

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) HYBRID STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2022, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION OFFICES.**

**Present:**  Will McCarvill, Chair

 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair

 John Knoblock

 Alex Porpora

 Amber Broadaway

 Brian Hutchinson

 Carl Fisher

 Dennis Goreham

 Ed Marshall

 Kelly Boardman

 Kirk Nichols

 Maura Hahnenberger

 Mike Christensen

 Mike Marker

 Patrick Shea

 Paul Diegel

 Roger Borgenicht

 Stuart Derman

 Tom Diegel

 Joanna Wheelton

 Serena Yau

 Danny Richardson

**Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy

 Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration

 Madeline Pettit, Community Engagement Intern

**Others:**  Steve Van Maren

Mike Doyle

 Josh Van Jura

 Brianna Binnebose

 Lance Kovel

**Opening**

1. **William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He reported that this was a hybrid meeting.

1. **The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders' Council DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, July 20, 2022.**

There were no corrections or suggestions for the July 20, 2022 Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes. As a result, Chair McCarvill stated that the minutes were approved.

1. **Announcements.**

Co-Chair Barbara Cameron shared announcements with the Stakeholders Council. She reported that the Silver Lake Boardwalk is under construction on the west side. Hikers can still use the east side. Next year, the east side will be renovated. That funding came from the Great American Outdoors Act (“GAOA”) grant. In addition, the U.S. Forest Service and Salt Lake County were finishing the Cardiff Meadow Ridge and Boardwalk. That work would be done by the end of the month. The U.S. Forest Service hired a full-time Ranger to supervise activity in the Cardiff Meadow area since it is one of the busiest trailheads in the Wasatch. The Town of Brighton would provide half of the funding for that position. Co-Chair Cameron noted that geological signs were installed in Big Cottonwood as part of the CWC Short-Term Projects program. In addition, the restroom situation had been much improved due to a private company taking on the cleaning.

Co-Chair Cameron reported that the Town of Brighton raised the price of a parking ticket along the highway in town. It was previously $25 and would now be $150. This was intended to curb illegal parking in the summer and winter months. She asked that Stakeholders share that information. Co-Chair Cameron informed the Council that Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen presented the Environmental Dashboard to several groups recently. Additionally, the Millcreek Canyon Committee held a productive meeting earlier that week. Plans were in the works to create a vision statement for Millcreek related to the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. There might be a field trip to the area later in the year or sometime next year.

John Knoblock shared additional information about the Silver Lake Boardwalk Project. The Forest Service had enough money to get the boardwalk in but not enough to redo the loop trail around the lake. As a result, Trails Utah applied for a grant and received $425,000 to redo the trail.

**UDOT Presentation**

1. **Josh Van Jura will Present UDOT’s LCC FEIS.**

Chair McCarvill noted that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) public comment period had ended. Despite this, he had asked Josh Van Jura to share a brief overview and answer any outstanding questions. Mr. Van Jura shared a slideshow presentation with the Stakeholders Council. He explained that the purpose and need of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS was to improve roadway safety, mobility, and reliability on SR-210. Travel times in 2050 were expected to be within the 80–85-minute range, which would result in substantial queuing. On SR-210, Wasatch Boulevard, and North Little Cottonwood, it was expected that the queuing would back up to 3500 East on 50 days of the year. On 9400, it was expected to extend past Wasatch Boulevard. He noted that there are also avalanche hazards in Little Cottonwood Canyon that had been considered.

Mr. Van Jura shared information about the public comments on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”). 14,000 comments were received. There was a lot of support for tolling and a phased implementation. He believed UDOT had decided to proceed with a phased approach due to the comments received. On August 31, 2022, UDOT selected the Gondola B Alternative as the preferred alternative with a proposed phased implementation plan. That alternative had a capital cost of $550 million. This was a reduction of $42 million as a result of consolidating the parking at the La Caille Base Station. There would be 2,500 stalls there. The reduction of the bus service would also reduce the cost by $3.6 million. The total travel time was expected to be 55 minutes. This was one minute longer than the Enhanced Bus with No Roadway Widening Alternative. He explained that the travel time included driving to the base station, parking, waiting for a gondola, and the gondola ride itself.

