

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEETING HELD MONDAY,**
2 **JULY 1, 2019 AT 3:30 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 Jeff Silvestrini, Commissioner Jim Bradley, Commissioner
8 Carlos Braceras, Commissioner Jenny Wilson, Commissioner Harris Sondak
9

10 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Legal Counsel Shane Topham,
11 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Intern Carly Lansche
12

13 **Excused:** Commissioner Chris Robinson, Commissioner Jackie Biskupski,
14 Commissioner Andy Beerman
15

16 **A. OPENING**
17

- 18 **i. Commissioner Chris McCandless will conduct the meeting as Chair of the**
19 **Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”).**
20

21 Chair Chris McCandless called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
22

23 **B. CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS THE CHARACTER AND**
24 **PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF ONE**
25 **OR MORE INDIVIDUALS (UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-205[1][a]).**
26

27 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bradley moved to go into closed session to discuss personnel actions.
28 Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Sondak-Aye,
29 Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner
30 Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Braceras-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner
31 Wilson was not present for the vote.
32

33 The Board was in a closed executive session from 3:30 p.m. to 3:55 p.m.
34

35 **MOTION:** Commissioner Peterson moved to close the executive session on personnel.
36 Commissioner Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of
37 the Board.
38

39 **C. RESUME OPEN MEETING 4:00 P.M. TO 4:05 P.M.**
40

- 41 **i. Commissioner Chris McCandless will Resume the Open Meeting as Chair of the**
42 **CWC.**
43

44 The open meeting resumed at 4:00 p.m.
45

1 **ii. The Commission will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of Monday,**
2 **June 3, 2019.**

3
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bradley moved to adopt Resolution 2019-16 approving the CWC’s
5 proposed budget for fiscal year 2019-201 with the proviso that there be more rigorous discussion in
6 terms of the position and its requirements. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion. Vote on
7 motion: Commissioner Braceras-Aye, Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye,
8 Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner
9 Beerman-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

10
11 The proposed new Deputy Director, Blake Perez, introduced himself and stated that previously he
12 worked for a non-profit helping low-income families build financial security with Community Action
13 Partnership of Utah. He served for four years on the Rose Park Community Council and was pleased
14 to be working with the CWC.

15
16 New Intern Carley Lansche was also welcomed.

17
18 Chair McCandless thanked Executive Director Ralph Becker and Communications Director Lindsey
19 Nielsen for bearing the additional load for the past several weeks.

20
21 **D. ELECTION OF OFFICERS 4:05 PM. TO 4:10 P.M.**

- 22
23 **i. Nominations for, and Election of, Chair.**
24 **ii. Nominations for, and Election of, Co-Chair.**
25 **iii. Nominations for, and Election of, Secretary.**
26 **iv. Nominations for, and Election of, Treasurer.**

27
28 CWC Attorney Shane Topham indicated that terms will be for two years from July 1, 2019 to
29 July 1, 2021.

30
31 Commissioner Silvestrini reported that Chair McCandless and Mayor Biskupski will not be returning
32 after the first of the year. As a result, he suggested that their replacements be named before selecting
33 leadership. He saw no reason to not extend the terms of the current officers through
34 December 31, 2019. Mr. Topham explained that the bi-annual election of officers is a function of the
35 Interlocal Agreement and he didn’t feel that the board can override that. He pointed out that there
36 have already been transitions along the way. Possible options were discussed.

37
38 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wilson moved to conduct a bi-annual election and reappoint the existing
39 officers with Chris McCandless as Chair, Jackie Biskupski as Co-Chair, Chris Robinson as Secretary,
40 and Jim Bradley as Treasurer. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion. The motion passed with
41 the unanimous consent of the Board.

42
43 Chair McCandless suggested that in December action be taken to be prepared for the first meeting in
44 January. He recommended that ex-officio members also be considered. Mr. Topham explained that
45 doing so would require an amendment to the Interlocal Agreement. Chair McCandless commented
46 that Brighton will likely want to have a seat on the Board, which will also require an amendment to
47 the Interlocal Agreement. He suggested that all of the needed amendments be addressed at the same
48 time.

