

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
2 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2021, AT 3:00 P.M. THE**
3 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**
4

5 **Present:** William McCarvill, Chair
6 Barbara Cameron, Vice Chair
7 Nate Furman
8 Kurt Hegmann
9 Brian Hutchinson
10 John Knoblock
11 Carolyn Keigley
12 Don Despain
13 Hilary Lambert
14 Carl Fisher
15 Erin Bragg
16 Alex Porpora
17 Mike Christensen
18 Kelly Boardman
19 Maura Hahnenberger
20 Roger Borgenicht
21 Dennis Goreham
22 Paul Diegel
23 Patrick Shea
24 Dave Fields
25 Michael Braun
26 Del Draper
27 Sarah Bennett
28 Megan Nelson
29 Christopher Robinson
30 Steven Issowits
31 Ed Marshall
32 Patrick Nelson
33

34 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
35 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
36 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
37 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
38

39 **OPENING**
40

41 **1. William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
42 **Council.**
43

44 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.
45

1 **2. William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic**
2 **Meeting as Per Legislative Requirements.**
3

4 Chair McCarvill read the following statement:
5

6 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, I as the Chair of the Stakeholders Council of the Central
7 Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined that conducting Stakeholder Council Meetings
8 at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks to the health
9 and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the overall incidents of
10 COVID-19 cases have diminished somewhat over the last couple of months, the pandemic remains
11 and the recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid
12 another surge in cases, which could then threaten to overwhelm Utah’s health care system.’
13

14 **3. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholder Council DRAFT**
15 **Minutes of Wednesday, April 21, 2021.**
16

17 **MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Minutes from
18 Wednesday, April 21, 2021. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
19 unanimous consent of the Council.
20

21 **4. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council DRAFT**
22 **Minutes of Wednesday, April 28, 2021.**
23

24 Vice Chair Barbara Cameron noted that page 7 of the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes from
25 Wednesday, April 28, 2021, referenced a substitute motion from Patrick Shea. A voice vote was
26 taken and the results were 12 aye, 11 nay, and 6 abstentions. Vice-Chair Cameron noted that the
27 minutes stated that the motion passed 12-to-11. She believed the minutes should read that the
28 motion failed because there was not a majority of yes votes. There were 29 Stakeholders Council
29 Members present at the meeting. The Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures document, on
30 Page 5, Section 6, Article E (2) states:
31

- 32 • Any agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council for approval
33 or recommendation to the CWC Board for approval.
34

35 **MOTION:** Vice-Chair Cameron moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes
36 from Wednesday, April 28, 2021, with an amendment to state that the substitute motion did not
37 pass as there was not a majority of affirmative votes. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion.
38

39 Chair McCarvill asked for discussion on the motion. Mr. Shea noted that a resolution is a
40 statement of principle and not a course of action. He felt it was important to represent that the
41 majority of Stakeholders Council Members that were present and voted wanted to support the
42 resolution. Vice-Chair Cameron noted that because there were six abstentions, there was not a
43 majority vote in favor of the resolution. Chair McCarvill believed the minutes reflected the
44 intention of the Stakeholders Council. The 12-11-6 vote was an indication of where the
45 Stakeholders Council stood. Brian Hutchinson believed the issue warranted more investigation
46 into Robert’s Rules of Order. His interpretation was that the majority voted ‘aye’ on the motion.

1
2 Vice-Chair Cameron noted that what constitutes a majority was identified in the Rules and
3 Procedures document. If the Stakeholders Council wants to change what constituted a majority,
4 that could be done in the future. She explained that a majority vote is over half of all present
5 Stakeholders Council Members and the vote did not meet that requirement. Mr. Hutchinson
6 commented that that is one interpretation of the language in the Rules and Procedures.

7
8 Chair McCarvill noted that there was some uncertainty about whether Vice-Chair Cameron had
9 read the Rules and Procedures accurately. He asked CWC Staff for input. CWC Executive
10 Director, Ralph Becker, felt that the language was fairly straightforward. If Stakeholders Council
11 Members want different language in the Rules and Procedures document, they have the right to
12 recommend that to the CWC Board. CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen, shared the
13 Rules and Procedures section that related to voting.

