

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS**
2 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M.,**
3 **COMMUNITY ROOM, 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**
5

6 **Present:** Chair Greg Summerhays, Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Jan Striefel, Kirk
7 Nichols, Carl Fisher, Brian Hutchinson, Ed Marshall, Will McCarvill, Julie
8 Geisler (Rep), Annalee Munsey (Rep), Troy Morgan, Del Despain, John
9 Knobock, Matt Kirkegaard, Sarah Bennett, Greg Summerhays, Paul Diegel,
10 Tom Diegel, Barbara Cameron, Pat Shea, Mike Maughan,
11

12 **Via Telephone:** Jenna Malone, Carolyn Wawra, Michael Braun, Kurt Hegmann, Megan
13 [REDACTED]
14

15 **CWC Staff:** Legal Counsel Shane Topham, Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy
16 Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office
17 Administrator Kaye Mickelson
18

19 **A. OPENING**
20

- 21 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
22 **Council (“SHC”).**
23

24 Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays called the meeting to order at approximately
25 3:13 p.m.
26

- 27 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
28 **Wednesday, November 20, 2019.**
29

30 **MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, November 20, 2019.
31 [REDACTED] seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
32

33 **B. MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE COMMITTEE UPDATE**
34

- 35 **i. The Stakeholders Council will Consider whether to Approve a Letter of**
36 **Support from the Stakeholders Council Concerning the Salt Lake County/U.S.**
37 **Forest Service FLAP Grant.**
38

39 Brian Hutchinson reported that at the last Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Committee Meeting they
40 discussed the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. It was established to improve
41 transportation facilities that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within federal lands.
42 The funds are expected to be received in four to five years. During that time, they hope to address
43 other issues associated with the shuttle concept. Support was sought from the Stakeholders
44 Council in their pursuit of the grant. The application was expected to be submitted the second
45 week of January.
46

1 **MOTION:** Brian Hutchinson moved to support the FLAP grant application. Tom Diegel
2 seconded the motion.

3
4 Ed Marshall, a resident of Millcreek Canyon, expressed strong support for the FLAP grant as it is
5 important to improve the infrastructure in Millcreek Canyon. Two amendments were proposed to
6 the last paragraph to make their support strong and unequivocal. He did not want language in the
7 document to create doubts about their decision.

8
9 Mr. Perez agreed that perhaps some rewording was necessary to eliminate the perception that there
10 are conditions. Mr. Marshall presented the modified language to make it clear that they support
11 the application.

12
13 John Knoblock supported the proposed amendment and understood that if the application is
14 submitted with conditions, it decreases the likelihood of receiving funding.

15
16 Carl Fisher from Save Our Canyons stated that he would abstain from the vote as his board had
17 not given clear direction and will be submitting their own letter. He did not want it to conflict with
18 the letter the Council is supporting. The concern of Save Our Canyons was that they continue to
19 accommodate vehicular traffic by providing more parking.

20
21 Tom Diegel from Wasatch Back Country Alliance hoped there would be an effort to improve
22 Millcreek Canyon on a broader basis rather than simply pursue a handful of road improvements.
23 He reported that this is a federal grant that will be reviewed and approved by federal
24 representatives. He pointed out that the last paragraph only refers to the County. He suggested
25 the language be modified to include the U.S. Forest Service.

26
27 Brian Hutchinson wondered if they are concerned about bringing attention to the issues that Carl
28 Fisher alluded to. He doubted that anyone present wants to widen the roads and add concrete for
29 a parking lot.

30
31 Dr. Bricker questioned whether there was a way to expand so that anyone reading the grant
32 understands the principles of the Mountain Accord. Possible options were discussed. It was noted
33 that the projects listed by the Forest Service do not include increasing the amount of parking. They
34 have been opposed to that all along and it is seen as a short-term fix. There was some question as
35 to whether anyone is in favor of increasing the parking as any part of a long-term solution. It was
36 suggested that the 30 projects be presented and narrowed down.

