorsement from Salt Lake County of the use of Visitor Use Management to plan for the future of our canyons will go a long way to ensuring that practices are implemented now in preparation of the future. We understand the Forest Service controls the management of the Wasatch Front public land. However, we, the citizens of Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Alta, and Brighton are the primary public which the Forest Service serves with their management. You, as elected public officials of Salt Lake County, have the ability and obligation to represent the interest, in particularity, of your constituents. As such, by taking a stance on VUM, on future management of the canyons, and on the priorities of said management, you are providing guidance to the Forest Service of what the public wants to see in the Wasatch Front. With environmental degradation increasing and the pressures on the canyons increasing, now is not the time to defer to the other authorities without compelling suggestions of how the land in our backyard should be managed.

Norm Henderson - 5.18.2020

Dear Salt Lake County Council -

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment regarding the Draft Wasatch Canyons General Plan. I have read the general plan and have the following comments. I appreciate all the hard work that the County department of Regional Planning and Development has put into this plan over the past several years. While there is a great deal to celebrate in this plan there are a few MAJOR issues that need immediate attention before the plan can be approved to adequately protect the health and safety of the residents and visitors of the Wasatch canyons.

**Mountain Transportation Plan** - One section of the plan that is severely deficient is the transportation section. Over 8 years ago, the state specified that the county develop a proposal for a mountain transportation system. Over the following years, the state appropriated millions of dollars for the county led Mountain Accord effort (now CWC) to come up with a mountain transportation system for the Wasatch that would link the seven ski resorts in two counties and provide for secondary egress from the canyons to protect residents and millions of visitors in case of emergencies. Many of us expected that a conceptual plan of action as outlined in SCR-10 to be included in the transportation component of the general plan. At the very least, a clear set of transportation goals like those set forth in SCR-10 should have been specified. It is very frustrating that the County is silent and does not identify the critical goals in its Wasatch Canyons General Plan, yet goes around its own planning process and makes mountain transportation system recommendations through other planning processes such as the Regional Transportation Plan (Wasatch Front Regional Council) and the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System planning process.

It is unclear and suspicious why the recommendations made through these other process should not show up in the County General Plan for the same area. It is critical that the County, in its General Plan, evaluate and identify all risks to the health and safety of its canyon residents and visitors and make an appropriate recommendation to ameliorate those risks.

**Forest Health** - Forest health relates directly to fire danger. Forest health includes more than just fuel loadings. Forests that have unnaturally high stand density become decadent and unhealthy as time goes on. The recent balsam woolly adelgid (BWA) infestation into large portions of the subalpine fir stands has caused even more stand decadence and extreme fuel loadings. The County has been specifically informed of the unhealthy condition of the forest stands in the Wasatch through the Environmental Dashboard developed through Mountain Accord. For whatever reason, the County General Plan has not used the results of the dashboard process to quantify and locate these unhealthy forest stands for the public; nor does the plan make recommendations to better manage the forests to improve health and reduce fire risk to better protect the residents and visitors.

**Road and trail access** - In order to properly manage forest health in the Wasatch, adequate road and trail access are required. Fire danger in the Canyons is high and mechanized access to the hot spots is a must. It is alarming that the Transportation section of the Plan does not adequately address this issue. The General Plan should include an inventory of available roads and rights-of-way necessary to better manage the forest, to fight fires, and to better protect our natural resources and watershed. The County is obligated to make recommendations to the various public land managers, such as the US Forest Service, Salt Lake City Public Utilities, and

## **Request: General Plan Update**

others. According to the DRAFT Plan, the County has failed to identify and provide this critical component to forest health, fire safety, and watershed protection.

Bruce Woolstenhulme – 5.19.2020

I appreciate the thought and planning efforts that have gone into this plan. As a cabin owner in upper Millcreek Canyon (The Firs residential recreation cabin tract), we travel the canyon road on a regular basis and certainly support activities/initiatives that promote safety for all that use the canyon. As well, we are concerned that the capacity of the canyon to reasonably and sustainably support recreational activities not be exceeded.

