

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION ANNUAL RETREAT HELD**
2 **THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2019 AT 1:00 P.M. AT THE HOMESTEAD RESORT, 700**
3 **NORTH HOMESTEAD DRIVE, MIDWAY, UTAH**
4

5 **Present:** Commissioner Chris McCandless, Mayor Mike Peterson, Commissioner Jim
6 Bradley, Commissioner Chris Robinson, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Jeff
7 Silvestrini, Mayor Jackie Biskupski, Mayor Jenny Wilson, Laura Hansen-
8 UTA, Chris Cawley, Doug Decker, Steve VanMaren, Abi Holt, Barbara
9 Cameron, Greg Summerhays, Bill Simmons, Barbara Cameron, Carl Fisher,
10 Mayor Elect-Danial Knopp
11

12 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Legal Counsel Shane Topham,
13 Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen,
14 Office Manager, Kaye Mickelson
15

16 **Absent:** Mayor Andy Beerman
17

18 **THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2019:**
19

20 **1. Welcome and Objectives.**
21

22 Chair McCandless called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m.
23

24 Those present introduced themselves. Chair McCandless introduced the CWC mascot, a Moose, an
25 annual award to be given out at retreats. Because of the tight timeframe, if someone gets off track a
26 member will say “Moose”. The person that gets off track the most will receive the award at the end
27 of the retreat.
28

29 The objectives were identified as:
30

- 31 • Finalize transportation strategy and work plan;
- 32 • Develop an action plan with the Stakeholders Council;
- 33 • Review and refine the current CWC mission;
- 34 • Revisit Mountain Accord;
- 35 • Create a 2020 CWC Strategic Plan;
- 36 • Budget policy;
- 37 • Discuss and decide on CWC leadership and membership;
- 38 • Identify the direction of the Federal Legislation;
- 39 • Discuss transportation objectives and goals; and
- 40 • Short-term goals.
41

42 Commissioner Bradley asked that as the federal legislation is addressed that there be a brief discussion
43 on the substantive land exchanges.
44

45 Mayor Silvestrini asked that they reaffirm their consensus toward the recommendation and the goals
46 and objectives in moving the legislation forward.
47

1 Mayor Biskupski thought it would be helpful for new members to know whether they are pursuing
2 the legislation. She suggested they have that discussion.

3
4 Commissioner Robinson suggested that they determine how to proceed with the legislation,
5 transportation, and how to pay for it. If the legislation isn't right, a decision should be made as to
6 whether to redirect resources elsewhere.

7
8 Mayor Peterson agreed that it is all-encompassing and appreciated both the short and long-term goals.
9 He felt that interim action could be taken to impact the canyons and the foothills. Because
10 Cottonwood Heights is situated between both canyons, transportation is critical to them as is Wasatch
11 Boulevard.

12
13 CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker reported that Mayor Beerman could not attend today's
14 session but would be present for the following day's discussion. He asked that they postpone the
15 major discussion about the legislation until the following day.

16
17 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen hoped to have time the following day to address
18 the mission statement, which she felt would be helpful for the Commission.

19
20 Office Manager, Kaye Mickelson hoped all could gain an understanding of carrying forward the
21 mission and goals of Mountain Accord.

22
23 Deputy Director, Blake Perez suggested they address the prioritization of projects in order to
24 collectively move forward. He pointed out that the agency is pivoting and is significantly different
25 than it was two years ago.

26 27 **2. Transportation Discussion and Initiatives.**

28
29 Mr. Perez reported that over the past few months, staff has been working on short-term transportation
30 goals and objectives. He presented a comprehensive list that was divided into sections such as policy,
31 roads, transit, etc. Staff would also address what they have accomplished, what they are currently
32 working on, and potential projects moving forward. The goal at the end of the discussion was to
33 define the direction they are going and establish a prioritization list of five to 10 projects. He also
34 wanted to address how to move forward with UDOT and the EIS.

35
36 Mayor Sondak addressed the issue of parking.

37
38 Mayor Peterson asked that transportation also be addressed. Mr. Perez explained that various projects
39 were based on the theme with active transportation being one of them. He also stated that trails are
40 included in the plan.

41
42 Mr. Becker commented on the principles of the Mountain Accord, how they are being pursued, and
43 how the work they are doing ties to the Mountain Accord. Four main objectives came out of Mountain
44 Accord, one of which was transportation. Over the course of Mountain Accord, there were a few
45 items that were agreed upon and that there was consensus on. One was that transportation problems
46 will not be solved with more vehicles. The combination of lack of parking, congestion on roads, and
47 limitations on expanding roads was an issue. They will not look at roads and vehicles as the primary
48 solutions. There was also extensive discussion about Guardsman Pass, which goes through the

1 mountains from front to back. There was discussion about the potential for it to become a year-round
2 road. The conclusion was that Guardsman Pass will never work as a year-round road. Much of the
3 issue was that there was no way to address the volume of traffic, which would require road widening.
4

5 There was a great deal of discussion about roads and it was ultimately determined that what is needed
6 is a public transit system. Under some circumstances it could be rail or buses, however, there was
7 not enough analysis and public engagement done to arrive at decisions. There was a consensus that
8 more land could be dedicated to parking in the canyons, which will have to be addressed at the mouths
9 of the canyons or in the valley through connections to a transit system. The issue was addressed
10 narrowly in terms of each canyon. Commissioner Robinson commented on the Guardsman Pass issue
11 and stated that there is no place on the Park City side to handle the volume.
12

13 Chair McCandless asked for an update on the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact
14 Statement (“LLC EIS”) and stated that they were included in the Transportation Action Plan (“TAP”)
15 that has gone back to the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). He asked what the role of
16 the CWC is as it relates to the EIS. His personal perspective was that as a cohesive group that sends
17 a message to UDOT through various elements of the process so unanimity will have a great impact.
18 If they are not cohesive it will be easy to minimize what they say they want.
19

20 Mayor Sondak commented that in conversations with the U.S. Forest Service and UDOT, there has
21 been a representation that there will not be more traffic but better traffic in Little Cottonwood Canyon.
22 The U.S. Forest Service will engage in a comprehensive understanding of what easier entry will
23 accomplish. He explained that the CWC will likely be the body that addresses the question of what
24 the result will be of better access.
25

26 Mayor Wilson hoped to have a better understanding of the transportation issues as a result of the
27 Retreat. She reported that when the CWC concept was presented, the understanding was that the
28 CWC would serve as a vehicle for leveraging large amounts of money toward major transportation
29 solutions. When amendments were accepted, they ultimately created more of a protection for Salt
30 Lake County. She understood that the Olympic games could drive a new transportation solution.
31 When discussing transportation it is important to address funding. She wondered if, as a group, they
32 could allow the UDOT process to play out and then reconvene.
33

34 Mayor Peterson reported that a presentation was made by UDOT some time ago on the current status
35 of the canyons and parking issues. On a snow day, there could be 7,000 cars traveling up the canyon
36 with only 5,000 available parking spaces. Something must be done to limit the number of cars
37 traveling up the canyons. Cottonwood Heights City has been actively seeking solutions. Over the
38 past two months, there were three public meetings where citizen comment was given. He reported
39 that the Legislature has allocated \$13 million, which is separate from the \$100 million and the \$65
40 million, to purchase land at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon for a major transportation hub.
41 The CWC needs to understand how that will be applied and impact the canyons.
42

43 Chair McCandless hoped to be able to offer solutions on how to move it forward and perhaps have
44 an action item as part of the December meeting. The problems exists and he expected it to be resolved
45 immediately. What happens in the future involves medium and long-range planning items that the
46 EIS will address. He suggested that the elements be segmented. For example, he explained that the
47 Forest Service has a number of projects that will help alleviate some of the transportation issues that

1 relate to parking. They can resolve some of the transportation problems by working together. He
2 considered the most important issue to be the ability to have input on the EIS as a group.

3
4 Mayor Silvestrini commented that rockslides over the summer gave him a lot of pause. In the event
5 of a nightmare scenario with thousands of people trapped in the canyons, there would be no way to
6 get them out and there is not enough lodging or food. He considered that to be a transportation and
7 emergency planning issue. He was concerned about having only one way out on Highway 210 and
8 would not want to move in a direction that precludes future solutions.

9
10 Mayor Biskupski considered it difficult to have a conversation about transportation when UTA and
11 UDOT are not present at the table. Chair McCandless suggested the group continue to submit
12 information and opinions on what they would like UTA and UDOT to do. Mayor Biskupski
13 considered UDOT pulling out of the CWC to be extremely concerning as well as the direction they
14 are heading with the EIS.

