



1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
4 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2021, AT 3:00 P.M. THE**
5 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM WITH NO ANCHOR**
6 **LOCATION.**
7

8 **Present:** Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Co-Chair Jan Striefel, Jess Kirby, Doug Fry,
9 Joanna Sheeton, Kirk Nichols, Megan Nelson, Nathan Rafferty, Ned
10 Hacker, Pat Shea, Paul Diegel, Sarah Bennett, Troy Morgan, Del Draper,
11 Abi Holt, Holly Lopez, Carolyn Warwa, Annalee Munsey, Dennis
12 Goreham, Randy Doyle, Don Despain, Ed Marshall, Catuscarlito, Gay Lynn
13 Benson, John Knoblock, Carl Fisher, Mike Marker, Deborah Case, Wayne
14 Wickizer, Barbara Cameron, Brian Hutchinson, Carolyn’s iPhone, Helen
15 Peters, Nate Furman, Steve Van Maren, Michael Braun, Mike Maughan,
16 Tamara Prue
17

18 **CWC Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker (via telephone), Deputy Director Blake
19 Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator
20 Kaye Mickelson
21

22 **1. OPENING**
23

24 **a. Dr. Kelly Bricker will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
25 **Council (“SHC”).**
26

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

29 **b. Chair Dr. 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 Stakeholders Council**
6 **DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, January 20, 2021.**
7

8 Ed Marshall noted that in the Millcreek Canyon Committee section, in the second and fourth
9 paragraphs, the speaker was Brian Hutchinson and not Mike Marker.
10

11 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, January 20, 2021, as
12 amended. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the consent of the
13 Committee. Carl Fisher and Brian Hutchinson abstained from the vote.
14

15 **2. RULES AND PROCEDURES: Brought Forward from January 20, 2021.**
16

17 **a. Stakeholders will Consider for Approval Recommendations on Changes to**
18 **Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures – Reference “Committees”:**
19 **Redlined and Clean Copies Attached. These Requests for Changes Come from**
20 **within the Current Committee Leadership of Stakeholders Council**
21 **Committees.**
22

23 Chair Bricker reported that proposed changes to the Rules and Procedures were brought forward
24 at the previous Stakeholders Council Meeting. It was decided at that time that the Stakeholders
25 needed more time to look over the recommendations. Chair Bricker noted that members of the
26 Stakeholders Council requested the updates to ensure that the Rules and Procedures were relevant
27 and accurate. Both a redline version and a final version were included in the packet.
28

29 Barbara Cameron noted that there were some blank sections. For instance, on Page 3 of the
30 document, the following examples could be found:
31

- 32 • Each Committee will be established for a period not to exceed ____.
- 33 • All Committees shall meet at least one per ____.
- 34

35 Deputy Director, Blake Perez discussed the first example. He noted that the Committees were
36 reestablished during the Stakeholders Council Meeting in January. The Committees were put
37 together to achieve a purpose and not necessarily to meet a timeframe. There may be flexibility
38 with the purpose and duration of each of the Committees. He suggested that the sentence be
39 reworded. Mr. Perez liked the idea of revisiting the Committees on an annual basis.
40

41 The second example was discussed. Mr. Perez did not believe the Stakeholders Council would
42 want to set specific rules on meetings because some Committees need to meet quarterly while
43 others need to meet every other month. Co-Chair Jan Striefel suggested that the language state
44 that Committees should meet at least once per year. Chair Bricker felt that made sense, especially
45 if the Committees are reviewed on an annual basis.
46

1 Ms. Cameron also made note of language related to a quorum, which stated:

- 2
- 3 • Subcommittees may consist of members of the Council or others approved by the Council's
- 4 majority vote. Each subcommittee shall include less than a quorum of the entire Council.
- 5

6 Mr. Perez clarified that the above language was crossed out. John Knoblock commented that on

7 the same page, there was language stating:

- 8
- 9 • The Committee Chair shall appoint a person to act as Secretary for the Committee.
- 10

11 Mr. Knoblock felt that point was not needed, since Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson fills that

12 role. Ms. Mickelson noted that CWC Staff is always available to the Stakeholders Council.

