

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEETING HELD MONDAY,**
2 **OCTOBER 1, 2018 AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL**
3 **CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**

5
6 **Present:** Commissioner Chris McCandless, Commissioner Mike Peterson,
7 Commissioner Jim Bradley, Commissioner Jackie Biskupski, Commissioner
8 Chris Robinson, Commissioner Jeff Silvestrini, Commissioner Harris Sondak,
9 Commissioner Ben McAdams (via telephone)

10
11 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Jesse Dean, Legal Counsel
12 Shane Topham, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen

13
14 **Excused:** Commissioner Andy Beerman, Commissioner Carlos Braceras

15
16 **A. OPENING**

- 17
18 **i. Commissioner McCandless will conduct the meeting as Chair of the Central**
19 **Wasatch Commission (CWC).**

20
21 Chair Chris McCandless called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

- 22
23 **ii. The Commission will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of Monday,**
24 **September 17, 2018.**

25
26 **MOTION:** Commissioner Peterson moved to adopt the minutes of Monday, September 17, 2018.
27 The motion was seconded by Commissioner Biskupski. The motion passed with the unanimous
28 consent of the Commission.

29
30 **B. PUBLIC COMMENT**

31
32 John Anderson reported that in a recent letter to the newspaper he mentioned the wilderness that
33 Envision Utah, the Mountain Accord, and the Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) continue to force
34 on the citizens and not specific individuals. He remarked that all three entities have the same goal
35 but different names. The end goal is more wilderness, which is not wanted. Mr. Anderson felt that
36 the \$8 million wasted on Mountain Accord was enough and considered it ‘un-American’ for
37 individuals who do not know the area to impose unwanted laws to control property.

38
39 Chair McCandless assured Mr. Anderson that as discussed the previous week, no private property
40 will be impacted. No restrictions will be imposed or recommended on any existing access that is
41 legally permitted.

42
43 Evan Johnson identified himself as a landowner in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. He expressed
44 concern that \$4.2 billion of Utah’s \$8.2 billion tourism industry is in Salt Lake County. He felt that
45 if anything, Salt Lake County needs more ski resort product and not less. The proposed legislation
46 would create ski resort monopolies and the land inside the ski resorts would increase dramatically in
47 value. Mr. Johnson commented that there had been a great deal of talk about mass transit and a lot
48 of money was spent on it. He questioned a situation where the masses cannot use the canyons.

1 Mr. Johnson commented that there seemed to be a conflict of interest among members of the board
2 and questioned why a land developer is chairing a land conservation commission. He also wondered
3 if the CWC would support Brighton City's incorporation efforts to the extent they supported the Town
4 of Alta being exempt from the Mountainous Planning District. According to a letter from Alta Ski
5 Lifts, 1.6 million people use 7,000 acres of ski area in the canyons, which puts 4,500 people on 20
6 acres; however, a person who owns 20 acres in the canyons cannot build a cabin. He questioned how
7 that is just. Mr. Johnson remarked that Salt Lake City provides Snowbird with 2,500 water
8 connections for housing but a neighbor gets sued by Salt Lake City for having one water connection.
9 He was not opposed to Snowbird, Salt Lake City, or the Forest Service making a profit but was
10 opposed to injustice and stepping on 'small people' to do it.

11
12 Mr. Johnson suggested that the CWC provide conflict of interest forms so that it is clear who does
13 and does not benefit from the CWC. He remarked that the CWC could be great, like the Mountain
14 Accord was supposed to be. He noted that the Mountain Accord failed because of poor management.
15 The Mountain Accord was sued and the court ruled that they violated the law. There was also talk of
16 a lawsuit against the CWC. Mr. Johnson remarked that there will be better canyons with better justice.
17 He did not understand why Big Cottonwood Creek should be pristine on top but spoiled on the bottom.
18 He also thought they could do a better job of providing data and disclosing conflicts of interest to the
19 public.

20
21 **C. COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

22
23 Commissioner Peterson commented that he visited the CWC website earlier in the week and was
24 pleased to see that it is up and running. He encouraged the public to refer to it and stated that a great
25 deal of information will be posted going forward.