15
16 Mayor Wilson stressed the importance of each entity being appropriately tasked.

17
18 Mayor Silvestrini agreed with Mayor Biskupski and stated that there are structural problems with the
19 participation of the Forest Service UDOT, UTA, and the Forest Service are federal partners and it is
20 not acceptable that they are not part of the discussion. His view of the EIS was that it is a short-term
21 answer. He suggested that the CWC launch initiatives and then address funding. Commissioner
22 Robinson commented on the relationship of the Forest Service, UTA, and UDOT.

23
24 Chair McCandless' opinion was that Carlos Braceras from UDOT was always uncomfortable not
25 being an elected official and voting with nine other elected officials. UDOT was tasked with
26 transportation while the CWC's tasks include various elements, including capacity. His
27 understanding was that the Capacity Study cost is \$1.5 to \$2 million with a five to 10-year lead time
28 to facilitate. There is, however, a problem today with transportation that they cannot wait five to 10
29 years to address.

30
31 Mr. Becker remarked that he and Chair McCandless met on several occasions with Mr. Braceras and
32 he was very uncomfortable serving with elected officials. Because there have been no specific
33 comments from UDOT about the legislation, he sent communication on behalf of the CWC to
34 Mr. Braceras requesting that they meet. Mr. Becker, Chair McCandless, and Mr. Perez ultimately
35 met with UDOT's Deputy Director of Planning, Teri Newell earlier in the week and had an open and
36 frank discussion about the fact that the way UDOT was responding to the CWC gave the impression
37 that they were either opposed the work of the CWC or that they plan to undermine what their efforts.
38 Ms. Newell was surprised by that and claimed that their intent was to remain neutral. Mr. Braceras
39 wished to remain neutral and not weigh in on the legislation.

40
41 Chair McCandless stated that the CWC can have an impact over the next several months by coming
42 together and prioritizing what they want and communicate that to UDOT. Mayor Wilson commented
43 that it is tricky without UDOT resources and public comment. She suggested there be a mechanism
44 in place to bring UDOT back to the table and involve UTA and the Forest Service. It is such a
45 complex project that in order to have a tangible impact, their participation should be a priority for
46 2020. Chair McCandless suggested that a larger portion of the CWC's full-time employees' time be
47 spent engaging and working directly with UDOT and UTA. He suggested asking the State of Utah
48 to allow UDOT to be an ex officio non-voting member in order to get their input.

1
2 Mr. Perez explained that staff has addressed ways to engage with UDOT in the EIS process over the
3 next few months. On November 18, a meeting is scheduled with their project team to discuss the
4 Purpose and Needs Statement and Screening Criteria. Staff will solicit feedback from the Board over
5 the next several days. One of the priorities for the CWC may be to come to a consensus on a
6 transportation system that is the CWC's preferred alternative that could be used in the coming months
7 with UDOT. When they release their next steps in the EIS process, they will be prepared to engage
8 in their preferred method to move forward.

9
10 Commissioner Bradley stressed the importance of the CWC's relationship with UDOT, UTA, the
11 Legislature, and the Governor's Office. He wanted to send the message to UDOT that the CWC is
12 worthy of participating in the process. He commented on how their short-term investments sync with
13 long-term investments and did not want to see a situation where they spend money on things
14 that are not necessary five to 10 years in the future. He saw them focusing on short-term issues such
15 as congestion on Wasatch Boulevard, capacity in the mountains, etc. There needs to be a broader
16 vision. He suggested there be a coordinated front with acceptance of the Legislation at the Governor's
17 Office and unanimity among the CWC and Stakeholders Council. Commissioner Bradley
18 commented that he did not completely understand the scope of the EIS.

19
20 Mayor Peterson explained that the EIS is critical to the City of Cottonwood Heights. UDOT has been
21 open with the City and they funded an independent study to develop a Wasatch Boulevard Master
22 Plan. He had no major concerns because UDOT has been open and changed their attitude with respect
23 to Wasatch Boulevard. They took into account the fact that it is a boulevard with medians,
24 landscaping, and an adjacent active transportation trail. He commented that much of what they are
25 doing is on target but there is some disconnect with the change in membership.

26
27 Mr. Becker reported that the Scoping Report identified issues with a draft Purpose and Need and
28 Alternative Screening Criteria. He explained that UDOT has narrowed its scope and determined the
29 need to spend money to fix Little Cottonwood Canyon traffic congestion as best they can. The
30 CCTAP portions that relate to parking and modes will require studies that feed into the LLC EIS.
31 Those issues are consistent with where CCTAP was. They are not abandoning the work of CCTAP
32 but folding it into the LLC EIS. The differences Mr. Becker saw in terms of Mountain Accord and
33 the mission of the CWC pertained to geography. He believed it will be difficult to make narrow
34 decisions if they do not look at the connection to Big Cottonwood Canyon. They are not looking at
35 the connections in either valley to whatever transportation decisions they make for Little Cottonwood
36 Canyon. Mr. Becker commented that between now and when UDOT comes up with their alternatives,
37 there will be a window of time when the CWC as a group can begin to be as well informed as possible
38 about the issues that may not be addressed fully by UDOT.

39
40 Mr. Becker acknowledged that he reviewed the Mountain Transportation Study that took place before
41 Mountain Accord. Mayor Biskupski commented that decisions came out about the transportation
42 piece and she was under the impression that Mountain Accord evolved because transportation was
43 not taking into account all of the other impacts in the Canyon. Mr. Becker explained that the catalyst
44 for Mountain Accord was the ski link.

45
46 Mr. Perez presented the portfolio they have been developing over the past few months, actions taken,
47 and what they are working on.

1. Policy initiatives. There had been discussion of establishing four-wheel-drive vehicles. They have a list of partner agencies and a project description. A pre-season approval process was in place for drivers with approved snow tires. A sticker would be given to drivers meeting the requirements to make it easier for UPD to see the sticker rather than look for the sign on the tire.
2. Vehicle chain option. Near Lake Tahoe near Donner's Pass, there is an opportunity to rent chains before entering. Something similar was envisioned here.
3. Parking policy and ordinances along roads and related fines and enforcement. The County may look at ordinances and enforcement in Little Cottonwood Canyon regarding on-road parking and potential fines.
4. An aerial policy was discussed. A conversation may be needed with the FAA.
5. Work with car rental companies and address their requirements. Those discussions were ongoing. This coming year will involve additional education for their clients as well as opposed to a willingness to provide snow tires. There had been talk of providing information on traction laws and possible alternative transit options. Mayor Wilson commented on the car rental component and reported that she toured the new airport and recognized there was a deep operational change due to the opening of the new airport in less than one year. She thought that maybe the training window to engage with car rental companies.
6. Develop transit and determine how bus stops are functioning and if they are at capacity.
7. Provide additional buses, frequency, and increase ski bus service, which was completed this year.
8. Provide parking areas for UTA bus service to the Canyons and ensure that the parking demand is met. A determination was being made of which Park and Ride lots can meet new demand with the shift in the service delivery.
9. Shuttle systems and incentives to get people out of their cars and onto transit. The year-round transit service to Big Cottonwood Canyon was highlighted in Mountain Accord. A determination was made of opportunities to prioritize transit working with UTA, UDOT, and UPD.

Chair McCandless considered parking and mass transit to be a short-term solution. Mayor Sondak recognized the need for a non-ski season transit service in Little Cottonwood Canyon as well. It was noted that the record number of people at Snowbird for a two-day period was 17,000. Chair McCandless considered the long-term solution to be identification and funding for parking nodes. Mayor Peterson stated that there must also be a policy to incentivize people to get out of their cars.

Chair McCandless liked the UTA shuttle system option, which could be accomplished with a police escort. Mayor Wilson had been working on that and acknowledged that it needs to be addressed. Mayor Peterson commented that the Legislature will be involved because of the regional impact.

1 Population increases could result in growth of 10% per year. He stressed the importance of taking
2 action. To him, parking was one of the mitigating steps they can take.

3
4 Laura Hansen from UTA could not speak on behalf of their Board of Trustees on whether they would
5 like to participate in a formal capacity on the CWC Board. UTA would like to be a collaborative
6 partner and work with the CWC, UDOT, and other entities. They also recognize that there is a
7 demand to increase mobility up and down the canyon. Currently, what is printed on the schedules
8 does not match the service they are able to provide because they are stuck in traffic with everyone
9 else. She expected there to be improvements in that this year. They will get behind whatever solution
10 or preferred alternative emerges. She pointed out that they not only need the capital infrastructure
11 but ongoing operational funding. As they go through the planning processes, they have a large area
12 they are responsible for. They also have neighborhoods that are very transit dependent. There was a
13 perception that if they put a lot of resources toward the Canyons while there are neighborhoods that
14 are in desperate need of better transit service, it puts them in a tricky position. She stated that with
15 Salt Lake City they have a model for sponsoring additional transit service.

