

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS**
2 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M.,**
3 **COMMUNITY ROOM, 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**
5

6 **Present:** Chair Greg Summerhays, Annalee Munsey, Barbara Cameron, Dan Knopp,
7 Bill Malone, Jan Striefel, Mike Maughan, Kirk Nichols, Wayne Crawford,
8 Brian Hutchinson, John Knoblock, Del Despain, Kurt Hegman, Will
9 McCarvill, Jenna Malone, Randy Doyle, Paul Diegel, Dave Fields, Chris
10 Cawley, Jeff Niemayer, Siri Vlastic, Laura Hanson, Teri Klug, Nathan
11 Rafferty, Jodi Gardberg, Tom Diegel, Christine Osborne
12

13 **CWC Members:** Chair Chris McCandless, Legal Counsel Shane Topham, Executive Director
14 Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director
15 Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson, Engagement Intern
16 Quinn Graves
17

18 **Excused:** Co-Chair Kelly Bricker
19

20 **Via Telephone:** Pat Shea, Troy Morgan, Carolyn Wawra, Sarah Bennett, Megan Nelson, Ed
21 Marshall, Mike Marker
22

23 **A. OPENING**
24

25 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
26 **Council (“SHC”).**
27

28 Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays called the meeting to order at approximately
29 3:00 p.m. He thanked outgoing Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Chair Chris McCandless
30 for his hard work and dedication. Brighton’s Mayor-Elect Dan Knopp was also congratulated. He
31 too would be transitioning out of the SHC at the end of the year. Jenna Malone would be filling
32 his spot.
33

34 Ms. Malone introduced herself and stated that she is a 15-year Salt Lake City and three-year
35 Brighton resident. She was recently elected to the Town Council and has worked as a member of
36 the ski patrol at Alta, is a backcountry skier, and works at Intermountain Medical Center.
37

38 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
39 **Wednesday, October 16, 2019.**
40

41 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, October 16, 2019.
42 Annalee Munsey seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
43 Council.
44

1 **B. FOLLOW UP ON CAPACITY COMMITTEE**

2
3 **i. Greg Summerhays will Lead a Brief Discussion on the Current Status of the**
4 **Capacity Committee and Recommendation.**

5
6 Chair Summerhays updated the Council on the Capacity Committee and reported that there have
7 been several discussions about the Capacity Study, which led to the formation of a committee to
8 further guide that discussion. He stated that there has been a lack of purpose and definition of the
9 committees so, at the recent CWC Retreat, they brought up the issue of committees and the
10 Capacity Study. The CWC was asked to report back to the SHC and provide additional definition
11 and direction with respect to how to proceed.

12
13 **C. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL SURVEY RESULTS**

14
15 **i. Blake Perez will Share Results from the Stakeholders Council Survey.**

16
17 Chair Summerhays thanked those who participated in the recent survey.

18
19 CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez presented information from the Retreat held a few weeks prior.
20 The two main responses involved the relationship with the CWC Board and the direction and
21 purpose of Stakeholders Council meetings. Some of the quotes submitted were shared as well as
22 goals for the future. Mr. Perez explained that the survey was an opportunity to inform the Board,
23 help determine next steps, and make them aware of the goals of the Stakeholders Council moving
24 forward and what they have accomplished thus far.

25
26 John Knoblock commented that the group's greatest strength is the fact that they are passionate
27 about the issue, which can also be a challenge. Based on the feedback received, there would be
28 discussion about potential changes to the structure of the Council and how they can be more
29 effective moving forward.

30
31 **D. CWC RETREAT AND FUTURE SHC STRUCTURE DISCUSSION**

32
33 **i. Chris McCandless, CWC Chair, will Share some of the Outcomes of the CWC**
34 **Retreat.**

35
36 CWC Chair Chris McCandless reported that a great deal was accomplished at the Retreat and many
37 difficult questions were asked and answered. He stated that the learning curve is steep and he
38 considered the Stakeholders Council to be an underutilized asset. Areas the CWC needs to focus
39 on were identified as:

- 40
41 1. Short-term projects;
42 2. Transportation solutions for Millcreek, Big, and Little Cottonwood Canyon; and
43 3. The federal legislation.