In reviewing the plan, I have particular concerns with possible plans to further improve the Alexander Basin Trailhead as it is listed as a "recreation" node. Indicated possible improvements to such nodes include the addition of more parking, restrooms, and trash collection facilities. Given the close proximity of this trailhead to The Firs cabin tract, we would be very concerned with any plan to add trash collection facilities as such facilities are frequently associated with the higher incidence of unpleasant odors, the presence of flies, etc. Any trash that is associated with the use of this trail system should just be taken out of the canyon; there would be no good reason to encourage hikers to leave the trash there. In addition, such a trash collection facility would encourage the presence of wild animals in the area. In the past several years, more and more black bears have been seen inside of and in the general area of the cabin tract. While we understand that we are living in the forest, we also are not looking to further encourage situations where humans and dangerous wildlife might collide. The parking area near the Alexander Basin trailhead is very limited in size with no real room for expansion. As the canyon is extremely narrow with limited visibility at this point, it is a somewhat dangerous area for traffic being that vehicles leaving the parking area must back out into the traffic lanes.

I understand that there are many factors to be considered and appreciate your taking these comments under consideration.

Barbara Townsend – 5.19.2020

I have two comments to make regarding the Mill Creek Canyon plans.

1) I do not believe that trash receptacles should be placed in the canyon. And especially not at trailheads. If you pack it in, you should pack it out. Accumulation of trash will attract wildlife. How often would the trash bins be emptied? Do we really want large trash trucks traveling in the canyon. I am very opposed to have trash bins in the canyon.

2) Dogs are out of control. I understand that the canyon currently allows dogs and they can officially be off leash on odd numbered days. However as a hiker I see people with 5 and 6 dogs and many times the dogs are off leash on even numbered days. Dog walkers should not be allowed.

David Parker - 5.19.2020

I am concerned about the county having trash bins in the canyon. There has been a considerable campaign to "pack it in, pack it out". Years ago, there were some trash bins. This was a smelly mess. Not only was there a problem with smell, but it also attracted undesirables in the Canyons with their rowdy parties and keggers. Further it brought out scavenger and aggressive animals such as bears and a plethora of raccoons. Resources could be better spent in other ways

Wayne Crawford - 5.19.2020

Dear County Council members, I read the story in the Desert News regarding fire danger in the canyons and the lack of a plan in the County's General Plan. I would like to add to the fire conversation. I am the President of Cardiff Canyons Owners Association, representing over 200 members with ownership interests in Cardiff Fork of Big Cottonwood Canyon above Doughnut Falls. We understand fire danger in the canyons and its relationship to forest health. I believe the County should view us, private landowners, as ready, willing, and able partners in the canyons. We would love to work with the County, US Forest Service, forestry professionals, and others to achieve better forest health, thereby decreasing the chances of extreme wildfires. Unfortunately, we find ourselves in unnecessary conflict with the County; I am not sure if this is due to the multiple and competing jurisdictions, or other reasons. Nonetheless, for the past, almost 2 years, one of our landowners has been defending himself