16
17 Mayor Sondak thanked Ms. Hansen for her efforts in collaborating with staff to provide enhanced bus
18 service.

19
20 Chair McCandless asked about police authority and if there is a funding mechanism allowing them
21 to augment the escort service for UTA buses inside the canyons. Ms. Hansen responded that their
22 police force has already offered assistance.

23
24 Mr. Becker commended UTA for their collaboration and stated that the expertise they brought was
25 remarkable. He thought it would be ideal for the CWC to tap into that as they consider the options
26 going forward. Ms. Hansen stated that they would be happy to offer their assistance.

27
28 Chair McCandless suggested the group identify five to 10 priorities for next year to focus on from a
29 transportation perspective.

- 30
- 31 1. Roads. Provides an opportunity to engage in the EIS process including additional
32 snow removal and traffic control vehicles, traffic flow improvements, bike lane
33 improvements, reducing locations of peak congestion, tolling decision making,
34 alleviate or remove on-road parking in the winter months, address on-road parking as
35 part of the EIS, and install a messaging system in various locations in the canyons and
36 parking lots.
 - 37
38 2. Communication. The ski resorts were commended for their advertising campaign
39 encouraging ridesharing and transit. Canyon communication and tool apps were also
40 helpful.
 - 41
42 3. One of the planning processes highlighted as part of Mountain Accord was the Big
43 Cottonwood Canyon to Park City connection. The scope of the project was to study
44 the economic transportation community and environmental determinants as well as
45 positive and negative impacts.
- 46

- 1 4. Transit, site, and master planning was spelled out in Mountain Accord. There had
2 been enthusiasm among the Stakeholders Council about the Trails initiative as well as
3 the Visitor Capacity Study.
4
- 5 5. The Millcreek Shuttle Sub-Committee was believed to be overly narrow and
6 determined not to be an option presently. There had, however, been discussions with
7 their partners at Salt Lake County and the Forest Service about pursuing a Federal
8 Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant, which would provide funding to improve
9 access to federal lands.
10
- 11 6. Millcreek Canyon Tollbooth. There was discussion about potentially increasing the
12 toll to help support the Forest Service. One of the recommendations of Mountain
13 Accord was to provide a shuttle along Millcreek.
14

15 Mayor Silvestrini stated that the FLAP grant application process is ongoing. The grant process was
16 described. If the up to \$10 million grant is awarded, a 6.75% match will be required. The grant
17 application due date is January 14, 2020.
18

19 Chair McCandless hoped to see electronic tolling put in place before being incorporated in Big and
20 Little Cottonwood Canyons. Outstanding issues to be addressed were identified.
21

22 Prioritization issues were discussed. In the short-term, the following were suggested:
23

- 24 • Determine UDOT’s next steps over the next several months.
- 25 • Bring UDOT back to the table.
- 26 • Parking.
27

28 Mayor Peterson commented that there was interest in continuing the conversation with UTA
29 regarding the possibility of providing funding for UTA police. Mr. Perez stated that the prioritization
30 was for heavy snow days, however, UTA clearly communicated that they have challenges from
31 Santaquin to Ogden on snow days as well.
32

33 Chair McCandless asked if there are short-term opportunities and whether they can prepare a funding
34 plan associated with those objectives.
35

36 Mayor Wilson suggested that the CWC have a more direct connection with UDOT, the Forest Service,
37 and UTA. She also recommended there be more clarity with respect to what authority and focus they
38 should have compared to their partners and stakeholders. Chair McCandless suggested that the
39 priority goals be refined and brought back on December 3 and adopt a resolution on transportation
40 priorities. Staff was asked to provide the information to the Board two weeks in advance of the
41 meeting in order for it to be circulated and discussed.
42

43 **MOTION:** Chair McCandless moved to adjourn until 3:30 p.m. The motion passed with the
44 unanimous consent of the Board.
45

46 The meeting was adjourned from approximately 3:00 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.
47

1 **3. Stakeholders Council.**
2

3 Mr. Perez previously provided the Board Members with a packet containing survey results on the
4 SWOT analysis. He reported on the current status of the Stakeholders Council, which includes 34
5 members. The Cottonwood Canyons Foundation recently resigned with its members representing
6 environmental, recreation, economic community groups, ski resorts, and the community at large.
7 There have been 10 meetings to date and they meet monthly. From the Stakeholders Council, two
8 committees were formed. One was the Visitor Capacity Committee and the other was the Millcreek
9 Shuttle Committee. Both were floundering and lacked clear direction on how to move forward. There
10 was interest from the majority of the Stakeholders Council in pursuing a Capacity Committee. That
11 group met a few times with Dr. Kelly Bricker who served as Chair of the committee. She provided a
12 Visitor Capacity Proposal that was reviewed by the Capacity Committee who unanimously approved
13 a recommendation to the Stakeholders Council to send on to the Commission.
14

15 Mr. Perez reported that the Millcreek Shuttle Committee began a few months earlier with the intent
16 being to pilot a shuttle program in Millcreek as early as January 1. There was discussion with the
17 Forest Service and Salt Lake County. The Forest Service did not feel it was feasible to have a pilot
18 shuttle program in the canyons and approved it as Step 8 in terms of approving mobility.
19

20 Stakeholders Council Chair, Greg Summerhays commented that they have a great group of passionate
21 people who want to see things happen in the canyons. Their greatest strength is the fact that they
22 have been able to convene a group with great ideas and insight into how the canyons should be used
23 from a recreational standpoint. Their weakness is that they have a group of people who are very
24 passionate. The current structure, however, makes it very difficult to reach a consensus.
25

26 Chair Summerhays reported that now is the time to create a different structure and perhaps narrow
27 their focus. He commented that without a change to how they are operating, members will lose
28 interest. The past 10 months had been very beneficial as he came to the group without much of a
29 background in Mountain Accord. Many, however, commented that the group rehashed what was
30 discussed previously. He suggested they look at how to use the time most effectively.
31

32 Mr. Perez acknowledged the presence of Stakeholders Council Members Barbara Cameron and Carl
33 Fisher. He read a letter from Vice-Chair Bricker that was submitted and made part of the record. She
34 described her vision of the work of the Stakeholders Council and requested direction from the Board.
35

36 Carl Fisher agreed with Greg Summerhay's SWOT analysis and echoed the sentiments expressed in
37 Dr. Bricker's letter. He agreed that the Stakeholders Council has a lot of potential but it is not being
38 harnessed. He recommended they break into smaller groups and dive into the issues.
39

40 Barbara Cameron agreed that there are very talented people serving on the Stakeholders Council. She
41 thought it would helpful for them to make a presentation to the Board. She also hoped to see the
42 group perhaps get some funding ideas. She recently returned from the wildfires in California, which
43 was very scary. She stated that they may need a committee on wildfire because there are many issues
44 she did not realize need to be addressed.
45

46 Mayor Knopp was of the opinion that UDOT left the CWC because of how John Thomas was treated
47 at meetings.
48

1 Mr. Perez shared the survey results and stated that those who commented indicated that facilitating
2 discussion in smaller groups was the most productive. The first question involved whether the
3 Stakeholders Council can improve. The two main points involved the relationship between the CWC
4 Board and the Stakeholders Council and the direction they want them to move forward. Many thought
5 the group seemed to wander and more direction and engagement were desired between the
6 Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. Others felt that monthly meetings were not the best venue
7 for debating issues and that meetings seem like a sideshow with very little work being done.

8
9 The possibility of holding Stakeholders Council Meetings on a quarterly basis was discussed. Nearly
10 50% of those surveyed were in favor of that type of structure. Many were in favor of fewer meetings
11 and convening when there are specific issues to be addressed.

12
13 Another question involved whether there was interest in forming a new committee of the Stakeholders
14 Council. The answers were split. Some of the responses involved a desire to form a committee but
15 only with a clear purpose and vision. Many also did not feel they had the space to share or work with
16 such a large group. The idea of working in smaller groups allowed them to participate more.
17 Mr. Perez commented on the Wasatch Back and reported that CWC staff recently had a productive
18 meeting with several stakeholders, commissioners, and jurisdictional staff about the Wasatch Back
19 and how the CWC can strengthen that partnership. He felt they were heard and overwhelmingly the
20 concerns raised pertained to transportation both locally and regionally. Action plans would be
21 developed going forward. Next steps involved an open discussion between the CWC and the
22 Stakeholders Council, how to address themes that arose, and the structure of the Stakeholders Council
23 moving forward.

