



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2021, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM WITH NO ANCHOR LOCATION.

Present: Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Vice-Chair Jan Striefel, Don Despain, Brian Hutchinson, Del Draper, Tara Tannahill, Kirk Nichols, Barbara Cameron, Helen Peters, Carolyn Wawra, Mike Maughan, Paul Diegel, Sandy Wingert, Nathan Rafferty, Randy Doyle, Colby Harman, Marci Houseman, Michael Braun, Michael Marker, Annalee Munsey, Ed Marshall, Megan Nelson, Troy Morgan, Dave Fields, Dennis Goreham, Steve Van Maren, Carl Fisher, Pat Shea, John Knoblock, Tom Diegel, Nate Furman, Will McCarvill, Sarah Bennett, Kurt Hegeman

CWC Staff: Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson

1. OPENING

a. Dr. Kelly Bricker will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council (“SHC”).

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

b. Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic Meetings as Per the Legislative Requirements.

Chair Bricker read the following statement:

Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, the Mountain Accord Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined that conducting Council Meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Salt Lake County Health Department have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to a new strain of Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). Due to the state of emergency caused by this global 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, October 21, 2020.**
7

8 Annalee Munsey reported that her last name was spelled incorrectly in the October 21, 2020
9 Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes. Ed Marshall noted that the Millcreek Canyon Committee
10 portion of the meeting should reference five members rather than six. He also asked that the
11 minutes specify that Mr. Paul Diegel was speaking instead of Mr. Diegel.
12

13 **MOTION:** Annalee Munsey moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, October 21, 2020, as
14 amended. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent
15 of the Committee.
16

17 **2. RULES AND PROCEDURES**
18

19 **a. Stakeholders will Consider and Approve Recommendations on Changes to**
20 **Rules and Procedures – Reference “Committee”: Redlined and Clean Copies**
21 **Attached.**
22

23 Chair Bricker reported that there were proposed changes to the Rules and Procedures. The
24 Stakeholder Council Members received both a redline and clean copy version of the document.
25 Chair Bricker asked the Council to share any additions, suggestions, or concerns. Pat Shea
26 wondered if the document could be amended at future Stakeholders Council meetings, if necessary.
27 CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez explained that the Stakeholders Council will recommend
28 approval of the document. It would then be forwarded to the Central Wasatch Commission
29 (“CWC”) Board for formal approval at the February CWC Board Meeting.
30

31 Mr. Perez overviewed the proposed changes for the Rules and Procedures document. He reported
32 that the changes pertained to the advisory committees. More definitions were added that related
33 to the purpose, authority, membership, and leadership as well as how often the committees will be
34 affirmed by the Stakeholders Council.
35

36 John Knoblock discussed his experience on the Millcreek Canyon Committee and commented that
37 part of the learning curve was understanding that the Committee should not give direct input to
38 groups like the U.S. Forest Service or the Unified Police Department (“UPD”). Instead, the
39 Committee is advisory to the Stakeholders Council, which was in turn, advisory to the CWC
40 Board. The Commissioners made the final recommendations.
41

42 Mr. Perez shared the redline version of the Rules and Procedures document with the Stakeholders
43 Council. Chair Bricker explained that the document created guidelines for advisory committees
44 to operate under. Mr. Perez shared the clean version of the Rules and Procedures document with
45 the Stakeholders Council for comparison.
46

1 Ed Marshall referenced page three of the document. He felt it was important that there be criteria
2 related to the appointment of committee members. There were standards specified in Section 3
3 for non-voting members but not for voting members. Mr. Marshall believed the committee
4 members should have a connection to the area that the committee related to. He reported that
5 Section 4 specifies that a person should “demonstrate appropriate knowledge of, and interest in,
6 the committee's assigned focus area.” Mr. Marshall suggested that statement also be included in
7 Section 3. He reiterated that there should be criteria related to the appointment of members to a
8 committee. Members should have sufficient interest in order to participate.

9
10 Mr. Marshall also referenced language in Section 4 that read, “...a desire to benefit the Council’s
11 work concerning that focused area and any affected geography.” He believed that the phrase, “any
12 affected geography,” was too broad and should be removed.