## Request: General Plan Update

against the County for cutting down a dead tree, leaning over a trail/road, on private property. This has cost him thousands of dollars in attorney fees and a tremendous amount of time. One hopes the General Plan will specifically address competing jurisdiction and set a clear direction on how to partner with them and move forward. Without pointing out the specific conflicts it is impossible to understand the problem and get resolution. The US Forest Service, State Agencies, and others identify these canyons as extreme fire danger, perpetuated by insect infestation, too many trees, and extreme amounts of underbrush. They have reclassified dead standing trees as fuel instead of habitat, and have now recommended physically thinning trees and removing the dead and down. Yet, the County spends enormous time and resources attacking the very people who can and should be their partner in this endeavor. The US Forest Service, State Agencies, and others identify these canyons as extreme fire danger, perpetuated by insect infestation, too many trees, and extreme amounts of underbrush. They have reclassified dead standing trees as fuel instead of habitat, and have now recommended physically thinning trees and removing the dead and down. Yet, the County spends enormous time and resources attacking the very people who can and should be their partner in this endeavor. The current general plan points out high fire hazard but makes no determination as to why. It also does not offer specific solutions on how to improve forest health and reduce hazardous fuel loadings in the wildland-urban interface areas of Big Cottonwood Canyon. It is important to add specificity and accountability to the plan to ensure that critical management goals are achieved. I respectfully request that you add language to the General Plan that highlights the importance of working with private landowners in the canyons to implement Best Management Practices for forest health and fire mitigation. I also request that the plan specify that the county will work with the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association and other private land and homeowners to create this language.

E. Blake Ingraham – 5.29.2020

Make sure public access and parking for hikers and skiers near Alta remains. No corporate takeover of our access points! No fees either, this is OUR National Forest. Its a shame how Alta now controls access to Albion Basin and charges a fee. Thank you!

Wayne Crawford – 6.1.2020

My name is Wayne Crawford, and as you know, I am the President of Cardiff Canyon Owners Association, representing over two hundred landowners in Big Cottonwood canyon. A particular concern of ours is that of forestry management, especially as it relates to the implementation of the previous Wasatch Canyons General Plan. I would like to avoid the mistakes of the past in an effort to prevent horrendous damage in the future. Specifically, the county has contributed to “powder keg” fire conditions in the canyons through its policies that generally prohibit tree thinning and removal in the canyons. As you recall, the Mormon Pioneers started logging in Big Cottonwood Canyon shortly after arriving in the year of 1847. They harvested most trees over 10 inches in diameter in the areas around a half dozen sawmills in the canyon. When logging was complete, the Wasatch Nursery at the mouth of the South Fork of Big Cottonwood Canyon (Mill D or Cardiff Canyon) provided hundreds of thousands of seedling pines for replanting for the next crop of timber. That crop is now ripe for harvest, and the oldest trees are succumbing to age, disease, and insect infestations. There are multiple areas of standing dead timber that will lead to substantial deforestation of the canyons if (when) a fire ever gets started. ALL parties will lose if there is a fire in the canyons. The forest service has recently recognized this extreme danger and reclassified these trees as fuel rather than habitat. Unfortunately, the county currently, and again through its draft general plan, fails to recognize and address this extreme hazard. In fact, not only does the county fail to recognize and address the blatant hazard, they are actively prosecuting one of my landowners for felling a dangerous tree. To add even more confusion, Salt Lake County Planning & Development Services claims we must have a permit to cut a tree, but when we ask for a permit, we are told there really isn't a permit. I am not sure if this is selective enforcement or what, but Salt Lake County's attempt to intimidate and punish has resulted in our landowner hiring an attorney and spending thousands of dollars in legal fees. This case is also inconsistent with the zoning of Forest and Recreation that only allows agricultural use of the land (timber crops) without a conditional use permit. For the County to essentially condemn and seize our timber crop and fine landowners \$800 per tree harvested is incomprehensible. While I am the first to admit confusion surrounding this issue, my question is simple: Does the County and Forest Service want to work with private landowners to decrease fire danger in the canyons, or do they want to create more conflict? Our private landowners, in spite of the ongoing prosecution by the county, stand ready, willing, and able to help and assist in achieving healthy

## Request: General Plan Update

forests, a healthy watershed, and better communication between elected officials and private property owners. The Wasatch Canyons General Plan must not only reference the fire danger, compounded by high stand density, dead and down, insect infestation, etc., but it must set a specific time frame for completion of inventories and management plans including instructions to remedy any conflicts in ordinances and policies regarding the removal of dead and down, standing dead, etc. Thank you in advance for your kind consideration of the foregoing, and for any assistance, you may be able to provide.