Over 20 different environmental impacts had been explored. This included air quality, water quality, noise, environmental justice, and impacts during construction. There was a lot of that included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. Mr. Van Jura shared information related to air quality. All of the alternatives would significantly improve the air quality because the intention was to shift 30% of people in private vehicles to transit. Almost 4,000 tons of greenhouse gases would be saved. The gondola had slightly higher emissions than the bus alternative, which he felt was important to recognize. UDOT took a close look at water quality concerns. Nearly half a million people received some or all of their drinking water from Little Cottonwood. As a result, UDOT focused on worst-case scenario modeling assumptions. Even using the worst-case conditions, safe drinking water thresholds for contaminants of concern were not approached.

Mr. Van Jura described the main reasons UDOT had selected the Gondola B Alternative as the preferred alternative. The first reason had to do with the purpose and need. The Gondola B Alternative had the highest travel time reliability because it operated in a separate alignment. It would not be prone to slide-offs, crashes, slow-moving vehicles, or avalanche debris on roads. Environmental impacts were considered in the preferred alternative selection process. Additionally, the gondola had the lowest overall lifecycle cost, which was another consideration.

UDOT recognized that the gondola would have high visual impacts. That was a concern to many canyon users. Since so many comments were received about the visual impacts, UDOT had done several artistic renderings. Those could be found in Chapters 17 and 32 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. Mr. Van Jura shared some of those renderings with the Council.

The phased approach was discussed. Currently, UDOT did not have the $550 million needed to implement the entire transportation project. The gondola made up $335 million of the estimated $550. There was $159 million in commonalities as well, which included snowsheds, trailhead improvements, parking restrictions, and tolling equipment. Some funds were allocated, with $13 million allocated for the purchase of right-of-way at the mouth of Big Cottonwood. UDOT recognized that the money was not all in hand and did not know how long it would take the secure the total amount of necessary funds. However, it was important to address existing issues.

Some of the proposed improvements included improving and increasing bus service, adding more parking, and tolling. The implementation would be phased and dependent on when funding becomes available. The sub-alternatives included tolling, transit, parking, widening of Wasatch Boulevard, snowsheds, trailhead improvements, and the no winter parking alternative. Mr. Van Jura reported that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS public comment period ended on October 17, 2022, at 11:59 p.m. He did not have an exact comment count at the current time, because some duplicate comments needed to be removed. However, he estimated that approximately 13,000 comments were received. He thanked everyone who submitted a comment. Moving forward, UDOT would read all of the comments and evaluate whether any additional engineering or environmental assessment was required. The intention was to have a Record of Decision (“ROD”) ready in the winter. Based on the number of comments received, it would likely be later in the winter.

Brian Hutchinson believed that UDOT had a narrow purpose and need statement. He also pointed out that the purpose and need did not focus on equity. It seemed that reliability was the most important factor. He wondered whether it would be possible to have a study that would address air quality impacts on a more regional level. Mr. Van Jura explained that UDOT felt the correct impact areas had been addressed. Some people felt that the purpose and need statement was too narrow, but he respectfully disagreed. He added that the air quality model was part of the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) air quality model. Lance Kovel and Brianna Binnebose were in attendance. Mr. Van Jura noted that they would answer certain Council questions.

Patrick Shea wondered what the cost of the EIS was to date. Ms. Binnebose offered to find that information and share it in the Zoom chat box. The amount was on the UDOT website. It was noted that the number was approximately $11.5 million. Mr. Knoblock wanted to know if there was a way to implement the single-occupant vehicle toll sooner. For instance, single-occupant vehicles could travel through a separate lane where there was a toll booth. Mr. Van Jura reported that UDOT had been analyzing tolling, but that sounded like more of an operational change than what was being considered part of the long-term EIS. Any additional construction in the canyon would require environmental clearances. He offered to find out more information after the meeting.

