

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) SPECIAL**
2 **MEETING OF THE STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL HELD, THURSDAY, JULY 29, 2021,**
3 **AT 4:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**
4

5 **Present:** William McCarvill, Chair
6 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair
7 Don Despain
8 Maura Hahnenberger
9 Dennis Goreham
10 Del Draper
11 Mike Marker
12 Hilary Lambert
13 Carl Fisher
14 Mike Christensen
15 Nathan Rafferty
16 Kirk Nichols
17 Kurt Hegmann
18 Roger Borgenicht
19 Alex Porpora
20 Dave Fields
21 Nate Furman
22 Brian Hutchinson
23 Sarah Bennett
24 Steven Issowits
25 John Knoblock
26 Michael Braun
27

28 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
29 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
30 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
31 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
32

33 **1. Opening – This is a Special Meeting Called at the Discretion of the Chair.**
34

35 **a. William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
36 **Council.**
37

38 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.
39

40 **b. William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic**
41 **Meetings as Per Legislative Requirements.**
42

43 Chair McCarvill read the following statement:
44

45 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, I as the Chair of the Stakeholders
46 Council of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined

1 that conducting Stakeholder Council Meetings at any time during the next
2 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks to the health and
3 safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the
4 overall incidents of COVID-19 cases have diminished somewhat over the
5 last couple of months, the pandemic remains and the recent rise of more
6 infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another
7 surge in cases, which could then threaten to overwhelm Utah’s health care
8 system.’
9

10 c. **William McCarvill will Read the Approach to the August 29, 2021, Special**
11 **Meeting of the Stakeholders Council.**
12

13 Chair McCarvill reported that the comments for the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) were due on September 3, 2021. There was a Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Meeting scheduled for August 2, 2021. In order to share something with the CWC Board, the Stakeholders Council decided to hold a Special Meeting of the Stakeholders Council. Chair McCarvill explained that there were two preferred alternatives included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS:

- 21 • Enhanced Bus with Roadway Widening for Peak-Period (Shoulder Lane);
- 22 • Gondola B (From La Caille) with Bus from Mobility Hubs.

23
24 UDOT would choose one preferred alternative in the winter. Chair McCarvill felt this was an opportunity for the Stakeholders Council to contribute and make each alternative the best it could be. He overviewed the approach for the Special Meeting of the Stakeholders Council. Stakeholders Council Members would be randomized into breakout session groups. Each group would have a moderator or Discussion Group Leader. The moderators included Co-Chair Barbara Cameron, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson, and CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker.

30
31 Stakeholders Council Members would share recommendations about how to improve the preferred alternatives. The moderators would make note of those recommendations. At the end of the exercise, Stakeholders Council Members would be asked to select the five areas they felt should be prioritized. This would create a rough ranking system of priorities. Chair McCarvill would compile the rankings and those rankings would be submitted to the CWC Board ahead of the CWC Board Meeting on August 2, 2021.

37
38 Don Despain asked how solid the La Caille site was for the gondola alternative. Chair McCarvill assumed it was secure since it was included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.
39
40

1 **2. Break-Out LLC DEIS Discussion Groups.**

2
3 **a. Stakeholders will Break Out into Groups to Discuss their Improvements to the**
4 **Two DEIS Transportation Modes.**

5
6 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen reported that there were currently 22
7 Stakeholders Council participants, not including CWC Staff. There would be three breakout
8 session groups led by Discussion Group Leaders. The breakout session would last for
9 approximately 40 minutes in total. 20 minutes would be dedicated to the gondola alternative and
10 20 minutes would be dedicated to the enhanced bus alternative listed in the UDOT Little
11 Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. Following the 40-minute breakout session, participants would
12 return to the regular Stakeholders Council Meeting. There would be a 15-minute break following
13 the session so the facilitators could compile all of the recommendations made.