James Thompson – 6.2.2020

Upon reading through the story map items, I don't see much in the way of reducing the amount of "private cars" going into the canyons--other than I believe I'm seeing more bus stops in the canyons--but there should be some buses or even vans designated for express destinations--i.e. some to individual resorts, some to trailheads, some to cabin areas, some to "sledding sites." But what really needs to happen is to have ways for the public to get to the canyon mouths, especially during peak periods (i.e. winter weekends) without having to drive themselves--but to have frequent mass transit opportunities--i.e. more buses, more vans, even building a light-rail line along the east side of the valley--and that these mass transit venues will be affordable! Thanks for your attention.

Aaron London – 6.4.2020

The Wasatch is already maxed out and yet developers keep pushing for more ski area expansion and interconnect. There's barely enough room already for everyone who wants to use the canyons whether they pay a ski area for the privilege or do it with their own two feet. To continue to allow ski area expansion, interconnect, and any further development of the canyons is to serve one group at the expense of another. The balance we have now must be preserved. No to interconnect. No to ski area expansion. Yes to sustainable transportation solutions that we can implement now and much less expensively than some massive boondoggle like a tunnel, train, or aerial system.

Cyle Buxton – 6.4.2020

Dear Salt Lake County Mayor and Council, I appreciate your attention to the DRAFT Wasatch Canyons General Plan. Since this is the first update to the plan in 30 years, I was anticipating the plan would identify all significant land management issues and propose some sort of clear path forward for areas of conflict. It is my understanding that the State has directed the County to do this through its general plan (which includes the County Resource Management Plan). Unfortunately, many long-festering land use issues that are important to private property owners and visitors are not even acknowledged as a problem in the DRAFT plan, let alone addressed in the plan for resolution. My family has owned land in Big Cottonwood Canyon for several decades; upper Cardiff to be exact. Private property rights and land use are very important to us. Not only does this issue affect me and other private landowners, but also, millions of canyon visitors. Unfortunately, the reference to private property in the Land Use section is vague and confusing at best. For example, on page 30, it specifically states: Item 3. Private Property: Provide for continuation and improvement of approved land uses. Can someone please tell me what this means? For example, while I am told I cannot camp on my own property, backpackers and day hikers are allowed to camp and picnic all through the Wasatch on public land (including land owned by Salt Lake City Public Utilities). As private landowners in the canyons, we are faced with confusion, vagueness, and what appears to be selective enforcement. Recently, my attorney, desperately wanting to know from the County what I can do on my private property, sincerely asked the County District Attorneys office if I could do something as simple as eat lunch on my property. Their response, "We don't know". To appreciate the confusion even further; I serve as Vice President of the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association. We have over 200 landowners in our Association. One of our landowners has a yurt; has had for years. To my knowledge, there has been no pressure from the County for permits, compliance, and inspections for this particular landowner and this particular yurt. However, in the last couple of years, the County has applied great pressure on me and another landowner as well, alleging non-compliance, and violation of multiple ordinances, etc. When we finally suggested to the County attorneys that we follow the same permitting process, the same fee schedule, and the same approvals as this particular landowner, we were met with blank stares. Of course, we provided the parcel number, the mining claim number, and stated that the owners are Mr. Rick Reese and Mr. Ted Wilson, the Mayor's father. When we pressed further, asking for the permits, the approvals, the inspection schedule, the vegetation disturbance reports, etc., for the Reese/Wilson yurt, we are told they do not exist. I like Rick Reese and I like Ted Wilson. Ted was a



**Request: General Plan Update**

good friend to my father who passed away a few years ago. However, I am beginning to wonder if the Mayor's father and his friend are getting preferential treatment, and if my biggest violation is not belonging to the right family tree. Private property rights should not be based on blood relations. The Wasatch Canyons General Plan can and must do much better than simply gloss over the rights of private property ownership. Let's identify the problems; let's have clear and concise ordinances, and let's have fair and equitable approvals, inspections, and enforcement. Sincerely, Cyle Buxton, Big Cottonwood Canyon

Dea Theodore – 6.1.2020

Dear Salt Lake County Council,

Please see below regarding source waters in our canyons. This information is important as we discuss the Wasatch Canyons General Plan DRAFT. I would like this entered as my comments. I am including Vaughn Cox with Granite Community Council on this email.