Carl Fisher noted that UDOT had evaluated a lot of different gondola configurations. The selection UDOT made was the gondola alternative with no buses. Mr. Van Jura confirmed this. There was no anticipated bus service from the mobility hubs to the base station. Mr. Fisher pointed out that in the initial screening reports, UDOT found that the gondola without buses alternative failed to meet the screening criteria because it would create congestion rather than alleviate congestion. He wondered what had changed. Mr. Van Jura clarified that the base station location had changed.

Mr. Fisher asked for additional information about the process for disposing of Forest Service lands in roadless areas to construct gondola towers. Mr. Kovel wanted clarification about the roadless areas because there was only one modification to where the gondola route was. He referenced 3.1W in the Forest Plan, a watershed emphasis that had a prohibition on road construction.

Mr. Fisher believed that 3.1W was important but some lands were protected under the roadless rule that the gondola towers would be impacting. He was also curious about the general Forest Service process. For instance, there would be an additional National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). Mr. Kovel explained that the Forest Service had been a cooperating agency since the inception of the EIS. The Forest Service had incorporated its requirements, reviewed the analysis, and provided input to UDOT throughout the entire EIS process. He discussed the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”). Under Title 23 Section 317, FHWA had the authority to appropriate Forest Service land for highway purposes. It was not a complete transfer of Forest Service land but a non-exclusive easement over Forest Service land. The Forest Service would retain the rights to that FHWA easement. FHWA and UDOT, by deed, would have the authorization to use that for highway purposes. The Forest Service did not have to make a decision for those easements under that scenario.

In a case where FHWA could not obtain an easement, the other option was that UDOT could come directly to the Forest Service and ask for a Special Use Permit. At the current time, the Forest Service was waiting for FHWA to weigh in. Mr. Kovel noted that within the EIS, there were a lot of “if/then” statements. FHWA had not formally weighed in yet and UDOT still needed to release the ROD. Mr. Fisher wondered if the ROD needed to be published before the FHWA process could move forward. Mr. Kovel explained that it was up to the FHWA to make that determination. Following the ROD and FHWA determination, the Forest Service would need to make a decision about any of the lands that the FHWA could not obtain an easement for.

Following the ROD and FHWA determination, the Forest Service would have to make a decision for any lands that the FHWA could not obtain an easement for. The Forest Service would issue a Draft ROD and then there would be a 45-day objection period, a 45-day objection resolution period, and then there would be a final Forest Service ROD. For some of the alternatives in the EIS, a Forest Plan amendment would be required. The only amendments that the Forest Service was considering for the Forest Plan were project-specific amendments. Those would not be forest wide and would not set precedent for future projects in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest.

Mr. Van Jura reported that there was no permanent roading anticipated for the construction of the gondola towers. The list of how each tower was anticipated to be constructed was included in Chapter 2. Mr. Kovel asked that any specific lands that Mr. Fisher had questions about be submitted via email. He offered to look into the details and share additional information following the meeting. Mr. Fisher explained that the specific lands were mentioned in the comment submitted by Save Our Canyons.

Mr. Shea noted that there was a regulation passed in November 2000 related to the roadless policy. That was still in effect. He did not agree that there would be no roads because roads would be needed for maintenance of the gondola towers. Mr. Shea asked whether a transfer would be possible, where an entity other than UDOT could own the gondola outright. Mr. Van Jura offered to look into that. It was noted that the underlying land could not be transferred to a different entity, because the Forest Service retained all rights to that land.

Kirk Nichols believed that the worst queuing was on I-215. UDOT had stated that the study area was large enough, but he did not find it to be so, since it did not account for that traffic queuing. He believed the gondola would only increase the queues in that area. He asked for further justification about the small UDOT study area. Mr. Van Jura did not disagree that the queuing that was experienced a few times a year was an issue. It was not very often that it queued back onto I-215, but it was a dangerous situation when it did happen. The majority of that queuing was related to the left turn delays associated with Big Cottonwood Canyon rather than Little Cottonwood Canyon. UDOT was studying the 30th busiest hour. Mr. Nichols pointed out that people would park by the gondola. Everything was connected and it was necessary to study those connected effects.