14
15 **b. Breakout Session Summaries Presented by Discussion Group Leaders.**

16
17 **c. Drawing from the Summaries of Each Discussion Group, Desired Features for**
18 **Each Mode will be Identified and Reviewed.**

19
20 **d. Stakeholders will Receive a Form where they will be Asked to Rank the Top**
21 **Desired Features for Each Mode.**

22
23 Following the breakout session and 15-minute break, CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez, shared
24 his screen with Council Members. It showed all of the recommendations made by Stakeholders
25 Council Members during the breakout sessions. Ms. Nielsen explained that since there were so
26 many recommendations, Stakeholders Council Members would eventually select eight priority
27 areas for each preferred alternative. The selection process would take place individually on a
28 Google Form after the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Mr. Becker noted that Stakeholders Council
29 Leadership and CWC Staff had not had enough time to eliminate all duplications on the list. Those
30 duplications would be removed once the list was consolidated and finalized.

31
32 Brian Hutchinson wondered how missed suggestions would be added to the list. Chair McCarvill
33 explained that those could be submitted to CWC Staff and added. Mr. Perez reported that the
34 recommendations list would be emailed to all members of the Stakeholders Council and each
35 member would have until noon the following day to fill out the form.

36
37 Ms. Nielsen suggested that the Stakeholders Council Members scroll through the breakout session
38 recommendations to determine whether anything needed to be added to the list. She explained
39 that the recommendations list had been worked on by Stakeholders Council Leadership and CWC
40 Staff during the 15-minute break. Due to the time constraints, it was still in a rough format.
41 However, she noted that the list would be cleaned up following the meeting.

42
43 Ms. Nielsen further discussed the prioritization process that would take place after the meeting. If
44 this were an in-person meeting, each Council Member would be given eight stickers and those
45 stickers would be placed next to certain elements that the Council Member felt were important or
46 should be prioritized. Since this was not an in-person meeting, this would be a Digital Dot Voting

1 Exercise instead. All Stakeholders Council Members would be sent the Google Form and would
2 be asked to select eight preferences for each preferred alternative. The form would be submitted
3 to CWC Staff and would then be shared with Chair McCarvill and Co-Chair Cameron, who would
4 draft a memo that took the data into account.

5
6 Mr. Hutchinson commented that one of his recommendations was not phrased properly. Instead
7 of saying, “Bus priority on Wasatch,” it should read, “Transit only lanes on Wasatch and 9400
8 South.” Ms. Nielsen acknowledged the clarified language. It was noted that some of the items on
9 the list were statements of persuasion rather than recommendations. For instance, there was an
10 item that read, “The gondola is less impactful for the watershed.” That was an opinion or statement
11 rather than a recommendation. Chair McCarvill suggested that there could be a recommendations
12 list as well as a separate list with statements. Several of the Stakeholders Council Members
13 believed the list should only include recommendations.

14
15 Kurt Hegmann assumed the list would be condensed as there were several repeat items. Mr.
16 Becker noted that repeat recommendations from the different breakout session groups would be
17 removed following the meeting. Mr. Hutchinson wanted to clarify another one of his items on the
18 list. Rather than, “Toll at mouth of canyon,” he felt it should say, “Tolling at the entrance of all
19 three canyons.” A note was made about the clarified language.

20
21 Michael Braun wondered if it would be best to send the draft list out, receive feedback and then
22 start the Digital Dot Voting Exercise. It was noted that adding an additional step would be difficult
23 due to the tight timeline. Mr. Becker explained that Stakeholders Council Leadership and CWC
24 Staff had started to clean up the recommendations list during the 15-minute break and they would
25 continue to clean it up after the Stakeholders Council Meeting. That process would eliminate any
26 clear duplications. If there were any items missing from the list, he suggested that Stakeholders
27 Council Members add them now or send an email to CWC Staff so those items could be included.
28 Ms. Nielsen noted that the Google Form could still be edited after it was sent out.

29
30 Mike Marker commented that it seemed like the objective of the breakout session and the Special
31 Meeting was to end up with a prioritized list of recommendations for each transportation
32 alternative. Those recommendations could make each alternative better. However, he felt that no
33 preference was shown between the two transportation alternatives. There would be no sense of
34 where the Stakeholders Council stood collectively or which alternative the Council preferred.
35 Ms. Nielsen explained that the Stakeholders Council would receive the recommendations list and
36 then make eight selections for each preferred alternative. The data from that exercise would
37 highlight where the Stakeholders Council stood as it related to areas for improvement.