44
45 There was discussion about creating three primary groups to address each of the above topics with
46 the involvement of the CWC Board. The groups would be asked to come up with ideas for
47 implementation, funding, and ongoing stewardship. The CWC Board was divided into three

1 groups consisting of those who could best represent the three areas. Chair McCandless reported
2 that December 31 will be his last day in office. He was sad to no longer be part of the CWC Board
3 but was pleased with how far they have come and the establishment of long-term solutions.
4

5 **ii. Greg Summerhays and Blake Perez will Lead a Discussion on the**
6 **Recommended Future Structure of the SHC.**
7

8 Mr. Perez reported that the discussion that took place at the Retreat was specific to the structure of
9 the Stakeholders Council. Some of the comments that came out of the survey mentioned the
10 review of the legislation and breaking into smaller groups. There was a consensus that everyone's
11 voices were heard and constructive feedback was given. In other meetings, it had been difficult to
12 have constructive dialog and come up with a proposal. There was also discussion of possibly
13 holding Stakeholders Council meetings quarterly rather than monthly and bringing back specific
14 action items that the group could debate and discuss.
15

16 Dave Fields' opinion was that the Stakeholders Council is too large, which results in reduced
17 productivity. Some members are chronically absent and he suggested the group size be reduced.
18 He considered the establishment of committees to be a step in that direction. Imposing attendance
19 guidelines was also discussed.
20

21 Annalee Munsey commented on short-term projects and questioned whether meeting quarterly
22 will be sufficient. She suggested that meetings continue to be held monthly and stated that
23 meetings can be canceled if there is no business to be conducted.
24

25 Executive Director Ralph Becker explained that the three committees will include the participation
26 of a total of nine CWC Board members. They will then invite others, including Stakeholders
27 Council members, to join the committees to work on the major topics. Chair Summerhays
28 suggested that each committee have a clearly defined purpose.
29

30 Legal Council Shane Topham reported that in order to change the structure from monthly to
31 quarterly meetings, a vote of the Council would be required with approval by the CWC Board.
32 The possibility of holding a December meeting was discussed. A poll was taken of those available
33 to meet and it was determined that a quorum of the Stakeholders Council would be available. The
34 next meeting was scheduled for December 18.
35

36 **E. UDOT EIS PURPOSE AND NEEDS/SCREENING CRITERIA STATEMENT**
37 **WORKSHOP**
38

39 **i. SHC will Break into Smaller Groups for a Facilitated Discussion to Solicit**
40 **Feedback on UDOT's EIS Purpose and Need and Screening Criteria.**
41

42 Mr. Perez provided the Council members with (1) the Project Overview and (2) the Purpose and
43 Need Screening Criteria document. The intent was for each group to provide comments, questions,
44 and concerns that will be analyzed and compiled into a formal comment document that the CWC
45 will provide to UDOT before the December 13 deadline. Each group was assigned one facilitator
46 and one scribe. The groups were asked to spend 15 to 20 minutes on the Purpose and Need
47 document and 20 minutes on the Screening criteria.

1
2 New Intern, Quinn Graves was introduced. She is a recent University of Utah graduate.

3
4 Mr. Perez reported that UDOT's EIS purpose is to substantially improve safety, reliability, and
5 mobility on State Road 210 from Fort Union Boulevard to the Town of Alta for all users. The
6 need for the project was described as:

- 7
8
- Increase mobility in the winter months during a.m. and p.m. peak travel periods relating to
9 transportation to the ski areas.
 - The greatest traffic volumes are on weekends and holidays and during and after
10 snowstorms.
 - Decreased mobility on Wasatch Boulevard resulting from weekday commuter traffic.
 - Safety concerns associated with avalanche hazard and traffic delays caused by the current
11 avalanche control program in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Periodic road closures for
12 avalanche control can cause two to four-hour traffic delays or longer that can cause traffic
13 to back up in the neighborhoods at the entrance to the canyons.
 - Roadway elements do not meet current design standards.
 - Limited parking at trailheads and ski areas lead to on-road parking that reduces mobility
14 and safety for all users.
- 15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The Stakeholders Council was divided into three small groups where there was discussion of the
22 Purpose and Needs Statement and the Project Overview.