13

14 Mr. Hutchinson suggested that all Committees be required to meet twice per year. Annalee

15 Munsey considered the once per year minimum to be appropriate and felt that it should be left to

16 the Chair of each Committee to determine what type of schedule is needed. Chair Bricker noted

17 that some Committees may need to wait on certain things to happen before meeting.

18

19 Mr. Perez overviewed the changes made to the Rules and Procedures document:

- 20
- 21 • Item #2: Purpose and Duration was changed to state:
 - 22 ○ The focus and purpose of each Committee shall be specified by the Chair with the
 - 23 Council's consent. Each Committee will be reviewed on an annual basis for
 - 24 consent from the Council.
- 25 • Item #4 (C) related to Duties of the Secretary of the Committee was eliminated; and
- 26 • Item #5 specified that all Committee shall meet at least once per year.
- 27

28 **MOTION:** Annalee Munsey moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures

29 document, as updated. Jan Striefel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous

30 consent of the Committee.

31

32 **3. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSION**

- 33
- 34 **a. Chair Dr. Bricker will Lead Discussion and Review the Decision Tree for the**
- 35 **Stakeholders Council Regarding the Process and Time Frame of Appointing**
- 36 **New Members of the Stakeholders Council.**
- 37

38 Mr. Perez explained that approximately half of the terms of the current Stakeholders Council

39 Member were expiring. The initial terms were for two years while the new terms would be for

40 four. He reported that there are six open seats due to resignations, moves and Council Members

41 who went on to become CWC Board Members. The CWC would advertise for applications

42 throughout May 2021. At the end of the month, the applications would be compiled and a small

43 Selection Committee, consisting of Dr. Bricker, Jan Striefel, CWC Commissioner Max Doileny

44 will make recommendations to the CWC Executive Committee. The new Stakeholders Council

45 Members would then be approved by the CWC Board at the July 2021 meeting.

1 Mr. Hutchinson noticed that there were omissions on the decision tree. For instance, it did not
2 include all of the Committee Assignments. Mr. Perez clarified that the focus was currently on
3 reappointments and open seats. However, CWC Staff would work to fill out the Committee
4 Assignments section as well.

5
6 **4. MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**

7
8 **a. Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Provide an Update**
9 **on the Work of the Committee to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted**
10 **on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission**
11 **Website.**

12
13 Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Paul Diegel reported that the Millcreek Canyon
14 Committee had been tracking the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. It is a \$12
15 million grant for transportation improvements in Millcreek. The tentative plan included issues that
16 would need to be worked out. However, once it reaches time for local input, Mr. Diegel believed
17 there would be an opportunity for the Millcreek Canyon Committee to get involved. He expected
18 the FLAP grant to be awarded in the near future. While it was not a certainty, Mr. Diegel felt it
19 was highly likely that the FLAP grant will be awarded to Millcreek. Mr. Diegel added that the
20 Millcreek Canyon Committee was also trying to determine how individual members could be more
21 involved in the U.S. Forest Service Stakeholders Groups.

22
23 Mr. Hutchinson commented that the scope of the FLAP grant application and the actual designs
24 of the various projects had largely unfolded with little response to Millcreek Canyon Committee
25 input. The FLAP grant was initially proposed to support infrastructure for a shuttle but it now
26 looked more like a paving project. Mr. Hutchinson did not believe the Millcreek Canyon
27 Committee should wait to speak out until the FLAP grant funds are awarded. He felt that a
28 roadway widening would change the character of the canyon. Mr. Hutchinson asked the
29 Committee to consider withdrawing their letter of support as the current scope does not resemble
30 what the Committee previously supported one year ago.