26
27 **D. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS FOR APPROVING MEETING MINUTES – Executive**
28 **Director, Ralph Becker and CWC Attorney Shane Topham.**

29
30 **i. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2018-26 Adoption Procedures for Approval of**
31 **Written Minutes of Public Meetings Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-203(4)(h).**

32
33 CWC Attorney, Shane Topham, reported that the Open and Public Meetings Act requires public
34 bodies to adopt process and procedures for approving their written minutes. He stated that draft
35 minutes must be made available to the public within a reasonable period of time. Within three
36 business days after they are approved, final minutes need to be posted on the State's Public Notice
37 Website and otherwise made available to the public. The CWC board needs to implement procedures
38 to accomplish that. The purpose of the above resolution was to put those procedures in place.

39
40 Commissioner Robinson referred to Section 5 of the proposed procedures, which provides a
41 mechanism by which the minutes automatically become approved if they are not acted upon at the
42 first business meeting of the public body that is at least three business days after the proposed minutes
43 are circulated to the meeting clerk to the members of the public body. He had never seen such a
44 provision and asked if it was subjective in nature. Mr. Topham's recollection was that the verbiage
45 was not required but added to ensure that the minutes are approved within a reasonable period of time.
46 He also stated that the audio recording is posted within three days of the meeting.

1 **MOTION:** Commissioner Silvestrini moved to adopt Resolution 2018-26 subject to amending the
2 second line of paragraph 5 from “first” to “second”. Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion.
3 Vote on motion: Commissioner McAdams-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner
4 Biskupski-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Commissioner Sondak-Aye,
5 Commissioner Robinson-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6
7 **E. DISCUSSION OF UPCOMING INDEPENDENT AUDIT – Executive Director Ralph**
8 **Becker and CWC Attorney Shane Topham.**

9
10 **i. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2018-27 Approving an Independent Contractor**
11 **Agreement with Greg Ogden, CPA, for Independent Auditor Services Under**
12 **Utah Code Ann. 11-13-529.**

13
14 Executive Director, Ralph Becker, reported that the CWC is required to conduct an independent audit
15 annually. An RFP was put out and the lowest bid proposal was accepted. Mr. Becker described the
16 contract approval process and stated that if an expense is less than \$1,000, the Executive Director can
17 authorize it. If it is between \$1,000 and \$5,000 the Commission Chair can approve it. Expenses that
18 exceed \$5,000 must be ratified by the full Commission. The proposed resolution is for an Independent
19 Contractor Agreement with Greg Ogden, CPA for Auditor services with an associated cost of just
20 over \$5,000 for a period of up to five years. The agreement can be terminated at any time by the
21 CWC. Mr. Topham pointed out that it is standard practice to change auditors every five years.

22
23 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to adopt Resolution 2018-27 approving and ratifying
24 entry into an Independent Contractor Agreement with Greg Ogden, CPA for Auditor Services.
25 Commissioner Silvestrini seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner McAdams-Aye,
26 Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner Biskupski-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner
27 Bradley-Aye, Commissioner Sondak-Aye, Commissioner Robinson-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-
28 Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

29
30 **F. STAFF MONTHLY REPORT**

31
32 **i. Presentation by Executive Director Ralph Becker of his Monthly Report.**

33
34 Mr. Becker reported on the draft Congressional Legislation and stated that staff has been working to
35 prepare potential legislation for the Congressional delegation. They continued to work toward the
36 issues identified in the past. They were looking to expand those issues somewhat because of a
37 proposal received from the Cardiff Canyon Property Owners’ Association and move forward with the
38 solutions suggested.

39
40 Mr. Becker referenced the last few pages of the report, which includes a summary of meetings held
41 in Washington, D.C. with their Congressional delegate the previous Thursday. Chair McCandless
42 and Executive Committee Member Mayor Peterson participated in the trip, which was noticed as an
43 Executive Committee Meeting because two of the three members of the Executive Committee were
44 present.

45
46 Mr. Becker reported that the Congressional delegation and their staffs are familiar with the draft
47 proposals for addressing issues in the canyons including portions that include Congressional
48 legislation. It was noted that a hearing was held on Congressman Chaffetz’s bill that was introduced

1 in 2016. They remained very receptive and the members they met with expressed their support. They
2 want to continue to work through the issues that remain. They do not anticipate that the legislation
3 that will be considered this year but they continue to work toward addressing the issues so that they
4 can be prepared when Congress is ready to take it up. Commissioner Peterson commended
5 Mr. Becker for his efforts and stated that the trip was very well planned and productive.

6
7 Commissioner Silvestrini asked if there was any feedback from Congressional staff about issues
8 pertaining to the legislation. Mr. Becker responded that they discussed each of the issues in detail.
9 Transportation was identified as a major issue. Chair McCandless commented that they seemed very
10 well informed of the Jason Chaffetz bill as well as modifications to the present proposal as it moves
11 forward. He found that to be encouraging.