13
14 Mr. Shea commented that the narrow jurisdictional interest was represented on the CWC
15 Commission. The advisory committees could be broader in order to obtain outside expertise. He
16 felt that certain limitations were present on the CWC Board but those limitations didn’t necessarily
17 need to apply to the advisory committees. Brian Hutchinson agreed with Mr. Shea and stated that
18 a limited scope might go against the purpose of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Marshall believed
19 there needed to be more specificity when it came to committee members. He noted that non-voting
20 members needed to have specialized knowledge or expertise of the committee work and
21 deliberations, but there was no such standard for committee members.

22
23 It was noted that the advisory committees forwarded advice to the Stakeholders Council and that
24 advice was then forwarded to the CWC Board. The advice could always be accepted or rejected.
25 Mr. Marshall pointed out that each advisory committee needed members who were able to give
26 good advice. Chair Bricker felt it may be beneficial to allow there to be multiple perspectives on
27 the advisory committees.

28
29 Nate Furman felt that Mr. Marshall’s point was interesting. However, he did not feel that adding
30 constraints to committee participation would be beneficial. Tom Diegel agreed that it would be
31 useful to have members with local knowledge, but wondered how enforceable limitations would
32 be. Mr. Marshall clarified that he was attempting to establish criteria for the Chair to evaluate
33 committee members. He believed that all members of the committees should have firsthand
34 knowledge. Mr. Shea suggested a compromise. There could be a condition in the Rules and
35 Procedures document that stated that each advisory committee must have one member from the
36 geographic location the committee was discussing.

37
38 Discussions were had about the term, “consensus-based,” in the Rules and Procedures document.
39 The document also made several references to voting and voting processes. Council Members
40 wondered how there could be a consensus when each member had an individual vote. Chair
41 Bricker explained that Council Members typically talked through any reasons for objection until
42 some level of comfort had been reached.

43
44 Ms. Munsey asked about meeting minutes. Chair Bricker stated that there were minutes for each
45 of the advisory committees. However, each committee still reported their activities to the
46 Stakeholders Council during regular Stakeholders Council Meetings. Communications Director,

1 Lindsey Nielsen clarified that a member of CWC Staff attended each advisory committee meeting
2 to help manage the meeting and record the meeting for the transcriber.

3
4 Carl Fisher commented that he wasn't comfortable supporting the recommended changes to the
5 Rules and Procedures at the present time. Discussions were had about postponing a
6 recommendation. Chair Bricker suggested that the Stakeholders Council table the item until the
7 next meeting.

8
9 **3. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSION**

10
11 **a. Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Lead a Discussion on Current SHC Membership.**

12
13 Chair Bricker reported that when the Stakeholders Council was formed in 2019, approximately
14 half the members were assigned to an initial 2-year term. Those 2-year terms would come to an
15 end in June 2021. CWC Staff sent a spreadsheet to Council Members that outlined the terms.
16 Chair Bricker asked that Council Members let Staff know whether they wanted to continue to serve
17 another term. The new term would be a 4-year term and would begin in July 2021. The
18 Stakeholders Council would accept applications for any open seats.

19
20 Mr. Hutchinson mentioned that the spreadsheet for committee assignments was still being filled
21 out. He also noted that there wasn't much visibility on the CWC website. He felt it was important
22 for people in the community to know who to reach on the various committees. Mr. Perez clarified
23 that the spreadsheet related to committee assignments would be reviewed at a later time. He
24 thanked Mr. Hutchinson for his suggestion related to visibility on the website.

25
26 Michael Marker wondered how Council Members should respond to the spreadsheet regarding the
27 terms. Mr. Perez asked that all responses be sent to CWC Staff by February 1, 2021. He would
28 follow up with any Council Members he hadn't heard from.

29
30 **4. MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**

31
32 **a. Ed Marshall, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Provide an**
33 **Update on the Work of the Committee to Date. Minutes of the Committee are**
34 **Posted on the Utah Public Notice Website.**

35
36 Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair, Mr. Marshall, reported that at the last Stakeholders Council
37 Meeting, a letter drafted by the Millcreek Canyon Committee had been approved. It was then sent
38 to the CWC Board where it received unanimous approval on November 2, 2020. The letter was
39 sent to government officials on November 3, 2020. At the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting
40 on November 23, 2020, three government officials were in attendance:

- 41
42
- 43 • U.S. Forest Service District Ranger, Beckee Hotze;
 - 44 • Salt Lake County Associate Director of Parks and Recreation, Wayne Johnson;
 - 45 • Metropolitan Services Associate Director of Public Works Operations, Leon Berrett.