31
32 Mr. Diegel explained that the FLAP grant is entirely run by the Federal Highway Administration
33 (“FHWA”) who will establish the scope and handle the work. The actual proposed scope of work
34 was only released to the Millcreek Canyon Committee a little over one month ago. There were
35 some elements that the Committee liked and some that they did not. Mr. Diegel was not in favor
36 of withdrawing the letter of support. If the FLAP grant was awarded, there would be opportunities
37 to weigh in on the scope of work. The Millcreek Canyon Committee requested a meeting with
38 Salt Lake County to determine their position.

39
40 Mr. Marshall did not believe the letter of support should be withdrawn. The FLAP grant was
41 requested in good faith by the County and the Forest Service. He noted that the amount was \$12
42 million and they had hoped that would be enough to widen Millcreek Road enough to include a
43 five-foot bicycle path all the way up the canyon. However, as the process began, they determined
44 that they would need three times that amount. As a result, the project was limited to the upper
45 portion of the canyon. The road from Elbow Fork up to the top of the canyon was narrow and

1 there were no shoulders above the winter gate. They believed that area needed the most
2 improvement and should be addressed first.

3
4 Chair Bricker commented that it seemed that there would be opportunities to define the scope and
5 the impacts moving forward. Carl Fisher noted that Save Our Canyons had heard concerns from
6 a number of different organizations about the impacts of road widening. Mr. Diegel stated that the
7 FLAP grant was for transportation-related improvements. The Millcreek Canyon Committee
8 would need to determine how the proposals will impact the transportation corridor.
9 Mr. Hutchinson reiterated his position that action needed to be taken immediately. Mr. Knoblock
10 discussed transit options, such as smaller shuttle buses, and noted that there was still an opportunity
11 to work toward transit solutions with the FLAP grant funds.

12
13 Chair Bricker suggested that the Millcreek Canyon Committee take a proactive stance. The
14 Millcreek Canyon Committee could work with the Preservation Committee to discuss possible
15 recommendations related to the FLAP grant funds.

16 17 **5. TRAILS COMMITTEE UPDATE**

- 18
19 **a. John Knoblock, Chair of the Trails Committee, will Provide an Update on the**
20 **Committee Work Completed to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted**
21 **on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission**
22 **Website.**

23
24 Chair of the Trails Committee, Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee prepared a list of
25 Committee goals and objectives. The Committee was also focused on supporting Salt Lake County
26 Parks and Recreation and the Forest Service with their Trails Master Plan process. Mr. Knoblock
27 noted that the Forest Service had been working on a trails inventory. It would also focus on user-
28 created trails and determine which were appropriate and which should be eliminated.

29
30 Additionally, the Trails Committee was working to prepare a list of family-friendly hikes in the
31 Central Wasatch. This would allow users to spread out on different trails. The Committee was
32 also focused on assisting the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation Adopt a Trail program and had
33 discussed supporting the trails included in the Forest Service Forest Plan: the Bonneville Shoreline
34 Trail and the Great Western Trail. There had also been discussions with Communications
35 Director, Lindsey Nielsen about the creation of a trail project spreadsheet to share on the CWC
36 website.

37
38 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee discussed ongoing short-term projects. For
39 instance, the two new bridges connected to the Desolation Trail reroute and the Utah Conservation
40 Corps and who was hired to handle the Desolation Trail maintenance project. Additional
41 volunteers would assist the Utah Conservation Corps with labor and supplies.

42
43 Ms. Cameron asked about the timeline for short-term projects. Ms. Nielsen reported that the call
44 for short-term project ideas had closed. The project finalists were invited to build out their initial
45 submissions with a more robust timeline and work plan. The Short-Term Projects Committee
46 would deliberate over the project ideas on April 27, 2021, at 8:00 a.m.