Paul Diegel left a comment in the Zoom chat box. It had been reported that the gondola would need an inspection after every artillery avalanche mitigation mission. He asked about the time it would take to reopen the gondola after those missions. Mr. Van Jura explained that there had been discussions with the gondola manufacturers about this. There were three ropes, two of which were track ropes and one of which was a haul rope. The haul rope had continuous non-destructive testing. This meant it was always operational. As for the track ropes, since they did not move, they would be inspected through cameras at the tower locations. It would be under five minutes from the last shot to the time that the inspection was complete. That would likely be less than the time required for the maintenance and avalanche inspectors to drive the slide paths to verify there was no road debris.

Kelly Boardman asked Mr. Van Jura to explain why UDOT was looking at Little Cottonwood Canyon in a vacuum. Traffic was just as bad in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Van Jura explained that a lot of traffic had been seen in Big Cottonwood Canyon as well. If tolling or occupancy restrictions were put in place within Little Cottonwood Canyon, it was likely that those would be implemented in Big Cottonwood Canyon at the same time. This would require a separate environmental document. That was all stated in Chapter 2 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. Chair McCarvill thanked Mr. Van Jura for his presentation and for answering Stakeholders Council questions.

**Stakeholders Council Committee Update**

1. **SHC Committee Annual Reports will be Presented at the November CWC Retreat.**

Chair McCarvill reported that the CWC Board Retreat was to take place on November 10, 2022. He and Co-Chair Cameron would attend that retreat. The Stakeholders Council Annual Reports 2022 would be shared at that time. It was reviewed with the Council Members. Co-Chair Cameron explained that it was also included in the packet. She asked that those present review the list of sub-committee members to determine that the names were accurate. It was noted that Joanna Wheelton needed to be added to the Trails Committee list. Co-Chair Cameron stated that the report would be presented to the full CWC Board at the CWC Board Retreat along with the survey results.

1. **Results of Survey.**

Co-Chair Cameron reported that a Stakeholders Council Survey 2022 was conducted. She thanked those who responded to the survey questions. Several common themes had been incorporated into the document. The following questions and answers were reviewed:

* Why did you join the Stakeholders Council?
	+ To advocate for watershed and environmental protection, better transit, and high-quality visitor experience;
	+ To promote equity in canyon transportation and recreation;
	+ To have a voice in what happens in the canyons;
	+ To stay informed;
	+ To help set goals, strategies, and solutions to ensure conservation and preservation; and
	+ CWC is the last, best opportunity to collaborate for sustainable canyon management and preservation.
* In 2023, the Stakeholders Council should:
	+ Increase Committee and Stakeholder contributions;
	+ Focus on sustainability of natural resources;
	+ Offer ideas to the CWC Board, not the other way around;
	+ Present more concrete actions for the CWC Board to consider;
	+ Increase communication with the public and decision-makers;
	+ Allow more voices to be heard, not dominated by a few; more surveys;
	+ Be proactive, not reactive;
	+ Provide clear communication and discussion;
	+ Focus on substance and action, not procedure and administration;
	+ Provide clear mission, vision, and meeting cadence; and
	+ Provide support for public transit planning.
* As for meeting frequency, the majority of Stakeholders Council Members voted for bi-monthly meetings to sync with CWC Board Meetings.
1. **SHC Committee Members will be Voted on at the January 2023 SHC Meeting.**

Chair McCarvill explained that on a yearly basis, sub-committee leadership and committee members need to be proposed and voted on. He reviewed the Millcreek Canyon Committee Members list shown on the Annual Report, which included Tom Diegel as Chair. Alex Porpora asked to be removed from the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

**MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to APPROVE the amended list for the Millcreek Canyon Committee Membership Composition for 2023. Kirk Nichols seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Chair McCarvill reviewed the Trails Committee Members list shown on the Annual Report, which included John Knoblock as Chair. Ms. Wheelton was added to the list and Stuart Derman also asked to be added as a member of the Trails Committee.

**MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to APPROVE the amended list for the Trails Committee Membership Composition for 2023. Co-Chair Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Chair McCarvill discussed the Preservation Committee. According to the bylaws, a committee needs to meet at least once annually. The Preservation Committee had not met in over a year. He understood that the Preservation Committee was under review and reorganization but it had not met the bylaw requirements. He believed this vote should be delayed until the January 2023 meeting while those issues are resolved and a plan to move forward is created.

**Cardiff Fork Proposal**

1. **Tom Diegel will Lead Discussion on Proposed Cardiff Fork Memo.**

Mr. Tom Diegel shared a memo related to the current conflict in Upper Cardiff Fork. He reported that there was an article in *The Salt Lake Tribune* one month ago related to the area. There hadn’t been any developments since the Special Use Permit expired in May 2022. For the last decade or so, there was a Special Use Permit in place between the Forest Service and the Cardiff Canyon Owner’s Association. The Special Use Permit allowed landowners to travel across public land on motorized vehicles, only on the rough historic mining road, in exchange for allowing the public to cross the private lands to access the adjacent public lands. That Special Use Permit alleviated a lot of the historical conflict in the area. However, the Special Use Permit expired in May 2022 and there was no application to renew the permit. Currently, landowners were no longer able to legally access their private inholdings. Additionally, the public no longer had the right to cross those private lands.

Mr. Diegel reminded those present that he represents the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance on the Stakeholders Council. The Wasatch Backcountry Alliance is concerned that there will be issues similar to what was seen prior to the issuance of the Special Use Permit. This means that the landowners will need to access their property illegally and there could be conflicts related to public access. There had been a lot of historical conflicts. As a result, there was a lot of concern about the future of the area. The Special Use Permit expired on May 31, 2022, and the Cardiff Canyon Owner's Association decided not to apply for a reissue of the permit. Mr. Diegel reported that in 2020, a yurt was built on a private parcel high above the bottom of the drainage and at the top of the permitted road without permission. From the perspective of Salt Lake County, it was an illegal yurt.

It was important to avoid conflict in the area. Mr. Diegel believed that the regulatory agencies would need a lot of support to curtail the activities that would lead to conflict. The idea of the memo was to ensure that everyone within the CWC knows what is happening. He felt that a formal Resolution would inform others that the organization supported the respective agencies, including the Forest Service, Salt Lake City, and Salt Lake County. Mr. Diegel requested that the Stakeholders Council consider a formal Resolution and move it forward to the CWC Board.

Mr. Hutchinson was in support of a proposal to the CWC but felt there was language in the proposed Resolution that should be adjusted. He noted that there are property owners at the base of the canyon that is impacted by snowmobiles and ATVs. Those vehicles were also damaging the road and causing high levels of road maintenance. He asked that the Resolution language not be related to a quick solution. There should be a solution where snowmobiles and ATVs were not permitted.

Mr. Fisher explained that this was a complicated legal issue. When he had spoken to Dave Whittekiend from the Forest Service at the last CWC meeting, he mentioned that people in the area want a right to access. That was not something that was within his job description to give. It was important for the Stakeholders Council to understand that this was a complex issue.

Ed Marshall agreed with the objectives outlined by Mr. Diegel. He also agreed with the comments from Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Fisher. Mr. Marshall explained that he would have to oppose the issue based on the current Resolution language. This was not because there was support for the Cardiff Canyon Owner’s Association necessarily, but because he was in support of private property rights in the canyon. The first sentence called on the government to exercise its power without there being a mention of the interests of the private property owners. The language needed to be balanced. Mr. Marshall pointed out that the second sentence suggested procuring funding to purchase the needed properties outright. This would violate the Interlocal Agreement of the CWC, which called for purchases from willing sellers only. The word “needed” had troubling overtones. He could not support the current Resolution but could support a variation of it with different language.