1 At the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting on December 21, 2020, the co-leader of the UPD
2 Canyon Control, Sergeant Ed Twohill, was able to attend and share his perspectives. Mr. Marshall
3 reported that all government officials reacted to the letter respectfully and positively. They had
4 also taken the time to respond to questions from the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

5
6 Mr. Marshall reported that he had written a three-page document, Chairman’s 2020 Final Report.
7 It was included in the Stakeholders Council Meeting Materials Packet. The report finalized all of
8 the information and feedback received from the government officials related to Millcreek Canyon.

9
10 Mr. Marker believed there was a typo in the Chairman’s 2020 Final Report related to road safety
11 and posted speed limits. He believed Mr. Berrett had been open to evaluating speed reduction at
12 and above Church Fork. Discussions were had about the recording of the meeting and what had
13 been discussed. Mr. Marshall reported that at Church Fork, the speed limit was 25 miles per hour
14 and there were signs posted in both directions. Mr. Marker suggested that Staff listen to the
15 meeting audio to confirm the discussion details.

16
17 Mr. Marshall talked about the different jurisdictions. The government officials had confirmed that
18 Millcreek Road above the winter gate when it is closed becomes a trail. Millcreek Canyon
19 Committee Members had asked whether the Forest Service would have uniform control over both
20 dogs and cyclists. Ms. Hotze reported that State statutes controlled the cyclists and county
21 ordinances controlled the dogs. The jurisdiction was divided and the Forest Service looked to
22 UPD for enforcement. UPD was willing to enforce but funding was key. Ms. Hotze had
23 considered increasing the funding to allow for additional UPD presence. Mr. Marshall reported
24 that the governing bodies played separate roles but generally worked in unison with one another.

25
26 Chair Bricker thanked Mr. Marshall and the Millcreek Canyon Committee for all of their work.
27 Mr. Marshall asked whether there were any objections to advancing the Chairman’s 2020 Final
28 Report to the CWC Board. Mr. Marker asked that the typo be double-checked.

29
30 **5. TRAILS COMMITTEE UPDATE**

31
32 **a. John Knoblock, Chair of the Trails Committee, will Provide an Update on the**
33 **Committee Work Completed to Date.**

34
35 Trails Committee Chair, Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee held their first formal
36 meeting on January 14, 2021. The Committee hadn’t met previously because Patrick Nelson from
37 Salt Lake City Public Utilities felt it was best to wait until the Salt Lake City Watershed
38 Management Plan moved forward. Similarly, Ms. Hotze and Zinnia Wilson from the Forest
39 Service felt it was best to wait until the U.S. Forest Service Trails Master Plan moved forward.
40 Mr. Knoblock reported that Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation also had a Trails Master Plan
41 in the works.

42
43 The first meeting of the Trails Committee focused on the development of a Committee mission,
44 vision, and goals. Mr. Knoblock shared the drafted mission of the Trails Committee:
45

- The mission of the CWC Stakeholders Council Trails Committee is to advocate for our trail system vision by working in partnership with the CWC, Forest Service Salt Lake Ranger District, Salt Lake County Parks, and Recreation, UPD, local municipalities, ski resorts, and Salt Lake City Watershed.

Mr. Knoblock outlined drafted language related to the trail system vision and trailheads:

- The vision of the trails system is that the trails system in the Central Wasatch area is interconnected, well maintained, has sustainable grades in construction, has directional signage at intersections, has adequate rule enforcement, services a wide variety of trail users, protects sensitive watershed areas, wilderness areas, and critical wildlife habitat and connects users to the many popular and scenic destinations in the Central Wasatch;
- The vision of the trailheads is that they have adequate off-road parking, have year-round restrooms, are serviced by convenient year-round mass transit, and have directional, educational, and interpretive signage with accurate maps.

Chair Bricker suggested that Mr. Knoblock discuss the Trails Committee goals during the goal-setting portion of the Stakeholders Council Meeting.

Mr. Shea noted that there could be a recommendation related to separate trails for bikers and pedestrians. Mr. Knoblock liked the suggestion. He stated that one of the goals was to improve user education and user enforcement. If there were segregated trails, enforcement would be essential. Chair Bricker believed that information about trail accessibility would be beneficial. Information about the grade or difficulty would allow users to choose trails appropriately.