1
2 **6. VISITOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE UPDATE**
3

- 4 **a. Annalee Munsey and Will McCarvill, Chair and Co-Chair of the Visitor**
5 **Management Committee, will Provide Updated Information. Information on**
6 **the Contracting of Utah State University to Complete Phase 1 of the Visitor**
7 **Use Study is Available on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central**
8 **Wasatch Commission Website.**
9

10 Chair of the Visitor Management Committee, Ms. Munsey reported that the CWC approved an
11 agreement with Utah State University for Phase One of the Visitor Use Study. She overviewed
12 the timeline. Before the end of May 2021, the Utah State University team would do a literature
13 review, interview key stakeholders, handle data compilation, and conduct some reviews and
14 reporting. The team was also looking at legislation and conducting a policy review. Ms. Munsey
15 noted that the CWC Board wanted the team to expedite the work and was not sure if that would
16 impact the timeline. The goal was to have an interactive webinar on June 1, 2021, before the team
17 continued to do more scoping and assessing of information.
18

19 Mr. Perez noted that there were discussions with Utah State University about expediting Phases
20 One and Two of the Visitor Use Study. The Selection Committee agreed to stay on as a Working
21 Group to receive key milestone updates from Utah State University. Updates could be shared with
22 the Stakeholders Council through either the consultant team or the Working Group.
23

24 **7. PRESERVATION COMMITTEE**
25

- 26 **a. Carl Fisher and Megan Nelson, Chair and Co-Chair of the Preservation**
27 **Committee will Provide an Update on the Committee Meeting and Direction.**
28

29 Preservation Committee Chair, Carl Fisher, reported that the Preservation Committee had not yet
30 met. The Preservation Committee was created at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting and was
31 ratified at the March CWC Board Meeting. Mr. Fisher and Megan Nelson had since discussed the
32 Committee. The objective was to take an all lands and systems approach to protecting and
33 preserving the natural resources of the Central Wasatch mountains. The Preservation Committee
34 meetings would be between 60 and 90-minutes long, with one-fourth of the time dedicated to a
35 presentation on current conditions, efforts, and policies. The remainder of the meeting time would
36 be spent working to forward the goals of the Committee.
37

38 Mr. Fisher noted that the Preservation Committee would expect to work on or provide feedback
39 on a number of different projects. That could include the Environmental Dashboard, reviewing
40 data already in existence, as well as looking at background information on past, present, and future
41 efforts to implement protective policies for the Central Wasatch. The Preservation Committee
42 could also take on some of the workload from the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee when
43 appropriate. Mr. Fisher asked that anyone interested in joining the Preservation Committee reach
44 out to a member of CWC Staff. The first meeting was scheduled to take place on April 29, 2021.
45

1 Ms. Nielsen suggested that any interested Stakeholders Council Members with a known interest
2 in joining the Preservation Committee state their name into the record. The list was as follows:

- 3
- 4 • Chair – Carl Fisher
- 5 • Co-Chair – Megan Nelson
- 6 • Dr. Kelly Bricker
- 7 • Pat Shea
- 8 • Jan Striefel
- 9 • Sarah Bennett
- 10 • Michael Braun
- 11 • Barbara Cameron
- 12

13 Ms. Nielsen added that the Preservation Committee Meeting would be open to the public. Anyone
14 from the public was welcome to attend. Mr. Fisher encouraged anyone interested to participate.

15

16 **8. CWC STAFF INFORMATION**

17

18 **a. Staff will Provide Information on Other Areas of CWC Work.**

19

20 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Environmental Dashboard was on track to be up and running by the
21 end of the year. She asked that any Council Members with questions or concerns reach out to her
22 for additional information.

23

24 Mr. Perez noted that the CWC’s Tentative Budget for fiscal year 2021-2022 would be discussed
25 at the May 2021 CWC Board Meeting. There would be a 30-day public comment period and the
26 budget was expected to be approved at the June 2021 CWC Board Meeting.

