



2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**  
3 **HELD MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 2021, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED**  
4 **ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION**

5  
6 **Board Members:** Chair Christopher F. Robinson, Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Mayor Dan Knopp,  
7 Mayor Mike Peterson, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Councilor  
8 Jim Bradley, Councilor Marci Houseman, Councilor Max Doilney

9  
10 **Excused:** Mayor Jenny Wilson, Ex Officio Member Carlton Christensen

11  
12 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez,  
13 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Administrator Kaye Mickelson,  
14 CWC Legal Counsel Shane Topham

15  
16 **Others:** Laura Briefer, Robert Sampson, Lisa Hartman, Lynn Pace, Annalee Munsey,  
17 Pat Shea, Jenna Malone, Roger Borgenicht, Jessica Kirby, Josh Van Jura,  
18 Lance Kovel, Jordan Smith, Matthew Lindon, Will McCarvill, Brian  
19 Hutchinson, Bekee Hotze, Steve Van Maren, Mimi Levitt, Tom Ward, Mike  
20 Marker, Randy Doyle, Megan Nelson, Abi Holt, Patrick Nelson, Chris Cawley,  
21 Mike Maughan, John Knoblock, Theresa Heinrich, Nick Duerksen, Carl  
22 Fisher, Roy Crandall, Helen Peters

23  
24 **OPEN CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**

- 25  
26 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the CWC Board Meeting Plus**  
27 **Commenting on the Electronic Meeting, No Anchor Location, as Noted Above.**

28  
29 Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

30  
31 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which  
32 was as follows:

33  
34 ‘I, as the Chair of the Board of Commissioners (the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch  
35 Commission (“CWC”), hereby determine that conducting Board meetings at any time during  
36 the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of  
37 those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the overall instance of COVID-  
38 19 cases has diminished somewhat over the past several months, the pandemic remains, and  
39 the recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid  
40 another surge in cases, which could again threaten to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’  
41

1 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the July 12, 2021 Board**  
2 **Meeting.**

3  
4 **MOTION:** Councilor Doilney moved to approve the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting Minutes.  
5 Councilor Houseman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
6 Board.

7  
8 **COMMITTEE AND PROJECT REPORTS**

9  
10 **1. Executive Committee: Meeting Scheduled for July 27, 2021, Cancelled Due to**  
11 **Commissioner Scheduling Conflicts.**

- 12  
13 • **Next Executive Committee Meeting Scheduled for Monday, August 16, 2021, 3:30 p.m.**  
14 **to 5:30 p.m.**

15  
16 Chair Robinson reported that the scheduled Executive Committee Meeting was not held on July 27,  
17 2021, due to scheduling conflicts. There had been discussion about holding an Executive Committee  
18 Meeting on August 16, 2021, however, it was suggested that the Central Wasatch Commission  
19 (“CWC”) Board meet the week of August 23, 2021, instead. This would allow time for the CWC  
20 Board to discuss the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft  
21 Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) ahead of the September 3, 2021, comment submission  
22 deadline. Chair Robinson noted that a poll would be sent out to Commissioners to determine the date.  
23

24 Chair Robinson shared additional thoughts related to ongoing projects. He commented that it was  
25 wonderful to be able to work with other agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest  
26 Service. Their willingness to collaborate on the Visitor Use Study was an excellent opportunity for  
27 the CWC. Chair Robinson was also appreciative of the work done by Utah State University and  
28 Dr. Jordan Smith. Additionally, he was impressed by the progress made on the Environmental  
29 Dashboard thanks to the University of Utah. Chair Robinson noted that there had been a lot of success  
30 with short-term projects as well. He also thanked the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee for their  
31 work. It was also noted that a day-long CWC Board Retreat has been scheduled for November 5,  
32 2021, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Commissioners should have received an invitation for the retreat.  
33

34 **2. Budget/Finance/Audit Committee: Chair Jeff Silvestrini will Provide an Update from**  
35 **the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee.**