37
38 John Knoblock from the Mount Olympus Community Council stated that the first step is to be
39 awarded the money. The more conditions that are imposed, the less likely they are to get the
40 money. There will then be a process for determining what projects will get done. A NEPA process
41 will be required for much of that. As a result, there will be plenty of time to give input and steer
42 the projects in the proper direction. Mr. Diegel's recollection from the previous meeting was that
43 the Forest Service will take the list and put a price tag on each of the projects. It was suggested
44 that more discussion was needed with regard to the verbiage in the letter. It was thought that there
45 would be more time to readdress it prior to the next meeting.

1 Mr. Hutchinson withdrew his motion and encouraged his fellow Council Members to add further
2 refinements via email.

3
4 Stakeholders Council Legal Counsel Shane Topham reported that all can give their input but
5 cannot be online at the same time, which is considered a public meeting. The matter would be
6 addressed at the next meeting scheduled for January 15, which is the day after the application is
7 due. Dr. Bricker explained that moving forward does not open the door to any expansions and
8 there is a very significant process in place to guide the intent of the spending in the future.

9
10 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to put forward the letter of support with the additions proposed
11 by Ed Marshall. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with
12 four abstentions by Carl Fisher, Jenna Malone, Megan [REDACTED], and Carolyn Wawra.

13
14 The next step was for the edits to be made after which it will be sent off. Chair Summerhays would
15 share the letter with the CWC Board at its January meeting. Helen Peters from Salt Lake County
16 would be presenting to the CWC Board with potentially two letters of support.

17
18 **C. CAPACITY COMMITTEE UPDATE**

19
20 **i. Dr. Kelly Bricker will Provide an Update on the Work of the Stakeholders
21 Council's Capacity Committee.**

22
23 Dr. Bricker reported that the last meeting was held on September 25. At the previous meeting,
24 they were asked to prepare a prospectus on what a capacity study might involve. At a subsequent
25 Stakeholders Council meeting, they were asked to provide case study examples, which were
26 provided. The committee voted on moving forward with the idea of the Capacity Study to the
27 CWC Stakeholders Council who would vote on whether to move it onto the CWC Board. The
28 group felt they were at the point of taking a vote.

29
30 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Capacity Committee's
31 Visitor Capacity Proposal and Recommending the Proposal to the Board of
32 the Central Wasatch Commission for its Consideration.**

33
34 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to forward the prospectus onto the CWC. Kirk Nichols
35 seconded the motion.

36
37 In response to a question raised, Dr. Bricker explained that the intent was to move the idea forward
38 and wait for the CWC to identify next steps on how to proceed.

39
40 Mike Maughan had concerns about moving forward with a study given that this body does not
41 have jurisdiction to do anything with it. He saw no point in spending money on something that
42 makes no sense to do.

43
44 Sarah Bennett questioned whether a Capacity Study should follow the results of transportation. In
45 speaking with Forest Service representatives, if there is a recommendation for some type of
46 transportation system that drops hikers and trail users at trailheads, that would trigger an EIS from

1 the Forest Service perspective. They would then have to look at how many people can be dropped
2 off at trailheads, which speaks to capacity.

3
4 Carl Fisher saw it differently and stated that their transportation choices should be informed by
5 capacity. They seemed to be building transportation without knowledge of what they trying to
6 create.

7
8 Mr. Maughan commented that currently, the ski areas work very closely with the Forest Service.
9 Their lift capacity is 60,000 people per day. They have concerns about backcountry use and
10 capacity there. He pointed out that use is increasing every year in the backcountry. There are
11 currently no toilets there so they are working with the Forest Service to address those issues.

12
13 Sarah Bennett stated that they need something with good data that they are confident that the Forest
14 Service, ski resorts, and others will use. With regard to data, Dr. Bricker stated that the prospectus
15 is a phased approach. The data collection will be targeted at the data gaps. Any decision will fall
16 on the Public Land Manager. The ski areas would not be part of the Capacity Study because they
17 set their capacity.