14
15 Chair McCarvill noted that there had been a motion, a second, and discussion. He called for a vote
16 on the item. Annalee Munsey and Brian Hutchinson asked to abstain from the vote. Michael
17 Braun asked for further discussion. He noted that the Rules and Procedures Document states that
18 any agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council. 12 is greater than
19 11 and is greater than 6. Vice Chair Cameron reported that there were 29 Stakeholders Council
20 Members present at the meeting. As a result, a majority of the vote would be 15. Mr. Braun
21 commented that the issue was moot as the process had moved forward already. Chair McCarvill
22 tabled all further discussion and brought the item back for a vote.

23
24 **MOTION:** Vice-Chair Cameron moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes
25 from Wednesday, April 28, 2021, with an amendment to state that the substitute motion did not
26 pass as there was not a majority of affirmative votes. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. Brian
27 Hutchinson and Carl Fisher voted Nay. Annalee Munsey abstained from the vote. The remaining
28 27 Stakeholders Council Members voted Aye. The motion passed.

29
30 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEMBER WELCOME**

31
32 **1. New Members of the Stakeholders Council will Briefly Introduce Themselves.**

33
34 Chair McCarvill reported that there are several new members of the Stakeholders Council. He
35 asked that each member introduce themselves.

36
37 Erin Bragg reported that she resides in Oakley, Utah, and is currently taking part in a seasonal
38 position in Anchorage, Alaska related to long-term ecological monitoring. She attended Graduate
39 School at the University of Utah and received an Environmental Humanities degree. Additionally,
40 Ms. Bragg was in the process of obtaining a Graduate Certificate from Utah State University in
41 the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).

42
43 Alex Porpora serves as the Executive Director of the Utah Society for Environmental Education
44 who works with education providers as well as local, City, and State agencies to help forward the
45 field of education through best practices, training, an annual conference, awards, and advocacy on

1 behalf of the field of environmental education. Ms. Porpora resides in Salt Lake City and was
2 delighted to join the Stakeholders Council.

3
4 Mike Christensen resides in Salt Lake City in the Rose Park neighborhood. He is a recent graduate
5 of the University of Utah City and Metropolitan Planning Master's Program. Additionally, he has
6 a Graduate Certificate in Sustainability from the University of Utah. Mr. Christensen reported that
7 he serves as the Executive Director of the Utah Rail Passengers Association and looked forward
8 to sharing input on some of the different ways public transit could be improved within the Wasatch
9 Canyons.

10
11 Kelly Boardman has a degree in Urban Planning from the University of California San Diego and
12 a Masters' Degree in Geography from the University of Utah. She had worked previously as an
13 Environmental Planner and done watershed management plans in the State of Utah.
14 Ms. Boardman was currently working in the ski industry. She serves as the Head Coach for the
15 Freeride Team at Solitude and worked there full-time. Ms. Boardman noted that she resides in the
16 Top of the World neighborhood and has lived in Cottonwood Heights for 24 years.

17
18 Maura Hahnenberger commented that she has lived in Salt Lake County for 20 years and currently
19 lives in the Sandy Hills area. She had a Ph.D. in Atmospheric Science from the University of Utah
20 and was currently an Associate Professor in the Geosciences Department at Salt Lake Community
21 College. Ms. Hahnenberger had a strong interest in education related to climate change, air quality,
22 and water within Utah. She is a skier, hiker, and climber and loves the canyons.

23
24 Roger Borgenicht resides in Salt Lake City in the Lower Avenues and was Co-Chair of Utahns for
25 Better Transportation, which was instrumental in getting the Legacy Parkway as a parkway and
26 continuous bicycle trail. He has been very involved in transit and active transportation activities.
27 Mr. Borgenicht was very excited to be part of the Stakeholders Council.

28
29 Dennis Goreham reported that he is the Conservation Director for the Wasatch Mountain Club.
30 He is a Geographer and ran the State of Utah's GIS program for 20 years. He retired approximately
31 10 years ago. Mr. Goreham moved to Utah in 1978 and has been hiking, climbing, bicycling, and
32 skiing in the Wasatch ever since.

33
34 Hilary Lambert was the incoming CEO of the Wasatch Mountain Institute, an educational non-
35 profit focused on the intersection of recreation and field science education. The aim was to get
36 students from the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back to experience immersive overnight outdoor
37 education and recreation experiences in the Wasatch as well as develop an understanding of where
38 their water comes from. It also provides students with tools to recreate responsibly and be
39 interested in the future of the Wasatch Mountains. Ms. Lambert has a Masters' Degree in
40 Curriculum and Instruction and experience in education. Additionally, she is an avid skier, hiker,
41 and climber in the canyons.

