



1  
2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
3 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2020 AT 3:00 P.M. THE**  
4 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM WITH NO ANCHOR**  
5 **LOCATION.**  
6

7 **Present:** Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Vice-Chair Jan Striefel, Chris Cawley, George  
8 Vargyas, Ed Marshall, Steve Van Maren, Mike Marker, Barbara Cameron,  
9 Julianna Christie, Bobby Sampson, Dennis Goreham, Don Despain, Kyle  
10 Maynard, Nate Rafferty, Ned Hacker, Carl Fisher, Donn Knopp, Carlton  
11 Christenson, Annalee Munsee, Brian Hutchinson, Del Draper, John  
12 Knoblock, Randy Doyle, Paul Diegel, Megan Nelson, Mike Maughan, Nate  
13 Furman, Patrick Shea, Steve Issowitz, Tamara Prue, Chris Robinson, Sarah  
14 Bennett, Dave Fields, Alex Schmidt, Helen Peters, Harris Sondak, Marci  
15 Houseman  
16

17 **CWC Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez,  
18 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye  
19 Mickelson  
20

21 **1. OPENING**  
22

- 23 **a. Dr. Kelly Bricker will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**  
24 **Council (“SHC”).**  
25

26 Stakeholders Council Chair, Dr. Kelly Bricker called the meeting to order at approximately  
27 3:00 p.m.  
28

- 29 **b. Chair Kelly Bricker will Read the Determination Letter Referencing**  
30 **Electronic Meetings as Per the Legislative Requirements.**  
31

32 Chair Bricker read the following statement:  
33

34 Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, the Mountain Accord Stakeholders Council of the Central  
35 Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined that conducting Council Meetings at any time  
36 during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks to the health and safety of  
37 those who may be present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President  
38 of the United States, the Governor of the State of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Salt  
39 Lake County Health Department have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to a new  
40 strain of Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). Due to the state of emergency caused by this global  
41 pandemic, we find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public

1 health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present  
2 at the location. According to the information of State Epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in  
3 an accelerated phase which has the potential to overwhelm the State’s health care system.  
4

5 **c. The Stakeholders Council Will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**  
6 **Wednesday, July 15, 2020.**  
7

8 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, July 15, 2020. Paul  
9 Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.  
10

11 **d. As Recommended by the CWC Executive Council, Jan Striefel will Complete**  
12 **the Current Term of Vice-Chair ending 6/30/2021 with the Resignation of**  
13 **Greg Summerhays – Vice-Chair, Dr. Kelly Bricker, Automatically becomes**  
14 **Chair for the Balance of the Remaining Term Ending 6/30/2021 Per Rules and**  
15 **Procedures.**  
16

17 Executive Director, Ralph Becker, reported that when a Chair steps down, the Vice-Chair  
18 automatically assumes the Chair position. This means that Dr. Kelly Bricker has now assumed  
19 the Chair position of the Stakeholders Council for the remaining term. The move was considered  
20 and approved by the CWC’s Executive Committee. Staff did not want to leave the Vice-Chair  
21 position vacant, so the Executive Committee recommended that Jan Striefel fill the position.  
22 Mr. Becker reported that certain criteria must be met in terms of the selection of the Chair and  
23 Vice-Chair positions. Whoever serves in those positions cannot be an advocate for a particular  
24 organization or have a specific business interest in the CWC. Members who fit that criteria were  
25 reviewed and Vice-Chair Striefel was selected to serve in that role for the interim period. The  
26 CWC Board would consider the matter at the November 2, 2020 meeting.  
27

28 Barbara Cameron wondered if the Stakeholders Council could nominate potential candidates.  
29 Mr. Becker stated that if there was someone the members of the Stakeholders Council want to  
30 serve as Vice-Chair, they could contact staff or the CWC Board Members. He noted that the  
31 Commission wanted to move forward quickly on an interim basis to ensure that someone is  
32 available in the event the Chair is unable to serve. Ms. Cameron suggested Marci Houseman but  
33 Mr. Becker explained that a Commission Member cannot serve on the Stakeholders Council.  
34