38
39 Chair McCarvill explained that he had not asked for a vote on a preferred alternative from the
40 Stakeholders Council because he felt the vote would be fractured and there would not be the
41 consensus. The Digital Dot Voting Exercise was the best the Council could do within the current
42 timeframe. He believed the data would be useful to the CWC Board because the CWC Board was
43 also split on the transportation alternatives. Chair McCarvill noted that the Mountain
44 Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document had been released because the CWC Board had
45 been unable to agree on one transportation alternative to support.

1 Mr. Marker noted that these kinds of decisions would always be somewhat political. He
2 commented that the Stakeholders Council included some of the best-informed members of the
3 community. Mr. Marker felt the Council would be doing a disservice if they did not let the CWC
4 Board know where they stood from a preference perspective. Mr. Marker believed that the Digital
5 Dot Voting Exercise would not be helpful to the CWC Board as it related to decision-making.

6
7 Mr. Becker explained that Chair McCarvill and Co-Chair Cameron spent a lot of time trying to
8 determine how to address the request made by a number of Stakeholders Council Members to hold
9 a Special Meeting. In the past, a Special Meeting had been held where the modes were debated
10 and a motion was made for a bus alternative as the preferred alternative. That vote had been split.
11 Mr. Becker reported that the information related to that motion and vote had been passed along to
12 the CWC Board at the time. When the recent request to hold another Special Meeting came
13 through, the feeling was that there would be a repeat of what happened during the last Special
14 Meeting. As a result, Chair McCarvill and Co-Chair Cameron decided to do something different
15 rather than rehash a process that would likely result in another split vote.

16
17 Mr. Braun agreed with the comments made by Mr. Marker. He believed that the Stakeholders
18 Council was a powerful group as it represented a large constituency of people. Mr. Braun had
19 brought up his ideas in both written and verbal format to CWC Staff. He wanted to see where the
20 Stakeholders Council stood in terms of a preferred alternative. While he agreed with the process
21 for the current Special Meeting, he felt that another Special Meeting would be beneficial in order
22 to reach a consensus on a preferred alternative. Chair McCarvill did not believe there would be a
23 consensus. Co-Chair Cameron noted that the vote was split last time. Mr. Braun pointed out that
24 the vote last time had been related to a resolution proposed by Patrick Shea. This vote would have
25 to do with a preference between the two transportation alternatives.

26
27 Carl Fisher felt that the recommendations list and the Digital Dot Voting Exercise were likely the
28 best that the Stakeholders Council would be able to do given the tight deadline. He commented
29 that there were some innovative ideas captured on the list. Mr. Fisher noted that there was one
30 theme that continued to arise in conversations with others about the UDOT Little Cottonwood
31 Canyon EIS. It had to do with the Purpose and Need Statement from UDOT. He wondered
32 whether the following questions could be posed in the form of a poll to the Stakeholders Council:

- 33
34
- Do we agree that the Purpose and Need Statement is the problem we are trying to solve?
 - Does the Purpose and Need Statement hit or miss the mark?
- 35
36

37 Mr. Fisher had heard many people say that they did not think UDOT was actually solving the
38 problems facing the canyons. John Knoblock agreed with the comments shared by Mr. Fisher. He
39 had encouraged Commissioners from the beginning to come to an agreement about what the
40 problem was that they were trying to solve. He did not feel there was agreement on that. Having
41 consensus about the underlying problem that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was trying
42 to solve would be beneficial. Mr. Knoblock noted that from his perspective, the UDOT Little
43 Cottonwood Canyon EIS was trying to solve the traffic issues associated with the ski resorts.