27

28 Mr. Perez discussed the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”). He reported that there was a
29 Commissioner’s Summit in March and additional discussions during the April 2021 CWC Board
30 Meeting. The goal was to reach a consensus recommendation that would be forwarded to the Utah
31 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). However, consensus had not been met. CWC staff had
32 met individually with CWC Board Members to walk through the evaluation matrix. Mr. Perez
33 stressed the importance of making a recommendation before the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon
34 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) is released in June 2021.

35

36 **9. OPEN DISCUSSION**

37

38 Pat Shea shared a recommendation in the Zoom chat box related to the MTS. He read it out loud
39 to the members of the Stakeholders Council:

- 40
- 41 • Recommendation of the CWC Stakeholders Council, adopted April 21, 2021:
 - 42 ○ Whereas there have been innumerable studies made addressing the transportation
 - 43 problem in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon and;
 - 44 ○ Whereas none of these studies have resulted in any significant improvement to ease
 - 45 the transportation problem in the east canyons and;

- 1 ○ Whereas the Stakeholders Council believes it is time to suggest an alternative, less
2 expensive solution for the next 5-10 years, during which time, new technologies
3 might develop a better transportation solution and;
- 4 ○ Whereas the Stakeholders Council believes enhanced bus service with several
5 geographically distributed pick up and drop off points is such a solution;
- 6 ○ Therefore, the Stakeholders Council of the CWC endorses an enhanced bus service
7 with several geographically dispersed pick up and drop off locations along the
8 Wasatch Front. This endorsement may be rebutted by the CWC if and when, by an
9 objective standard, a better, more environmentally sustainable solution can be
10 determined, proposed, and adopted.

11
12 Mr. Hutchinson seconded the recommendation. Chair Bricker opened up the recommendation for
13 comments and discussion. Michael Braun wondered if the recommendation indicated that the
14 Stakeholders Council would not agree with whatever recommendation the CWC made. Mr. Shea
15 noted that the CWC had not come up with a recommendation. He felt that the suggestion for an
16 interim solution that lasted 5 to 10 years would be a better way of approaching the transportation
17 situation. Mr. Braun asked about the recommendation for a cog rail system. Mr. Shea clarified
18 that the recommendation for the cog rail system had come from CWC staff and not the CWC
19 Board. He noted that the CWC staff recommendation had not been well received.

20
21 Nathan Rafferty asked if the suggestion was to adopt the enhanced bus alternative that was
22 included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Mr. Shea explained that it would be a
23 different configuration. There had been discussions with Ex-Officio Member Carlton Christensen
24 and some of the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) planners. Mr. Shea reported that there was a
25 map that showed five or six key locations that could serve as drop-off and pick-up locations on a
26 non-stop basis to Snowbird or Alta. He believed it was important to remove vehicles from the
27 road and discussed paid parking and tolling. Mr. Rafferty asked about the cost estimate. Mr. Shea
28 did not have an exact number but strongly recommended that the snowsheds not be included.

29
30 Kirk Nichols asked if the recommendation was outside the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.
31 Mr. Shea confirmed that the recommendation was independent from the UDOT Little Cottonwood
32 Canyon EIS with the hope that it might influence UDOT to either amend the EIS or one of the
33 alternatives to include more dispersed pick-up and drop-off areas. Mr. Hutchinson believed the
34 recommendation from Mr. Shea would address computer-related issues. He suggested that the
35 recommendation be Phase One of the transportation solution.

36
37 Ms. Cameron wondered if the recommendation shared by Mr. Shea included tolling. Mr. Shea felt
38 that tolling would likely be included in the second phase. Mr. Hutchinson believed that tolling
39 and paid parking would need to be included in the first phase. Discussions were had about the
40 necessity of a phased approach to transportation.