35 Dave Fields asked for more information on Vice-Chair Striefel’s background. Mr. Becker reported  
36 that Vice-Chair Striefel initially was put forward by the League of Women Voters as a suggestion  
37 for a Stakeholders Council position. She previously ran a landscape, architectural, and  
38 environmental planning firm, called Landmark Design. Vice-Chair Striefel worked on a variety  
39 of matters, including some related to transportation. She sold her business, retired, became  
40 involved with the League of Women Voters, and eventually became a member of the Stakeholders  
41 Council. Vice-Chair Streifel added that Landmark Design was involved in recreation planning  
42 and environmental planning projects.  
43

44 Chair Bricker publicly thanked Greg Summerhays for his leadership in the Chair role. She also  
45 thanked Vice-Chair Striefel for assuming the Vice-Chair position.  
46

1 **2. VISITOR USE MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

2  
3 **a. Staff Will Provide Funding Update.**

4  
5 CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez, reported that at the next Budget/Finance Committee Meeting  
6 they will consider recommendations for the use of reserves to work on the Environmental  
7 Dashboard and Phase 1 of the Visitor Use Management Study. They will weigh in on what  
8 membership contributions have been made and determine whether the CWC was able to fund the  
9 projects.

10  
11 Mike Marker noted that there had been a lot of interest in the Visitor Use Management Study. He  
12 did not feel there was a guarantee that the study would be funded. Mr. Becker reported that the  
13 Stakeholders Council initially recommended the Visitor Use Management Study, which had gone  
14 on to the CWC Board. A determination was made to pursue Phase 1 of the study subject to the  
15 following conditions:

- 16  
17
  - Sandy City approving their budget amendment to include funding for the CWC; and
  - Solicit funding from other sources.

18  
19  
20  
21 Mr. Becker noted that Sandy City may be moving forward with the budget amendment. He hoped  
22 they would reach a final decision before the end of the month. There had also been commitments  
23 to provide private funding. Mr. Becker felt that the next steps would be for the Budget/Finance  
24 Committee to make a recommendation about whether to move forward and use CWC reserves to  
25 initiate the study. There may still be conditions related to Sandy City and private funding.  
26 Mr. Becker considered the Visitor Use Management Study to be an important project.

27  
28 **3. TRAILS COMMITTEE**

29  
30 **a. John Knoblock will Provide an Update on Trails Committee Work Done to**  
31 **Date.**

32  
33 Trails Committee Chair, John Knoblock, reported that one of the main reasons for the Trails  
34 Committee was to push forward the Trails Master Plan. He noted that there was interest among  
35 various parties and governmental entities and it was important to coordinate with them.  
36 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee was coordinating with Patrick Nelson from Salt  
37 Lake City Watershed. Mr. Nelson did not want to move forward with the Trails Master Plan until  
38 Salt Lake City Watershed has completed its Watershed Management Plan. Mr. Knoblock reported  
39 that the Trails Committee was also working with the U.S. Forest Service. He noted that they had  
40 an employee working on a trails inventory of user-created trails.

41  
42 The Trails Committee was also working with Martin Jensen and Walt Gilmore from Salt Lake City  
43 Parks & Recreation. Mr. Jensen wanted Parks & Recreation to be the lead agency that pulls the  
44 Trails Master Plan together. Mr. Jensen had been working with Helen Peters, from the Salt Lake  
45 County Regional Planning Department, to secure funding through the Transportation Choice Fund.

1 He was attempting to pull funding together and would coordinate with the Trails Committee, Salt  
2 Lake City Watershed, and the U.S. Forest Service.