24
25 Mayor Wilson was pleased to see so many people engaged and coming together. It seemed universal
26 that more direction was needed in addition to helping prioritize. She hoped to see the group set an
27 agenda of priorities that could be taken on. Greg Summerhays referenced the Accord, which
28 addresses key actions and breaks them into four groups; environment, transportation, recreation, and
29 economy. Another question was who should draft the proposals. He recommended that the Board
30 provide the Stakeholders Council with specific priorities. They can then break into smaller groups
31 and debate the issues and ask staff to make adjustments and changes.

32
33 Commissioner Robinson commented that they can be a catalyst for change. He also considered
34 transportation and transit to be the cure-all because much of the opposition is that they are focused on
35 the federal designation rather than current problems. If they can address the access issue, they will
36 have the currency needed to address other things. The hope was to provide them the means to defend
37 what they want to do on other fronts as opposed to trying to push something like the federal
38 designation that currently has a lot of opposition in part because many believe it is focused on the
39 wrong problem.

40
41 Mayor Sondak hears often that the terms of Mountain Accord are not being met and that they need to
42 renegotiate. He questioned to what extent the members of the Stakeholders Council want to reach a
43 consensus. Greg Summerhays stated that the majority are present because they want to reach the best
44 possible solution and are willing to work toward a consensus.

45
46 Carl Fisher estimated that 70% want agreement and 30% are agitators. He felt there was more
47 opportunity to talk than to listen and people are very positional in what they have to offer and do not
48 challenge themselves to think outside the box. He commented that when by breaking up into smaller

1 groups, one person or one special interest cannot dominate the conversation. It was also observed
2 that over the past few meetings, attendance has declined. It was suggested that they assess
3 participation and determine who wants to participate and be involved going forward. It was noted
4 that the range of membership in the Interlocal Agreement was 28 to 35 members. There were over
5 100 applicants, with the challenge at the time being to limit membership to 35.

6
7 Mr. Becker explained that when the Stakeholders Council was formed, they were specifically asked
8 to help the Commission with transportation issues. Some of the Stakeholders Council members had
9 a very different idea of what they wanted to see addressed. That, in some ways, usurped the direction
10 of the Board. Chair McCandless wanted to ensure that separation is maintained between the Board
11 and the Council in order to get honest, solid answers. He suggested that the task be completed within
12 the first three months of 2020. The Stakeholders Council's short-term goals were to find tasks based
13 on Mountain Accord. He supported the idea of the Council taking an active role in the EIS and
14 breaking into small groups.

15
16 Chair McCandless suggested the group be divided into four primary groups based on four primary
17 aspects of Mountain Accord and convene on a monthly basis to address the tasks assigned to them.
18 That was expected to take at least one or two months in order to facilitate findings to report back to
19 the group as a whole. He estimated it to be a six-month process. He also recommended that the
20 Council come up with a policy and direction. He did not want the Board to have undue influence on
21 the decision made by the Council.

22
23 Commissioner Bradley thanked the Stakeholders Council for their input, which had been extremely
24 valuable. He stressed the importance of maintaining balance and making sure the right people are
25 involved.

26
27 Mayor Wilson stated that while respecting the goal of economic stability by resorts in the canyon, she
28 was not always comfortable with the parity toward economic development. It seemed to her that they
29 may not need a fourth committee pertaining to economic development. If they choose to provide
30 direction, she believed that mirroring the priorities of Mountain Accord was the best method.

31
32 Mayor Knopp believed they need direction to ensure that both are headed in the same direction.
33 Mayor Peterson thought they could do both and set parameters.

34
35 Mayor Sondak's understanding was that the Stakeholders Council needs direction from the Board
36 and there should be more discussion about what the committees will be charged with.

37
38 Mr. Perez reported on the survey and potential action items including a Valley-wide survey of the
39 legislation. The thought was that more people need to have a better understanding of the CWC and
40 the legislation as well as shared messaging on the eKit, which is a monthly messaging package for
41 stakeholders to share quickly and easily. A change in time was also recommended for Stakeholders
42 Council meetings. It was suggested that those speaking identify themselves and their agency before
43 speaking per Roberts Rules. It was also valuable to provide reports on the Forest Service quarterly
44 stakeholder meetings and focus groups. Priority lists should be created and the CWC logo should
45 appear on stakeholder and jurisdictional websites. At the November Stakeholders Council meeting,
46 they can finetune the results of the retreat.

1 Chair McCandless identified the following goals:
2

- 3 • The Board should establish short-term goals and create a policy so that the Council knows
4 what to expect.
- 5
- 6 • Prepare a short list of projects for the Council to address.
7
- 8 • The Board should provide the Stakeholders Council with guidance without being overly
9 imposing in terms of direction.
- 10
- 11 • Meetings should be held quarterly with monthly meetings conducted based on guidance from
12 the CWC Board on subcommittees.
13

14 Mr. Becker commented that aligning the Stakeholders Council with the Mountain Accord
15 Committees was intended to develop the strategy. Implementation may differ. Mayor Sondak
16 identified transportation and recreation as the two primary categories. Both must fit within the context
17 of environmental concerns and the ability for businesses to sustain themselves. Chair McCandless
18 liked Greg Summerhay's direction that there be monthly reports. Procedural issues were discussed.
19

20 Mayor Silvestrini recommended that the Stakeholders Council form a Transportation Committee that
21 will; (1) study the EIS and make recommendations to the CWC; and (2) study and recommend a
22 process for guiding long-term transportation options. Mayor Wilson was not comfortable turning
23 over something so lofty to a citizen group that meets monthly. She suspected that the group will need
24 time to reassess the directive of the EIS.
25

26 Greg Summerhays commented that if UDOT brought a plan to the Stakeholders Council, they could
27 provide constructive feedback but he questioned whether the group could come up with a proposed
28 plan. Mayor Silvestrini suggested that during the comment period on the EIS that they provide
29 feedback on it.
30

31 Timing issues were discussed. Mr. Becker explained that the draft EIS will be completed next fall.
32 Staff tried to figure out how to support the changes and the Commission. Chair McCandless
33 suggested they study the Purpose and Needs Statement and draft a letter from the Central Wasatch
34 Commission signed by everyone. Mr. Perez commented that they could give a Stakeholders Council
35 perspective at the November meeting and structure it like they did for the legislation.
36

37 Carl Fisher saw value in the CWC articulating its vision for transportation. If something is in conflict
38 with that, it should be addressed. The intent was to align the vision.
39

40 Mr. Becker identified the following:

- 41
- 42 • Define short-term goals;
- 43
- 44 • Provide guidance and flexibility to the Stakeholders Council. This may include quarterly
45 meetings with small group meetings.
- 46
- 47 • Provide guidance on the process.
48

1 Mr. Becker commented that one of the things that came out of the committees pertained to
2 transportation. It was suggested that they look at long-range options and the EIS.

3

4 **4. Reception.**

5

6 **5. Dinner.**

7

8 **6. Adjournment.**

9

10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to adjourn until the following day. The motion passed
11 unanimately.

12

13 The Thursday session adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION ANNUAL RETREAT HELD**
2 **FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2019 AT 8:00 A.M. AT THE HOMESTEAD RESORT, 700 NORTH**
3 **HOMESTEAD DRIVE, MIDWAY, UTAH**
4

5 **Present:** Commissioner Chris McCandless, Mayor Mike Peterson, Commissioner Jim
6 Bradley, Commissioner Chris Robinson, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Jeff
7 Silvestrini, Mayor Jackie Biskupski, Mayor Jenny Wilson, Mayor Andy
8 Beerman, Mayor-Elect Danial Knopp, Laura Hansen-UTA, Chris Cawley,
9 Doug Decker, Steve VanMaren, Abi Holt, Barbara Cameron, Greg
10 Summerhays, Bill Simmons, Barbara Cameron, Carl Fisher, Katherine
11 Kanterm
12

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

17 **FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2019:**
18

19 **1. Breakfast.**
20

21 **2. Strategic Planning.**
22

23 The Board Members shared their thoughts and impressions from the previous day.
24

25 Mayor Peterson appreciated the opportunity to identify issues with the Stakeholders Council. He
26 liked the idea of creating subcommittees with specific tasks that are centered around the cornerstones
27 of Mountain Accord.
28

29 Mayor Biskupski stressed the importance of making decisions going forward and giving clear
30 directives in order to make progress.
31