41
42 Mike Maughan asked about the level of detail included in the recommendation. He noted that it
43 seemed to be very high level. He wondered how the Stakeholders Council could approve
44 something without the details to understand the difference between the current recommendation
45 and the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS enhanced bus alternative. Mr. Shea did not believe
46 the Stakeholders Council was the place where that level of detail could be generated. However,

1 the CWC Board, CWC staff, and interested participants from the Stakeholders Council would be
2 able to determine the details. Mr. Braun felt that UTA already had geographically distributed pick-
3 up and drop-off locations. Mr. Shea did not believe that there were enough dispersed locations.
4

5 Mr. Perez shared a map with the Stakeholders Council Members in the Zoom chatbox. It included
6 eight different regional bus hubs with a 15-minute service frequency to each of the Cottonwood
7 Canyon ski resorts. He also shared the associated costs. Mr. Perez reported that under that
8 scenario, approximately 470 buses would be needed to deliver the service effectively. UTA
9 currently has 400 buses.
10

11 Mr. Knoblock believed the recommendation needed more fleshing out. He asked if it was
12 appropriate for the Stakeholders Council to vote on something that was not on the meeting agenda.
13 Mr. Shea reported that a recommendation could be made at any time during a meeting. Chair
14 Bricker noted that Council Members may need additional time to consider the recommendation.
15 Mr. Fisher felt that the recommendation from Mr. Shea was timely. He liked it because it showed
16 conviction from the Stakeholders Council and felt it might encourage the CWC to put energy and
17 resources behind an in-depth analysis on bus systems and enhanced regional transit.
18

19 Mr. Marshall noted that CWC staff and the Commission invested several years into evaluating
20 different long-term alternatives. Even if the Stakeholders Council preferred the bus alternative,
21 the recommendation would tell the CWC that the Council did not believe in any of the other
22 alternatives. He felt that the recommendation would need to include a whereas clause stating:
23

- 24 • The Stakeholders Council believes that buses are the appropriate alternative.
25

26 Mr. Marshall also expressed concerns related to some of the language in the recommendation. For
27 instance, the line that said, “This endorsement may be rebutted by the CWC...” He felt that may
28 overstep the position of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Marshall reminded Council Members that
29 the Stakeholders Council is an advisory body. Mr. Marker felt that the recommendation made by
30 Mr. Shea was consistent with the charter. The Stakeholders Council existed to advise the CWC.
31 If members of the Stakeholders Council felt that there were other transportation alternatives to
32 consider, and if it was the right and responsibility of the Stakeholders Council to make them known.
33

34 Mr. Maughan reported that Alta Ski Area has been trying to increase bus ridership for over 30
35 years. He commented that it was disheartening that Alta Ski Area provided free bus ridership for
36 over 10,000 people and less than 500 took advantage of it. He noted that less than 3% of the total
37 canyon visitors chose to ride the bus. Mr. Maughan believed it was more difficult to make a bus
38 solution work for families with children and a lot of equipment and mentioned incentives geared
39 toward single-occupancy vehicles. He also expressed concerns that certain measures to incentivize
40 users to move onto public transportation would have more of an impact on lower-income residents.
41 Discussions were had about parking at ski resorts.
42

43 Mr. Rafferty stated that it was difficult for him to support a recommendation that was not included
44 on the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda. He felt it was premature to ask Council Members
45 to vote on the recommendation. Mr. Shea suggested that there be a two-week period where
46 Stakeholders Council Members could study and amend the recommendation. Mr. Perez wanted

1 to hear more from the Stakeholders Council about what they envisioned. He noted that the next
2 two weeks would be extremely busy for CWC staff.

3
4 Dave Fields noted that UDOT was working on a transportation solution, the CWC Board was
5 working on a transportation recommendation, and now it seemed that the Stakeholders Council
6 was working on a separate recommendation. Mr. Shea explained that the role of the Stakeholders
7 Council was to advise the CWC. He felt it was consistent with the role of the Stakeholders Council
8 to pass along suggestions to the CWC Board.

9
10 The Council Members discussed an additional meeting of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez
11 reported that it would be difficult to accommodate schedules. Mr. Shea suggested that the
12 recommendation be added to Google Docs and the members of the Stakeholders Council could
13 make comments or observations. From there, a final document could be put together and circulated
14 to Stakeholders Council Members. Members could express support or opposition.