3  
4 Patrick Shea wondered when the Trails Committee was created and who was serving on the  
5 Committee. Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee was created in January 2020 and  
6 included Ms. Cameron and Sarah Bennett. The Committee had not met formally at this stage but  
7 was working behind the scenes to coordinate with various agency partners. Mr. Shea believed  
8 Kyle Maynard from Friends of Alta should be included on the Committee.

9  
10 Ms. Bennett noted that the Trails Committee planned for a small project with the Salt Lake Ranger  
11 District, using money from the CWC that was slated for small projects. \$20,000 was identified  
12 for a bridge project on the Desolation Trail. The timing was pushed back, which allowed the  
13 Committee to write a grant and double the money. This would broaden the scope and allow for  
14 additional trail fixes in the Big Cottonwood drainage.

#### 15 16 **4. MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**

- 17  
18 **a. Ed Marshall, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Provide an**  
19 **Update on the Work of the Committee to Date. Minutes of the Committee are**  
20 **Posted on the Utah Public Notice Website.**

21  
22 Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair, Ed Marshall, reported that many of the issues facing  
23 Millcreek Canyon differ from those facing the Cottonwood Canyons. He noted that there is a  
24 County Road rather than a State Highway. Mr. Marshall stated that the County Road is not fully  
25 developed. A few years ago, a four-foot-wide righthand shoulder was constructed on the uphill  
26 side but it only extends for the first three miles. In the upper canyon, the upper half of the County  
27 Road has no shoulder and the top portion becomes very narrow.

28  
29 From November 1 to July 1 of each year, the road is closed halfway up the canyon at the winter  
30 gate. The County Road becomes a trail and is used by many diverse groups for various recreational  
31 purposes. Mr. Marshall noted that approximately 90% of the users are pedestrians and many of  
32 them have dogs. When there is snow on the ground, there are often cross-country skiers. When  
33 there is little or no snow on the ground, there are mountain bikers and road cyclists. These diverse  
34 user groups set the scene for potential conflicts above the winter gate. These conflicts could lead  
35 to public safety issues. Mr. Marshall noted that determining how to manage these issues had been  
36 frustrating for the U.S. Forest Service and the Parks and Recreation Department. There had been  
37 discussions about banning bikes and dogs on alternating days.

38  
39 The Millcreek Canyon Committee discussed the issues for the following reasons:

- 40  
41
  - User conflicts and public safety are important issues and should be addressed;  
42  
43
  - Resolving these issues was a recommendation of the Mountain Accord for Millcreek  
44 Canyon. The CWC is advancing the proposals of the Mountain Accord; and

- 1 • None of the user groups want the U.S. Forest Service or the County to close the road to  
2 them on alternating days.  
3

4 Mr. Marshall reported that there are six members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee besides  
5 himself. They were identified as:  
6

- 7 • Del Draper;  
8 • Paul Diegel;  
9 • Tom Diegel;  
10 • John Knoblock;  
11 • Brian Hutchinson;  
12 • Polly Hart and Hillary Jacobs from Millcreek F.I.D.O.S. are unofficial members as well as  
13 Mike Mikhalev from the Salt Lake County Bicycle Advisory Committee and Salt Lake  
14 resident, Kathleen Bratcher.  
15

16 Mr. Marshall noted that the Committee has been working on proposals to mitigate potential user  
17 group conflicts for five months. They were looking for approval from the Stakeholders Council  
18 so that the proposals could be forwarded to the CWC Board for approval.  
19

20 Mr. Diegel noted that this was not a complete list of the issues in Millcreek Canyon. The  
21 Committee focused largely on road-related issues, safety, and overall user experience. He reported  
22 that the Committee came up with possible recommendations that focused on the following three  
23 scenarios:  
24

- 25 1. The road is open to cars;  
26  
27 2. The road is snow-covered and closed above the winter gate; and  
28  
29 3. The road is partially bare and cyclists can ride up the road.  
30

31 Mr. Diegel stated that one of the rules the Committee imposed was to recommend solutions that  
32 could be implemented fairly quickly and that do not involve changing rules or laws.  
33

