



9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
10 **COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2022, AT 3:00**  
11 **P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**  
12

13 **Present:** William McCarvill, Chair  
14 Barbara Cameron, Vice Chair  
15 Brian Hutchinson  
16 Dave Fields  
17 Pat Shea  
18 Ed Marshall  
19 Mike Christensen  
20 Alex Porpora  
21 Amber Broadway  
22 Annalee Munsey  
23 Carl Fisher  
24 Del Draper  
25 Dennis Goreham  
26 Jan Striefel  
27 John Knoblock  
28 Kirk Nichols  
29 Michael Marker  
30 Michael Maughan  
31 Paul Diegel  
32 Tom Diegel  
33 Maura Hahnenberger  
34 Kelly Broadman  
35 Randy Doyle  
36 Roger Borgenicht  
37 Sarah Bennett  
38 Nathan Rafferty  
39 Kurt Hegmann  
40 Troy Morgan

41  
42 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director  
43 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director  
44 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director  
45 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator  
46

1 **Others:** Ben McAdams, CGI Consultants  
2 Hannah Barton, CGI Consultants  
3 Steve Van Maren  
4

5 **Excused:** Megan Nelson  
6

7 **1. Opening.**  
8

9 **a. William McCarvill will Conduct the Special Meeting as the Chair of the**  
10 **Stakeholders Council.**  
11

12 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He thanked Erin Bragg and Nate  
13 Furman for their service. Both had since moved on from the Stakeholders Council. Chair  
14 McCarvill explained that there needed to be 18 Stakeholders Council Members present to conduct  
15 business unless a change is being made to the Rules and Procedures.  
16

17 **b. William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic**  
18 **Meetings as Per Legislative Requirements.**  
19

20 Chair McCarvill read the following statement:  
21

22 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, I, as the Chair of the Stakeholders Council of the  
23 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”), hereby determines that conducting Stakeholders  
24 Council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a  
25 substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.  
26 The COVID-19 pandemic remains, and the recent rise of more infectious variants of the  
27 virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another surge in cases, which could again threaten  
28 to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’  
29

30 **c. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council**  
31 **DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, January 19, 2022.**  
32

33 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes from  
34 January 19, 2022. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous  
35 consent of the Council.  
36

37 **2. Common Ground Institute Presentation and Workshop.**  
38

39 **a. Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute**  
40 **(“CGI”) will Present and Lead a Discussion with Stakeholders on The Central**  
41 **Wasatch Compact.**  
42

43 Chair McCarvill explained that all of the Stakeholders Council Members would have two minutes  
44 to share comments with Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute  
45 (“CGI”). The comments would be related to the canyons and the Central Wasatch Compact  
46 document.

1  
2 Kirk Nichols was most concerned about the road and congestion in winter. He felt one of the  
3 solutions would be reservations and metered entry rather than construction. Mr. Nichols also  
4 expressed concern related to vehicular noise in the canyon year-round. Snowmobiles,  
5 motorcycles, trucks, and personal vehicles all made a lot of noise in the canyons, which is  
6 disruptive. Additionally, roadside parking is an area of concern. In the winter, it is a hazard for  
7 skiers and snowboarders, and in the summer, it is a hazard for bicyclists.  
8

9 Mike Christensen had the same transportation concerns as were expressed by Mr. Nichols.  
10 However, he felt that a lot of time had been spent looking for a perfect solution when there are  
11 other options to move forward with. For instance, expanded bus service and year-round bus  
12 service could be implemented. That would make access to the canyons more equitable.  
13

14 Chair McCarvill was pleased to see that the Central Wasatch Compact included language related  
15 to the growing population. It also made references to visitation and the need to measure and  
16 quantify the effects that visitation levels had on the environment. It was important to balance use  
17 and protection, and he was glad to see that addressed within the document.  
18

19 Vice-Chair, Barbara Cameron, was proud of the fact that the Stakeholders Council had pushed  
20 forward on discussions related to management in the canyons. She was concerned that the Central  
21 Wasatch Compact had removed the word “restrooms,” and believed it should be added back to  
22 specifically address that concern and need. Vice-Chair Cameron had mixed feelings about certain  
23 portions of the Central Wasatch Compact. She felt that Paragraphs 3 and 4 could be removed  
24 because the intention of the paragraphs was not clear. Paragraph 6 had strong and specific  
25 language and she wanted to see that remain in the document. As for the listed outcomes, she liked  
26 all of them, with the exception of the second outcome, and felt that needed to be removed. The  
27 Central Wasatch Compact has strengths and weaknesses. A few thoughtful removals would  
28 improve the document overall.  
29