12
13 Mr. Becker reported that the website is now up and running and being improved daily.
14 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen, presented the new more fully built out website that was
15 launched earlier in the day. A demonstration of the website was provided to the Commission. Chair
16 McCandless commended staff for their efforts.

17
18 **ii. Presentation by the Executive Director Concerning the Status of the New Office**
19 **Space Lease and Buildout.**

20
21 Deputy Director, Jesse Dean, reported that since their last meeting staff has moved forward with the
22 new office space at the Gateway and are currently reviewing design alternatives. The intent was to
23 maximize the 1,500 square-foot space recognizing the need to be cost efficient and plan for the future
24 of the Commission. Chair McCandless indicated that the plan will be distributed to the Commission
25 for their input, review, and approval.

26
27 **iii. Presentation by Staff Concerning the CWC Stakeholder Council, CWC October**
28 **Retreat, CWC Website, and Digital Communications.**

29
30 Mr. Dean updated the Commission on the Stakeholder Council and reported that the application
31 closed earlier in the day at 12:00 p.m. The application was opened on September 12 and between
32 September 12 and October 1, over 120 applications were received. A selection committee will be
33 established comprised of Janna Young from Summit County, Carly Castle from Salt Lake City Public
34 Utilities, Matt Dias from Park City, and Kimberly Barnett from Salt Lake County. The group will try
35 to reduce the group of 120 to a pool of 28 to 35 applicants. Commissioner Biskupski thanked those
36 who have stepped up to review the applications.

37
38 Mr. Dean indicated that a question that arose during the Stakeholder Council process pertaining to
39 the jurisdictions and whether Commission Members will have a seat as part of the Stakeholder
40 Council. Mr. Dean explained that each member of staff will be very involved with the Stakeholder
41 Council, however, in order to keep the 28 to 35 seats available, it will be important that it be comprised
42 of public, community, and private organizations.

43
44 Commissioner Robinson asked if there are criteria for selecting the stakeholders so that there is broad
45 representation. Mr. Dean explained that the selection criteria is included online and will take into
46 account where each member lives, personal and professional experience, and goals for the
47 Commission. It was clarified that the committee will make a recommendation to the Commission.
48 The goal was to have the group narrowed down by the November Commission Meeting.

1
2 Mr. Dean reported on the upcoming CWC Retreat scheduled for October 19 and 20 in Midway. It
3 will be open to the public and primarily deal with the future of the Central Wasatch Commission.
4 The main objective is to establish a working strategic plan that staff and the Commission can work
5 toward and implement. Topics include future funding, future governance, and future legislation.
6

7 **G. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED UPDATE TO WASATCH CANYONS GENERAL**
8 **PLAN.**
9

- 10 i. **Jake Young and Wilf Sommerkorn of Salt Lake County will discuss Salt Lake**
11 **County's current process to update its Wasatch Canyons General Plan, which**
12 **was last adopted or revised in 1989. The purpose of the plan is to guide future**
13 **development and preservation in the canyons. The presentation will include the**
14 **goals and timeline of the plan.**
15

16 Wilf Sommerkorn, identified himself as the Director of Regional Planning and Transportation for Salt
17 Lake County and reported that several years ago when the State Code was adopted to establish the
18 rules for local land use planning and land use regulation, there was a requirement that all local
19 governments were to have a General Plan or Master Plan in place for their jurisdiction. The Central
20 Wasatch is primarily located in the unincorporated portion of Salt Lake County, with the exception
21 of Alta. The County adopted a plan for the Wasatch Canyons in 1989 that was prepared by
22 Mr. Becker's firm. It was suggested that the plan be reviewed and updated every five to 10 years.
23 Mr. Sommerkorn reported that there has been a lot of discussion about the canyons and pointed out
24 that the plan has not been updated since 1989. In 2013, the County began the process of formally
25 updating the plan but that effort was put on hold with the formation and execution of the Mountain
26 Accord effort. Since completion of the Mountain Accord, they have been working on a plan update.
27

28 Canyon Plans Update Program Manager, Jake Young, updated the Commissioners on the process to
29 date. He explained that the area of the General Plan includes Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood,
30 Millcreek, Parleys Canyon, and the foothills. 19 specific goals have been proposed for the Wasatch
31 Canyons. To date, there have been more than 15 public open houses and they have received a great
32 deal of input. Their website also contains various strategies for the different goals.
33