34 Committee recommendations for when the road is open to cars were as follows:  
35

- 36 • Encourage pedestrians to use the south side of the road in the lower canyon below Maple  
37 Grove. This would be for travel in both directions. The shoulder on the south side is much  
38 wider than on the north side and there is a better line of sight;  
39  
40 • Remind users that traffic rules for cyclists must be enforced. It is important to make sure  
41 cyclists understand they are part of the road system and are subject to the same rules;  
42  
43 • Post “Share the Road” and “Give Three Feet” signs to encourage pedestrians, cyclists, and  
44 motorists to share the road and allow for space;  
45

- 1 • Crosswalk or series of crosswalks at the Millcreek Inn area and the complex with picnic  
2 areas on both sides of the road. There is a lot of congestion in these areas and crosswalks  
3 would make it clear that motorists and cyclists need to slow down to accommodate others;  
4
- 5 • Install a flashing crosswalk light at Log Haven. There is a crosswalk area that is frequented  
6 by restaurant patrons. A flashing crosswalk light would signal user groups to slow down;  
7
- 8 • Reduce the speed limit above the winter gate, where the road gets narrower and sightlines  
9 are reduced. The speed could be as low as 15 mph in the upper regions of the canyon; and  
10
- 11 • Put flashing speed signs up, either permanently or periodically with variable measuring  
12 signs. These would show user groups how fast they are going.  
13

14 The following Committee recommendations were shared for when the gate is closed above the  
15 winter gate:

- 16 • Existing rules that apply to user groups need to be clarified and enforced. This can be done  
17 through clearer wording on signs and written materials as well as consistent enforcement;  
18
- 19 • Establish recommendations and rules of etiquette for the canyon;  
20
- 21 • Pedestrian traffic both up and down the canyon should stay in the south lane of the road.  
22 Cyclists and skiers should be in the south lane going up, in the middle of the road to pass,  
23 and in the north lane during descent. Restrict descending cyclists to a third of the road,  
24 since there are generally more people visiting the canyon on foot; and  
25
- 26 • Encourage cyclists to recognize that this is a shared mixed-use trail. Cyclists need to give  
27 an audible warning (a shout or a bicycle bell) when approaching pedestrians and be  
28 prepared to slow down as necessary. A public awareness campaign could spread the word  
29 using social media, clear signs, and enforcement officers.  
30

31  
32 Mr. Diegel reported that there were minor updates made to the letter sent to the Stakeholders  
33 Council. He noted that the main focus of the Committee recommendations was to increase safety  
34 and improve the overall user experience.  
35

36 Mr. Hutchinson commented that it was important to be mindful of the unintended consequences  
37 of some of the decisions. He raised concerns that one of the advocacy groups at the last meeting  
38 seemed to have an unbending position. Mr. Hutchinson considered the environment in the canyons  
39 to be ill-suited for off-leash dogs. In addition, he did not believe dogs should be permitted every  
40 day. He suggested that the Stakeholders Council consider the issue further so that improvements  
41 can be made to necessary policies.  
42

43 Mr. Marshall commented that there are few places in the east Salt Lake area where people can  
44 walk their dogs and have them off-leash. Millcreek Canyon allows dogs because it is a designated  
45 watershed but not a protected watershed. The water from Millcreek Canyon is not used for  
46 culinary purposes and there is no filtration plant. Dog walkers are one of the largest user groups

1 in the canyons and there tend to be far more dog walkers than cyclists or downhill skiers.  
2 Mr. Marshall recognized that space is needed for skiers and downhill cyclists due to the speed  
3 differences. A split was proposed so that one-third of the road would be dedicated to a specific  
4 user group and two-thirds to the remaining user groups. The road is 22 feet wide with two 11-foot  
5 lanes. Mr. Diegel added that some of the issues Mr. Hutchinson was worried about would diminish  
6 if the existing rules are followed.