18
19 Barbara Cameron commented that the data collection aspect is probably the most important piece.

20
21 Brian Hutchinson asked about the boundaries of the proposed Capacity Study. Dr. Bricker stated
22 that the scope needs additional work to understand what they want to do. She expected the scope
23 to come into play after the desktop review.

24
25 Barbara Cameron identified air quality as one of the gaps in the environmental dashboard and
26 commented that currently, it is very bad. Dr. Bricker confirmed that air quality will be included
27 in the dashboard.

28
29 Kirk Nichols thought that UDOT should be funding this to avoid getting to the end and having
30 problems. He commented that eventually, it can look like a dashboard with information that is
31 available to decision-makers. Dr. Bricker stated that Zion National Park is planning to implement
32 something similar to a dashboard for visitors to be more informed about where the crowds are and
33 which trails might be more open than others.

34
35 The motion was amended to reference a Visitor Use Management Study. All voted in favor of the
36 motion with the exception of Mike Maughan who was opposed.

37
38 **D. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL STRUCTURE AND MEETING SCHEDULE**

39
40 **i. Greg Summerhays and Blake Perez will Lead Discussion on how the**
41 **Stakeholders Council will Function over the Next Year.**

42
43 Chair Summerhays reported that there had been discussion of holding meetings quarterly rather
44 than monthly in an effort to get more work done. There had been discussion with the CWC about
45 how that might work.

1 Executive Director, Ralph Becker reported that during the retreat there was discussion about the
2 Stakeholders Council relationship with the CWC Board and how to be more productive. The
3 Commission set up three committees to focus on various areas including the congressional
4 legislation, short-term projects, and transportation. Participation was desired from Stakeholders
5 Council members on the committees.

6
7 Mr. Becker explained that some in the decision-making realm at the state and congressional level
8 do not feel that adequate progress is being made on transportation. One of the issues being
9 discussed is the need for more focus on transportation issues and what a mountain transportation
10 system should be. The intent was take 9 to 12 months to get the engagement and expertise needed
11 to move forward.

12
13 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen reported that the committees that have been formed
14 are being treated as if they are also public bodies. They will be noticed on the CWC website in
15 addition to the public notice website.

16
17 John Knoblock asked that notification be provided of upcoming meetings.

18
19 Chair Summerhays explained that the intent was to take the January meeting and determine what
20 committees to form at the stakeholder level and take time to debate and determine the purpose of
21 each committee. Dr. Bricker indicated that a meeting was held early on in the formation of the
22 Stakeholders Council about various committee ideas. That would be reinvigorated and resent out
23 at some point.

24
25 Mr. Perez stated that the Board wanted to avoid any potential overlap. Because the committees
26 are open and stakeholders are encouraged to attend, participate, and engage, there was a
27 recommendation to avoid any overlap in terms of what the committees are doing. He encouraged
28 the Council to think about potential committees that may be relevant and serve a need and purpose.

29
30 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Recommending any Appropriate**
31 **Amendments to the Stakeholders Council’s ‘Rules and Procedures’ Pursuant**
32 **to Such Discussion (including Section VI, Meetings, concerning Regular**
33 **Meetings) to the Central Wasatch Commission Board as Provided in Section**
34 **XI, Amendment, of those Rules.**
35

36 Mr. Becker indicated that the bylaws indicate that the Stakeholders Council meets monthly. A
37 change could be made today to hold meetings quarterly.

38
39 **MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved that commencing in January 2020, Stakeholders Council meetings
40 be held quarterly. Sarah Bennett seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
41 consent of the Council.