1
2 Commissioner Wilson offered to support staff’s collection of modifications to the Interlocal
3 Agreement prior in order to be prepared to take action in late 2019.
4

5 **E. ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD PROJECT UPDATE AND DISCUSSION**
6 **4:10 P.M.**
7

8 **i. CWC Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen will provide an update on the**
9 **Proposed Slope, Timeline, and Budget for the Environmental Dashboard.**
10

11 Ms. Nielsen reported that an Interlocal Agreement has been signed on behalf of the University of
12 Utah. In addition, they have a preliminary scope of work for Phase 1 to bring the Environmental
13 Dashboard indicators to completion. She briefly presented the scope of work for Phase 1 at the June
14 meeting. The timeline was pending approval and review of the ILA. Work was to begin thereafter.
15 The timeline for Phase 1 will take the remainder of 2019. The environmental indicators were expected
16 to be completed in November and December at which point there will be an initial review of the work
17 that has been completed in Phase 1. Phase 2 will begin after December 2020. The full scope of work
18 for Phase 2 to bring the project online will require an initial rescoping based on work and discoveries
19 made in Phase 1.
20

21 Commissioner Braceras explained that the Interlocal Agreement will take them through Phase 1 after
22 which they will have an opportunity to review the results. At that point, they will be better able to
23 scope Phase 2.
24

25 **ii. Consideration of Resolution 2019-20 Approving the CWC’s Entry into an**
26 **Interlocal Agreement with the University of Utah on Behalf of its DIGIT Lab and**
27 **its Ehleringer Lab for Completion of the CWC’s “Environmental Dashboard”**
28 **Project.**
29

30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Peterson moved to adopt Resolution 2019-20 approving the CWC’s entry
31 into an Interlocal Agreement with the University of Utah on behalf of its DIGIT Lab and its Ehleringer
32 Lab for completion of the CWC’s Environmental Dashboard Project. Commissioner Wilson
33 seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Sondak-Aye,
34 Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner
35 Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Braceras-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.
36

37 **F. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE AND DISCUSSION 4:30 P.M. TO 4:35 P.M.**
38

39 **i. Stakeholders Council Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Provide an Update on**
40 **the June Stakeholders Council Meeting and Work Moving Forward.**
41

42 Stakeholders Council Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker gave a recap of the June 17 meeting. She reported
43 that Stakeholders Council Meetings have been moved to Cottonwood Heights City Hall and will be
44 held the third Wednesday of every month from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Community Room. At
45 the most recent meeting, the CWC gave background information on the Mountain Accord, the Central
46 Wasatch Commission, and the goals and objectives set out for the Stakeholders Council. Staff also
47 provided information on the Central Wasatch National Conservation Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”)

1 Act and the transportation work and partnerships with the Utah Department of Transportation
2 (“UDOT”) and the Environmental Dashboard.

3
4 The Stakeholders Council created an eight-person subcommittee to work on a pilot program for a
5 Millcreek shuttle program. Stakeholder Brian Hutchinson will lead the subcommittee and any
6 proposals or recommendations from the Millcreek Shuttle Committee will be subject to the Central
7 Wasatch Commission Board and the review and approval of relevant partner agencies. Vice-Chair
8 Bricker reported that she gave a brief overview of definitions and concepts related to carrying
9 capacity. There was also discussion with a Forest Service representative.

10
11 **G. VISITOR CAPACITY PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION 4:35 P.M. TO 5:20 P.M.**

12
13 **i. Stakeholders Council Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Provide a Brief Overview**
14 **of Visitor Capacity Definitions, Concepts, and Processes.**

15
16 Dr. Bricker presented the Board with a truncated version of the presentation she gave to the
17 Stakeholders Council. She explained that they study and care about visitor use management to ensure
18 that recreational areas and special places and their benefits persist. They utilize visitor frameworks
19 to protect resources and improve visitor experiences as well as continually support appropriate public
20 access. The ultimate goal is to ensure the long-term viability of the resources and social and
21 managerial conditions that make desired visitor experiences possible. Visitor management and
22 monitoring is important because patterns of outdoor recreation and visitor use are continually
23 changing. These changes often result in the need to consider social and environmental justice factors
24 such as race, class, gender, and age to accommodate shifting visitor experiences. These patterns are
25 driven by marketing campaigns, rising international tourism, low travel costs, social media, weather,
26 and new emerging forms of recreation.