7  
8 Mr. Draper noted that the Committee had not tried to change any of the existing rules. They took  
9 the situations that existed and tried to add safety among various user groups. Whether dogs should  
10 be permitted or allowed to be off-leash was beyond the scope of the Committee.

11  
12 Mr. Shea wondered if the Committee had considered having the water analyzed for pathogenic  
13 and non-pathogenic material. Even though Millcreek Canyon is not used for potable water, the  
14 analysis could show what is actually happening within the canyon. Mr. Diegel felt it was a good  
15 idea but not part of the current project recommendations. Mr. Shea believed it was a primary  
16 health concern and should be prioritized.

17  
18 Mr. Knoblock noted that the Committee wanted to move something forward that is achievable  
19 right away. He worried that attempting to alter dog regulations would slow the Committee down.  
20 Mr. Diegel agreed and stated that the Committee does not have the authority to say whether dogs  
21 are allowed in the canyons. They could give opinions or make a recommendation if the U.S. Forest  
22 Service or Salt Lake County ask, but it would be presumptuous to take on the issue.

23  
24 Mr. Hutchinson felt that an increasing number of dogs are being accommodated simply because  
25 there are not many places for them to go. He wondered if the Committee was being consistent  
26 with the principles of the Mountain Accord by accommodating domestic animals in a natural  
27 setting rather than seeking to restore and preserve the natural setting. He asked if the Committee  
28 was being consistent with the Mountain Accord and if the canyons should move away from  
29 allowing dogs. Mr. Marshall responded that the Committee was being consistent with the  
30 Mountain Accord, which reasonably promotes canyon recreation. He noted that dog owners have  
31 been using the canyon for decades. Mr. Marshall stated that there is no wildlife near the road  
32 during the day due to cyclists and various other user groups. As a result, the dogs will have no  
33 impact on wildlife during that time.

34  
35 Carl Fisher wondered if there was a way to implement some of the recommendations on a  
36 temporary or trial basis. This would allow the Committee to evaluate the impacts of the proposed  
37 changes. Mr. Marker stated that he would be more comfortable if a formal timeframe was  
38 determined to review and assess whether the changes are working. Mr. Diegel explained that the  
39 intent was to pass the recommendations along to the U.S. Forest Service and Salt Lake County and  
40 work with them to determine how to best enact the proposed changes. Reviews and timeframes  
41 would be resolved at the detail level.

42  
43 Mr. Marshall noted that the Committee would present suggestions to the U.S. Forest Service and  
44 Salt Lake County. Everything was in writing to ensure that the majority of the Committee was in  
45 agreement about the recommendations. If the recommendations have the approval of the  
46 Stakeholders Council as well as the CWC Board, they would carry more weight. This would

1 increase the likelihood that some of the proposals will be accepted and implemented by the U.S.  
2 Forest Service and Salt Lake County.

3  
4 The Council discussed adding a recommendation to the proposal stating that the results would be  
5 monitored. Mr. Hutchinson suggested a monthly review process while Mr. Marshall suggested a  
6 quarterly review process. It was noted that the U.S. Forest Service and Salt Lake County would  
7 handle the implementation of the recommendations as well as monitoring.

8  
9 **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to approve the recommendations presented by the Millcreek  
10 Canyon Committee to the CWC Board, as amended, with a condition to request periodic  
11 monitoring if any of the proposed changes are implemented. Mike Marker seconded the motion.  
12 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

13  
14 **5. CWC MOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (“MTS”) DRAFT**  
15 **ALTERNATIVES**

16  
17 **a. Introductory Remarks by Julianna Christie: MTS Summit Facilitator.**

18  
19 Julianna Christie, Facilitator for the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Virtual Summit,  
20 reported that she had spoken with 26 Stakeholders, including members of conservation groups,  
21 recreation groups, the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, ski resorts, Ski Utah, Forest Service, private  
22 property owners, watershed managers, and Chair Bricker. Ms. Christie reviewed some of the  
23 findings from the Stakeholder discussions as follows:

