



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”)
BOARD MEETING HELD MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2022, AT 3:30 P.M.
THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT
A PHYSICAL LOCATION

- 8 **Board Members:** Chair Christopher F. Robinson
9 Mayor Erin Mendenhall
10 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
11 Mayor Dan Knopp
12 Councilor Max Doilney
13 Councilor James Bradley
14 Mayor Monica Zoltanski
15 Mayor Roger Bourke
16 Mayor Mike Weichers
17 Commissioner Carlton Christensen, Ex-Officio Member
18 Commissioner Annalee Munsey, Ex-Officio Member
19
20 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
21 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
22 Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Communications Director
23 Kaye Mickelson, CWC Office Administrator
24 Shane Topham, Legal Counsel
25
26 **Excused:** Mayor Jenny Wilson
27
28 **GCI Consultants:** Ben McAdams
29 Hannah Barton
30
31 **Others:** Laura Briefer
32 Bobby Sampson
33 Catherine Kanter
34 Alex Schmidt
35 Dennis Goreham
36 John Knoblock
37 Rick Trapp
38 Dave Fields
39 Troy Morgan
40 Barbara Cameron
41 Will McCarvill
42 Catherine Raney
43 Carl Fisher
44 Chris Cawley
45 Ed Marshall
46 Gabrielle Wald
47 Justin Wilde
48 Lance Kovel

- 1 Mike DeVries
- 2 Mike Marker
- 3 Patrick Nelson
- 4 Steve Van Maren
- 5 Scott Williams
- 6 Andrew Smith
- 7 Josh Van Jura
- 8 Tom Ward
- 9 Patrick Shea
- 10 Marilyn Dunham
- 11 Susan Trapp
- 12 Brian Maffly
- 13 Freddie Stromness
- 14 Sarah Reale
- 15 Onno Wieringa
- 16 Sally Brown

17
18 **OPENING**

19
20 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the CWC Board Meeting Plus**
21 **Determine the Need for an Electronic Meeting, No Anchor Location, as Noted Above.**

22
23 Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

24
25 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which
26 was as follows:

27
28 'I, as the Chair of the Board of Commissioners (the "Board") of the Central Wasatch
29 Commission ("CWC"), hereby determine that conducting Board Meetings at any time during
30 the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of
31 those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the number of new cases of
32 COVID-19 may be diminishing, the pandemic remains in effect, with hospitals near capacity,
33 and continued vigilance for at least the next 30 days seems warranted to avoid another surge
34 in cases, which could again threaten to overwhelm Utah's healthcare system.'

35
36 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the February 7, 2022, Board**
37 **Meeting.**

38
39 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE the February 7, 2022 Board Meeting Minutes.
40 Mayor Mendenhall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1 **COMMITTEES AND PROJECTS**

2
3 1. **Executive/Budget/Audit Committee.**

4
5 a. **Informational: Fraud Risk Assessment.**

6
7 Chair Robinson reported that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee met on February 28, 2022, and
8 reviewed the Fraud Risk Assessment that was prepared by CWC Staff. State Law requires that the
9 Fraud Risk Assessment be submitted annually. Mayor Jeff Silvestrini noted that the CWC Board had
10 seen the assessment before. He felt the organization was doing a good job overall but pointed out
11 that an additional 200 points could be added if all of the Board Members provide proof that they had
12 completed the Special District Training and signed the Conflicts of Interest Disclosure.

13
14 2. **Informational: Environmental Dashboard.**

15
16 a. **Per Staff Memo: Commissioners will Review the Beta Version of the**
17 **Environmental Dashboard in the Second Half of March.**

18
19 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen noted that all CWC Board Members should have received
20 an informational memo related to the Environmental Dashboard. That memo included an update and
21 timeline for the project. She reported that the University of Utah team had a beta version of the
22 Environmental Dashboard ready, which CWC Staff had already seen. The team would be reaching
23 out to each CWC Board Member to set up one-on-one meetings between the middle of March 2022
24 and the end of March 2022. Those one-on-one meetings would allow the team to walk each Board
25 Member through the beta version and collect feedback. The public engagement campaign for the
26 Environmental Dashboard would begin on April 20, 2022.