42
43 Chair McCarvill noted that he and Vice Chair Cameron would be calling all new Stakeholders
44 Council Members to personally welcome them to the Stakeholders Council. Calls would also be
45 made to existing Stakeholders Council Members to determine how they feel the Advisory Council

1 is working. Some of those calls had already been made. Chair McCarvill noted that there had
2 been interesting and informative conversations with those he had spoken to thus far.

3
4 **LCC DEIS DISCUSSION**

5
6 **1. Stakeholders will Make General Comments on the DEIS.**

7
8 **a. Comments will be Limited to Two Minutes Each.**

9
10 Chair McCarvill noted that discussions will take place related to the Utah Department of
11 Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement
12 (“EIS”) and how it matches with the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document.
13 Each member was allotted approximately two minutes. If that was not an adequate amount of time
14 for discussion, he was prepared to set up a separate Stakeholders Council Meeting related to the
15 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS so everyone could be heard.

16
17 John Knoblock believed that the road widening for a bus lane would have a larger watershed
18 impact than the gondola. The gondola seemed less likely to cause potential impacts to the
19 watershed, which was listed as a priority in the MTS Pillars Document. Mr. Knoblock mentioned
20 the last pillar, related to forwarding the legislation, and noted that he did not know that UDOT
21 could do anything about that. He referenced the tolling stations and stated that if single-occupant
22 vehicles were removed from the road, many other issues may resolve themselves. In terms of
23 visitor capacity, a gondola system could stop loading cars and with the enhanced bus alternative,
24 the variable tolling cost could be increased significantly to reduce the number of vehicles.

25
26 Del Draper reported that he drives up and down Little Cotton Canyon regularly. In his experience,
27 that road works 99% of the time and there are only 15 to 30 days per year that it does not work.
28 He noted that the real issue is traffic on Wasatch Boulevard rather than in the canyon itself.
29 Mr. Draper wondered if there was room in the process for incremental changes to be made. For
30 instance, start with tolling to see how much that reduced vehicles on the road. He did not believe
31 a dedicated bus lane in the canyon would be needed but rather the issues on Wasatch Boulevard
32 should be addressed first. It would make sense to work on more incremental solutions rather than
33 to focus on a \$600 million solution. Additionally, Mr. Draper believed UDOT had created a false
34 equivalency between the gondola and the enhanced bus alternative because so much environmental
35 damage would take place from the road widening. The same was true with dollars. Both of the
36 alternatives would cost approximately the same amount. However, the bus alternative would not
37 cost as much if the road was not widened.

38
39 Mr. Shea reported that he sent a request to Ms. Nielsen and CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez at
40 the beginning of the meeting. The request was to discuss a possible resolution. He commented
41 that with controversial subjects, a procedure often begins to delay the process rather than getting
42 to the heart of the issue. Mr. Shea explained that the resolution questioned the need to spend \$186
43 million on road widening, \$86 million on snowsheds, and \$99 million for two transit hubs. He felt
44 that if there was some kind of money available at the City or State level, it could be used to maintain
45 some kind of trust fund for Little Cottonwood Canyon or Big Cottonwood Canyon instead.

1 Mr. Shea did not agree with the spending high amounts of money to benefit two ski resorts, some
2 State Legislators, and other public officials who would profit from the gondola.

3
4 Mr. Perez noted that the email from Mr. Shea had been received at the start of the meeting. It
5 would be up to Chair McCarvill and Vice-Chair Cameron whether they would like to present that
6 resolution. Chair McCarvill suggested that the meeting continue as planned. If there was
7 additional time at the end of the meeting, the resolution could be looked at by the Stakeholders
8 Council. Chair McCarvill noted that whatever was presented would not be actionable at the current
9 meeting and could not be voted upon as it was not on the official Stakeholders Council agenda.