32 Mayor Silvestrini supported the idea of forming committees and making progress on reaching a
33 solution.
34

35 Mayor Sondak liked the engagement with the Stakeholders Council and findings ways to move
36 forward.
37

38 Mayor Wilson found their ability to share thoughts and ideas to be very valuable. She hoped to have
39 a clearer understanding of how staff interfaces with the Chair, the Executive Committee, and the
40 general membership and focus on the role of the Stakeholders Council.
41

42 Commissioner Bradley supported the proposed direction to resolve various issues.
43

44 Chair McCandless appreciated the discussion with the Stakeholders Council the previous day. He
45 considered it to be an underutilized asset and liked the idea of having definitive decisions made on
46 the federal legislation at the December 3 meeting. His hope was to find a way to preserve the quality
47 of life that exists for future generations.
48

1 Executive Director, Ralph Becker reviewed the background for the legislation going back to
2 Mountain Accord. With respect to the federal legislation, he suggested they not get into the specific
3 provisions and instead focus on where the Board wants to go in terms of moving forward. He reported
4 that in the 1980s, three plans were developed in an effort to resolve issues in the Wasatch Mountains.
5 The U.S. Forest Service completed its plan and dealt with a number of issues. At that time, Salt Lake
6 City and Salt Lake County decided to plan for the Wasatch and tough issues were addressed. Because
7 there was no formalized entity, people began to fall out. The catalyst for Mountain Accord was one
8 of those decisions and the proposal was to connect what was then the Canyons Ski Resort and Solitude
9 through lifts. The owners of the Canyons were frustrated and the Forest Service refused to consider
10 the plan.

11
12 The legislation provided for the disposal of the property to the ski areas, which created a backlash.
13 Mountain Accord was established with an executive committee consisting of 25 people that included
14 individuals from the public and private sectors. Consultants were hired with a process was developed
15 with four themes consisting of transportation, the economy, the environment, and recreation. There
16 were 60 to 70 people involved in each committee with each independently determining what they
17 want for the future of the Wasatch. They worked over an 18-month period with each of the four
18 pieces ultimately combined.

19
20 Mr. Becker reported that when he was hired, he was charged with putting forward the federal
21 legislation. In November of 2018, they asked the Congressional Legislation to move it forward. One
22 of the first things that happened was a change in management at Alta Ski Lifts and they no longer
23 wished to pursue the land exchange.

24
25 Mr. Becker explained that there are things that are done in the legislation that could not be done any
26 other way. For example, wilderness cannot be created without Congressional Legislation. One of
27 the critical pieces of Mountain Accord that was resolved was where and where not to allow
28 development in the mountains. He reported that a number of years ago Salt Lake City compiled a list
29 of proposals for major development that had been on the table for the preceding 10 to 15 years. Part
30 of Mountain Accord, which would have been solidified in the designation, was to provide more
31 certainty about where real development should take place. Contributing to that was the land exchange
32 to realign ownership. Mr. Becker addressed the potential intended outcomes of Mountain Accord.

33
34 Mayor Sondak did not think the December 3 meeting would be the place to learn from each other and
35 what they think about the issues. He preferred to discuss the legislation and make decisions about
36 what they think ought to be included. He agreed with Mr. Becker that they need to deal with issues
37 other than water. It was in that spirit that the Board was asked to support a Visitor Management Plan.
38 Mayor Sondak stated that there are different points of view about the Alta Ski Lifts Company and he
39 acknowledged that they have been difficult to pin down, however, his understanding was that they
40 want to be engaged in the land exchange but they do not support the legislation in its current form.
41 He commented that last winter was a big winter and there were serious problems with transportation
42 and public safety. His main concern was that it precludes the building of new roads in a National
43 Conservation and Recreation Area (“NCRA”). Unless there is a better management plan to get out
44 of Little Cottonwood Canyon, he would not want to preclude that.

45
46 Chair McCandless was of the opinion that the legislation has come a long way. In terms of the land
47 exchanges, he would eliminate all nine pages of the land exchange language from the bill. Their
48 constituents in this instance are largely the ski areas and they have all requested that they not include

1 the exchange. He recommended that a provision be included in the language that defines the Visitor
2 Management Plan provision.

3
4 Mayor Beerman commented that many are frustrated with the legislation and have gone through
5 numerous versions. He stressed the need for the legislation but understood why they need to go back
6 in time to the start of Mountain Accord. Previously, there was a lot of discussion about access to the
7 canyons. At that time, he was a Council Member and invested a great deal of time in this particular
8 effort. He stressed that the pinnacle is land preservation. If they cannot preserve the mountains and
9 watershed then nothing else matters and they will have lost what is most important. What they
10 thought was a transportation effort turned into a preservation effort. Access to the mountains helped
11 with preservation. Ultimately, the residents wanted to preserve the mountains first and foremost. In
12 order to do that they had to build trust with the residents and the environmental community and come
13 recognize the limits of economic development and manage that to the point that it could thrive without
14 hurting the environment.

15
16 Mayor Wilson asked what would remain if they were to eliminate the land exchanges. Chair
17 McCandless stated that his preference would be to create a Wasatch National Park but would settle
18 for the NCRA designation. That will create wilderness areas and may provide more federal notoriety
19 and may result in additional funding. It also gives them the capacity to define the ski area boundaries
20 even though they are not going to participate in the exchanges. He commented that they are going to
21 run out of water, in which case it will not make any difference whether they have great recreation and
22 access or not.

23
24 Conservation issues were discussed. Mayor Silvestrini considered the land exchanges to be a valuable
25 part of the bill because it is a goal involving bringing land on the mountain into public ownership.
26 He felt it was in the long-term public interest.

27
28 Chair McCandless reported that he spoke with a couple of ski area owners and indicated that they
29 have a couple of challenges. The first is primarily financial. The differential between the mountain
30 land and the base land from a trade value is significantly greater in disparity than anticipated. In
31 addition, the Forest Service stated that they do not want any fractured title or properties where there
32 are mineral rights versus service rights in a vote. The priority areas are riddled with fractured titles.
33 The Forest Service has also indicated that they do not want to own property with mines beneath it. It
34 was reported that there are 1,200 miles of mines in Little Cottonwood Canyon. The ski areas are also
35 worried that they are offending the Forest Service. Where they are on their property, they need to
36 make sure that they have a good working relationship and they cannot afford to offend them. They
37 are worried that they are at that point.

38
39 Mr. Becker reported that principles were followed for the exchanges including getting the ski resorts
40 off the mountainside and lands outside of the ski areas. He pointed out that it would be meaningful
41 if it were to become public. To identify the base areas of the ski area for private lands was also
42 significant. Language could be drafted to set those types of parameters. An important piece of
43 Mountain Accord was to have development where there are existing nodes of development.

44
45 Mayor Wilson commented that there is an erosion of trust that needs to be reestablished. She
46 suggested they take another look at the broader framework and perhaps discuss the possibility of a
47 conversation easement and work toward a consensus. She was interested in better understanding the
48 process and next steps.

1
2 Mayor Sondak suspected that some of the opposition to the land exchange might be the hope that the
3 legislation collapses as a result. He was concerned about starting over and thought there was a divide
4 and a diminished strategy being taken.
5

6 Commissioner Robinson looked at what they are trying to accomplish with the tools available. He
7 commented that a bill could be a tool for accomplishing all of the goals. The goal of many was that
8 there are private inholdings in the Central Wasatch. Some would like to see those consolidated into
9 federal ownership. The land exchange was one means of doing that with lands owned by the ski
10 resorts. Another provision would have allowed other private lands to be similarly acquired by the
11 resorts and traded. He saw no value to the land exchanges as currently drafted in the bill if the premise
12 is that they will not trade into split estate, will not deal with any mining legacy of the exchange, or
13 retain and indemnify the United States for any environmental cleanup at fair market value.
14 Commissioner Robinson commented that many detractors are owners of private real property in the
15 canyons that is not owned by the resorts. They think that somehow their efforts are further
16 diminishing their rights as property owners. Possible options were discussed including finding
17 another way in and out of the canyons. He questioned whether the bill is doing anything to advance
18 that.
19

20 Bill Simmons commented that when they reached an agreement with the resorts, the Forest Service
21 was very involved. It was his understanding that the resorts are meeting directly with Congress on
22 their own land exchanges. It seemed that they were competing against a more direct road and they
23 do not have the same appeal they used to. He was not sure how to overcome that. Commissioner
24 Robinson stated that the resorts are free to seek their own legislation with respect to the land
25 exchanges. Mr. Simmons stated that while that is true, it is difficult to go it alone. He remarked that
26 Congress does directed land exchanges on a regular basis.
27