- 36  
37 • **Draft Minutes of the July 22, 2021, Meeting were Included in the Board Packet Sent**  
38 **Electronically. These Minutes will Supplement Information to the Following**  
39 **Recommendation and Resolution:**  
40 • **Recommendation: The CWC Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Recommends the CWC**  
41 **Move Forward with the Physical, Environmental, and Ecological Study Aspects of the**  
42 **Visitor Use Study and Develop a Resolution to Approve. The Resolution (Resolution**  
43 **2021-16) Following Proposes Deliverables and Payment to Occur Over Two Fiscal**  
44 **Years: 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.**  
45 • **The Committee Also Recommends the Social Study Aspects of the CWC Visitor Use**  
46 **Study be Completed in Partnership with the Forest Service Visitor Monitoring Analysis**  
47 **Study (“FSVMAS”) Scheduled to Begin October 2021 and End September 2022. This**  
48 **Partnership will Include Questions Specific to Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big**

1 Cottonwood Canyon, and Millcreek Canyon, thus Becoming a Subset of the FSVMAS  
2 and a Part of the Ongoing (every five year) Study Cycle.

- 3 • The Committee Also Recommends the Social Study Aspects of the CWC Visitor Use  
4 Study Costs, Now Approximating \$30,000, be Provided by Donated Monies Through  
5 Collaboration with Stakeholder Organizations, Fundraising Efforts, and the State of  
6 Utah.
- 7 • Included in the Following Resolution (Resolution 2021-16) is the Request to Consider  
8 Returning \$50,000 from Reserves to the 2021/2022 CWC Fiscal Year Budget Designated  
9 for Visitor Use Study and Hold in Abeyance the Potential to Request Reserves in the  
10 2022/2023 Fiscal Year to Fund Any Balance of the Social Aspects Study.

11  
12 Mayor Silvestrini thanked members of the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee and the Visitor Use  
13 Study Selection Committee who had contributed to discussions related to the Visitor Use Study. He  
14 encouraged Commissioners to read the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting Minutes as they  
15 reflected a number of conversations related to the Visitor Use Study as well as the extensive effort  
16 overall. Since the last CWC Board Meeting, the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee had learned more  
17 about an opportunity to collaborate with the Forest Service.

18  
19 The Budget/Finance/Audit Committee and Visitor Use Study Selection Committee agreed that the  
20 ecological aspects of the study were key and should be funded in the first fiscal year. However, there  
21 had been some debate about the benefits of the social aspects of the study. It was noted that several  
22 members felt the social aspects were extremely important. Mayor Silvestrini explained that the Forest  
23 Service would be doing their own Forest Service Visitor Monitoring Analysis Study (“FSVMAS”) in  
24 the fall and as a result, the CWC had the opportunity to work with the Forest Service on the social  
25 aspects of the Visitor Use Study. This would result in significant cost savings for the Commission.

26  
27 Mayor Silvestrini reported that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee was prepared to recommend  
28 that the CWC fund the ecological aspects of the Visitor Use Study in the current fiscal year and fund  
29 the social aspects of the Visitor Use Study in the next fiscal year. The social aspects of the study  
30 would involve a collaboration with the Forest Service and contributions would be sought from  
31 interested member jurisdictions and organizations. Mayor Silvestrini noted that there had been recent  
32 conversations between CWC staff, Dr. Smith and the Forest Service. Additionally, they would meet  
33 later in the week (August 3<sup>rd</sup>) to work out details and ensure that the study would satisfy the needs  
34 of the Visitor Use Study.

35  
36 Chair Robinson commented that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting Minutes included  
37 comments from Will McCarvill. Mr. McCarvill wanted to make sure that the Forest Service study  
38 focused on Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, and Millcreek Canyon. Mayor  
39 Silvestrini believed the purpose of the discussions between CWC staff, Dr. Smith and the Forest  
40 Service was to ensure that both entities were able to work together. He informed the CWC Board  
41 that the Forest Service had expressed reservations about two studies taking place at the same time.  
42 They felt it could impact the integrity of the data. The Visitor Use Study would require a special use  
43 permit and that permit may be restricted in order to accommodate the Forest Service data. He hoped  
44 the CWC would be able to collaborate with the Forest Service and that there would be some  
45 flexibility. It was the assumption of the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee that both entities could  
46 work together.