27
28 Robert Manning, a leading researcher in carrying capacity in parks and protected areas, posed the
29 question of how much the environment can be used without spoiling it. The concept of carrying
30 capacity has a relatively long and rich history in environmental and natural resource management. In
31 its broadest manifestations it is applied to a population that can ultimately be accommodated in a
32 given area or on the planet as a whole.

33
34 Questions associated with visitor capacity and managing public lands of our forest resources and
35 environmental management include what levels of environmental impacts are acceptable and what
36 type of environmental and related social conditions do we want to maintain. It has become clear
37 through research and practical application that there cannot be any one inherent visitor capacity of a
38 forest or related area. Visitor capacity can only be determined as it relates to environmental and
39 associated social objectives for managing an area’s visitor use. Visitor use refers to human presence
40 in an area for recreational purposes including education, interpretation, inspiration, enjoyment, and
41 mental and physical health.

42
43 Dr. Bricker described the effects of visitor use. She explained that protecting resources while
44 managing visitor benefits is complex and depends on several factors and impacts and varies with the
45 type and timing of use, distribution of use, visitor expectations, environmental setting, amount of use,
46 and several site specific factors. Tools and strategies can be applied to analyze the number of visitors
47 and where, when, and why they go, what they do, and the impacts they leave behind. Visitor capacity
48 is one of the tools used to assess impacts within a given area. Land managing agencies agree that

1 visitor capacity is a component of visitor use management and is the maximum amounts and types of
2 visitor use that an area can accommodate while achieving and maintaining desired resource conditions
3 and visitor experiences that are consistent with the purpose of which the area was established.
4

5 Visitor capacity is a tool that can aid managers in achieving and maintaining desired conditions. It is
6 important to identify visitor capacity when the amounts and types of use directly relate to achieving
7 and maintaining desired conditions or when identifying a visitor capacity is legally required. To
8 identify the most appropriate visitor capacity metric, they assess all aspects of amounts and types of
9 use that effect those desired conditions. There are several factors that may impact visitor capacity.
10 These may include increasing or removing parking areas, improved accessibility to certain sites, trail
11 conditions, wildlife and nature viewing opportunities, snow cover, and transportation efficiency. The
12 second core aspect of establishing visitor capacity is to monitor resource conditions based on
13 indicators and how they address thresholds, which are the management decisions or minimum
14 acceptable conditions for indicators. The third core aspect of visitor capacity is to apply management
15 practices to ensure that the thresholds or standards for the indicators are maintained.
16

17 Dr. Bricker reported that regular monitoring of visitor evaluations and overall satisfaction or
18 acceptability of specific kinds of experiences is essential regardless of whether visitor capacity is used
19 as a management tool. Ultimately, managers of public lands must find ways to set goals and
20 objectives that maintain the range of desired experiences and benefits. This is a challenging task in
21 that there are seemingly infinite numbers of people seeking to share a finite space.
22

23 Commissioner Peterson asked Dr. Bricker to describe how the Stakeholders Council responded to her
24 presentation. Dr. Bricker stated that one of the issues raised was that they form a subcommittee
25 around the topic area and focus on some of the specific issues surrounding visitor capacity. The
26 matter was to be discussed again at the next meeting.
27

28 **ii. Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Forest Supervisor Dave Whittekiend will Lead a**
29 **Discussion on Visitor Capacity.**
30

31 David Whittekiend identified himself as the Forest Supervisor for the Uinta Wasatch Cache National
32 Forest. He reported that they are a formal cooperating agency on the UDOT Little Cottonwood
33 Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“LLC EIS”) and an active partner on the Cottonwood
34 Canyon Transportation Action Plan (“CCTAP”). They welcomed the opportunity to participate on
35 both. Stakeholders have expressed concern over increased visitation to the Cottonwood Canyons and
36 many believe that the future of UDOT transportation improvements may facilitate additional
37 visitation. At this time, the Forest Service is not considering specific carrying capacity. Through
38 their forest plan monitoring, they have determined that many of the areas on Uinta Wasatch Cache
39 may handle increased use with the construction of sustainable infrastructure such as better trails,
40 improved trailheads, additional outhouses, and facilities that better accommodate user demands and
41 mitigate impacts that may take place from recreational use.
42

43 Parking capacity on National Forest lands in the Cottonwood Canyons is currently managed to year
44 2000 levels as a desired future condition in the forest plan to reduce watershed impacts. Visitors,
45 however, took it upon themselves to discover additional parking areas along roadside areas so parking
46 has expanded in the Cottonwood Canyons since 2000. The alternatives currently being developed in
47 the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS do not propose an increase and may result in a slight decrease in
48 current parking capacity through the elimination of roadside parking near Forest Service trailheads.