Thank you

Dea

**What's really in our drinking water?**

If Sandy City's "fluoride in our drinking water" crisis taught us anything, it is, Salt Lake County residents deserve concise information, better data, and more transparency about our drinking water.

My inquisitive mind and degree in Biology just wouldn't let go of the question, "What's really in our drinking water"?

Everyday, whether consciously or subconsciously, we look at our gorgeous Wasatch Mountains, but how often do we take the time to really find out what, in those canyons, affects our drinking water?

The Director of Salt Lake City Public Utilities confidently states:

1. It takes less than 24 hours for a drop of water at the top of the Wasatch Mountains to reach a faucet in Salt Lake City.
2. The Wasatch Canyons provide water to Salt Lake City, Cottonwood Heights, Holladay, Millcreek, and parts of unincorporated Salt Lake County.
3. By starting out with the cleanest possible source waters, we are better able to protect public health and safety.
4. Salt Lake City Public Utilities reports to the public an annual Water Quality Report that shows drinking water contaminant levels <http://www.slcdocs.com/utilities/CCR.pdf>

Ok, so far so good.

However, a deeper dive reveals Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon watersheds have been declared impaired waters by the State of Utah for Cadmium, Zinc, and Copper.

**Wait! What did you just say? Did you just say our Wasatch Canyons; the pristine source of our drinking water have been listed as "impaired" waters by the State of Utah as required by the Federal Clean Water Act?**

Yes, that's what records show. [https://slco.org/globalassets/1-site-files/watershed/2015\\_slco\\_integratedwatershedplan\\_revsep2017.pdf](https://slco.org/globalassets/1-site-files/watershed/2015_slco_integratedwatershedplan_revsep2017.pdf) Page 27

**But what does that impairment have to do with our drinking water and should we be concerned about these metal contaminants in our drinking water? For instance, exactly what is Cadmium?**

According to GreenFacts <https://www.greenfacts.org/en/cadmium/1-2/index.htm>, Cadmium, in its elemental form, is a soft, silver-white metal.

**Well, surely this silver-white metal is harmless to the human body, right?**

Cadmium is toxic and it is not an element used by the body. It mainly affects kidneys and bones. It is also a carcinogen by inhalation. Cadmium can accumulate in the liver, kidneys, and bones, which may serve as sources of exposure later in life.

**Um, so where does Cadmium come from?**

Cadmium is produced mainly as a by-product of mining and, as everyone knows, lots of mining occurred in our watershed over the past 150 years.

**Well, surely our water suppliers are testing for this toxic material in our drinking water; Right?**

Well, maybe. It appears Salt Lake City Public Utilities samples for all contaminants only once a year; in January. They do not sample multiple times throughout the year, especially during the spring runoff when surface contaminants might be more evident. When asked about that, they say they are doing the minimum as required by law. Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy also sample for toxic materials. They sample at least once a month.

**Surely this testing information is readily available to the public, right?**

Well, yes and no. Results from the annual sampling conducted by Salt Lake City Public Utilities is summarized in an annual Water Quality Report that is published and readily available to the public. *However, curiously, Cadmium is not included.* The Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy monitoring results are not readily available to the public. However, one can file a GRAMA request, spend hundreds of dollars in fees, and hope public officials comply with transparency laws. <https://openrecords.utah.gov/>

**Well, surely Salt Lake City Public Utilities and Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy reports their once a year test results to Salt Lake County Health Department, Right?**

I cannot confirm that.