Mr. Diegel pointed out that there are private property owners in the area who had claims. However, they had historically not been very respectful of the adjacent public lands, in his opinion. Mr. Marshall clarified that his comments were not based on the specifics of the situation. He wanted to ensure that a precedent was not established where private property rights were not treated even-handedly and government power was called upon without limits. He did not oppose the objective of the Resolution but wanted to make sure the language respected private property rights.

Mr. Paul Diegel was not sure that the Stakeholders Council or CWC involvement would make a difference but he felt this was an important issue. Some of the property owners believed that the property boundaries were incorrect and there was no public land there. It seemed that some were trying to take the law into their own hands, which was a concern. If there was no resolution, he was concerned that there could be violent interactions during the winter season. This needed to be taken seriously, but he did not know whether any of the government entities were taking it all that seriously.

Mr. Knoblock wanted to address the language related to purchasing needed properties. He believed that meant needed for access and by no means implied that there would be an eminent domain put forth. Chair McCarvill believed those present had brought a lot of different perspectives to the table. He wanted to see interested Stakeholders Council Members rewrite the language. He agreed that this was an important issue and that there needed to be more visibility. A motion needed to be presented to the full CWC Board. He wanted the CWC Board to consider the issue and recommendation. This would likely need to wait until the January 2023 Stakeholders Council Meeting so a vote could be taken and the revised language written. Mr. Shea wanted to make a motion at the current meeting. He was concerned that the winter months would be extremely dangerous if nothing was done. Discussions were had about possible motion language.

1. **Stakeholders Council will Consider Voting on Memo.**

**MOTION:** John Knoblock moved that the Stakeholders Council forward the proposal to the CWC Board, allowing for minor language changes ahead of the next CWC Board Meeting. Co-Chair Cameron seconded the motion.

There was discussion regarding the motion language. Mr. Tom Diegel explained that he would be happy to work with Mr. Marshall and the Stakeholders Council leadership to adjust the language. A substitute motion was proposed in the Zoom chat box to simplify the process. Mr. Knoblock accepted the substitute motion language. He believed it made sense to keep the motion simple.

**MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved that the Stakeholders Council forward the following language to the CWC Board: Out of concern for the canyon, public safety, public lands, watershed, and private property rights, just to name a few, we urge the CWC to try and find a resolution to the issues in Cardiff Fork, understanding that there are complicated legal issues at play. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

**Transportation Memo/Resolution**

1. **Pat Shea will Lead Discussion on Proposed Transportation Memo.**

Mr. Shea commented that he had been frustrated with the roundabout way that areas of the Central Wasatch were being handled. For instance, Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, and Millcreek Canyon. He believed that the transportation choices from UDOT were being driven by private economic interests. That was the reason he had asked Mr. Kovel earlier in the meeting whether there was an opportunity for the Special Use Permit to be transferred to a public-private entity instead. Mr. Shea felt it was time to make a clear recommendation.

Co-Chair Cameron believed the Resolution, titled, “Resolution of Common Sense and Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon,” was a well-written document with supported material and direct, pointed questions for UDOT. However, she was concerned with the fourth point, which stated: “The Stakeholders Council requests immediate action on Federal Legislation to protect against the damage the State seeks to initiate with its FEIS.” She asked that a substitution be made and it instead read: “The Stakeholders Council requests that action on the Federal Legislation be considered at a time when we can offer a reasonably safe and high-quality visitor experience.” The infrastructure in the canyon was not able to support more visitation. There was limited public transit and none in the summer as well as disorganized parking and increasing crime. The Cardiff Mill D area was consistently on the Unified Police Department ("UPD") heat map for the most police activity in the entire Wasatch. There were many high-crime areas. Though progress had been made with graffiti and restrooms, there was a lot more to be done. It was important that there be a safe and high-quality visitor experience before Federal Designation was considered.