27
28 3. **Informational: Short-Term Projects.**

29
30 a. **Per Staff Memo: The 2022 Short-Term Projects Call for Ideas is Open Monday,**
31 **March 7, 2022, through April 4, 2022.**

32
33 Ms. Nielsen reported that the call for short-term project ideas was open and would close on April 4,
34 2022. After that time, CWC Staff would work with the Short-Term Projects Committee to determine
35 which short-term projects the CWC would fund. Mayor Zoltanski asked where the criteria for the
36 short-term projects could be found. Ms. Nielsen explained that the criteria was available on the CWC
37 website for review. It would also be included in a press release.

38
39 **PARLEY'S MINE DISCUSSION**

40
41 1. **The Board will Consider Taking Action Concerning the Parley's Canyon Mine.**

42
43 Chair Robinson noted that Parley's Canyon is part of the geography included in the Central Wasatch.
44 There are also many CWC Board Members with an interest in the canyon. It was requested that there
45 be discussion about the Parley's Canyon Mine project. Chair Robinson reported that there is a limited
46 liability company, known as Tree Farm, LLC, who acquired 634 acres near the Mount Aire exit on
47 the south side of the canyon. Applications had been submitted for large and small mining claims with
48 the Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining. As a result, the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee

1 prepared Resolution 2022-13, which would be considered as an action item later on in the CWC Board
2 Meeting.

3
4 Mayor Silvestrini invited fellow CWC Board Members to support the Resolution. He explained that
5 Resolution 2022-13 would voice opposition to the mining operation in Parley's Canyon. In Millcreek,
6 there are already fugitive dust issues from the existing mine in Parley's Canyon. That mine was much
7 smaller and was located on the north side. Mayor Silvestrini reported that the State did not regulate
8 fugitive dust when prevailing wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour. Millcreek had filed a motion to
9 intervene with the Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining. Additionally, the city provided testimony
10 and opposition to the Salt Lake County Planning Commission. Salt Lake County was considering an
11 Ordinance Amendment to remove mining as a Conditional Use in the Foothills and Canyons Overlay
12 Zone. In addition, Salt Lake City had also filed a motion to intervene. Their concerns were related
13 to water quality and water supply. Millcreek shared those concerns, as Salt Lake City Public Utilities
14 provided water to approximately 80% of Millcreek residents. Mayor Silvestrini felt that the mine
15 project was incompatible with the mission of the CWC.

16
17 Catherine Kanter explained that Salt Lake County, which includes the Mayor's Office and the
18 Council's Office, needs to abstain from the action item. Salt Lake County served as a jurisdictional
19 authority over the matter in a number of different arenas. It was prudent that the County not
20 participate in the vote on the proposed Resolution. Chair Robinson thanked Ms. Kanter for sharing
21 that information.

22
23 CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker reported that the "Central Wasatch Commission Statement
24 Regarding Tree Farm, LLCs Proposed Open Air Mine in Parleys Canyon" document was shared with
25 CWC Board Members. The document included a number of statements that had been shared by Board
26 Members and was then distilled into a one-page document. Mr. Becker noted that the document had
27 already been reviewed by several Board Members. Chair Robinson explained that the document was
28 an addition to Resolution 2022-13. The proposed statement, which voiced opposition to the mine
29 project, would be signed by the various CWC Board Members.

30
31 Laura Briefer explained that the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities also filed a motion to
32 intervene. Their concerns had to do with water resources and water quality impacts. Additionally,
33 there were air quality and emissions concerns. She encouraged the CWC Board to show their support
34 for the Resolution and the statement document.

35
36 Chair Robinson read the draft version of the "Central Wasatch Commission Statement Regarding
37 Tree Farm, LLCs Proposed Open Air Mine in Parleys Canyon" document. He asked for feedback on
38 the document and Resolution 2022-13. Ex-Officio Member, Carlton Christensen explained that
39 because he was not able to vote during CWC Board Meetings, he did not feel comfortable signing the
40 document. It was important that he not take a formal position. Chair Robinson felt that was
41 appropriate. Commissioner Bradley agreed with Ms. Kanter that the County should not sign the
42 document, but he expressed his support for the intent and purpose of the letter.