30 Mr. McAdams asked to share background information before the Stakeholders Council Members  
31 continued to comment on the Central Wasatch Compact. CGI looked at the Mountain Accord and  
32 determined that it could be separated into two parts. The first part was largely focused on  
33 principles and values that the Mountain Accord signers felt should guide the decisions in the  
34 Central Wasatch. The second part of the Mountain Accord included specific and highly negotiated  
35 actions that the parties at the time felt should be taken in the Central Wasatch. CGI maintained  
36 the principles and values in the Central Wasatch Compact and made updates based on CWC Board  
37 Member input. The intention was to separate the specific actions from the principles.  
38

39 Michael Maughan appreciated the collaborative process that was used when the Mountain Accord  
40 was developed. He recognized that since then, there have been a lot of changes. While he  
41 supported taking care of the environment, watershed, and sustainable recreation, some of the  
42 carryover language from the Mountain Accord that was now in the Central Wasatch Compact did  
43 not reflect the changes in positions that had occurred or the information that had been learned since  
44 then. He did not believe he could address everything that did not work for the ski areas within the  
45 allotted two minutes. Alta Ski Area could not support the Central Wasatch Compact as currently  
46 drafted. He had hoped there would be a process where the U.S. Forest Service, the Utah

1 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), Salt Lake City Public Utilities, and other Stakeholders  
2 in the canyons, could sit down and negotiate acceptable language.

3  
4 Patrick Shea noted that ski companies have incremental growth. All of the ski lifts are not built at  
5 once, because it was important to fully understand the impacts of each decision. Mr. Shea believed  
6 that anything proposed in the Central Wasatch should be implemented incrementally.

7  
8 John Knoblock wanted to hear more about what would happen with the list of intended actions. A  
9 lot had changed since the Mountain Accord was signed. He thought that the Central Wasatch  
10 Compact would not only restate the principles and values but would also look at the details of the  
11 intended actions. It would be good to see what actions listed in the Mountain Accord had been  
12 completed or worked on and what was still outstanding. Mr. Knoblock noted that the words, “must  
13 occur in conjunction with,” were troubling, because it is difficult to get everything to happen at  
14 the same time. Action should be taken as opportunities arise.

15  
16 Amber Broadaway felt that the nine-day turnaround time for comment was too short for such an  
17 important piece of written material. Additional time would have been beneficial. She also hoped  
18 that the survey results would have been shared and discussed to better inform future decisions  
19 about the Central Wasatch Compact. Ms. Broadaway was concerned about language that  
20 mentioned the interconnectedness of decision-making. She did not want to see transportation and  
21 environmental concerns put on hold due to some of the more difficult pieces.

22  
23 Ed Marshall stressed the importance of homeowner representation in the Central Wasatch  
24 Compact. The CWC should not be in the business of taking or downsizing property and there  
25 needed to be some assurances included in the action items. Mr. Marshall had suggestions for  
26 Sections 3, 5, and 7 of the intended outcomes listed in the Central Wasatch Compact. Those  
27 suggestions were included in a Memorandum that he had written. He also pointed out that certain  
28 sections of the Central Wasatch Compact were not transparent and made references that would not  
29 be understood without insider background information. Additionally, the introductory paragraph  
30 on Page 1 of the document focused solely on recreational users. It did not say anything about the  
31 people who lived and worked in the canyons. He suggested that be amended.

32  
33 Michael Marker was surprised that the Central Wasatch Compact did not acknowledge the  
34 situational changes that had taken place in the seven years since the Mountain Accord was signed.  
35 Many of those changes were acknowledged at a CWC Board level and should also be mentioned  
36 in the document. He agreed with the comments shared by Mr. Marshall and stated that  
37 homeowners should be recognized in the Central Wasatch Compact. Mr. Marker explained that  
38 since UDOT and the Forest Service had jurisdictional control over the CWC project area, both  
39 entities needed to be at the table. Lastly, he stressed the importance of a shared vision for the  
40 CWC. He felt that a lot of the difficulties reaching consensus had to do with the lack of a clearly  
41 defined vision. The principles and values were important, but a shared vision was needed.