1 This would eliminate the additional parking that has taken place and ideally move it into better
2 developed and designed trailheads.

3
4 Mr. Whittekiend reported that alternatives currently under development in the UDOT LLC EIS
5 include snow sheds, trailhead improvements, winter transit to ski areas, and Wasatch Boulevard
6 improvements and do not provide a direct nexus to increased visitation on National Forest System
7 lands outside of the permitted ski areas. Additionally, the Forest Service does not govern visitor
8 capacity at the permitted ski areas. It is the position of the Forest Service that a Visitor Capacity
9 Study is not warranted as part of the UDOT LLC EIS since there is currently no indication of a direct
10 nexus to increased visitation on National Forest System lands outside of the ski areas based on
11 alternatives currently being evaluated in the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process.

12
13 Mr. Whittekiend explained that potential projects included in the transportation analysis such as
14 transit service to Forest Service trailheads, may warrant an analysis of potential impacts to National
15 Forest System resources because of the potential for increased visitation and use at those trailheads.
16 He explained that any agency or organization may perform a capacity study for National Forest
17 System lands, however, the consideration and decision to potential implement any actions from a
18 study would rest solely with the Forest Service. Any proposal to the Forest Service would be
19 evaluated for consistency and analyzed under the NEPA process. The Forest Service will continue
20 to work with the CWC and UDOT during the EIS process and the transportation process to facilitate
21 feasible and beneficial outcomes. Their participation, which began with Mountain Accord, has
22 always been to find solutions to the issues they face including visitation in the canyons, impacts to
23 resources, and ultimately protection of the watershed. They were prepared to work with the CWC on
24 potential solutions.

25
26 Commissioner Sondak asked Mr. Whittekiend to clarify the why, given UDOT’s EIS, that there is
27 not likely to be an impact requiring a capacity study. Mr. Whittekiend explained that currently they
28 are looking at improvements. The area they believe would have the biggest potential for impact
29 would be increased transit. At this time, the only plans for transit stops are at the ski areas. There is
30 the potential for increased visitation at the ski areas, but they also anticipate the ski areas to be able
31 to manage use. They were not looking at any proposals for increased transit to Forest Service
32 trailheads. Mr. Whittekiend explained that parking capacity currently and will continue to limit
33 visitation. Busses will be going to the ski areas only.

34
35 Commissioner Wilson asked about the summer and winter service to the ski areas and how much
36 more is beneficial. She asked staff to provide her with a copy of the contract the Forest Service has
37 for the ski resorts and was surprised to learn that they expire in the next 20 years. She questioned
38 whether an extension was being considered. She pointed out that the ski resorts have relied on that
39 contract to build lifts, finance, and expand their operations and asked if thought had been given to the
40 fact that soon it will be time to consider further conversations about that. Mr. Whittekiend responded
41 that with respect to reissuance of the special use permits with the ski areas, whenever they reissue
42 permits they always have a conversation. He was not sure they would be looking at wholesale
43 changes in operations or removing structures but they would have discussions about management of
44 the ski areas and how that fits with the Forest Plan goals and conditions. Those conversations,
45 however, had not yet begun.

1 **H. RESOLUTION 2019-21 APPROVING A POLICY REGULATING THE USE OF THE**
2 **CWC'S PUBLIC PROPERTY UNDER H.B. 163 5:20 P.M. TO 5:25 P.M.**

3
4 **i. Consideration of Resolution 2019-21 Approving a Policy Regulating the Use of**
5 **the CWC's Public Property in Furtherance of H.B. 163 Enacted in the 2019**
6 **General Session of the Utah Legislature, with an Effective Date of 1 July 2019.**
7

8 Mr. Topham reported that the Utah Code historically has prohibited the misuse of public monies but
9 has not been as explicit on the misuse of public property. HB 163 that was enacted in the last
10 Legislative Session, goes into effect today, and criminalizes the misuse of public property. The bill
11 allows governmental entities that own public property to create a policy for their entity that describes
12 the permissible private use of the public property. It was proposed that the Board enact the policy
13 attached to Resolution 2019-21, which outlines what sorts of personal use of public property is
14 permissible.
15