10
11 Ms. Lambert commented that there is not much difference between the UDOT enhanced bus
12 service alternative and the enhanced bus service in peak period with the shoulder lane alternative.
13 The mobility goals were the same, both had snowsheds, both increased reliability, and both
14 decreased the travel time from the no-action alternative. Ms. Lambert pointed out that the
15 transportation time was shorter for the enhanced bus alternative that had not been selected as a
16 preferred alternative by UDOT than it was for the gondola alternative. She felt it would be
17 beneficial to recommend that UDOT reconsider that alternative. Ms. Lambert agreed with other
18 Stakeholders Council Members that incremental changes, such as tolling and snowsheds, could be
19 the best way to proceed. Once a gondola is built or a road widened, it cannot be undone.

20
21 Carl Fisher appreciated Ms. Lambert's comment related to the enhanced bus alternative that did
22 not include road widening. He reported that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS
23 discussed the benefits of the avalanche sheds, which only amounted to approximately 6 to 11 days.
24 It was important to note that the avalanche sheds were included with both the enhanced bus
25 alternative as well as the gondola alternative. Mr. Fisher believed it was important to remember
26 that there were certain controlling mechanisms that helped to protect the watershed. For instance,
27 there was a level of control on the road. If another mode of transportation was introduced, it would
28 be much more difficult to protect the watershed. He agreed with other comments that the existing
29 infrastructure in the canyons had not been used to the highest degree possible. Mr. Fisher felt that
30 a phased or incremental approach would be better.

31
32 Ms. Hahnenberger expressed concerns that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS had a
33 very narrow focus. Some of the transportation alternatives would shift the traffic issues and visitor
34 use issues to Big Cottonwood Canyon instead. It was important to consider both Big Cottonwood
35 Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon as well as how the chosen transportation alternative would
36 impact the nearby communities and existing transportation systems.

37
38 Ms. Porpora referenced the idea of year-round transit service in the MTS Pillars Document. The
39 way that busing was currently laid out, it was intended to prioritize the winter days. However, she
40 felt it was important to take a step back and consider accessibility. Ms. Porpora commented that
41 she was in favor of an incremental and phased approach. She also noted that it was important to
42 look into how to incentivize people to use an alternate mode of transportation.

43
44 Mr. Braun stated that the effectiveness of any transit solution in the canyons would be dependent
45 upon whether or not there was high-capacity, high-frequency transit from elsewhere in the valley
46 to the canyons. That was missing from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

1
2 **Nate Furman, Member of the Stakeholders Council will Provide Information**
3 **Pertaining to DEIS Proposed Alternative Impacts on Climbing Areas in the**
4 **Central Wasatch.**
5

6 Nate Furman reported that he is a Stakeholders Council Member and also serves on the Board of
7 the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance. Some of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance personnel took time to
8 determine where the potential roadway widening and gondola would affect climbing resources.
9 The gondola would affect 35 boulders and 142 problems. The enhanced bus with road widening
10 would affect 29 boulders and 131 problems. Mr. Furman shared maps to illustrate how each
11 alternative would impact the climbing resources in the canyon.
12

13 It was noted that the gondola would not cause the destruction of climbing resources. However, it
14 would dramatically impact the overall user experience. The road widening could cause more
15 destruction to the climbing resource as some boulders would be eliminated. Mr. Furman explained
16 that climbing had grown in popularity. As a result, there were more climbers utilizing natural and
17 irreplaceable resources. Since both alternatives would impact the user experience and the ability
18 to recreate, users would start to congregate around boulders that were less impacted by the
19 transportation alternatives. There would be more people than usual around the remaining boulders.
20

21 Mr. Furman noted that the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance did not support the gondola alternative or
22 the enhanced bus with road widening alternative due to the changes that would occur to the natural
23 resources. He offered to share his email address in the Zoom chat box for any Stakeholders
24 Council Members that wanted to discuss the information further. Chair McCarvill thanked
25 Mr. Furman for his informative presentation. Additional Stakeholders Council Member comments
26 were shared about the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.
27

28 Mr. Hutchinson commented that the enhanced bus alternative was encumbered by unnecessary
29 road widening and there were many other obstacles within that option that made it expensive and
30 less popular. He reported that during the Transportation Committee Meeting earlier that day,
31 UDOT stated that tolling would take place at the entrance of ski resorts. That would still invite
32 cars up the canyon and make the transit option less appealing. Mr. Hutchinson discussed the
33 importance of equal access to the canyons. Those without a vehicle, without access to a vehicle,
34 or who were unable to spend time waiting in traffic lines were unable to access the canyons. He
35 felt there needed to be some set guidelines and rules for UDOT as it related to equal access.
36