1 **CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION SITUATIONAL ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT**

- 2
- 3 1. **CGI will Provide an Overview of the Final Recommendations Stemming from the**
4 **Central Wasatch Commission Situational Assessment.**
- 5
- 6 2. **Commissioners will Consider Accepting the Final Report Concerning the Common**
7 **Ground Institute’s Central Wasatch Commission Situational Assessment and**
8 **Recommendations.**
- 9

10 Chair Robinson reported that the Common Ground Institute (“CGI”) provided the CWC Board with
11 a report of their recommendations stemming from the CWC Situational Assessment. One of the
12 action items later in the meeting was to determine whether the CWC Board would accept the
13 “Situational Assessment and Recommendations Report.” He asked Ben McAdams and Hannah
14 Barton from CGI to discuss the Situational Assessment. Mr. McAdams thanked the CWC Board and
15 Stakeholders Council for their accessibility and input during the Situational Assessment process.

16

17 The Executive Summary was reviewed. Mr. McAdams explained that CGI interviewed over 40
18 individuals, including CWC Board Members, Stakeholder Council Members, and members of the
19 public. Those interviews informed the recommendations. Mr. McAdams noted that the
20 recommendations were broken into two parts. The first part of the assessment involved a review of
21 the Mountain Accord charter to determine any necessary changes that may need to be made to update
22 the document and reflect the current situation. He stated that the Mountain Accord charter is
23 approximately 17 pages, with the first three pages dedicated to timeless principles and values, and the
24 last 14 pages dedicated to specific, highly negotiated agreements.

25

26 CGI broke the Mountain Accord charter into two pieces. Some of the specific action items no longer
27 had the same level of commitment from various stakeholders. While those action items were still
28 important and should remain a focus of the CWC, it was recommended that the more timeless values
29 and principles be readopted by the organization. CGI recommended the adoption of a “Restatement
30 and Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document.

31

32 The second part of the CWC Situational Assessment involved reviewing the organizational structure
33 of the CWC itself. Mr. McAdams reported that many CWC Board Members believed the purpose of
34 the CWC was to implement the Mountain Accord. He agreed with this statement, but through various
35 conversations, it was discovered that many believed the purpose of the organization was actually
36 much broader than simply implementing the listed recommendations in the Mountain Accord. CGI
37 felt that the most valuable purpose for the CWC was: to provide a unique and irreplaceable cross-
38 jurisdictional forum in order to maintain the desired delicate balance of values and principles
39 articulated in the Mountain Accord. He believed the true purpose of the CWC was to be a multi-
40 jurisdictional, multi-issue forum that brought together members of the public, Stakeholders, and CWC
41 Board Members to assess and make recommendations related to the Central Wasatch.

42

43 Mr. McAdams reported that the “Situational Assessment and Recommendations Report” included
44 additional information about the purpose of the CWC, the governance structure, voting, the frequency
45 of CWC meetings, CWC representation, and engagement with external entities, the CWC funding
46 structure, and the Stakeholders Council. Chair Robinson wondered whether approving the
47 “Situational Assessment and Recommendations Report” meant that the CWC would adopt all of the
48 listed recommendations. Mr. McAdams noted that some of the recommendations would require

1 further discussions. For instance, some recommendations had two options. He envisioned the CWC
2 would receive the report as a final product, review it, and allow it to inform some of the organizational
3 decisions over the next several months, rather than adopt all of the recommendations.
4

5 Chair Robinson asked to hear CWC Board Member reactions to the report. Mayor Erin Mendenhall
6 appreciated the work that had been done by CGI. The CWC Situational Assessment felt like a
7 necessary step for the organization to take. It was important to ask the foundational questions and
8 acknowledge that certain changes had taken place over time. She felt the assessment had been
9 successful. Chair Robinson shared some of the recommendations:
10

- 11 • CWC Board Meetings take place quarterly as opposed to monthly;
- 12 • Consider the degree to which the organization empowers CWC Staff and the
13 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee to do work in between CWC Board Meetings;
- 14 • The current governance by Interlocal Agreement was satisfactory, with Ex-Officio Members
15 brought on, but the organization could continue to look for more State involvement;
- 16 • The Stakeholders Council was a satisfactory way to bring in non-elected voices;
- 17 • Continue with the same level of staffing, but potentially phase into something less;
- 18 • Consider whether to conduct business by consensus or a simple majority.
19

20 Mr. McAdams shared additional information about the recommendations read by Chair Robinson.
21 He discussed staffing and explained that after speaking with CWC Board Members and CWC Staff,
22 it seemed the CWC Staff was busy and was doing a lot. There were some things on the horizon that
23 would continue to keep CWC Staff busy. When the current Executive Director and Office
24 Administrator retired at the end of June, the organization could consider downsizing. However, the
25 current level of staffing may need to continue in order to handle future projects.
26