34 Mr. Young commented on the importance of Goal Number Two, which is to explore and implement
35 options for a dedicated funding source to assist in the implementation of Canyons capital
36 improvement projects and provide ongoing support for maintenance and operations to support the
37 growing demands of the Canyons. Mr. Young explained that the intent is to provide dedicated
38 funding for each canyon for restrooms, trailheads, parking lots, trails, etc.
39

40 Goal Number Three deals with Transit Service Enhancement. Mr. Young reported that summer
41 visitation is growing more rapidly than winter visitation and there is not enough parking at specific
42 destinations.
43

44 Goal Number Six addresses Parking Management. Mr. Young explained that as part of the Forest
45 Service Management Plan, there cannot be increased parking stalls in the Canyons. If parking is
46 added in some locations, it needs to be decreased in others. After speaking with the Forest Service,
47 they discovered that specific parking lots can be improved by having painted stalls and increasing
48 efficiency. A number of locations are extremely dangerous due to the proximity to the highway or

1 rivers. Parking garages were also being considered near the canyons. Mr. Young commented on
2 feedback received from the public and stated that nearly all have received positive input. The next
3 step will be to implement them into the General Plan draft.

4
5 Commissioner Silvestrini asked about the level of public engagement. Mr. Young responded that
6 there has been engagement throughout the County with the majority being from the east bench. At
7 public open houses there have been 20 to 100 in attendance. Thousands of comments have been
8 received online.

9
10 With regard to timing, Mr. Young explained that they are currently writing the draft of the General
11 Plan, which will be available late fall or early winter. The adoption process was to begin early next
12 year. Commissioner Bradley inquired about potential future demand and questioned at what point
13 the canyon will reach its carrying capacity. Mr. Sommerkorn commented that it is entirely appropriate
14 to specify in the plan an area that needs further study. Upon completion of the study, the plan may
15 be modified.

16
17 Commissioner Sondak asked how the County-level plan is integrated with the towns' and cities'
18 plans. Mr. Young responded that there has been a lot of collaboration. They also have established a
19 steering committee that includes representatives from the Forest Service, UDOT, UTA, and Salt Lake
20 City Public Utilities.

21
22 Commissioner Robinson asked how the plan relates to the CWC. Mr. Young stated that they were
23 present to get input from the Commission. CWC staff has also been part of the process.
24 Commissioner Robinson commented that there appears to a significant amount of overlap.
25 Mr. Sommerkorn remarked that one of the challenges in the Canyons has been that there are a number
26 of overlapping jurisdictions. The need for good coordination among the various entities was stressed.
27 The desire was to reflect each other's recommendations and be consistent. Chair McCandless
28 reiterated that they are coordinating the federal legislation and stressed the importance of identifying
29 potential conflicts within the legislation to avoid future problems.

30
31 **H. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL BY UTAH STATE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE TO**
32 **PETITION THE FOREST SERVICE TO AMEND THE "ROADLESS**
33 **CONSERVATION RULE".**

- 34
35 i. **Brianne Emery, Natural Resources Planner, Public Lands Policy Coordinating**
36 **Office of the Office of the Governor, will discuss her office's proposal to petition**
37 **the U.S. Forest Service to enact a Utah-specific version of the Forest Service's**
38 **2001 "Roadless Conservation Rule" to allow for more active forest management**
39 **on certain Forest Service lands.**

40
41 Brianne Emery, Natural Resources Planner with the Governor's Public Lands Policy Coordinating
42 Office, thanked the Commission for the invitation to report on the State's effort to petition the 2001
43 Roadless Conservation Rule. The intent of the rule was to protect social and ecological values and
44 characteristics. She commented that roadless areas generally consist of 5,000 acres or more.
45 Throughout the process, they discovered that many are much smaller, typically because they are
46 adjacent to larger areas. Ms. Emery made a PowerPoint presentation and identified Forest Service
47 Lands, Designated Wilderness, and Inventoried Wilderness Areas on a map displayed. It was noted

1 that 49% of forested lands are under the Inventoried Wilderness designation. These areas were also
2 identified within the CWC focus area.