Mr. Fisher wondered whether the Trails Committee was necessary when several other governmental agencies were tackling trail-related issues. He noted that the primary focus of the CWC was transportation and legislation and felt it was important to continue to focus on those topics. Mr. Knoblock clarified that the Trails Committee was an addition to the efforts of the other agencies. The Committee would work in support of the various trail plans and provide valuable input. He felt that the Trails Committee may be able to shed light on overlooked issues as well.

Sarah Bennett commented that the Trails Committee could ensure that separate efforts came together as effectively as possible. Mr. Fisher wasn't sure that the Committee would be additive. Barbara Cameron commented that the Trails Committee could work to keep the Stakeholders Council informed and in the loop about the separate trails-related efforts.

6. VISITOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE UPDATE

- Annalee Munsey and Will McCarvill, Chair and Co-Chair of the Visitor Management Committee Will Provide Updated Information.**
- Review RFP Timeframe: RFP will be Available for Distribution and Review on Public Notice Website, CWC Website, State of Utah Purchasing and Procurement: RFP is Based Upon Prospectus Approved by SH/CWC.**

1 c. **Selection Committee Membership.**

2
3 Visitor Management Committee Chair, Ms. Munsey reported that the Visitor Management
4 Committee met on December 15, 2020. The request for proposal (“RFP”) was reviewed during
5 the meeting. Ms. Munsey informed the Stakeholders Council that the RFP would be distributed
6 on January 22, 2021, and close on February 15, 2021.

7
8 Ms. Munsey read out the names on the Selection Committee:

- 9
10 • Mayor Jeff Silvestrini;
11 • Mayor Harris Sondak;
12 • Annalee Munsey;
13 • Will McCarvill;
14 • Patrick Nelson;
15 • Helen Peters.
16 • Jan Striefel; and
17 • Carl Fisher.

18
19 Mr. Perez reached out to the Forest Service and asked them to participate on the Selection
20 Committee. However, they declined due to limited staffing resources. The Visitor Management
21 Committee would keep the Forest Service up to date on all progress. Ms. Munsey reported that
22 the contract was expected to begin on March 1, 2021.

23
24 **7. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL COMMITTEE**

25
26 a. **Per Rules; After One Year, SHC will Consider Reaffirming Current**
27 **Committees or Creating New Committees.**

28
29 Chair Bricker reported that per the rules and procedures, each year, the Stakeholders Council
30 reassessed the purpose of the committees and discussed whether new committees should be
31 created. Chair Bricker asked the Stakeholders Council whether they agreed to continue with the
32 following committees:

- 33
34 • Trails Committee;
35 • Visitor Management Committee; and
36 • Millcreek Canyon Committee.

37
38 There was no opposition to the current committees. Mr. Fisher suggested the formation of a
39 Preservation Committee. He noted that the Mountain Accord focused on the protection of the
40 Central Wasatch Mountains. Many of the conversations about protection and preservation had
41 been overrun by conversations about transportation. Mr. Fisher believed it would be beneficial to
42 have a Preservation Committee to discuss specific areas that need protection. Ms. Cameron
43 commented that preservation was discussed in all of the other committees.

44
45 Mr. Perez asked Mr. Fisher to elaborate more on the idea of a Preservation Committee. He
46 wondered whether the committee would focus on supporting the legislation. Mr. Shea suggested

1 that the Preservation Committee could oversee the Environmental Dashboard project. Mr. Fisher
2 felt that many future projects could happen at the expense of the Wasatch. Transportation modes
3 and trails all needed infrastructure that would take away from the protection of the resource. He
4 believed a Preservation Committee could define areas that needed protection, look at areas that
5 required restoration, and discuss how to appropriately protect those areas.
6

7 Mr. Knoblock wasn't opposed to a Preservation Committee and noted that one of the Trails
8 Committee's goals was to protect critical wildlife and watershed areas. He mentioned the work
9 that Ms. Wilson at the Forest Service was doing to identify user-created trails that should be
10 removed or redone. Mr. Knoblock believed that a Preservation Committee could inform Trails
11 Committee decisions. Both committees could work together to ensure that all trail placement was
12 appropriate. Ms. Bennett commented that trails were a resource management tool. She was not
13 opposed to a Preservation Committee but felt that it would overlap with some of the other
14 committees. Ms. Bennett believed the committees were devoted to the preservation of wildlife.
15 Mr. Tom Diegel suggested that the Preservation Committee could be a smaller committee with
16 three members. Each member would be a representative from one of the other advisory
17 committees.
18