37 Chair McCarvill noted that CWC Chair Christopher Robinson was present at the Stakeholders
38 Council Meeting. CWC Chair Robinson thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for
39 continuing to dedicate time to the transportation discussions and to the CWC. He also welcomed
40 the new members to the Stakeholders Council.
41

42 Mr. Braun believed the MTS Pillars Document was very comprehensive. He asked Mr. Becker
43 whether the CWC Board had ever taken a vote on the five transportation alternatives presented by
44 UDOT. Mr. Becker reported that there had not been a vote on each specific option, but there had
45 been more than a dozen discussions related to the different options. It was apparent that there was
46 a split among CWC Board Members as it related to a transportation preference. CWC Chair

1 Robinson explained that the CWC operated under the principle of consensus. At no time had the
2 CWC Board reached a consensus on any of the transportation modes. The MTS Pillars Document
3 was intended to state that the CWC Board had been unable to reach a consensus on a specific
4 transportation alternative but there were several areas where consensus was reached.
5

6 Mr. Braun noted that what he heard from the Stakeholders Council was that neither of the two
7 transportation alternatives was appropriate. He commented that the Granite Community Council
8 had been able to come up with an opinion about what would be best for Little Cottonwood Canyon
9 and had been able to share that. While he felt the work done by the CWC Board was important
10 and the MTS Pillars Document was robust and clear, he wondered when the CWC Board would
11 make a clear decision. CWC Chair Robinson explained that the CWC Board needed to speak with
12 a united voice. The CWC Board wanted the Stakeholders Council to evaluate the UDOT Little
13 Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS and forward their recommendation.
14

15 Steven Issowits stated that there had been a lot of great comments. He noted that the ski resorts
16 had implemented reservations and paid parking but he did not believe that had solved all of the
17 transportation issues. Mr. Issowits referenced the comments shared by Mr. Braun. While the
18 CWC was a consensus group, it did not seem that there was a lot of consensus happening due to a
19 lack of balance. He stressed the importance that everyone works together to achieve more balance.
20

21 **MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**

22 **1. Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Provide an Update on the** 23 **Work of the Committee to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted on the Utah** 24 **Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.** 25

26
27 Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, reported that the Millcreek Canyon
28 Committee had spent the last four or five months talking to Salt Lake County, Millcreek City, and
29 the U.S. Forest Service about the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant and the proposed
30 work in Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Diegel noted that the Committee had been providing input on the
31 design direction and were monitoring the progress of the grant.
32

33 Chair McCarvill asked for more information on the FLAP grant. Mr. Diegel explained that it was
34 a grant that provided transportation updates. The last he heard, all that remained was for the
35 County to sign off on the agreement for the FLAP grant. It would include the area from the Winter
36 Gate to Upper Big Water and would have lane widening, rearranging, restriping, parking lot
37 rearrangements, and some enhancements for visitor experience at the trailheads. The total project
38 value was \$19.6 million and the intention was that this could be the first phase of two. Salt Lake
39 County and the Forest Service planned to apply for a second phase to continue the work.
40

41 Mr. Hutchinson was not in support of the development. He felt the proposal would dramatically
42 alter the character of the upper part of Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Hutchinson believed the issue
43 warranted wider consideration from the CWC. The original intention was to look at bathrooms
44 and infrastructure in order to ready the canyon for a shuttle system. The FLAP grant project
45 included road widening and straightening as well as wall reinforcement. Mr. Draper reported that

1 the Forest Service believed the road improvements could take place with a categorical exclusion
2 to NEPA. There would be one public outreach meeting.

3
4 Mr. Knoblock added that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had been told that the road was failing.
5 It was not built with the proper foundation underneath and it was slumping down into the creek.
6 The road needed to be rebuilt to last long-term. 24-feet was proposed. Mr. Knoblock wondered
7 whether there should be 11-foot traffic lanes or whether the traffic lanes should remain at 9-foot-
8 wide and include the addition of a 4-foot bicycle lane. Many of the Millcreek Canyon Committee
9 Members wanted there to be a bicycle lane with the narrower road in order to prevent vehicle
10 speeds from increasing and to accommodate cyclists.