- 24
- 25 • There was unanimous acknowledgement that congestion is increasing in the canyons. This  
26 is a year-round concern;
  - 27
  - 28 • Many of the Stakeholders want to see the transportation solutions presented alongside  
29 visitor use management issues and environmental concerns;
  - 30
  - 31 • There was a desire for a Visitor Use Management Study that will update current  
32 information, fill in any gaps, and incorporate climate change predictions. Many believe  
33 this should be started before transportation decisions are made;
  - 34
  - 35 • Appreciation was expressed for the CWC and the fact that the MTS approach is regional;
  - 36
  - 37 • The transportation solutions many of the Stakeholders want to see should aim to:  
38
    - 39 ○ Reduce the number of cars in the canyons;
    - 40
    - 41 ○ Be as inclusive as possible and serve year-round and dispersed users; and
    - 42
    - 43 ○ Consider who will be paying for the transportation solution versus who will benefit  
44 from the transportation solution.
    - 45



- 1 • There was largely universal support for expanded bus service and a mass transit system  
2 that connects to that expanded bus service. Electric buses were mentioned;  
3
- 4 • Many of the Stakeholders supported tolling because it would disincentive vehicular traffic  
5 but there were some concerns about the social justice implications; and  
6
- 7 • Mixed opinions were expressed about snowsheds. There were questions about the costs,  
8 visual impacts, and some watershed concerns.  
9

10 Ms. Christie noted that some of the Stakeholders did not have a preference for which transportation  
11 mode was selected, some rejected the suggestions altogether, and others felt it was too early to  
12 weigh in on a decision. She shared some of the benefits and concerns shared by Stakeholders  
13 related to the different modes of transportation as follows:  
14

- 15 • The benefits of choosing rail had to do with the fact that it could make multiple stops. This  
16 would support dispersed users. The downsides were related to the large footprint, high  
17 cost, the need for snow removal, questions about the base area and concerns about the  
18 impacts of rail bringing increased visitors to the area; and  
19
- 20 • The benefits of choosing aerial had to do with the smaller footprint and the fact that there  
21 is less of an environmental impact. The downsides were related to there being service to  
22 the ski areas rather than dispersed users, high price tag, questions about the base area, and  
23 concerns about the impacts of aerial bringing increased visitors to the area.  
24

25 **b. Stakeholders Council will Break into Groups to Provide Feedback on Each**  
26 **Alternative.**  
27

28 Mr. Perez explained that the Stakeholders Council would break out into smaller discussion groups  
29 to discuss the MTS alternatives. There would be three groups in total with a leader and a scribe:  
30

- 31 • Group #1: Laura Hanson (Lead) and Kaye Mickelson (Scribe);
- 32 • Group #2: Chris Cawley (Lead) and Caroline Rodriguez (Scribe);
- 33 • Group #3: Ned Hacker (Lead) and Kyle Maynard (Scribe).  
34

35 Mr. Becker reported that the CWC Board requested more direct input from the Stakeholders  
36 Council. The groups would allow for interaction and discussion about the MTS alternatives. He  
37 noted that several Commissioners were listening in on the Stakeholders Council Meeting. They  
38 were interested in hearing some of the discussions ahead of the summit.  
39

40 Mr. Perez assigned the Stakeholders Council Members to their groups for a discussion period.  
41

42 **c. Stakeholder Council will Discuss Preliminary Questions and Concerns**  
43 **Regarding MTS Summit.**  
44

45 Ms. Mickelson reported that the Group #1 discussions were about the gondola and expanding the  
46 bus service. There were concerns about being able to protect the watershed, development

1 increases, and capacities. Stakeholders noted that they had already seen an increase in volume and  
2 transportation would cause volumes to increase even more. There was discussion related to the  
3 impact on water quality, the user experience, whether busses can handle all of the transportation  
4 needs, and whether gondolas are a safer alternative. They noted that the gondola does not include  
5 snowsheds but it would remove a lot of vehicles from the road.  
6