1 Mayor Sondak noted that he expressed concern during the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee  
2 Meeting. He wanted to ensure that the recommendation would be a wise use of the CWC funds. He  
3 was fairly well persuaded that the physical and ecological aspects of the Visitor Use Study were worth  
4 the money but did not believe the social aspects were worth the money, based on reasons he had  
5 articulated previously. However, the price of the social portion of the study would be reduced if the  
6 collaboration with the Forest Service took place. He felt the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee was  
7 in a position to recommend moving forward with the social aspects of the Visitor Use Study if the  
8 collaboration took place and outside money was raised.

9  
10 Mayor Sondak had hesitations about the high cost of the mobile locational data. Following the  
11 Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting, he received the underlying research report that was  
12 referred to in Dr. Smith’s proposal. That research showed that the trail counters and mobile locational  
13 data were as good as one another for the purposes of the study referred to. As a result, he still had  
14 hesitation about spending that much money on the mobile locational data for the Visitor Use Study.  
15 Councilor Jim Bradley commented that he shared many of the concerns expressed by Mayor Sondak.  
16 Chair Robinson wondered whether Mayor Sondak and Councilor Bradley were in favor of rewriting  
17 the resolution. Councilor Bradley felt that minor rewording was a possibility.

18  
19 Chair Robinson thanked the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee for their work. He believed the fact  
20 that the Forest Service was engaging with the CWC was important. Additionally, the cost savings  
21 would be beneficial. Chair Robinson explained that there were many Stakeholders Council Members  
22 and interested parties who felt that the social aspects of the Visitor Use Study were important. He  
23 asked for suggestions related to the potential rewording of the resolution. Mayor Harris Sondak read  
24 a portion of the resolution to the CWC Board, which was as follows:

- 25  
26
- WHEREAS, the CWC’s Budget and Finance Committee has recommended that the CWC  
27 should (a) proceed with the Ecological Component as part of USU’s Phase 2 work during the  
28 CWC’s current fiscal year, (b) agree to collaborate with the Forest Service to include the  
29 Social Component as part of the FSVMAS to the extent reasonably possible, (c) contract with  
30 USU to complete the Social Component during the CWC’s 2022-2023 fiscal year as part of  
31 Phase 2, utilizing such funds as are budgeted for that purpose by the CWC, supplemented as  
32 possible by monies donated to the CWC either by private organizations, member jurisdictions,  
33 or the State of Utah, and (d) amend the CWC’s current budget as appropriate to move \$50,000  
34 from the CWC’s financial reserve to the current year budget’s approved expenditures to  
35 augment funding for the Use Study (collectively, the “BFC Recommendation”)...
- 36

37 Mayor Sondak suggested that the wording change from “supplemented as possible,” to “if  
38 supplemented sufficiently.” That slight alteration would ensure that some funds were supplemented  
39 and the CWC would determine whether or not that amount was sufficient. Mayor Silvestrini believed  
40 that language would honor the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee discussions. Councilor Bradley  
41 agreed. Mayor Mendenhall wondered whether there was a way to place a contingency on the monies.  
42 Mayor Sondak noted that the language could be, “contingent on being supplemented sufficiently.”  
43 Mayor Silvestrini preferred the previously suggested language.

44  
45 **3. Legislative Committee: Meeting Scheduled for Wednesday, August 18, 2021, 10:00 a.m.**  
46

1 Chair Robinson noted that Item 6 on the agenda would be discussed immediately following Item 3  
2 on the agenda. The agenda would then resume as planned. He reported that a Legislative/Land  
3 Tenure Committee Meeting was scheduled to take place on August 18, 2021, at 10:00 a.m.