23
24 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen summarized the comments from her group including
25 that the 50% increase listed on the first page of the document is an underestimate. There was also
26 support for adding consideration for pollution mitigation. The issues were clearly identified as
27 congestion in the canyons, avalanche issues, and environmental and water problems. Her group
28 also identified the need for a holistic transportation solution that includes consideration for parking
29 and mitigating roadside parking. There was also a proposal for an expansion of Highland Drive
30 to mitigate traffic on Wasatch Boulevard.

31
32 With regard to the screening criteria, there was a desire to provide enforcement for tire and traction
33 laws in the canyons. Potential conflicts on the road were identified such as bike and car
34 interactions. There was also discussion about addressing noise. It was suggested that parking be
35 away from the canyons and that airport rental car policies be addressed.

36
37 Mr. Perez described the discussion from his group which included air quality issues. There was
38 no mention of summer transit. There was talk of expanding the study area from rim to rim rather
39 than from the roadway, the need to ensure more automated options, and preventing unequipped
40 vehicles from traveling up the canyon. It was noted that the screening criteria does not have a
41 sense of urgency. The desire was to complete projects within the next few years rather than extend
42 them out to 2050. Short-term delivery and impacts that UDOT may be overlooking were also
43 addressed.

44
45 Chris Cawley described the discussion from the third group, which included many of the points
46 covered previously. The conversation focused on the Purpose and Needs Statement and screening
47 criteria. With regard to the Purpose and Needs Statement, there was healthy debate about the

1 prevalence of environmental concerns in the purpose statement. The group generally agreed that
2 the transportation-specific elements in the Purpose Statement were well crafted but there was
3 specific concern about the prevalence of watershed and water quality.
4

5 The group identified additional needs that were not included in the summary of the list of needs.
6 Specifically, emergency access, ingress and egress were discussed. They discussed the impact that
7 vehicles traveling up Little Cottonwood Canyon without proper snow tires have on the function of
8 the transportation system. They also addressed the need for the alternative to facilitate the
9 effectiveness of public transit and transit priority. It was noted that environmental protection and
10 environmental concerns were not strongly reflected in the needs statement. There were questions
11 about the screening criteria and 2050 serving as the forecasting horizon. They discussed the
12 relationship between the Purpose and Needs Statement and whether it could include an
13 environmental component. Environmental concerns were addressed as part of the Level 2 criteria
14 as well as the general feasibility and the timing and phasing of a project. There were also concerns
15 about operations and maintenance funding and the long-term implications of the project.
16

17 **F. CWC STAFF REPORT**

18
19 **i. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide a Brief Overview of the**
20 **Work CWC Staff Accomplished or Made Progress on During October and**
21 **November.**
22

23 Mr. Becker reported that over the last month the Board held a Retreat that was summarized earlier
24 in the meeting.
25

26 The Board revisited the federal legislation after receiving a letter just before the Retreat from the
27 four ski areas indicating their desire to withdraw land exchanges from the federal legislation. The
28 Board made a determination to readdress the legislation before moving forward.
29

30 Mr. Becker reported that a great deal has been accomplished with respect to the Environmental
31 Dashboard with the first phase expected to be completed by the end of the year. The transportation
32 component focused on the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement, which the
33 Board has been very actively engaged in.
34

35 Ski bus service was enhanced with UTA and the CWC providing the funding for this year. What
36 is planned will represent a 25 to 40 percent increase in ski bus service.
37

38 **G. OPEN DISCUSSION**

39
40 **H. ADJOURNMENT**

41
42 **MOTION:** [REDACTED] moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by [REDACTED]. The
43 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
44

45 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
46 5:00 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, November 20, 2019.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____