Mr. Shea was supportive of the amendment suggested by Co-Chair Cameron. Chair McCarvill offered an additional amendment for consideration. He wanted the items listed to be added to the comments that were recently put together by the CWC Board on the FEIS. Mr. Knoblock explained that he would have a difficult time supporting the Resolution, because of the following:

* The Stakeholders Council supports the common-sense approach for alleviating traffic conditions in Little Cottonwood Canyon, particularly during the Winter ski season, provided that specific traffic flow goals are stated in 2022/23 and when the desired traffic flow numbers have been achieved the proposed Gondola construction would be eliminated.

He explained that the “common-sense approach” was not a clearly defined term. Mr. Shea reported that this was a term that Mayor Jenny Wilson and Mayor Erin Mendenhall had used previously. Mr. Fisher suggested that language be added to state, “as Salt Lake County has referred to, a common-sense approach.” That could create additional clarity. He expressed concerns about the amendment proposed by Co-Chair Cameron. He believed that Federal Legislation would help address the issues rather than create a barrier. The Forest Plan did not currently support having transit access to trailheads. That was something that needed to be cleared up, which could be done through Federal Legislation. He did not want to see that removed from the proposed language.

Mr. Shea believed there were ways to reach a consensus. He asked that Stakeholders Council leadership read the recommendation that was currently under consideration at the CWC Board Retreat for feedback. It could be added to the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda in January 2023 for further discussion. Chair McCarvill thanked Mr. Shea. He felt there had been a good discussion on the matter. Mr. Shea asked that Mr. Knoblock, Mr. Fisher, and Co-Chair Cameron submit the amendments that they wanted to see and distribute those to the Stakeholders Council for consideration. He could then create an edited version of the document and redistribute it.

**2. Stakeholders Council May Vote on Proposed Memo.**

The vote was delayed until the January 2023 Stakeholders Council Meeting.

Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez noted that there could be discussions about whether or not the item was appropriate to discuss at the CWC Board Retreat. He believed it would be possible to present the item to the Executive Committee in mid-November. Mr. Shea suggested that the Stakeholders Council leadership present a report at the CWC Board Retreat. Something more definitive could move forward from the Stakeholders Council in January 2023. Mr. McCarvill believed the first step was determining whether there was Council agreement on the language.

**CWC Retreat**

**1. Blake Perez will Provide an Overview of the Goals and Objectives of the Annual CWC Retreat. Q&A from SHC Members will Follow.**

Mr. Perez reported that the CWC Board Retreat would take place on November 10, 2022, from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The retreat would take place at Silver Fork Lodge. There would be a virtual option as well. The retreat had three main components: Strategic Plan evaluation, goal and value prioritization, and Stakeholders Council direction. There was an optional hike and a social dinner event following the CWC Board Retreat. The meeting agenda was on the Utah Public Notice website.

**Open Comments**

Ms. Wheelton reported that the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation season just wrapped. Since the foundation had collaborations and partnerships with many Stakeholders Council Members, she wanted to highlight some of the accomplishments made that year. The Cottonwood Canyons Foundation worked on eight major projects. 65 miles of trail received to repair and maintenance, 25 miles received heavy maintenance and construction, 55 new drainages were built, 286 drainages were repaired and maintained, 4,800 feet of trail was naturalized, and a lot of work was done on campsite naturalization. In addition to the eight major projects, the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation had also worked on 28 trails for annual maintenance. As for weeds, 11,000 pounds of weeds were removed from the canyons. The Cottonwood Canyons Foundation had collaborations with residential groups as well. 1,500 native plants were planted, 164 acres were surveyed, and 71 acres were treated.

Over 6,500 hours of volunteer time was dedicated to the canyons and there were approximately 600 volunteers. Additionally, 226 guided walks were offered. Each one of those walks had important watershed education components. Those were good outreach opportunities within the community. Ms. Wheelton reported that there had been over 10,000 in-person and virtual students who participated in their water education program. Co-Chair Cameron thanked the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. Mr. Knoblock believed the Forest Service had given the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation the go-ahead to expand the Adopt-a-Trail Program to all trails in the canyons.

**Adjourn Meeting.**

1. **William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

**MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.
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