11
12 Ed Marshall stated that the FLAP grant program was strictly for transportation and access. It was
13 never intended for infrastructure, so projects like restrooms and trailhead improvements were not
14 allowed under the program. The FLAP grant was currently waiting to have matching funds come
15 in from local sources. Originally, the project area was going to be from Elbow Fork to the top of
16 the canyon. The engineers for the FLAP grant decided that they would like the area to go down
17 further, which added quite a bit of additional cost. While the FLAP grant amount would be
18 increased, there was also a need for a greater contribution from the local community.

19 20 TRAILS COMMITTEE UPDATE

21 22 1. John Knoblock Chair of the Trails Committee will Provide an Update on the 23 Committee Work Completed to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted on the 24 Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.

25
26 Mr. Knoblock, Chair of the Trails Committee, reported that the main goal of the Committee was
27 to review, comment, and be participants in a County-wide Trails Master Plan process. However,
28 at the last meeting, Martin Jensen with Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation stated that he did
29 not have the staff or budget available to take that on. Mayor Jenny Wilson said that she was taking
30 funding for that plan under consideration for the 2022 budget.

31
32 Brighton was required by law to do a General Plan. As part of their General Plan process, Mayor
33 Dan Knopp wanted to include a Trails Master Plan for Brighton. Zinnia Wilson, the Trails
34 Manager with the Forest Service, said that the Forest Service would like to be partners to ensure
35 that whatever trails plan was developed by Brighton would be actionable. The Greater Salt Lake
36 Municipal Services District (“MSD”) would be hired to lead the planning process. That work
37 would tie into the Forest Service trails inventory process. The Forest Service was currently trying
38 to clean up and color code a trails inventory map that was dedicated to the user-created trails in
39 the Central Wasatch. Mr. Knoblock explained that the inventory would determine:

- 40
- 41 • Which user-created trails could potentially become official trails;
- 42 • Which user-created trails should remain as user-created trails; and
- 43 • Which user-created trails went through sensitive areas and should be eliminated.
- 44

1 The Trails Committee had also tried to expand the list of family-friendly hikes and determine what
2 needed to be done to fix certain trails so they could become family-friendly. This would ensure
3 that Silver Lake and Donut Falls were not the only family-friendly attractions.
4

5 Patrick Nelson noted that he had just heard about the Brighton Trails Plan a few days earlier. He
6 stressed the importance of trails maintenance and hoped that it would be considered in the process.
7 Additionally, Salt Lake City Public Utilities needed to finish its Watershed Management Plan.
8 The current timeline for the Watershed Management Plan was next summer. Chair McCarvill
9 agreed that trail maintenance was a critical issue to think about.
10

11 **VISITOR USE COMMITTEE UPDATE**

13 **1. Annalee Munsey and William McCarvill, Chair and Co-Chair of the Visitor Use 14 Committee will Provide Updated Information.**

16 **a. Information on the Contracting of Utah State University to Complete Phase I 17 of the Visitor Use Study is Available on the Utah Public Notice Website and 18 the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

19
20 Ms. Munsey, Chair of the Visitor Use Committee, shared background information related to the
21 Committee. She explained that the Stakeholders Council created the Visitor Use Committee in
22 January 2020 and it included 12 members from the Stakeholders Council. At that time, Dr. Kelly
23 Bricker was on the subcommittee and presented a prospectus for a Visitor Use Study that included
24 two phases. Since that time, the Committee had explored funding options for the study.
25

26 The Committee and CWC Staff recommended that Phase I be funded by the CWC. The CWC
27 Board approved funding for Phase I of the study. The Visitor Use Study Work Group was created
28 to provide input on the request for proposal (“RFP”) and to review the submissions. The Visitor
29 Use Study Work Group consisted of Stakeholders Council Members, CWC Board Members as
30 well as Patrick Nelson and Helen Peters. Input on the RFP was provided, it was posted and many
31 responses were received. A decision was made in March 2021 and a consultant was selected. The
32 contract was approved in April 2021 for Utah State University to handle Phase I. The RFP also
33 mentioned Phase II. Ms. Munsey noted that the intention of Phase I was to answer the following:
34