42
43 Meetings would be held quarterly or as necessary going forward.
44

1 **E. CWC STAFF REPORT**

2
3 **i. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide a Brief Overview of the**
4 **Work CWC Staff Accomplished or Made Progress on During September and**
5 **October.**
6

7 Mr. Perez reported that over the past few weeks staff has worked on the response for UDOT for
8 the EIS, which was a very robust process. At the last meeting, they spent about one hour discussing
9 the Purpose and Need and screening criteria. Most of the comments were included in the document
10 from Stakeholders Council Members, CWC Board Members, jurisdiction members, and staff. The
11 document outlined what CWC is, the Mountain Accord, and comments on the purpose and need
12 screening criteria as well as alternatives mentioned throughout the process. It was submitted on
13 December 13 and confirmation was received from John Thomas at UDOT that it was received in
14 a timely manner.
15

16 A successful press event was held on buses on a busy day and good feedback had been received.
17 Mr. Perez would be speaking with UDOT in the next few weeks about data and ridership. Staff
18 had received very positive feedback thus far about the service. Even the elimination of the Park
19 and Ride at Little Cottonwood Canyon seemed to have been of benefit to riders and drivers alike.
20

21 Ms. Nielsen stated that the press event for the ski bus was held on November 25 with the service
22 kicking off fully on November 31. At last month's meeting, Intern Quinn Graves was present and
23 continues to work on outreach activities. Council members who are aware of community events
24 they feel would be appropriate for the CWC to have a presence at were encouraged to contact staff.
25

26 Phase 1 of the Environmental Dashboard work was wrapping up. Dr. Jim Ehrlinger was present
27 at the December 2 CWC meeting and presented the culmination of the work included in Phase 1,
28 which featured substantial recommendations for changes for the originally scoped framework.
29 Another presentation was to be made at the January 6 meeting.
30

31 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Short-Term Projects Committee of the CWC met for its first meeting
32 the previous Monday. The next meeting was scheduled for January 27.
33

34 It was reported that the CWC website has gone through substantial updates.
35

36 CWC Chair Chris McCandless was leaving office with New Chair Chris Robinson from Summit
37 County lead the next meeting scheduled for January 6. Mayor Jenny Wilson will serve as New
38 Co-Chair.
39

40 Mr. Perez reported that they are looking at including the Town of Brighton as a new CWC member.
41 The process was not expected to begin until February or March when they have fully taken their
42 roles and formally applied for membership with approval from the CWC Board and member
43 entities. They were also exploring ways to have ex officio members serve on the Board who may
44 be non-voting. These potential entities include Metropolitan Water District, UTA, and hopefully
45 UDOT. Kirk Nichols generously offered to conduct an education session on the EIS process.
46 Those interested were invited to notify staff.
47

1 Mr. Perez updated the Council on the federal legislation and explained that the Federal Legislation
2 Committee has been working with stakeholders on how to get back to a consensus. What they
3 have heard is that there needs to be more involving transportation.
4

5 Brian Hutchinson observed that the CWC made a \$60,000 investment in the boost in bus service.
6 He stated that many have shifted to the bus and he has noticed that there is a lot of capacity on
7 buses during various times of the day but suggested they increase marketing. Of greatest concern
8 to him was a delayed opening day due to control work and whether they will have an escort to the
9 front of the line. Mr. Perez stated that there have been ordinance challenges although there is still
10 interest in pursuing an escort. They may work with the Sandy Police Department on one particular
11 route to obtain the escort service. He acknowledged that there have been some challenges
12 associated with it. The first hurdle was understanding the policies and ordinances pertaining to
13 safety. Mr. Perez stated that UTA has a great dashboard showing their ridership on all routes.
14

15 In terms of marketing for the ski bus, posts were continually being added to social media as well
16 as the CWC website. Ideas were also being discussed to potentially highlight the ski bus.
17

18 **F. OPEN DISCUSSION**
19

20 Pat Shea reported that he will be teaching in California through April and asked about the
21 possibility of having Kyle Maynard replace him on the Stakeholders Council to represent Friends
22 of Alta on a permanent basis. Mr. Perez stated that they were in the process of addressing how to
23 replace members and formalizing the process.
24

25 **G. ADJOURNMENT**
26

27 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Carl Fisher. The
28 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
29

30 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
31 4:37 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, December 18, 2019.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____