3
4 Ms. Emery commented they have found that there are misconceptions about the meaning of the
5 roadless rule. She explained that construction is prohibited except under the following specific
6 circumstances:

- 7
- 8 • To protect public health and safety;
- 9 • CERCLA response;
- 10 • Reserved or outstanding rights;
- 11 • Road safety improvement;
- 12 • To prevent irreparable resource damage; and
- 13 • In conjunction with pre-2001 mineral leases.
- 14

15 The following exceptions also exist for timber harvesting prohibition:

- 16
- 17 • To improve endangered, proposed, sensitive species habitat;
- 18 • To maintain or restore characteristics of the ecosystem;
- 19 • Incidental to another activity that is not otherwise prohibited;
- 20 • For personal or administrative use; and
- 21 • IRA characteristics have been substantially altered by road construction and timber cutting
- 22 within certain parameters.
- 23

24 Reasons Utah wants a State-Specific Rule include the following:

- 25
- 26 • Give the local Forest Service districts more flexibility to manage the unique challenges in
- 27 Utah's roadless areas, promote health forests, and mitigate catastrophic wildfires.
- 28 • Many of Utah roadless forests suffer from bark beetle-infestations, excessive buildup of
- 29 deadfall and ladder fuels, excessive tree density, pinyon-juniper encroachment into sagebrush
- 30 habitat, and other symptoms of poor forest health.
- 31 • These conditions can impair watershed health, degrade wildlife habitat, and increase risks of
- 32 catastrophic wildfires.
- 33 • Catastrophic wildfires pose extreme risks to Utah's air quality, water quality, wildlife,
- 34 recreation, and private property in the "wildland-urban interface."
- 35 • A State-specific roadless rule could give the Forest Service greater flexibility to remove
- 36 deadfall and ladder fuels, cut beetle-infested trees, minimize pinyon-juniper encroachment,
- 37 and thin overgrown standards in Forest Service roadless areas.
- 38 • Such project in roadless areas will help safeguard Utah's watersheds, air quality, wildlife and
- 39 resiliency to catastrophic wildfires.
- 40

41 Ms. Emery reported that the goal is to submit a petition to the Department of Agriculture the
42 beginning of December. It was acknowledged that there are disadvantages to pursuing something of
43 this magnitude so quickly, however, they are seeking as much feedback as possible to include in the
44 petition. Once submitted, the petition can be accepted by the Department of Agriculture or returned
45 for revisions. Once accepted, it will go through an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Analysis.
46 Ms. Emery explained that the petition is a start and what it includes now may not be part of the final

1 result at the end of the EIS. They are, however, including as much data and justification up front as
2 possible to expedite the EIS process.

3
4 Items that could change under a State-specific rule were broken down into the following three
5 management categories:

- 6
7 1. Primitive Areas – Same management as 2001 Rule (no change).
- 8 2. Forest Restoration Areas – (moderately restrictive).
- 9 3. Forest Stewardship Areas – (least restrictive).

10
11 What will remain include:

- 12
13 • Land that remains under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service.
- 14 • NEPA reviews will still be required for projects.
- 15 • Motorized travel must follow each Forest’s Travel Management Plan.
- 16 • Access to mineral extractions is limited to pre-2001 permits.
- 17 • Wilderness or other land use designations remain.

18
19 Ms. Emery reported on the dates and locations for public listening sessions scheduled throughout the
20 month of October.

21
22 Commissioner Silvestrini asked Ms. Emery to describe the commonalities and differences in the
23 management plan that Utah would request compared to what has already been approved for Idaho or
24 Colorado. Ms. Emery responded that Utah differs significantly from Colorado, which is largely
25 focused on opening areas for mining access and large scale timber. Idaho, however, is very similar
26 although they performed no public outreach and are not user-friendly. In the end she expected Utah’s
27 petition to be very similar to what Idaho submitted.

28
29 Commissioner Biskupski asked who will own the road rights-of-way. Ms. Emery responded that the
30 U.S. Forest Service will own them as well as roads that remain for public access and recreational use.

31
32 Commissioner Robinson asked for further clarification on what the CWC was asked to do.
33 Ms. Emery explained that first and foremost they want to make the CWC aware of what they are
34 doing. Suggestions and recommendations were welcomed.

35
36 Commissioner Bradley’s understanding was that the State will prepare a petition that will be sent to
37 the Forest Service. If accepted, the Forest Service agrees to manage those areas. Ms. Emery stated
38 that that is not necessarily the case. Once the petition is submitted and accepted, an EIS will be
39 performed that will look at all of the inventoried wilderness areas. One of the recommendations set
40 forth would hopefully be one of the alternatives put forward. They are, however, trying to provide as
41 much justification, background, and data as possible so that when the EIS is conducted they have all
42 of the details available.