15
16 Chair Bricker was excused from the remainder of the meeting. Co-Chair Striefel assumed the
17 Chair.

18
19 Executive Director, Ralph Becker appreciated the interest and investment of time that the
20 Stakeholders Council had taken. He noted that everything that was discussed previously by the
21 Stakeholders Council had been brought forward to the Commission. Mr. Becker discussed the
22 recommendation made by Mr. Shea. He did not believe the item was on the agenda as an action
23 item. The Commission had a position that all action items needed to be noted for consideration.
24 Council Members debated whether or not a vote on the recommendation would be appropriate.

25
26 Mr. Becker reported that certain comments made during the Stakeholders Council Meeting had
27 been inaccurate, specifically as it relates to information about UTA. He noted that CWC Staff
28 could ask UTA if they would be willing to visit with the Stakeholders Council to further review
29 information. Additionally, all formally presented information could be found on the CWC website
30 or the Utah Public Notice website. Mr. Becker suggested that the Stakeholders Council consider
31 all information, as presented by the experts, prior to a vote.

32
33 Co-Chair Striefel discussed possible next steps. She commented that she and Chair Bricker could
34 meet with CWC staff to determine the best approach. Mr. Shea reiterated his suggestion that the
35 recommendation be added to Google Docs for members of the Stakeholders Council to comment
36 on. A resolution could be put forward by Zoom or via email. Co-Chair Striefel liked the idea of
37 putting the document on Google Docs for Stakeholders Council feedback.

38
39 Mr. Hutchinson believed there was a motion on the floor. He noted that Mr. Shea had read the
40 original recommendation dated April 21, 2021. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Mr. Shea
41 proposed an amendment to the recommendation. He asked that it also state:

- 42
43
- 44 • There will be a two-week period of time for the Stakeholders Council to review, comment,
45 and amend the draft, after which there will be a meeting duly called for the Stakeholders
46 Council to consider further actions on the recommendation.

1 It was noted that Mr. Shea did not make a motion on the recommendation. He brought up a topic
2 of conversation about the recommendation. Discussions were had about whether there was a
3 motion on the table. Mr. Becker commented that he would want to defer to CWC legal counsel.
4 However, CWC staff had not had a chance to consult with CWC Attorney, Shane Topham about
5 the recommendation because the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda did not include an action
6 item. Mr. Becker discussed how to move forward. He stated that CWC staff would do everything
7 possible to bring the matter back before the Stakeholders Council in a forum that follows all
8 requirements of State law and CWC procedures.

9
10 Mr. Becker did not want to commit to a two-week timeframe but felt the item could be addressed
11 within one month. Co-Chair Striefel agreed that it might take more than two weeks. She
12 recommended that the item not be voted on during the current Stakeholders Council Meeting.
13 Further discussions were had about how to appropriately move forward. Co-Chair Striefel
14 referenced her previous suggestion that she and Chair Bricker meet with CWC Staff to determine
15 a suitable approach and then report back to the Stakeholders Council.

16
17 There was discussion about whether a motion had been made. Co-Chair Striefel asked Mr. Shea
18 if he would be willing to take back his motion. Mr. Shea felt that the best solution was to have
19 individual Stakeholders Council members make comments on the recommendation, let CWC staff
20 review the document, and then have additional discussion in two weeks.

21
22 Ms. Cameron asked that an amendment be made to the recommendation. She wanted information
23 related to Big Cottonwood Canyon to be included and wondered if the motion could be postponed
24 until that was done. Mr. Shea was in support of that. Mr. Braun seconded the motion. Discussions
25 were had about whether there needed to be a vote. It was noted it was acceptable to place a motion
26 in pending status for a future meeting. Co-Chair Striefel stated that there was no need to vote on
27 the motion. Mr. Shea confirmed that it now had a pending status.

28
29 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

30
31 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to adjourn. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion
32 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

33
34 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
35 5:35 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, April 21, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____