16 **MOTION:** Commissioner Silvestrini moved to approve Resolution 2019-21 approving a policy
17 regulating the use of the CWC's public property in furtherance of HB 163. Commissioner Wilson
18 seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Sondak-Aye,
19 Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner
20 Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Braceras-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.
21

22 **I. RESOLUTION 2019-22 APPROVING ENTRY INTO A FUNDING INTERLOCAL**
23 **AGREEMENT WITH SALT LAKE COUNTY 5:25 P.M. -5:30 P.M.**
24

25 **i. Consideration of Resolution 2019-22 Approving the CWC's Entry into a Funding**
26 **Interlocal Agreement with Salt Lake County.**
27

28 Mr. Becker reported that the above item was provided to formally accept or approve Salt Lake
29 County's action to extend their cooperation and participation in the Central Wasatch Commission and
30 funding. They looked at different ways for the jurisdictions that are members of the CWC to look at
31 how to formally participate, including their appropriation and ongoing participation. The original
32 Interlocal Agreement called for a commitment of a number of years and they are now past that time
33 so each of the jurisdictions are taking individual actions to extend their participation financially with
34 the CWC. The proposed resolution reflects Salt Lake County's Interlocal Agreement, which is the
35 approach they have taken to extend their participation.
36

37 Commissioner Silvestrini asked who drafted the document and whether it can be made available in
38 electronic format to the other municipal jurisdictions that are members of the CWC. Mr. Topham
39 confirmed that he drafted the agreement, previously had provided it to the Board members in a
40 changeable format, and would again provide it to the Board members in a changeable format.
41

42 Commissioner Sondak indicated that they passed a budget that included the allocation of funds for
43 the CWC and asked if each entity now needs to pass a resolution like this one. Mr. Topham explained
44 that that is the case and the Interlocal Agreement is a mechanism to accomplish the funding.
45

46 Mr. Becker pointed out that the Budget Finance Committee, in preparation for the fiscal year and in
47 looking at budgets going forward, suggested that each of the jurisdictions look at extending for one
48 year the budget allocated in prior years. The Budget Finance Committee and the CWC looked at a

1 more sustainable and easier approach going forward. He spoke with the Budget Committee Chair,
2 Chris McCandless, about reconvening that Budget Committee fairly soon so that they and the Board
3 can continue the work that was suspended during completion of the municipal budgets.

4
5 **MOTION:** Commissioner Silvestrini moved to approve Resolution 2019-22 approving an Interlocal
6 Agreement between the Central Wasatch Commission and Salt Lake County. Commissioner Peterson
7 seconded the motion and expressed appreciation to Salt Lake County for their contribution. Vote on
8 motion: Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Sondak-Aye, Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Chair
9 McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner
10 Braceras-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

11
12 **J. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT 5:30 P.M. – 5:45 P.M.**

13
14 **i. Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide His Monthly Report to the Board.**

15
16 Mr. Becker reported that within the last month staff has moved into their new space over the Gateway
17 in the Cicero Building. They continued to move forward with the Congressional legislation and in
18 their work with the State Legislature. The Legislature passed a bill in the last session to notify the
19 Legislature of any proposed public land designations and give them the opportunity to review and
20 consider their participation. They have been in discussions with leadership in both the House and the
21 Senate and the co-chairs of the Natural Resources Interim Committee of the Legislature. It appeared
22 that they were planning to perhaps have a field trip and take the matter up in September 2019.

23
24 Staff was also continuing their work on the congressional legislation. They have been meeting with
25 members of their congressional delegation and there has been internal review of the draft legislation
26 that was adopted as a recommendation in November of 2018 by the CWC. There was technical
27 review of language as well as organization of the bill. They were going through another round of that
28 review with delegation staff. Mr. Becker had been working on a narrative that will make it easier for
29 the public and others to follow the changes. They would be working on a two-step process starting
30 in the next few weeks to get a draft out for circulation among the jurisdictions and entities directly
31 affected by changes and then provide a draft for public review. The matter would be brought back to
32 the Commission in late summer or early fall.