27 In almost every interview, CGI heard a desire to better engage with the State of Utah. With the
28 decision from Salt Lake County to leave the CWC, there were also questions about how the ongoing
29 engagement with Salt Lake County would work. Mr. McAdams reported that Salt Lake County
30 believed their position with the CWC should change, but there was still a desire to engage and have
31 a constructive relationship with the CWC. CGI saw the County entering into a similar position as the
32 State of Utah, where there would need to be deliberate outreach. One of the recommendations as it
33 related to the State of Utah was to look beyond the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”).
34 For instance, the Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation or the Utah Office of Tourism may be appropriate
35 avenues to explore. The “Situational Assessment and Recommendations Report” proposed several
36 ways to continue to engage UDOT and the State of Utah. Similar thinking could apply to the County.
37

38 Mr. McAdams discussed voting within the organization. During the interviews, some people had
39 talked about consensus and others had discussed simple-majority voting. The CGI recommendation
40 was that the organization shift to a majority voting situation. He noted that the organization had dealt
41 with difficult issues in the past, which may trigger a need for a consensus vote. The suggestion was
42 that the default be a majority vote, but that a majority may trigger a consensus vote. For instance, the
43 majority could determine whether it was significant enough for consensus to be required. The CWC
44 would need to assess which issues required consensus support and which were sufficient with a
45 simple-majority vote. While CGI had looked into weighted voting, it was not recommended.
46 Ultimately, the power of the CWC had to do with convening and persuasion. He was concerned that
47 weighted voting would undermine that. There needed to be a degree of trust and goodwill involved.
48

1 Councilor Max Doilney thanked CGI for producing the report promptly. It was encouraging that
2 there was some consensus on the top priority items. He believed that the CWC had a lot of power as
3 long as everyone continued to work together. Councilor Doilney praised the short-term projects
4 because those were immediate impacts that residents saw. Those projects allowed the organization
5 to continue to build momentum. He was encouraged by the report and assessment.

6
7 Mayor Zoltanski thanked CGI for their work. She liked the idea of recommitting to the principles of
8 the Mountain Accord. One thing that stood out to her related to the survey results and the fact that
9 participants were very aligned in the hierarchy of needs. She explained that the environment was
10 prioritized above recreation, transportation, and economy. It was suggested that the CWC have a
11 Situational Assessment done every five years or so to reassess.

12
13 Chair Robinson read out a statement from the document that he believed was a broadened purpose
14 statement. He asked CWC Board Members to share their feedback on the following:

- 15 • While many Stakeholders noted simply that the CWC’s purpose is to implement the Mountain
16 Accord, we conclude that the purpose of the CWC is much broader. We believe the most
17 valuable purpose for the CWC is the unique and irreplaceable multi-issue, cross-jurisdictional
18 stakeholder-inclusive forum it provides to maintain the delicate balance of values and
19 principles in the Mountain Accord.
20
21

22 Councilor Bradley agreed with the statement. He also appreciated the work done by CGI.

23 24 **RESTATEMENT AND RECOMMITMENT OF THE VALUES AND PRINCIPLES OF THE** 25 **MOUNTAIN ACCORD**

26 27 **1. Commissioners will Consider Adopting a Restatement and Recommitment Concerning** 28 **the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord.** 29

30 Mr. McAdams shared the redline version of the “Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and
31 Principles of the Mountain Accord” document. It was a comparison between the current document
32 that was before the CWC Board as an action item and the version reviewed at the last CWC Board
33 Meeting. A few changes had been made since that time as the result of conversations with the
34 Stakeholders Council and the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. He reported that the original title
35 for the document was “The Central Wasatch Compact.” It had been retitled to the “Restatement and
36 Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document instead. Mr.
37 McAdams explained that there was support for “The Central Wasatch Compact,” and the organization
38 may want to consider pursuing a one or two-page vision statement with that tile. However, it would
39 likely warrant a longer period of engagement than what CGI had been contracted for.
40

41 Another change that had been made to the document was the addition of “live and work” to recognize
42 people that lived and worked within the canyons. The 13-pages of highly negotiated and specific
43 commitments in the Mountain Accord had been removed from the document. This did not mean that
44 the CWC was backing away from its commitment to the Mountain Accord and a statement was
45 included in the “Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain
46 Accord” document to clarify that. The implementation of the negotiated outcomes remained a priority
47 to the CWC, to the greatest extent achievable. Some of the landowners wanted the document to state
48 that land exchanges were voluntary. That was consistent with the intent of the Mountain Accord.