28 Chair McCandless considered what was described to be a directed land exchange, which he would
29 not support. Commissioner Robinson commented that land exchange is one tool. Chair McCandless
30 commented that they allowed the land exchange language to remain in the bill as a tool someone can
31 use, if desired. He pointed out that preservation and transportation were a package deal. His
32 suggestion was that the Board should collectively do their job as directed by Mountain Accord and
33 pass the legislation and get it to the federal delegation and ask them to represent them and move it
34 forward through Congress. If they do not pass something, they will have failed.
35

36 Bill Simmons stated that they have had setbacks including Congressman Chaffetz not choosing to run
37 again. There was also a delay in terms of the CWC being formed. They went from a point where
38 members of Congress were rushing to introduce the bill to now Congressman Curtis being the likely
39 person to introduce it since it is in his district. He made it clear that he was not in a position to want
40 to introduce the legislation. If circumstances change, that could change his desire to introduce the
41 legislation and will affect the rest of the delegation.
42

43 Mayor Beerman asked if strategically if there is any benefit to bringing it out in pieces and separating
44 the legislation from the land exchanges if they are not mutually exclusive and they agree to the terms
45 of each. Mr. Simmons shared his concerns with breaking it up. Mayor Beerman was of the opinion
46 that the land exchange benefits both the resorts and the preservation community and could stand
47 alone. He questioned whether breaking it into pieces might be better than doing nothing.
48

1 Chair McCandless had heard that the ski areas are still supportive of the bill but not the exchange.
2 Mr. Simmons stated that the perception was that they no longer support the bill. Mayor Silvestrini
3 agreed that there has to be something in it for the ski areas. Mayor Wilson stated that the letter
4 identifies concerns they have with the land exchange and they do not believe it is realistic. Their
5 recommendation was that the energy that would otherwise be spent on this portion of the bill be used
6 for transportation solutions.

7
8 Mayor Sondak reported that he received an email from Mike Maughan who indicated that the CWC
9 has the opportunity to impose legislation that would have broad consensus and a higher chance of
10 success by making certain changes. Chair McCandless commented that Mr. Maughan has spoken out
11 numerous times as a representative of all of the ski areas without having the authorization to do so.
12 By adopting the legislation as an organization with modifications in December means that they have
13 a placeholder and can address the legislation if and when it becomes an option. His concern with
14 Mr. Maughan's correspondence was that it is not consistent and he speaks for people that he has no
15 authorization to speak for. Chair McCandless considered Mr. Maughan's credibility to be lacking.

16
17 Chair McCandless commented that one option is to look for a different route for acquisition and
18 protection of some privately held lands. The only way to do that openly without federal intervention
19 and funding is to do it privately and acquire certain private lands. In order to do that, a funding
20 mechanism is needed. In concert with that, a number of improvements have been proposed. He
21 addressed the idea of including on the ballot a proposal for a general obligation bond in Salt Lake
22 County. He considered the protection of the watershed to be one of the most significant issues facing
23 them as elected officials today. He suggested the possibility of pursuing a bond, not only for land
24 acquisition but for improvements to the canyons, sewer connected restrooms, trails, trailheads,
25 parking, etc.

26
27 Mayor Wilson reported that they have utilized bonding and it was not an idea she would resist. Some
28 barriers were identified as when and how. She suggested there first be new transportation solutions
29 in place first to help them better identify priorities. In a recent survey of top priorities, preservation
30 of the canyons was very low compared to homelessness. Chair McCandless agreed that there has to
31 be a County-wide benefit that is tied directly to transportation in order to get the support they need.
32 He wanted to do what they were mandated to do, which is to protect the canyons and the watershed.

33
34 Commissioner Robinson suggested they come up with something they haven't been able to do. He
35 addressed the notion of a directed exchange. He thought that with collaboration they could come up
36 with a new version of the legislation that is bolder. One issue to be addressed was how to get out of
37 Little Cottonwood Canyon. On the land exchanges, they could come up with language to address
38 their specific needs.

39
40 Mayor Beerman reported that in Summit County they have seen great success with open space bonds.
41 In their experience, the public was solidly behind a bond that they expected to be controversial. He
42 considered there be a great deal to be gained and little to lose by taking the issue to the voters.

43
44 Mayor Sondak commented that to him the value of the base ski areas has to depend on the zoning of
45 those areas. Currently, Alta's zoning of the base facilities area is FR 50, which allows for one
46 structure per 50 acres. He questioned whether it was possible to include in the legislation a cementing
47 of some kind of capacity in those areas.

1 Chair McCandless reported that Snowbird presently has an approved Master Plan where they can
2 build an additional 3,000 residential units on the sites that they have approved. In 20 years there was
3 the potential for Alta Ski Area to be purchased. Mayor Peterson stated that he was involved with
4 Mountain Accord and served on the Recreation Committee. He was discouraged by the process since
5 the due process with Mountain Accord was something that everyone signed. He believed there were
6 positive aspects of the Mountain Accord and the legislation but was concerned about where they are
7 today and strategic planning.
8

9 Commissioner Robinson was not suggesting that they abandon the Accord. He wanted to find a way
10 to perpetuate the spirit of the Accord going forward. Chair McCandless referenced previous
11 comments and questioned whether some of the work being done outside of the work of the CWC was
12 an effort to get the federal legislation to go away. The basic foundation of the legislation is
13 extraordinarily solid and follows the process of the Accord. He suggested that at the appropriate time
14 it be moved forward to Congress.
15

16 Mayor Wilson strongly disagreed and was concerned that it is passed over and goes nowhere. Mayor
17 Peterson had the same concerns and stated that there was not a consensus. Mr. Becker had noticed
18 over the years that good ideas eventually get done. In years to come, the issues will be the same and
19 the solutions will not be substantially different. With Mountain Accord some legislation was
20 introduced and the CWC Board was directing staff and working over the last 18 months on legislation
21 that has only revealed the differences in greater detail than a consensus. Staff's intent was to work
22 toward finding what will go forward that achieve the momentum that existed four years ago. One
23 issue was whether to pursue a land exchange under different conditions. In looking at old ideas, some
24 suggested they pursue a national park status. He stated that those types of ideas may attract public
25 interest and support and change the dynamics of the situation.
26

27 Mayor Wilson suggested that the CWC weigh in on UDOT's process more directly. She
28 recommended that they engage more directly with their stakeholders and take one year to back up
29 what they put forward. She did not suggest they start over.
30

31 Mayor Beerman suggested that long term there be further protections on parking. His fear was that
32 they have lost trust and credibility as a group because they have spent all of their time working on the
33 legislation and eroding various stakeholders that have been part of the process and have little to show
34 for it. He encouraged the group to not lose track of that. He considered facilitating UTA, trails,
35 trailheads, bathrooms, and signage to be inexpensive fixes that will help facilitate and accomplish and
36 build credibility and trust. He encouraged the group to not lose track of the little things that may help
37 them reach their main objective. It seemed that they were spending the bulk of their time and
38 resources in the legislation.
39

40 Mayor Biskupski agreed that they need to work on other issues but stressed the importance of
41 establishing a subcommittee to help put forward the legislation. She suggested a bill be prepared that
42 all can support. If they are able to rally support for the legislation it will show that they will be moving
43 in the right direction.
44

45 Commissioner Robinson asked if was practical to work to come up with a new version of the
46 legislation or approve what is before them on December 3 with minor revisions. Ron Dean had heard
47 from Congressman Curtis that they are not in a position to move something forward. He suggested
48 they spend time lining up their politics to make sure it is received in a positive way. For example,

1 the land exchanges can be looked at in a way that does not cost the Utah taxpayers an enormous
2 amount of money and recognizes the enormous value to the public that the lands have. He agreed
3 that there are key people in Washington, D.C. who understand the intricacies of land exchanges.
4 Whatever is put forward, however, needs to have the support of all of the key stakeholders. He
5 recognized that a lot of patience is required on the part of the Board and their representatives in
6 Congress.

7
8 Mayor Biskupski reported that she visited Washington, D.C. the previous week and it was very clear
9 that there is still interest in the legislation. They want the Board to work out the issues with the
10 stakeholders. They also are waiting on the transportation piece. She stated that their desire is for the
11 Board to figure out the rest of the issues while transportation is being worked on. Another comment
12 from Senator Romney was how much growth they want to accommodate.

13
14 Mayor Silvestrini did not expect the legislation to be successful without the support of the ski resorts.
15 Chair McCandless doubted that Alta would come to the table with any long-term commitment.

16
17 Commissioner Robinson preferred that they pursue new legislation and put something forward that
18 they believe will work for everyone rather than asking for opinions and massaging it from there.