42  
43 Sarah Bennett was pleased to re-read some of the agreed-upon principles and values but noted that  
44 there had been a lot of change since some of the initial ideas were set forth. She was concerned  
45 that those changes were not addressed in the Central Wasatch Compact. There were also many  
46 diametrically opposed views and visions amongst the Stakeholders Council, CWC Board

1 Members, and partners who had committed to the Mountain Accord. As a result, it seemed  
2 ineffective to state that no piece could move forward without another. She felt that a lot of the  
3 CWC efforts were taking root and were growing organically. Wherever progress was able to be  
4 made, it needed to be made, without trying to tie everything together.

5  
6 Tom Diegel explained that he was on the Stakeholders Council as a representative of the Wasatch  
7 Backcountry Alliance. He was confused about the Central Wasatch Compact process. It seemed  
8 like a lot of the items that were discussed in the Mountain Accord were ignored or pushed aside.  
9 For instance, items that were important to the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, like locking in the  
10 resort boundaries. He felt there were a lot of platitudes taking place and there was no real sense  
11 of direction. He wanted to better understand how outstanding issues would be addressed. Just  
12 because the Mountain Accord had been redlined out of the Central Wasatch Compact did not  
13 necessarily mean that the issues should be overlooked. Mr. Diegel pointed out that there was no  
14 mention of UDOT and the Forest Service in the document.

15  
16 Kurt Hegmann stated that he represents the Mill D Cabin Owners Association. The document was  
17 good in terms of the values section but where the actions section talked about transferring lands,  
18 he felt there should be the inclusion of the word “voluntary,” otherwise it could sound a little  
19 heavy-handed. He shared information about the train in Zermatt, Switzerland, and explained that  
20 the area is similar to the Wasatch. Mr. Hegmann stated that the trails are being heavily used and  
21 it may be beneficial to separate the hikers and the bicyclists at some point. There were a lot of  
22 solvable issues in the Central Wasatch, and it was important to take action.

23  
24 Chair McCarvill asked Mr. McAdams about the next steps for the Stakeholders Council, the CWC,  
25 and the Central Wasatch Compact. Mr. McAdams clarified that the Central Wasatch Compact  
26 was not meant to replace or amend the Mountain Accord. The Mountain Accord would remain as  
27 a separate document. Mr. McAdams explained that the Mountain Accord set out values and  
28 specific strategies, where the Central Wasatch Compact was a restatement of the broad principles.  
29 There were still specific actions that needed to be taken. However, those action steps would fall  
30 to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. The Central Wasatch Compact was simply a  
31 statement of the values and principles that the organization was based on.

32  
33 Mr. McAdams noted that the CWC asked CGI to complete its work by March 1, 2022. That was  
34 the reason the work focused on the value statements. He and Ms. Barton had conducted over 40  
35 interviews as part of the Situational Assessment and there were 170 responses to the survey. That  
36 data would be anonymized and then made available for review. The comments made during the  
37 current Stakeholders Council Meeting would be summarized and shared with the CWC Board. In  
38 early March, the CWC Board would decide whether the Central Wasatch Compact was a statement  
39 of values that should be adopted or whether additional changes needed to be made.

40  
41 Carl Fisher liked the general idea of the Central Wasatch Compact. However, he felt it needed to  
42 be shortened and convey a vision for the Wasatch rather than simply be a recommitment to the  
43 Mountain Accord. He also felt the document needed to resonate with the community as a whole.  
44 There was an imminent threat to the canyons in the Central Wasatch. Mr. Fisher reported that  
45 there were transportation discussions related to Little Cottonwood Canyon, there was a  
46 transportation plan being looked at for Big Cottonwood Canyon, there was a road widening and

1 engineering project being proposed for Millcreek Canyon, and there was a 700-acre mine being  
2 proposed in Parleys Canyon. He was concerned that there were not enough environmental actions  
3 taking place. That work needed to be prioritized.  
4

5 Paul Diegel noted that there was one component of the CWC that was not discussed enough, which  
6 was the jurisdiction of the CWC and the extent to which the organization could implement change.  
7 He explained that suggestions had been made to the Forest Service in the past, based on research  
8 and user input, but the reception had been lackluster. There needed to be a mechanism in place  
9 that would allow the CWC to take action and achieve what they wanted to achieve.  
10