1
2 Mr. McAdams reported that when the 13-pages were removed, there were several statements related
3 to restrooms that were also eliminated from the “Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and
4 Principles of the Mountain Accord” document. Some of the Stakeholders Council Members felt that
5 it was important to acknowledge that one of the goals was to continue to provide appropriate
6 restrooms at roadside trailheads. As a result, that language had been added back into the document.
7 Mr. McAdams informed the CWC Board that he had received letters from four of the ski resorts
8 expressing opposition to the document. The letter referenced carryover language from the Mountain
9 Accord and the new language that caused them concern. Mr. McAdams noted that the principles
10 were fairly broad. He understood that there were specific issues that the ski resorts had with some of
11 the previously negotiated agreements, but the purpose of the CWC was to continue to work through
12 those disagreements and try to reach a consensus. Chair Robinson asked that the letters be shared.
13

14 Mayor Silvestrini expressed his support for the “Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and
15 Principles of the Mountain Accord” document. Chair Robinson stated that he was impressed with
16 what CGI had been able to accomplish within the limited timeframe. Mayor Dan Knopp wished that
17 the document focused more on transportation and visitor management. He believed that needed to be
18 a cornerstone of the CWC work. Chair Robinson pointed out that the “Restatement and
19 Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document was not a specific
20 action plan. Instead, it restated the values from the Mountain Accord. He read from the document:
21

- 22 • We agree to support this restatement and recommitment and work diligently and in good faith
23 to adhere to the values and principles herein, both as a whole and within our respective
24 jurisdictions....to achieve the outcomes described above, we agree to pursue a comprehensive
25 and interdependent package of actions including voluntary land exchanges, land designations,
26 transportation improvements, environmental monitoring, visitor use management, and other
27 actions....we agree to continue to build upon public engagement efforts, maintain public
28 transparency, and implement a disclosure procedure for conflicts of interest for future efforts.
29

30 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

31

32 Chair Robinson opened the public comment period.
33

34 *Will McCarvill* expressed his support for the work that had been done by CGI. He was excited to see
35 that people were re-engaged and reinvigorated within the organization.
36

37 *Barbara Cameron* noted that a lot of work had gone into the document and she was grateful for
38 everything that CGI had done. She also reported that the Big Cottonwood Community Council voted
39 unanimously to support the proposed Ordinance Amendment from Salt Lake County to prohibit
40 mining in forestry and recreation zones. The Council would be in support of the CWC Resolution.
41

42 *John Knoblock* thanked CGI for the work that had been done. He felt the “Restatement and
43 Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document was a good summary
44 of the principles and values of the Mountain Accord. It would ensure that everyone involved in the
45 CWC had a solid understanding of the goals moving forward. Mr. Knoblock hoped to see a
46 continuation of the project, where a list of all the intended actions and the status of each of those
47 actions could be compiled. He noted that there needed to be some sort of renegotiation to handle the
48 land exchange aspect of the Mountain Accord. Mr. Knoblock reported that the U.S. Forest Service

1 and Salt Lake City Watershed had indicated that funding was a serious issue for restrooms and
2 restroom maintenance. He urged CWC Board Members to look into funding for restrooms. It was
3 also important that restrooms were available, maintained, and open year-round.

4
5 *Carl Fisher* thanked CGI and the CWC Board for their work. He felt it was important for everyone
6 to remember the commitments that had been made in the past. He believed the “Restatement and
7 Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document was beneficial.
8 Additionally, he was appreciative of the discussions that had taken place related to Parley’s Canyon.

9
10 Chair Robinson read the comments that were submitted to the CWC via email.

11
12 *Justin Wilde* was opposed to a gravel pit in Parley’s Canyon. He stood with the CWC in opposition
13 of the mine and supported the proposed Ordinance Amendments from Salt Lake County.

14
15 *Scott Williams* noted that the Tree Farm, LLC proposal had awakened many residents. The property
16 was bordered by the Grandeur Peak and Mount Aire National Conservation and Recreation Area. If
17 the project was allowed to move forward, it would diminish the preservation impacts as well as the
18 quality of life along the Wasatch Front. He asked that the CWC endorse Resolution 2022-13.