- 35 • What key indicators do we need to pay attention to and what data about recreation use in
36 the canyon currently exists?
- 37 • What are the most appropriate ecological, physical and social indicators for distinct types
38 of recreation settings within the canyons?
- 39 • What indicators should be prioritized in Phase II of the project to most effectively guide
40 management decisions and investments in outdoor recreation infrastructure throughout the
41 canyons?
42

43 Ms. Munsey reported that Phase I was nearly complete and the consultant had prepared a Phase I
44 Draft Report. On July 28, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. there would be a CWC Visitor Use Indicator
45 Development Workshop, where the consultant, Dr. Jordan Smith, would discuss the report.
46

1 The funding for Phase II of the Visitor Use Study was currently being evaluated. Ms. Munsey
2 reported that the proposed cost was \$288,212.64. It was recently reported that there was an
3 opportunity to collaborate with the Forest Service on the social aspect of the Visitor Use Study. If
4 the CWC approved the collaboration, it could save as much as two-thirds of the costs that had been
5 allocated to the social aspects of the study.
6

7 Ms. Munsey noted that the Visitor Use Committee supported looking at all aspects of use in the
8 canyon: social, recreational, economic, and ecological. The Visitor Use Committee recommended
9 reconvening in November 2021 to reevaluate the need for the Committee. A recommendation
10 would be made to the Stakeholders Council during the January 2022 meeting. Mr. Becker added
11 that the State appropriated \$95,000 to help the CWC with the cost of the Visitor Use Study. They
12 were very appreciative and it had made a notable difference.
13

14 **PRESERVATION COMMITTEE UPDATE**

15 16 **1. Carl Fisher and Megan Nelson, Chair and Co-Chair of the Preservation Committee** 17 **will Provide Updates on Committee Meetings and Direction.** 18

19 Mr. Fisher reported that the Preservation Committee had met twice. The Committee had been
20 unable to meet recently due to scheduling conflicts. However, certain members of the Committee
21 were working on issues related to diversity and inclusion. There had been some outreach to
22 minority organizations to try to better understand their perspectives on the issues confronting the
23 Wasatch. It was important that all users of the canyon felt included, engaged, and heard.
24

25 Additionally, the Preservation Committee wanted to hear from other leaders around the region.
26 The Committee was trying to line up speakers from Leave No Trace Center for Outdoor Ethics
27 and The Sawtooth Society but it had been difficult for their schedules and the Preservation
28 Committee Member schedules to align. Mr. Fisher hoped that another meeting would take place
29 within the next month or so.
30

31 **CWC STAFF UPDATE**

32 33 **1. Staff will Provide Information on Other Areas of CWC Work.** 34

35 **a. Environmental Dashboard.** 36

37 Chair McCarvill reported that CWC Staff would provide updates related to other areas of CWC
38 work. Ms. Nielsen shared information about the Environmental Dashboard. She reported that
39 they were in the midst of creating template pages, which would be workshopped and reviewed by
40 the Environmental Dashboard team at the University of Utah. The data amalgamation was moving
41 along well. Ms. Nielsen noted that one of the elements, soils, was nearly done with the data
42 amalgamation. The current focus was trying to determine how to best get the information into a
43 consumable format for everyone that wanted to use it. She explained that there would be a large
44 span of user groups that would need to be able to use the Environmental Dashboard.
45

1 **b. Short-Term Projects.**
2

3 Ms. Nielsen shared information related to short-term projects. She reported that in the last fiscal
4 year, the CWC allocated funding for six short-term projects and entered into partnerships with
5 organizations such as Alta Ski Lifts for some sign restoration around the Cecret Lake area, the Salt
6 Lake Climbers Alliance for the Jacob Ladder reroute project, and the Cottonwood Canyons
7 Foundation for their preservation sustainability initiative, which would hire trails crews to provide
8 trails maintenance throughout the tri-canyon area.
9

10 Additionally, there was a partnership with Utah Open Lands to partially fund two projects for the
11 season: the Bonanza Flat Trailhead Transit Program and the Cottonwood Canyons Stewardship
12 Program. The transit program was a shuttle service from Park City to some of the most heavily
13 trafficked trails in the Wasatch Back. The stewardship program was a Utah Open Lands staff-
14 administered user survey, which was intended to inform the land managers of the various uses.
15 Lastly, there was a partnership with the Utah Geological Association and the Town of Brighton to
16 replace some existing geological interpretive signage in Big Cottonwood Canyon.
17