33
34 Mr. Becker commented on the Environmental Dashboard and stated that it will be an incredible
35 resource for anyone who interacts with the mountains. It will contain a common set of data that has
36 been peer reviewed and that will provide a foundation for ongoing analysis and a central place to find
37 useful information.

38
39 Mr. Becker reported that a proposal was received from members of the Stakeholders Council as well
40 as the Board to look at a pilot shuttle program in Millcreek Canyon. Commissioners Silvestrini and
41 Bradley had been particularly involved in that. Brian Hutchinson, a member of the Stakeholders
42 Council, had also been providing assistance. At its last meeting, the Stakeholders Council agreed to
43 form a subcommittee to look at implementing a pilot shuttle program as soon as this winter. A group
44 of eight members will serve on the subcommittee and it will be expanded to include those not on the
45 Stakeholders Council. The Mountain Accord called for the implementation of studies conducted in
46 2012 to determine whether a pilot program could be implemented.

1 Staff continued to spend a great deal of time working with John Thomas from UDOT on the LLC EIS
2 and the CCTAP. A firm schedule was being followed and an enormous amount of technical expertise
3 had been brought to bear.
4

5 Mr. Becker reported that Carly Lansche has been hired as an Intern and has been tremendously
6 helpful. The Selection Committee also spent a great deal of time over the past month interviewing
7 candidates and ultimately hired Blake Perez.
8

9 **K. PUBLIC COMMENT**

10
11 Pat Shea commented that the Environmental Dashboard is a dynamic process and will involve
12 ongoing monitoring that will be invaluable to all of the communities in the Salt Lake Valley and the
13 Wasatch Back.
14

15 He commented that with regard to the federal legislation, there is no chance of it passing before 2021.
16 As a result, he saw no reason for this group and Mr. Becker to spend time and money in Washington,
17 D.C., which he considered to be fiscally irresponsible. He stated that the House is controlled by the
18 Democrats and in the Senate the minority still has a strong voice. Action will not be taken in light of
19 the 2020 election and for the Board to waste time and money pursuing it is not prudent.
20

21 Mr. Shea next commented on Dave Whittekiend's presentation. He did not see how anyone could
22 possibly expect not to have an impact on the National Forest while increasing the ability of people to
23 get up the canyon. The idea of going forward with an EIS and not understand what Dr. Bricker talked
24 about seems to be putting the cart before the horse. The citizens and the Board need to understand
25 what the impact will be on the National Forest and the watershed. He was not opposed to the EIS
26 going forward and stated that the Visitor Capacity Study could begin while that is going on. He did
27 not, however, trust promises about something to be done in the future when it needs to be done
28 contemporaneously with the EIS. He urged the Board to make sure that UDOT understands that that
29 has to be part of the EIS.
30

31 Paul Godat addressed transportation safety and reported that he spoke to Mr. Thomas before the
32 meeting and submitted a proposal to enhance safety in the canyons. It was obvious that there are laws
33 on the books now to make it safer. Mr. Godat referenced 920-6 and stated that it is not enforced,
34 which is the problem. He proposed that with the rule-making authority that UDOT has, that they
35 require snow tires. He describe the difference between snow and mud tires and stated that if there
36 was a way to expedite getting approved vehicles up the canyon with an inspection process, it would
37 move traffic up the canyon more quickly. He commented that it only takes one car to go sideways.
38 Mr. Godat stated that to him safety is paramount and non-negotiable. He was appalled by the lack of
39 enforcement and asked what was being done to ensure that proper equipment is going up the canyon.
40 He suggested that fines and penalties be imposing to get people's attention. He hoped something
41 could be done this year to prevent non-complying vehicles from going up and down the canyon.
42

43 Chair McCandless was unaware of the difference between snow and mud tires until tonight and
44 suggested the Board ask the Salt Lake County Sheriff make a presentation on canyon enforcement.
45

46 Steve Van Maren commented that within 12 hours of his note being sent to staff, the agenda was
47 updated correctly. He thanked the Board for their efforts.
48

1 Allen Orr requested that the Board not make things worse and defer to UDOT to manage SR-210 in
2 Little Cottonwood Canyon, the UFA, and the Marshall of the Town of Alta to manage public safety
3 of vehicles in Little Cottonwood Canyon. He urged the Board to be skeptical about what their
4 congressional representatives and senators are willing to do about a federal legislative conservation
5 and recreation area in the canyons. He asked that each member of the Board ride a ski bus to and
6 from Alta with a young person under the age of 13 with ski gear and report on their experience.