19
20 *Andrew Smith* reported that saveparleys.org was a newly formed group of property owners and
21 citizens with a mission to protect and preserve the Wasatch Mountains. The proposed gravel pit in
22 Parley’s Canyon was a concern. Mr. Smith believed that the potential threats and health issues that a
23 mining operation would cause in the area needed to be brought into public awareness, examined, and
24 then stopped. The proposed gravel pit contained environmental threats and fugitive dust concerns.
25 Mr. Smith felt that there were more than enough gravel pits in the surrounding area and another was
26 not necessary. He supported the Resolution proposed by the CWC.

27
28 *Stephanie Reece* asked that the CWC Board oppose the Tree Farm, LLC proposal to protect air
29 quality, limited water resources, mountains, and wildlife habitats.

30
31 The CWC Board reviewed the letters submitted by the four ski resorts. Ms. Nielsen reported that the
32 letters had also been shared with CWC Board Members via email.

33
34 Chair Robinson read a letter from Dave Fields at Snowbird in response to “The Central Wasatch
35 Compact,” that was originally released for comment. It stated that the resort was committed to the
36 health of the lands and the water that the lands produced. The resort also served as a critical recreation
37 resource for the growing Utah population. While the resort continued to support the elements of “The
38 Central Wasatch Compact” that promoted sustainable recreation, environment, and watershed, the
39 resort was not prepared to support some of the new language or elements that carried over from the
40 original Mountain Accord. Consensus had been a foundational element of the Mountain Accord and
41 the CWC, but that had proven to be a challenge, especially given the lack of participation from key
42 stakeholders and agencies. Snowbird believed “The Central Wasatch Compact” doubled down on a
43 strategy that had proven to be challenging. Trying to tie all goals together as an interdependent
44 package further reduced the opportunity for incremental improvement.

45
46 Chair Robinson noted that some of the language had been changed since “The Central Wasatch
47 Compact” was initially released for review. That included the title, as it was now the “Restatement
48 and Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document.

1
2 A letter from Amber Broadaway at Solitude was read next. It stated that Solitude fully supported the
3 paramount goal of promoting sustainable resources and recreation in the Cottonwood Canyons.
4 However, the resort was not prepared to support “The Central Wasatch Compact,” due to the
5 abbreviated comment period. There was a desire to participate in a more collaborative process. Ms.
6 Broadaway requested that the CWC further engage resort representation, other local stakeholders,
7 and relevant agencies with jurisdiction in the Cottonwood Canyons, to achieve the kind of
8 collaborative support that was encompassed in the 2015 Mountain Accord. Solitude was committed
9 to working with the CWC to further shape and define a Compact that benefited from collective
10 perspectives.

11
12 Chair Robinson read a letter from Mike Maughan at Alta Ski Area. It stated that Alta Ski Area had
13 consistently worked in conjunction with the Forest Service, Army Corps of Engineers, and Salt Lake
14 City Public Utilities for decades to provide recreational opportunities while minimizing impacts on
15 the ecosystem, forest, and watershed in upper Little Cottonwood Canyon. Alta Ski Area appreciated
16 the collaborative process of the Mountain Accord and was disappointed that "The Central Wasatch
17 Compact" was not drafted through a similar process. The resort supported elements of the proposed
18 compact, but it could not be supported as currently drafted. The carryover language and new language
19 added did not reflect the changes in position, conditions, and circumstances that had occurred.

20
21 A letter from Randy Doyle at Brighton was shared next. He explained that Brighton had always been
22 committed to the sustainability of a healthy mountain environment and the protection of the
23 watershed. The resort had worked closely with all of the Federal, State, and local partners to provide
24 recreational opportunities while mitigating the impacts of that use. The Mountain Accord was unique
25 because there was a collaborative process. Over the last seven years, a lot had changed, and some of
26 the key action items in Mountain Accord had met roadblocks. Rebranding the Mountain Accord into
27 “The Central Wasatch Compact” reduced the likelihood of positive change. Brighton remained
28 committed to working towards the protection of the watershed and sustainable recreation, but could
29 not support “The Central Wasatch Compact” due to the rushed process.

30
31 There were no further public comments. The public comment period was closed.