44
45 Chair McCarvill believed there had been a lot of good discussion during the Stakeholders Council
46 Meeting. Transportation was a difficult issue and there were a lot of conflicting interests. He

1 wondered if the Stakeholders Council would need to learn some new ways to work together in the
2 future. For instance, there may be alternate ways of problem-solving or approaching an issue.
3 Chair McCarvill asked Stakeholders Council Members to think about how to approach these types
4 of difficult issues in the future so either consensus would be possible or a vote would not be as
5 divisive. He wanted to find a way for the Stakeholders Council to work together better.
6

7 Dave Fields wondered if the data from the recommendations list and Digital Dot Voting Exercise
8 would be shared with the CWC Board. Chair McCarvill confirmed this. Mr. Fields felt this would
9 be instructive and provide the CWC Board with beneficial data to work with. Mr. Marker did not
10 feel that data would be helpful. Mr. Fields noted that UDOT was very invested in the EIS process.
11 He did not see them suddenly changing their Purpose and Need Statement and so, he appreciated
12 the recommendations list and Digital Dot Voting Exercise. It took the two preferred alternatives
13 and tried to make them as beneficial as possible through clear feedback.
14

15 Mr. Fisher commented that there had been a lot of conversation about how consensus could not be
16 reached there was no consensus about the problem they were trying to solve. He did not feel there
17 had been a genuine effort to try to reach a consensus on the problem statement. Mr. Knoblock
18 agreed but Mr. Fields did not believe there would ever be agreement on the problem itself. Chair
19 McCarvill stated that the Stakeholders Council could either provide some recommendations on the
20 preferred alternatives or have no input at all. UDOT had stuck with their Purpose and Need
21 Statement throughout the process and he did not think that it would be changed.
22

23 **3. Summary of Visual Dot Exercise.**

24 **a. CWC Staff and the Stakeholders Council Leadership will Provide a Summary** 25 **of the Digital Dot Voting Exercise to the Stakeholders.** 26

27
28 Ms. Nielsen outlined the process moving forward. She explained that CWC Staff would clean up
29 the Google Form with the recommendations from the breakout sessions. That list would be sent
30 to all Stakeholders Council Members that evening. All of the Stakeholders Council Members
31 would have until noon the next day to submit the form. Ms. Nielsen asked that each person select
32 the eight most important bullet points for each of the preferred alternatives. After noon the next
33 day, the data would be compiled and shared with the Stakeholders Council Members and the CWC
34 Board. Chair McCarvill and Co-Chair Cameron would use that data to create a memo that would
35 also be delivered to the CWC Board.
36

37 Mr. Hutchinson wondered whether there would be time to make slight revisions to the
38 recommendations list. Ms. Nielsen noted that the revisions could be sent to CWC Staff. However,
39 she explained that any suggested modifications would need to be sent in as early as possible since
40 Stakeholders Council Members would start to select their eight most important bullet points once
41 the Google Form was sent out via email.
42

43 Mr. Becker believed there had been a lot of excellent comments made during the meeting. He
44 thought that Mr. Fisher had brought up a good point about the Purpose and Need Statement and
45 how that framed the decision-making process. The MTS Pillars Document that was developed by
46 the CWC Board included items that were outside of the scope as defined by UDOT because the

1 CWC Board felt those items were necessary in order to address the transportation issues. Mr.
2 Becker noted that the MTS Pillars Document addressed the issue raised by Mr. Fisher and others
3 about the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS scope being too narrow. Mr. Fisher did not
4 believe that UDOT was tied to the two preferred alternatives. UDOT was tied to the data that
5 supported those two alternatives. If the data changed, the UDOT preference could also change.
6

7 **4. Adjourn Meeting.**
8

9 **a. William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
10 **Council.**
11

12 Chair McCarvill brought the meeting to a close. He noted that Stakeholders Council Leadership
13 and CWC Staff would begin work on the document clean-up. The Digital Dot Voting Exercise
14 would be sent out to Stakeholders Council Members as soon as possible. Chair McCarvill thanked
15 the Stakeholders Council Members for their participation in the Special Meeting.
16

17 **b. William McCarvill, Chair, and Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair, will Compose a**
18 **Summary Memo Detailing the Improvements Identified During the**
19 **Stakeholder Ranking Exercise, which will be Sent to the CWC Board Ahead**
20 **of the August 2 Board Meeting.**
21

22 Chair McCarvill explained that Stakeholders Council Leadership and CWC Staff would start work
23 on the document clean up and send it out to Stakeholders Council Members shortly. Ms. Nielsen
24 asked that Stakeholders Council Members check their inboxes later that evening.
25

26 **MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to adjourn the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Michael Braun
27 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
28

29 The Central Wasatch Commission Special Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Special Stakeholders Council Meeting held Thursday, July 29, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____