7
8 According to Google, the population of the Wasatch Front in 2010 was approximately 2.2 million.
9 In 2019, it was estimated to be around 2.6 million. With 400,000 more people comes more traffic.
10 These are consequences of population growth and is what they have invited. Until they can control
11 snowstorms and freezing temperatures, there are going to be days with slower travel times up the
12 canyons unless there is a tram or gondola. Mr. Orr asked that the Board set reasonable and realistic
13 goals. Last, he asked that the Board keep an open mind about ski areas connecting as a part of
14 reducing vehicles in the canyons.

15
16 Evan Johnson identified himself as a property owner in the canyon and stated that he is also associated
17 with the Save Our Big Cottonwood Creek effort. With regard to the Environmental Dashboard, he
18 recommended that they put E. coli as one of the indicators. Salt Lake City Public Utilities has tested
19 the water in the canyon and some of the tests have come back showing 2,400 counts of E. coli. The
20 safe swimming count in a lake is 60. He also suggested that the Total Dissolved Solids (“TDS”)
21 indicator also be included on the Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Johnson explained that in the canyon
22 the TDS runs at about 200 but at the end of Big Cottonwood Creek it is at about 1,200 to 1,400.

23
24 Mr. Johnson pointed out that 57% of the water in Big Cottonwood Canyon never enters the treatment
25 plant. Of the water that is treated, 75% is used on lawns. It didn’t seem to make sense to protect the
26 watershed for outdoor use. Mr. Johnson commented that currently there are 16 toilets in 50 square
27 miles to serve 1.7 million visitors per year in Big Cottonwood Canyon. When toilets are not used,
28 human waste can total up to 1 million pounds over 20 years. For that reason, high E. coli counts are
29 being seen in the canyon. He estimated that Big Cottonwood Canyon is short by about 50 toilets.

30
31 Mr. Johnson appreciated those who work for the CWC but his opinion was that all positions should
32 be volunteer. If the money paid for salaries was used for toilets, water quality would improve and
33 the watershed would be protected. The savings from using staff volunteers would allow for the
34 purchase of 25 new toilets per year.

35
36 With respect to visitor capacity, it is great as long as it does not push out private property owners.
37 Mr. Johnson reported that 20% of the canyon is privately owned but there is never any mention of
38 use.

39
40 Roger Burke identified himself as the President of Alta and a constituent of Mayor Sondak. He
41 referenced Pat Shea’s remarks and stated that what he sees indicates that they will increase the
42 capacity to at least Little Cottonwood Canyon. History indicates that when capacity is increased, it
43 fills up. He wondered how bad it will have to get before they collectively decide that enough is
44 enough.

45
46 Mike Maughan suggested that in the Canyons they implement four-wheel drive vehicles only with
47 mud and snow tires from November 30 through April 1. He believed that would have a significant
48 impact on traffic flows. He reported that 52% of the ski days this year had snow in Little Cottonwood

1 Canyon yet they still had more congestion and traffic than in recent years. Many cars that come into
2 the canyon are rental cars so he suggested that rental car companies help facilitate a better
3 transportation experience without changing infrastructure.

4
5 There were no further public comments.

6
7 **L. COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

8
9 Commissioner Peterson acknowledged that the population of the valley has impacted the Wasatch
10 Front and the canyons and the city of Cottonwood Heights is very concerned. A few years ago they
11 applied for a grant to prepare a Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan. As they initiated the plan, they
12 recognized through public input and open houses that Wasatch Boulevard is not just a highway and
13 it impacts the city directly. They shared their concerns with UDOT recently who have now indicated
14 their intent to consider Wasatch Boulevard from 6200 South to Little Cottonwood Canyon as a
15 gateway area. He was very pleased and stated that as a gateway it will include such things as active
16 transportation, sensitivity to pedestrian impacts, landscaping buffers and medians, and moving park
17 and ride areas to the gravel pit area. Commissioner Peterson considered that to be a positive change.
18 Going forward, they would like to involve UTA, the County, and others.

19
20 **M. ADJOURNMENT**

21
22 **MOTION:** Commissioner Silvestrini moved to adjourn. The motion was not seconded. The
23 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

24
25 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:15 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, July 1, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____