32
33 Chair Robinson discussed the letters from the ski resorts and explained that a compact was not being
34 created to replace the Mountain Accord. The organization was asking whether there was a recommit
35 to the principles of the Mountain Accord. It was not a replacement for the lengthy process that would
36 be necessary to approve a compact in the future. He felt that some of the comments in the letters
37 were out of date, considering a lot of the changes that had been made to the document.

38
39 Mayor Silvestrini felt the purpose of the document was to reaffirm the principles of the Mountain
40 Accord. It did not tackle a lot of issues that may be addressed in the future with respect to action
41 items. He was troubled by the fact that the ski resorts had been fairly general with their comments.
42 There was no specific language that was referenced. He also noted that the “Restatement and
43 Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord” document referenced some of
44 the changes that had occurred since the Mountain Accord was originally signed.

45
46 Ms. Kanter agreed that the letters shared from the ski resorts were quite vague. She noted that one of
47 the letters mentioned that the document was divisive, but most of the language was taken directly
48 from the existing Mountain Accord. That being said, she was interested in hearing more from the ski

1 resorts and felt it may be beneficial to wait to take action on the item. This would allow the ski resorts
2 to look at the latest version of the “Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and Principles of
3 the Mountain Accord” document and share comments. However, she pointed out that if the item was
4 not voted on now, Salt Lake County would not be able to sign off on the document.
5

6 Mayor Knopp agreed with Ms. Kanter that the vote may need to wait a month. The ski resorts had
7 expressed concerns about the abbreviated comment period. Since that time, there was another version
8 of the document that those entities had not been able to review and comment on. Mayor Knopp also
9 echoed concerns from Mr. Fields about interconnectedness. If everything needed to be tied together,
10 it would be difficult to make progress. Mayor Roger Bourke asked CGI about engagement with the
11 ski resorts. Mr. McAdams reported that the ski resorts participated in the Stakeholders Council. The
12 letters had also been reviewed and changes had been made to the document. He felt that many of the
13 changes that were made accommodated the concerns expressed by the resorts. In addition, the level
14 of engagement had been high and the period of engagement was over a month.
15

16 Mr. McAdams addressed the issue of interconnectedness. CGI felt that the notion of
17 interconnectedness was foundational to the CWC. However, that did not mean that every trailhead
18 improvement or restroom improvement needed to be interconnected to every single piece of the
19 Mountain Accord document. Mayor Bourke liked what CGI had presented, but with the four ski
20 resorts being against the document, he wondered how effective it would be. Chair Robinson
21 explained that in the redline version of the document, it stated: “We, the signers of the Accord.” That
22 language had been removed. The restatement focused on a recommitment to the principles of the
23 Mountain Accord by the elected officials and voting members of the CWC Board. It was possible to
24 postpone the vote by one month, but he pointed out that the ski resorts were not being asked to sign
25 the document. It was something that could be approved at the current meeting.
26

27 Mayor Mike Weichers felt it may be beneficial to wait another month. He noted that it would allow
28 the ski resorts to share more specific feedback. Mayor Silvestrini believed the letters were vague and
29 he invited the ski resorts to share more specific comments with the CWC Board.
30

31 **ACTION ITEMS**

32

33 1. **(Action) The Board will Consider Resolution 2022-11 Appointing an Ex-Officio Member**
34 **of the Central Wasatch Commission from the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake**
35 **and Sandy.**
36

37 Chair Robinson explained that the CWC Board wanted to recognize the membership of the
38 Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy. The Ex-Officio Member who would represent
39 that membership was Annalee Munsey. The approval of Resolution 2022-11 would allow Ms.
40 Munsey to become an active participant on the CWC Board. It would also accept the Metropolitan
41 Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy as a member of the CWC.
42

43 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-11 Appointing an Ex-Officio
44 Member of the Central Wasatch Commission from the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and
45 Sandy. Mayor Zoltanski seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
46

1 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Resolution 2022-12 Approving Entry into the Second**
2 **Amendment to an Interlocal Agreement with Utah State University for a Visitor Use**
3 **Study for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons: Phase II Social Aspects.**
4

5 Mayor Silvestrini explained that when the Visitor Use Study was previously discussed, it was
6 determined that the social component of the study would require additional funding. The reason for
7 the Interlocal Agreement was to add the social component back into the study. The organization
8 could fund that through reserves or the State appropriation that would be received. Chair Robinson
9 thanked CWC Staff and those involved in the State appropriation.
10