43
44 With regard to the process in terms of the State’s final product, Ms. Emery explained that they are
45 asking for county-specific input and working with natural resource agencies. She stressed that they
46 want to submit something that both the Forest Service and the public can accept to avoid the petition
47 being thrown out in its entirety.

1
2 Commissioner Peterson assumed that the petition language may be altered based on the feedback
3 received. Ms. Emery responded that they will avoid changing the management descriptions because
4 so much work has already gone into them. They were still trying to determine the best way to
5 incorporate the public input.

6
7 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Robinson, Ms. Emery explained that some counties
8 have been hesitant to provide recommendations because Forest Service jurisdictions are involved.
9 The are comparing county recommendations with a Resource Specialist and trying to stay true to the
10 recommendations provided while informing counties of the potential for them to change based on the
11 resource information and feedback received.

12
13 Commissioner Biskupski asked if the recommendation that the Governor ultimately signs off on will
14 identify actual road locations. Ms. Emery explained that all of the polygons already show roads or
15 trails that existed prior to 2001. She was aware of a few instances where they would be asking for a
16 new road, which would be subject to Forest Service approval.

17
18 Commissioner Biskupski asked if the process would enable the State to look at roads that have gone
19 through the RS-2477 battle differently. Ms. Emery stated that there is no connection to the RS-2477
20 case and what they are trying to accomplish with forest management levels. Commissioner Biskupski
21 next inquired as to whether there is any emphasis on Grand Staircase Escalante or the Bears Ears
22 areas. Ms. Emery confirmed that there is not. They are looking State-wide and those areas are under
23 BLM jurisdiction.

24
25 Chair McCandless asked if there is any funding attached to the process. Ms. Emery was not sure. In
26 response to a suggestion made by Chair McCandless, Mr. Dean stated that the presentation and
27 supporting documents will be placed on the State's Public Notice website at the conclusion of the
28 meeting. Chair McCandless asked that Ms. Emery's organization read CWC's proposed federal
29 legislation and provide an opinion on changes or ideas on potential improvements are items that may
30 be in conflict. He also suggested that the Stakeholders' Council get involved and encourage public
31 engagement. Potential timing issues were identified. It was noted that the Stakeholders' Council will
32 not be formed in time for the November 1 deadline to provide County input. The CWC could,
33 however, form an ad hoc committee to give feedback.

34
35 **I. DISCUSSION OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH NATIONAL CONSERVATION AND**
36 **RECREATION AREA ACT.**

37
38 **i. Presentation by Executive Director Ralph Becker of the Status of the Proposed**
39 **Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act.**
40

41 Mr. Becker reported that the ad hoc group will be meeting with the Cardiff Canyon Property Owners
42 group. Commissioner Silvestrini agreed to lead that effort on behalf of the CWC. Commissioner
43 Robinson asked what portion of the private lands are in Cardiff Canyon. Mr. Dean stated that
44 according to the Cardiff Canyon Property Owners' Association, there are approximately 1,100 acres
45 in Cardiff.

46
47 Mr. Becker explained that there have been ongoing disputes with regard to ownership, values, access,
48 and uses, particularly in Cardiff primarily because of the intermixing of private and public lands.

1 Mr. Becker, Chair McCandless, and staff met with representatives of the Property Owners'
2 Association to discussed a variety of issues. Based on that discussion, the Owners' Association was
3 asked to prepare a proposal. Two options were presented with the hope being to explore them further
4 and determine whether there is an opportunity to address them as part of the legislation or otherwise.

5
6 Chair McCandless commented that one of the challenges has been to establish a schedule and come
7 up with legislative language in the Accord. He suggested there be another push for public comment.
8 Commissioner Biskupski recommended the stakeholders have an opportunity to weigh in.
9 Mr. Becker commented that it has been five years since the Mountain Accord began and over one
10 year since the CWC was formed. As a result, ongoing participation from individuals who will be part
11 of the Stakeholders Council was well reflected.

12
13 Commissioner Peterson suggested that part of the upcoming Retreat include a Strategic Action Plan
14 for the CWC. Mr. Becker reported that staff met with several individuals who have other
15 responsibilities in the mountains on both sides of the ridges. Part of the discussion at the Retreat will
16 include recognizing the role of the Commission to provide coordination and implement the Mountain
17 Accord.

18
19 **J. ADJOURNMENT**

20
21 **MOTION:** Commissioner Biskupski moved to adjourn. The motion passed with the unanimous
22 consent of the Commission.

23
24 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Meeting held Monday, October 1, 2018.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____