So Mayor and Council members, my research says we should be more concerned, not less concerned, regarding our watersheds, our source waters, and testing schedules.

I now have more questions, not fewer.

Salt Lake County residents must be better informed. Our elected officials must be more forthcoming and more transparent about the quality of our precious drinking water and how the current contaminant levels can affect public health.

Salt Lake County's Wasatch Canyons General Plan must not only acknowledge watershed impairment but the effect of that impairment on the quality of our drinking water. The plan must point to or describe clear actions and dates to remedy this concerning impairment.

Margert Hatch – 6.1.2020

Dear Mr. Snelgrove,

I am contacting you today to show my support for the Wasatch Canyons General Plan update. However, I would like to share a few specific concerns that I encourage you to spend more time addressing.

The Wasatch Mountains deserve the highest level of protections available to ensure a healthy future for our

**Request: General Plan Update**

community. Wasatch Canyons General Plan outcomes should enhance environment, water, habitat protections by upholding or expanding stringent zoning and ordinance for development.

I do not support ski resort expansion or ski lift interconnect and encourage this plan to result in a future with LESS development and infrastructure NOT MORE within our canyons.

Private vehicle congestion impacts our air, water, wildlife habitat, public safety and economic viability in a real way. Are we planning for safety, canyon capacity, economics or public benefit when doing transportation projects?

The capacity of the canyon and environmental conditions needs to inform our actions. I request you fund a capacity analysis, and manage to protect the values at risk in these canyons. The Environmental Dashboard which will help identify ecological data gaps is still incomplete. Without this information, all objectives are effectively shooting in the dark.

The pandemic and public health threats we are experiencing have cast a bright light on the value of the Wasatch Mountains. They are a place where I find renewal and interaction with nature whether with friends, family, or a few of the millions of others that visit this place each year. I applaud you for taking the time to hear my comment and wish to voice my support for taking the time to make the Wasatch General Plan a document that prioritizes the health of the ecosystem and access to public lands over short term economic gains for a few.

Lisa Bagley – 5.29.2020

Dear SLCo,

Hope you are all doing well and Happy Friday!

I have attached an informational, educational, and enlightening document for you to study as you are considering approval of the Wasatch Canyon General Plan Draft entitled: "Agreement For Shared Stewardship Between The State of Utah And the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Intermountain Region".

The Agreement was signed by by Governor Gary Herbert and and The Secretary of Agriculture on 5/22/19 just last year. It is disconcerting that "The State and Forest Service Intermountain Region have developed six mutual commitments for Shared Stewardship in Utah...The State and Forest Service make the following mutual commitments to advance Shared Stewardship in Utah:" and none of the six mutual commitments are mentioned in the Wasatch Canyon General Plan.

I see in Land Use section CRMP (County Resource Management Plan) a brief description of fire management and forest management, but no details. Also, under Environment section a mention of All Canyon Strategy: wildfire, earthquake, landslide, insect and others with a brief mention of CWPP (Community Wildfire Protection Program), UFA, UDOT, and SLC Public Works. Again no details. Salt Lake County Emergency Management Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan Draft 2019 also makes a brief mention of CWPP. Again, lack of details

I live in Millcreek less than five minutes to the mouth of the canyon. In paragraph 1-bullet point 3, UWRAP (The Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, & States Lands' Utah Wildfire Risk Assessment Portal) is mentioned. If you click on this link, you will see that Millcreek Canyon is assessed at Extreme or Very High. [wildfirerisk.utah.gov](http://wildfirerisk.utah.gov)<<http://wildfirerisk.utah.gov>>

The Forest Service owns about 96% of the land in Millcreek Canyon and big portions of the other Wasatch Canyons. Let the Forest Service do their job as outlined in Agreement for Shared Stewardship Between State of Utah and the Forest Service. In paragraph 1 State Initiatives and Forest Service Initiatives are laid out. I encourage you to include them in the Wasatch Canyons General Plan Draft.