19 Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the Preservation Committee generate a list of threatened sites and
20 discuss concerning environmental trends. Mr. Shea felt the committee could look at things that
21 were being constructed or proposed. It could also ensure that all activities fit within the aspirations
22 of the CWC, Mountain Accord, and advisory groups. Mr. Marshall thought it would be helpful to
23 have the goals and purpose of the Preservation Committee outlined. Mr. Shea offered to come up
24 with language following the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Mr. Fisher pointed out that other
25 committees had been formed without having their goals and purpose outlined ahead of time.
26

27 **MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved to establish the Wasatch Preservation Committee. Brian
28 Hutchinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with two opposed and two abstentions.
29

30 Chair Bricker reported that there would be four advisory committees moving forward.
31

32 **b. Leadership on Each Committee.**
33

34 Chair Bricker reported that the next item on the agenda related to the leadership on each advisory
35 committee. She asked the current advisory committee Chairs to state whether they wanted to
36 continue their position. Ms. Munsey and Mr. McCarvill were willing to continue their roles as
37 Chair and Co-Chair of the Visitor Management Committee. Mr. Knoblock was willing to continue
38 with his role as Chair of the Trails Committee. Mr. Marshall believed it was a good idea to have
39 a different Chair each year. As a result, the Millcreek Canyon Committee had elected Mr. Paul
40 Diegel to serve as Chair. Del Draper had been elected to serve as Vice-Chair. Mr. Perez noted
41 that the recommendation would be forwarded to the CWC Board for formal approval.
42

43 Nominations for the newly formed Wasatch Preservation Committee were discussed. Mr. Shea
44 nominated Mr. Fisher as Chair and Megan Nelson as Co-Chair. Mr. Fisher and Ms. Nelson
45 accepted the positions. There was no opposition to the nominees.
46

1 Mr. Shea suggested that the Stakeholders Council have an ex officio member participate in the
2 CWC Budget/Finance Committee Meetings and report back. Mr. Becker noted that the meetings
3 were open to the public. Stakeholders Council Members were welcome to participate and report
4 back to the Stakeholders Council. He didn't feel there needed to be an ex officio member. Chair
5 Bricker wondered whether Staff could provide Budget/Finance Committee updates at future
6 Stakeholders Council Meetings. Mr. Becker confirmed this.

7
8 Mr. Perez reported that the Budget/Finance Committee hadn't met in a few months but there were
9 meetings scheduled. Council Members discussed the suggestion made by Mr. Shea for an ex
10 officio member. Michael Braun didn't believe an ex officio member was necessary. Chair Bricker
11 asked that Staff provide notice of future Budget/Finance Committee Meetings to the Stakeholders
12 Council Members.

13
14 Mr. Shea noted that there had been a budget of \$96,000 for government relations and \$60,679 had
15 been spent. He wondered what that money had gone towards. Mr. Becker clarified that those
16 numbers were from the budget from last year. The budget for the current year had \$20,00 allocated
17 for government relations. He explained that from the time the CWC was formed, it had
18 government relations representatives in Washington. This year, there was no budget for a
19 Washington representative. The \$20,000 was for a representative at the State level, Casey Hill.
20 Mr. Hill's contract had been considered and approved by the CWC Board.

21 22 **8. CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION COMMITTEE UPDATES**

- 23
- 24 **a. Short-Term Projects Committee.**
- 25 **b. Transportation Committee.**
- 26 **c. Legislative Land Tenure Committee.**
- 27

28 No CWC Committee updates were shared.

29 30 **9. GOAL SETTING**

31
32 Councilor Marci Houseman reported that the goal-setting conversation would take place at a later
33 date. The Stakeholders Council could regroup and determine the most appropriate time.

34 35 **10. OPEN DISCUSSION**

36
37 Chair Bricker thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for their commitment. She reminded
38 Council Members on two-year terms to reach out to Mr. Perez by February 1, 2021.

39 40 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

41
42 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to adjourn. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion
43 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

44
45 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
46 4:49 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, January 20, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____