4  
5 **4. Transportation Committee: Chair Dan Knopp will Lead Discussion on Tolling and a**  
6 **Recommendation on the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.**

- 7  
8 • **Draft Minutes of the July 21, 2021, Transportation Committee were Included in the**  
9 **Board Packet Sent Electronically.**  
10 • **Recommendation: The CWC Transportation Committee Recommended that the**  
11 **Central Wasatch Commission Recommend through Resolution that the LCC EIS Long-**  
12 **Term Transportation Solution Not Solely be a Bus-Based Solution.**

13  
14 Mayor Dan Knopp reported that the Transportation Committee met on July 21, 2021, and had a  
15 productive meeting. It included himself, Mayor Peterson, and Councilor Doilney. The  
16 Transportation Committee as a whole believed that buses were not the long-term solution but agreed  
17 that buses were the only solution for the next few years. The Transportation Committee also agreed  
18 that things could not remain as they were currently and some high-capacity solutions needed to be  
19 explored. Mayor Knopp wondered whether it would be possible for the CWC Board Members to  
20 answer the following questions:

- 21  
22 • Do you think that buses are the answer?  
23 • Do you think that the gondola is the answer?  
24

25 Mayor Knopp believed it was important to understand everyone's position. The Transportation  
26 Committee also discussed the fact that there would likely not be a consensus on a transportation  
27 alternative and the CWC Board may need to go with the majority in order to get behind something.  
28 Chair Robinson noted that the agenda item had been framed as a resolution that suggested the UDOT  
29 Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS long-term solution should not be solely bus-based. He believed  
30 the questions posed by Mayor Knopp would be better suited to the CWC Board Meeting that would  
31 be held the week of August 23, 2021. Mayor Mendenhall felt it was peculiar to ask about a preferred  
32 alternative through an agenda item resolution that did not include text for the CWC Board to review.  
33 Mayor Knopp clarified that he had intended the item to be a conversation and not a resolution.  
34

35 Chair Robinson reported that the CWC was a consensus-based organization. The CWC Board had  
36 agreed on the Mountain Transportation System ("MTS") Pillars Document, which was silent on a  
37 mode but shared several CWC Board priorities. Various members had expressed a public opinion on  
38 a preferred transportation alternative and that was appropriate. However, he was not sure that the  
39 CWC forwarding a split vote on an alternative would accomplish a great deal. The official  
40 communications from the CWC needed to include areas of consensus.  
41

42 Councilor Bradley did not think either/or conversations would be productive. He liked the way the  
43 Stakeholders Council had promoted their ideas. That approach highlighted appropriate changes for  
44 both of the preferred alternatives. Councilor Bradley noted that UDOT considered buses to be a  
45 reasonable long-term alternative on par with the gondola system and it was important to keep that in  
46 mind. The MTS Pillars Document showcased what the CWC Board had agreed upon and was  
47 extremely important. Individual members could disagree as it related to a particular mode but could  
48 still discuss the pros and cons of each alternative. He noted that it was important to be productive in

1 their approach. He was not prepared to declare a preference one way or the other but reported that  
2 Salt Lake County was putting together a response to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

3  
4 Councilor Houseman thought that question being asked was whether individual members of the  
5 Commission felt that the long-term solution needed to be more than a bus-only solution. She did not  
6 read it as there being a formal resolution. Councilor Houseman noted that her role on the CWC was  
7 to represent Sandy City. They believed there would need to be a layered approach. There had recently  
8 been a City Council Meeting in Sandy City and conversations were had about whether it needed to  
9 be a bus or gondola alternative or whether there could be a layered approach where buses would  
10 continue to be used. She felt the real question seemed to be:

- 11  
12 • Will Little Cottonwood Canyon be widened?

13  
14 Councilor Houseman did not believe that buses in their current state were the long-term solution. The  
15 issue was more about whether the better long-term solution included widening Little Cottonwood  
16 Canyon or if the better long-term solution included a gondola system. Councilor Houseman also  
17 noted that there were some really interesting takeaways from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon  
18 Draft EIS. She hoped to hear from other Commissioners about their takeaways and learnings but  
19 acknowledged that there may not be enough time during the current meeting.