11 Brian Hutchinson felt it was beneficial to distill the Mountain Accord document down to the basic  
12 components. He believed that the Central Wasatch Compact would benefit from specific  
13 measurements of success. Mr. Hutchinson explained that his biggest concerns for the Central  
14 Wasatch had to do with the environment and equitable access. The success of equitable access  
15 should not be based on the level of commerce that occurred in the canyons or nearby communities,  
16 but it should be based on the ability of people of all backgrounds to reach the canyons from various  
17 destinations in the valley. He did not believe the Stakeholders Council or CWC Board membership  
18 was representative of Salt Lake Valley and felt there needed to be more diversity.  
19

20 Dennis Goreham disagreed with the comment shared by Vice-Chair Cameron earlier in the  
21 meeting. He did not believe Paragraphs 3 and 4 should be deleted. Those were two of the strongest  
22 parts of the Central Wasatch Compact. He did not feel that everything needed to be done in  
23 conjunction but noted that a trust level was built through the Mountain Accord. That trust level  
24 was lost when individuals pursued independent interests without considering how those choices  
25 would impact some of the broader actions and goals.  
26

27 Alex Porpora liked the inclusion of climate change in the Central Wasatch Compact. Her concerns  
28 related to access. She felt this document was an opportunity for the organization to be visionary,  
29 but it didn't quite do that. It was important to understand how the CWC would bring people  
30 together as champions of the Wasatch Mountains. Additionally, she felt this was an opportunity  
31 to think more about community engagement. For instance, was the CWC engaging the community  
32 enough through focus groups and listening sessions, in addition to the surveys. Ms. Porpora  
33 understood that time was of the essence in this matter, but without significant public input, it would  
34 be difficult to make decisions and understand the values in the community.  
35

36 Randy Doyle noted that a lot of work had gone into the Mountain Accord. Since then, many things  
37 had changed, and some actionable items were not practical anymore. However, some of the  
38 actionable items in the Mountain Accord were still practical and possible. He was afraid that by  
39 separating the Mountain Accord and the Central Wasatch Compact, the organization would fail to  
40 move forward. He believed that the public wanted to see action being taken by the CWC.  
41

42 Chair McCarvill thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for sharing feedback on the Central  
43 Wasatch Compact. He asked if there were any general comments. Mr. Fisher reported that Save  
44 Our Canyons had been working with a coalition of location organizations to develop a Community  
45 Benefit Agreement related to the Olympic Games. It was not a referendum against the games. He  
46 explained that the agreement addressed the importance of environmental protections, employing

1 local workforces, and the utilization of past venues. It also discussed homelessness. Mr. Fisher  
2 suggested that the Stakeholders Council look at the agreement in the future and consider taking  
3 action. It could then be forwarded to the CWC Board for consideration.  
4

5 Mr. Knoblock asked for additional details about the CGI scope of work. It sounded like reviewing  
6 the intended actions from the Mountain Accord was not within the scope of the contract.  
7 Mr. McAdams noted that many on the Stakeholders Council were involved with the Mountain  
8 Accord. That process started in 2012 and the Mountain Accord document was signed in August  
9 2015. He felt the ongoing mission of the CWC was to engage Stakeholders at all levels of  
10 government and work to find solutions that would maintain the delicate balance of the Wasatch  
11 and preserve the values and principles stated in the Mountain Accord. A recommitment and  
12 restatement of those values and principles was a good starting place. The ongoing work of the  
13 CWC was to implement those values through specific actions. The CWC Board would determine  
14 what path the Central Wasatch Compact took. It could be adopted at the next CWC Board Meeting  
15 or further refined.  
16

17 Mr. Shea did not believe all of the comments and survey results needed to be anonymized. He  
18 also felt it was important to pause and fully understand what the Central Wasatch Compact was  
19 committing to. Mr. Shea suggested that the document be called the Central Wasatch  
20 Environmental and Economic Compact instead of the Central Wasatch Compact, so there would  
21 be an added focus on environmental preservation.  
22

### 23 **3. Adjourn Meeting.**

#### 24 **a. William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders** 25 **Council.** 26

27  
28 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to adjourn. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion  
29 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.  
30

31 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, February 23, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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