18 Ms. Bragg asked about the Utah Open Lands transit program. She wondered whether there was a
19 condition as part of that grant that vehicles would need to be removed from the road. Ms. Nielsen
20 explained that there were no conditions included with the short-term projects grant.
21

22 **c. Transportation Committee.**
23

24 Mr. Perez shared updates related to the Transportation Committee. He reported that the MTS
25 Pillars Document had been developed and was sent to UDOT shortly before the release of the
26 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was published. The Transportation Committee had
27 met earlier that day to start to craft a direction on a potential comment document to UDOT ahead
28 of the September 3, 2021 deadline for comments related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon
29 Draft EIS. Mr. Perez anticipated that there would be one more meeting before that deadline in
30 order to refine any document comments that were developed.
31

32 Mr. Perez noted that part of the State appropriations were for the bus bypass service. The CWC
33 had been working with the local police departments, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), and UDOT
34 on implementing the bus bypass service for the upcoming season. The concept was that on trigger
35 days (weekends and heavy snow days) the local police department would provide an escort service
36 for the buses, in areas where it was deemed safe and appropriate, in order for those buses to bypass
37 congestion and get up to the ski resorts faster. Progress was being made related to that service.
38

39 Vice-Chair Cameron added that the Transportation Committee had discussed tolling in the most
40 recent meeting. Vince Izzo from the UDOT EIS team reported that if Little Cottonwood Canyon
41 was tolled then Big Cottonwood Canyon would be tolled as well. The toll gantry would be placed
42 at lower Solitude and lower Snowbird to allow backcountry access to the lower canyon without
43 tolling. Additionally, Mr. Izzo reported that there likely would not be anything in place for five
44 years. It would take a year or so to obtain funding from the Legislature and there would be a few
45 years needed for the installation of the chosen transportation alternative.
46

1 **d. Legislative/Land Tenure Committee.**
2

3 Mr. Becker shared updates related to the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee. He reported that
4 many Stakeholders Council Members participated in the development of the Central Wasatch
5 National Conservation Recreation Area (“CWNCR”) Act. A fifth draft was put out for public
6 review in October 2020. Many comments were received and those comments had been
7 summarized. Mr. Becker reported that a Legislative/Land Tenure Committee Meeting would take
8 place on August 18, 2021. The Meeting Materials Packet would include a summary of the
9 comments as well as potential changes to the Legislation. The intention was to bring the
10 Legislation back to the CWC Board in the next few months. As decisions were being made about
11 transportation, one of the pillar conditions would be ready for congressional consideration.
12

13 **OPEN DISCUSSION**
14

15 Mr. Shea had shared his one-page resolution in the Zoom chatbox. He believed the Stakeholders
16 Council was looking at smaller things but was avoiding some of the larger fundamental questions.
17 He suggested that the Stakeholders Council allow time for everyone to review the resolution, edit
18 it, make comments and ask questions. Then there could be another meeting before the end of
19 August to discuss the resolution or any substitute motion. Mr. Shea felt the resolution would be a
20 good catalyst for discussion. Mr. Fisher noted that the meeting would need to happen before the
21 end of July 2021 because the next CWC Board Meeting was scheduled for early August.
22

23 Chair McCarvill felt that it was important to have a balance between discussion and information
24 during the meetings. The Stakeholders Council was currently meeting quarterly and he believed
25 it was difficult to fit both the discussion items and informational items into one meeting. Chair
26 McCarvill wondered whether there was a preference to prioritize discussion time or information
27 time. He asked Stakeholders Council Members to think about that and share feedback within the
28 next several days. He also asked Stakeholders Council Members to consider whether they were
29 willing to hold another meeting to further discuss the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.
30

31 Mr. Fisher felt the subcommittees were doing great work. It was good to hear updates related to
32 each committee but he suggested that only the action items committees planned to bring to the full
33 CWC Board be shared. The Meeting Minutes were available and all meetings were open and
34 available to listen to or participate in. Mr. Fisher believed that might provide additional time
35 during the actual Stakeholders Council Meetings to discuss other items.
36

37 **ADJOURN MEETING**
38

39 **1. William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
40 **Council.**
41

42 **MOTION:** [redacted] moved to adjourn the Stakeholders Council Meeting. [redacted] seconded the
43 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
44

45 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:00 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, July 21, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____