7 Mr. Crawley reported that the Group #2 discussions covered each of the primary alternatives.  
8 There was support for any solution that would accommodate growth and reduce vehicular  
9 congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon. It was noted that there were challenges related to  
10 physically locating a rail line in the upper canyon, given the layout of development and the existing  
11 infrastructure. Comments were made for and against a bus-based system. Some believe bus-based  
12 solutions would utilize existing infrastructure and serve dispersed users, while others felt it would  
13 not be reliable due to weather and geographic circumstances. Clarification was needed on the  
14 relationship between MTS and the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). There was also  
15 discussion regarding snowsheds and whether they would be favorable.  
16

17 Mr. Maynard reported that the Group #3 discussions were centered around the alternatives in the  
18 MTS and EIS. There were concerns about choosing an alternative without fully understanding all  
19 of the associated projects and impacts. All of the alternatives had negative impacts to consider  
20 and a number of different projects were tied to each alternative. Stakeholders noted that there were  
21 different needs for Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Some of the  
22 Stakeholders felt there was a lack of interest in preserving open spaces in the area. There was also  
23 a back and forth conversation about integrating traffic solutions into the valley.  
24

25 Ms. Christie discussed the preliminary approach for the Mountain Transportation System Virtual  
26 Summit, which would take place on November 13, 2020, and November 14, 2020. Day One would  
27 include the following:  
28

- 29 • Review the objectives and the agenda;
- 30
- 31 • CWC presentation about the MTS process and the draft alternatives. Review what has  
32 been discovered from the expert panel, public comment period, and the Build Your Transit  
33 online tool;
- 34
- 35 • Presentation by Laura Briefer from Salt Lake City Public Utilities to discuss what is being  
36 done to protect the watershed;
- 37
- 38 • Work as a group to establish a problem statement. Criteria will be identified in order to  
39 determine how to judge each solution;
- 40
- 41 • Discuss each of the draft alternative elements. There will be clarifying questions to start  
42 as well as a reaction round. For any areas where a consensus is not reached, plans will be  
43 discussed in order to move forward; and  
44
- 45 • Review the agreements and outstanding next steps.  
46

1 Ms. Christie shared the preliminary approach for Day Two of the summit as follows:  
2

- 3 • Review the agenda and the results from day one;
- 4
- 5 • CWC presentation to discuss the question: “Can buses alone solve the transportation  
6 issues?”;
- 7
- 8 • A detailed discussion of each alternative; and
- 9
- 10 • Recap all learnings and discuss next steps.
- 11

12 **6. CONCLUDING REMARKS**  
13

14 Mr. Becker reported that the next CWC Board Meeting was scheduled for November 2, 2020. In  
15 addition to discussing the Millcreek Canyon Committee recommendations, there would be  
16 discussions related to the Budget/Finance Committee. The Committee was considering whether  
17 to move forward with the completion of the Environmental Dashboard. There was also discussion  
18 about initiating funding through reserves in order to move forward with the Visitor Use  
19 Management Study.  
20

21 The Legislative/Land Tenure Committee and the Executive Committee recommended moving  
22 forward with the next draft of the Congressional Legislation for public review. If the CWC Board  
23 approved the draft, it would be put out for public review shortly after the Board Meeting.  
24 Mr. Becker reported that the most significant change to the draft had to do with land exchanges.  
25 The ski resorts did not want to continue pursuing the land exchange proposals at this time. They  
26 were removed from the draft bill in order to move forward with the other elements of the bill.  
27

28 Chair Bricker thanked Vice-Chair Striefel, the group leaders and scribes, and the Stakeholders for  
29 their participation in the meeting.  
30

31 **7. ADJOURNMENT**  
32

33 **MOTION:** Annalee Munsee moved to adjourn. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion  
34 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.  
35

36 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately  
37 5:15 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, October 21, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_