11 **MOTION:** Councilor Bradley moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-12 Approving Entry into the
12 Second Amendment to an Interlocal Agreement with Utah State University for a Visitor Use Study
13 for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons: Phase II Social Aspects. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion.
14 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
15

16 **3. (Action) The Board will Consider Resolution 2022-13 Concerning the Proposed Parley’s**
17 **Canyon Mine.**
18

19 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-13 Concerning the Proposed
20 Parley’s Canyon Mine. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
21 consent of the Board. Councilor Bradley abstained from the vote.
22

23 **4. (Action) The Board will Consider Resolution 2022-14 Accepting the Final Report**
24 **Concerning the Central Wasatch Commission Situational Assessment and**
25 **Recommendations.**
26

27 Chair Robinson noted that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee could discuss what to do with the
28 “Situational Assessment and Recommendations” document at a future meeting.
29

30 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-14 Accepting the Final Report
31 Concerning the Central Wasatch Commission Situational Assessment and Recommendations. Mayor
32 Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
33

34 **5. (Action) The Board will Consider Resolution 2022-15 Adopting a Restatement and**
35 **Recommitment Concerning the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord.**
36

37 Chair Robinson recommended that Resolution 2022-15 be tabled until the next CWC Board Meeting.
38 Mayor Knopp wondered if there would be a public comment period at that time. He felt the public
39 perception was that there had not been enough time to share input. Chair Robinson suggested that
40 the CWC website could inform the public that the document would be discussed at the April 2022
41 CWC Board Meeting. Written comments could be submitted before that meeting. Mayor Silvestrini
42 felt the CWC should specifically invite the ski resorts to respond in more detail.
43

44 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to CONTINUE Resolution 2022-15 Adopting a Restatement
45 and Recommitment Concerning the Values and Principles of the Mountain Accord, to the next CWC
46 Board Meeting, and that CWC Staff make contact with the ski resorts with respect to their comments,
47 and that additional public comment be invited and allowed at the next meeting. Mayor Weichers
48 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1
2 Chair Robinson thanked Salt Lake County, which included Mayor Wilson, Ms. Kanter, and Councilor
3 Bradley, along with many other representatives who had worked with the CWC over the past several
4 years. This would be the final meeting with the participation of Salt Lake County in its current
5 capacity. On behalf of Mayor Wilson, Ms. Kanter thanked everyone involved in the CWC. The
6 CWC had been a great partner with Salt Lake County and the experience had been rewarding. She
7 noted that the County anticipated remaining engaged with the organization in some capacity.
8 Councilor Bradley stated that he was honored to have served on the CWC and share his perspective.
9 He would continue to be an advocate of the work done by the CWC. The County would continue to
10 be fully engaged in the protection of the canyons and was there to assist in any way they could.

11
12 Mayor Knopp reported that with the assistance of Representative Gay Lynn Bennion and Jeff Bossard,
13 went before the State Legislature last month. He asked for \$10 million for transportation for Big
14 Cottonwood Canyon. The State Legislature came back with \$5 million, which would be administered
15 through UDOT. He would be working closely with UDOT and he hoped that there would be input
16 from the CWC as well. Mayor Knopp wanted to focus those funds on bus transit centers with
17 restrooms that could also be used in the summer at trailheads.

18
19 Ms. Briefer reported that the Salt Lake City Watershed Management Plan update was being kicked
20 off. It was a process that was led by Stakeholders and the Advisory Committee to meet the Safe
21 Drinking Water Act regulatory requirements. The new plan would update the 1999 plan fairly
22 extensively, in terms of adding some additional information about climate change, wildfires, and
23 increased recreation. There would be a number of public open houses over the next few months.

24
25 Chair Robinson asked that Mayor Wilson, Ms. Kanter, and Councilor Bradley join the April 2022
26 CWC Board Meeting at the very beginning for a small virtual send-off. He also reported that there
27 had been some concerns about the continued virtual meetings. The CWC would move to a hybrid
28 model at the next meeting and there would be an anchor location.

29
30 **ADJOURN BOARD MEETING**

31
32 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC Board Meeting.**

33
34 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to ADJOURN the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Knopp
35 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

36
37 The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Monday, March 7, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____