19
20 Mayor Sondak had a conversation with Congressman Curtis who asked him which of the elected
21 officials is leading the effort. He thought that a task force would help address that.

22
23 Mayor Peterson commented that to him, of equal importance to him, was the UDOT relationship and
24 involvement in transportation solutions.

25
26 Commissioner Robinson suggested that they listen and adapt while accomplishing what they want to.
27 One of the messages they continue to hear is that preservation and conservation are being addressed
28 ahead of transportation.

29
30 Chair McCandless summed up the conversation and stated that they will convene a smaller group of
31 representatives from the CWC incorporating some stakeholders and come up with solutions to bring
32 back to the table with the hope that all four ski areas will get onboard. No resolution was to be
33 proposed at the December 3 meeting. He reported that he has had countless meetings with Alta doing
34 actually what has been discussed. At the end of the meetings they felt like they had a resolution only
35 to find that the following day something else would come from Alta. He had no hope that Alta will
36 come to the table with a solution that is acceptable and he had no faith in their ability to make and
37 keep a commitment. Chair McCandless pointed out that Brighton, Solitude, and Snowbird have been
38 very supportive and he believed they could reach a consensus.

39
40 Commissioner Robinson suggested that they have a product that will have enough support and get
41 traction.

42
43 Chair McCandless summed up the discussion and stated that the intent was to bring in a few Board
44 Members to relook at the legislation as currently constituted to incorporate an abbreviated version of
45 the land exchanges and bring the ski areas in individually in an effort to encourage them to come back
46 to the table in terms of the Conservation Recreation Area legislation. He expected it to require one
47 year's worth of work. At the same time, they need to minimize their efforts from the staff's
48 perspective on the federal legislation and focus an equivalent or appropriate amount of time on short-

1 term goals associated with re-establishing the trust that has diminished. They will continue to be
2 involved with UDOT in terms of transportation.

3
4 Commissioner Robinson hoped to see an abbreviated schedule in order to not lose momentum. The
5 task forces should be expeditious and meet with some urgency. He recommended that they push
6 between now and the end of March. He suggested that three task forces be created.

7
8 Mayor Wilson expressed her support but suggested that rather than one or two Board Members
9 participating that there be a quorum. Chair McCandless explained that limiting it to two or three
10 members will spread the work out and not obligate the Chair to spending an inordinate amount of
11 time. The consensus was to have three Board Members serve on each subcommittee.

12
13 Mr. Becker commented on the legislation and stated that the State Legislature is showing a great deal
14 of interest in the work of the CWC and they need to respond to what they seem to want to take action
15 on. Procedural issues were discussed. It was noted that the two items that came out of the previous
16 day's discussion were the EIS and long-range options.

17
18 Mayors Biskupski and Peterson would serve on the UDOT EIS subcommittee as well as the new
19 representative from Sandy City.

20
21 Mayors Wilson and Sondak and Commissioner Robinson wished to serve on the Federal Legislation
22 Subcommittee.

23
24 Mayors Silvestrini, Beerman, and Wilson volunteered to serve on the Short-Term Projects
25 subcommittee.

26
27 Stakeholders Council Chair, Greg Summerhays was asked to make recommendations for each task
28 force and have those recommendations submitted to the Board prior to the December 3 meeting where
29 they would be ratified.

30
31 Chair McCandless suggested that subcommittee meetings be open to the public recognizing that a
32 quorum would not be present.

33
34 The group took a 30-minute break.

35
36 Doug Decker introduced himself and reported that he is a faculty member at Portland State
37 University's Hatfield School of Government. Each year his group travels around the west to
38 communities that are facing problems and innovate new ways to work together to collaborate and get
39 things done. He considered himself to be a student of Mountain Accord. He stated that it has been
40 valuable to understand the challenges they face. Their function is to learn and listen.

41
42 Commissioner Bradley reported that he found the activity earlier in the day to be very productive. He
43 also appreciated Commissioner Robinson's thorough and articulate comments regarding the issues.

44
45 Mr. Perez reported that their intent is to set a strategic plan and vision of how to move forward over
46 the next few months and year. He performed a SWOT analysis over the last few weeks and shared
47 the results. The survey was sent to 27 people including all of the Board Members and their staff.
48 There were 11 responses received. The intent was to identify the Central Wasatch Commission's

1 internal strengths, internal weaknesses, external opportunities, and external threats. He also planned
2 to examine how the CWC can use its strengths to take advantage of opportunities, avoid real and
3 potential threats, overcome weaknesses, and minimize weaknesses and avoid threats. The results
4 were compiled and listed.

5
6 Mr. Perez reported that overwhelmingly, the strengths of the CWC were identified as:

- 7
- 8 • Coordinating;
- 9 • Convening and Balancing interests’
- 10 • Creating forum planning;
- 11 • Collaboration; and
- 12 • Refining Interests.

13
14 Something the CWC is doing that no one else is was described as:

- 15
- 16 • Mountain Accord implementation; and
- 17 • Protecting the Wasatch Mountains.

18
19 Opportunities people identified included:

- 20
- 21 • Transportation Improvements;
- 22 • Improving opportunities as a convener;
- 23 • Open space purchases;
- 24 • Trails;
- 25 • Funds; and
- 26 • Projects.

27
28 Threats were identified as:

- 29
- 30 • Funding;
- 31 • Diverting resources,
- 32 • Current funding not sustainable;
- 33 • Losing support;
- 34 • No clear priorities;
- 35 • Not well known;
- 36 • Degradation of natural environment; and
- 37 • Not passing federal legislation.

38
39 Ways to change the threats were discussed. Chair McCandless thought the key was to be persistent.
40 He acknowledged that there will always be threats and recognized that the task at hand is
41 extraordinarily important.

42
43 Progress on short-term goals was discussed. Commissioner Robinson commented that it is a value
44 proposition and funding follows value. Chris Cawley stressed the importance of education. It was
45 noted that the legislation is the means to a much greater end. Carl Fisher stated that they cannot
46 duplicate other efforts and need to be known for what they do in a specific area. He also suggested

1 that there needs to be a brand or reputation associated with the CWC that is solutions-oriented rather
2 than controversy-oriented.

3
4 Mayor Wilson agreed that there is a lack of understanding. With that, she believed that a better
5 definition of priorities was needed along with better communication. One of their weaknesses was
6 identified as confusion and misunderstanding.

7
8 The group next addressed how the CWC can use its strengths to take advantage of the opportunities
9 identified. Chair McCandless commented that they are stronger when they are together and work as
10 a unit. He urged the members to work as a group once a vote is made regardless of how they feel
11 individually. Commissioner Robinson suggested that they capitalize on their strengths by listening
12 and adapting to a changing environment.

13
14 Mr. Perez agreed to refine the document further. His intent was for it to be a working document.

15
16 Mayor Peterson reported that at last year's retreat they specifically stressed the need for short and
17 long-term goals. He did not want to lose that vision and continue in that direction.

18
19 **3. Budget Policy.**

20
21 The above matter was moved to the December 3, 2019, meeting agenda.

22
23 **4. Membership and Executive Committee.**

24
25 Mr. Becker reported that the membership of the Board is nine in addition to a representative from
26 UDOT as reflected in the Interlocal Agreement. He and Chair McCandless met with the Governor
27 and took that under advisement. The Executive Committee is comprised of four people. They met
28 most recently when staff was hired. The Executive Committee cannot constitute a majority of the
29 Board since that would equate to a regular Board meeting. It is, however, still subject to public notice
30 requirements. Chair McCandless reported that as new members come on, the Executive Committee
31 will get busier and it will become increasingly difficult to hold meetings to address day-to-day
32 business objectives.

33
34 Mr. Becker pointed out that even with one change in membership, the Interlocal Agreement will have
35 to be amended. CWC Attorney, Shane Topham explained that to admit a new member, a majority of
36 the board has to vote to approve the addition of the new member. The new member's governing body
37 then has to agree to enter into the Interlocal Agreement. Mayor Wilson's opinion was that they do
38 not have to amend the Interlocal Agreement, however, a majority vote of all Board Members would
39 be needed to affirm and approval obtained from the legislative bodies of each of the members.

40
41 Mr. Becker reported that it is a significant process. There are several options and membership could
42 take different forms. They could have voting members, non-voting ex officio members, or neither.
43 Possible options were discussed as well as potential future roles of members.

44
45 Mayor Silvestrini stressed the need for UTA and UDOT to be involved. Commissioner Robinson
46 agreed and suggested they serve as ex officio members. Mr. Becker stated that UTA is already
47 committing in their current budget to contribute to the CWC. Commissioner Robinson commented

1 that there are advocates for projects in Wasatch County that want to engage with the CWC but he was
2 unsure whether the government itself has expressed an interest.

3
4 Mr. Cawley commented that the Chairman from the Wasatch County Council has repeatedly asked if
5 they can get more involved in the CWC. He suggested that before they offer them membership that
6 they invite them to attend meetings and participate and determine whether it is worthwhile.
7 Jurisdictional issues were discussed. Chair McCandless was comfortable with the Metropolitan
8 Water District being an ex officio member. He believed they would be a great asset to the CWC.

9
10 Commissioner Bradley was uncomfortable amending the Interlocal Agreement frequently. He asked
11 if it would be possible to structure the ex officio positions and allow the Board to make a decision on
12 who they admit rather than go back to each of the Councils.

13
14 Mr. Topham explained that there are two classes of Commission Members including those that are
15 appointed by members and appointed Commissioners who represent a member. Once an entity is
16 admitted to the CWC it has the right to appoint its own Commission Member who will sit on the
17 Board. There are two types of appointed Commissioners; one is appointed by the Board to represent
18 the Wasatch Back. Summit County is filling that role currently. The other is to represent the interest
19 of UDOT. All other Commissioners are appointed by members and have the same rights.

20
21 Mayor Wilson explained that when the first draft of the Interlocal Agreement was circulating there
22 was a sense that because of Salt Lake County's bonding ability, the Salt Lake County Council was
23 on the line politically more than other entities. As a result, much of the language in the Interlocal
24 Agreement was included to protect the Salt Lake County Council from future bond issuance or
25 utilization of an additional tax increment. The Members of the Salt Lake County Council are sensitive
26 to the fact that although they have great partnerships with mayors and communities when it comes
27 time to develop methods and systems for transportation dollars, they do not always see unilateral
28 participation. Chair McCandless commented that every legislative body has the ability to opt-out of
29 financial obligations imposed by the CWC.

30
31 Mr. Becker acknowledged that Brighton is going to be a change. The question for the Board is to
32 determine whether to look at other members. He pointed out that it is a laborious process and it will
33 be helpful for staff if the Board would make a decision about whether to have different categories of
34 membership. Chair McCandless asked if they can pass a resolution to accept Brighton as a member
35 prior to the town making application. Mayor Wilson suggested the possibility of drafting a memo
36 and having the Board recommend the approval.

37
38 Mr. Topham commented that about one year earlier the Board enacted a resolution adopting a process
39 for admitting new members. His recollection was that the trigger for starting the process was a request
40 from members of the body to consider membership. Mr. Becker noted that the Interlocal Agreement
41 calls for three steps including (1) unanimous approval of the Commissioners from the organized
42 members; (2) a two-thirds majority vote of all of the Commissioners then serving on the Board; and
43 (3) approval by the legislative body of each of the members.

44
45 Mayor Wilson reported that on December 2 the Board could grant approval and spend the month of
46 December getting the legislative bodies to grant approval. They cannot actually seat a member until
47 approval is granted. Mr. Topham's understanding was that the trigger for starting the process is a

1 request by the governing body for the proposed new member to become a member of the CWC. He
2 stated that the initial trigger cannot occur until after January 1, 2020.

3
4 Chair McCandless reported that if the process allows them to bring the issue forward on December 2
5 they will do so. If not, they will include the matter on the agenda for the first meeting in January with
6 the anticipation that Brighton will have been formed and submitted a request as required. He agreed
7 to proceed with the process as expeditiously as possible. Commissioner Robinson thought it would
8 be helpful to set forth specifics on the cost of membership.

9
10 Mr. Becker stated that UTA seems to have an interest and are making budget preparations. Chair
11 McCandless suggested they take Mayor Silvestrini's advice and have the Board appoint ex officio
12 members to fill a spot equal to no more than one-third of the total votes associated with the
13 Commission. They would be non-voting members but would have a seat at the table and can give
14 input. Mayor Beerman suggested that Messrs. Topham and Becker study the issue in more detail and
15 report back on December 3 with a plan to move forward. It was noted that the original Interlocal
16 Agreement was focused on keeping a small membership and giving control to parties that are most
17 exposed by bonding.

18
19 Upcoming changes to the CWC Board as result of the most recent election were described. It was
20 noted that a new Chair and Vice Chair will be elected at the December 2 meeting.

21 22 **5. CWC Mission Statement Workshop.**

23
24 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen separated those present into two groups and performed a
25 mission statement exercise.

26
27 Ms. Nielsen asked the group to move through a mission statement writing workshop. She displayed
28 a statement prepared one year earlier and worked through the ideas of the group on how to improve
29 the statement and establish a mission statement moving forward. The groups were asked to take 10
30 minutes to in once sentence tell a story of what the CWC looks like when doing its best work. She
31 explained that typically mission statements consist of 10 words or less, however, the current one is
32 14 words. The mission statement should consist of one sentence describing the goal of the CWC and
33 how it is accomplished.

34
35 Ms. Nielsen asked the groups to next circle every mention of a place or a person, place a square
36 around every action word, and underline anytime something in the story changed for the better. The
37 group was then asked to make a chart on a separate piece of paper and place each of the words in
38 different parts of the chart. At the conclusion of the exercise, Ms. Nielsen stressed the importance of
39 each word that is used when referring to the CWC so that there is continuity among those in the group
40 and to think about how they are evolving.

41
42 The mission statement from the first group was as follows:

43
44 Preserving and enriching the Central Wasatch Mountains to protect the natural environment, improve
45 access, and concentrated growth.

46
47 The shortened version was as follows:

1 Protecting and enriching the Central Wasatch Mountains for future generations.

2
3 The mission statement from the second group was as follows:

4
5 Implement community-based solutions that protect the Wasatch Mountains, its watershed, and
6 manage user impacts.

7
8 **6. Wrap Up.**

9
10 Those present were invited to share their final thoughts.

11
12 Commissioner Robinson enjoyed the retreat and felt they had come up with a fairly short-term
13 schedule and organization moving forward.

14
15 Mayor Silvestrini appreciated the focus on the federal legislation and the strategy for the new budget.

16
17 Mayor Wilson felt that they accomplished a great deal including coming up with an action plan for
18 the federal legislation. She appreciated those involved in the discussion and was pleased that they
19 have a plan in place. She was disappointed that they did not discuss the issue of capacity, which she
20 considered to be critical. She stated that they need an agreed-upon process to determine capacity as
21 well as a coalition of the process around capacity. There is plenty of capacity on the mountain and
22 peak days are of most concern. She did not want to use public dollars from people who will never
23 spend much time in the canyons. She did not suggest it be included in the equation for taxing when
24 what they are doing is ultimately cleaning up the mess in order to get more skiers on the mountain or
25 more people to summer events. She remarked that that diminishes the quality of the experience for
26 general users.

27
28 Mayor Biskupski questioned what capacity looks like to a resort. She commented that they could
29 build a train and a tunnel to the ski resorts but the quality of life that attracts people cannot be
30 maintained if they do not understand capacity. She explained that people want short-term solutions
31 to the growth that is occurring. She suggested they figure out how to maintain the watersheds
32 successfully.

33
34 Commissioner Bradley felt they had discussed some of the critical topics that will lead to success.
35 What was discussed requires follow-through, which will be critical. One of the most important things
36 they did was establish three subcommittees. He also liked how they plan to integrate and utilize the
37 Stakeholders Council going forward.

38
39 Mayor Peterson stated that in addition to the impact in the canyons, they need to realize that the City
40 of Cottonwood Heights is ground zero and has 35,000 residents living between the two canyons. The
41 impact to his constituents is something he was sensitive to. He supported the formation of the three
42 subcommittees.

43
44 Mayor Beerman felt the group had a good foundation. When Mountain Accord was formed, he had
45 a lot of optimism and excitement. He had the same feeling when the CWC was formed. He hoped
46 that one year from now when they meet again that progress and action will have been taken in order
47 to reach their potential.

1 Chair McCandless awarded the moose described at the beginning of the retreat to Commissioner
2 Robinson.

3
4 Chair McCandless hoped that once he is gone that the organization will be able to make correct
5 decisions and carry on and protect the Central Wasatch Mountains. He was confident in the Board's
6 ability to do that.

7
8 Intern Carly Lansche reported that she will be taking a new position at the Bureau of Land
9 Management ("BLM") but thanked the group for exemplifying leadership and collaboration.

10
11 A photo of those present was taken at the conclusion of the meeting.

12
13 **7. ADJOURNMENT**

14
15 The Central Wasatch Commission Retreat adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Annual Retreat held Thursday, November 7 and Friday, November 8, 2019.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____