20  
21 Mayor Peterson felt it was important to provide some clarification from the perspective of the  
22 Transportation Committee. He did not believe the discussion at the CWC Board Meeting was  
23 intended to be a resolution. As for his position, he was not convinced that the transportation  
24 alternative should be a solely bus-based solution as he did not have enough information. However,  
25 he was also not ready to say that the gondola was the best solution. Of the two alternatives, buses in  
26 the short-term and interim bases would be a solution. He felt there needed to be some type of phased  
27 approach either into a more formal long-term bus solution or a gondola solution but had not made a  
28 decision either way. Mayor Peterson explained that the Cottonwood Heights City Council would take  
29 an official position in two weeks and he would support that position.

30  
31 Councilor Doilney noted that the Transportation Committee Members were not convinced that a  
32 solely bus-based solution was the long-term solution. There had been discussions during the meeting  
33 about trying to reach consensus and whether CWC Board would be willing to make a recommendation  
34 if there was not a full consensus. Councilor Doilney did not believe that consensus on a preferred  
35 alternative would be reached within the next two weeks. He wondered whether there was some  
36 version of consensus that would allow a CWC recommendation to be heard by UDOT. His concern  
37 about how much weight a non-consensus recommendation from the CWC would carry with UDOT  
38 was reflected in the Transportation Committee Minutes.

39  
40 Laura Briefer commented that the word solution was being used a lot. She wondered whether there  
41 was a need to define, by consensus, the problem that the CWC was trying to find the solution for.  
42 She got a sense that the Purpose and Need and preferred transportation alternatives included in the  
43 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS were to solve a certain problem that UDOT had  
44 identified. Ms. Briefer did not know that everyone on the CWC agreed that was the right problem to  
45 solve from the perspective of the Mountain Accord. It would be helpful to have clarity on the problem  
46 as the CWC Board moved towards the next meeting.

1 Mayor Sondak noted that Ms. Briefer had made a good point about making sure the CWC understood  
2 the problem they were trying to solve. He commented on the statement from the Transportation  
3 Committee that the long-term transportation solution should not be solely bus-based. Mayor Sondak  
4 wondered if that statement recommended tolling in addition to a bus or if that statement recommended  
5 something else in addition to a bus. Mayor Sondak felt that the CWC Board needed to discuss what  
6 was inadequate about each of the potential solutions and determine how to make them better. The  
7 MTS Pillars Document may be the key to that process.

8  
9 Councilor Houseman pointed out that many people were wondering whether the CWC would do  
10 anything more than the MTS Pillars Document. She felt it was important to come to an agreement  
11 and make some sort of recommendation that acknowledged the strengths and challenges related to  
12 both transportation alternatives. She believed part of the role of the CWC was to help influence and  
13 shape good decision-making by UDOT. Councilor Houseman supported making a clear  
14 recommendation. Part of being a leader was stepping out to say, “We have listened, we have learned,  
15 we have discussed, and per our priorities, this is our preferred solution because of how it aligns to our  
16 priorities.” Councilor Houseman wondered whether there was an opportunity for the CWC Board to  
17 do this.

18  
19 Councilor Bradley stated that it had been rewarding to hear the comments made during the CWC  
20 Board Meeting. He wondered whether there would be a benefit to looking further into the bus  
21 approach since there would be buses for at least the next season or two. There was a great deal to  
22 learn about them. For instance, how tolling would work as well as issues related to parking, year-  
23 round service, and access to other points in the canyon. Councilor Bradley felt it was unfortunate that  
24 the CWC Board had to forego a more detailed learning process because a decision needed to be made  
25 quickly in order to comment on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

26  
27 Mayor Knopp referenced the comments made by Councilor Bradley and explained that a decision  
28 would be made by UDOT shortly and the CWC would either provide input or they would not. If the  
29 CWC Board continued on as it had and Commissioners were not direct about their preferred  
30 alternative, the CWC may be unable to share any input. He hoped that CWC would be able to provide  
31 a real contribution to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

32  
33 Chair Robinson felt the discussion had been an excellent catalyst and primer for how the CWC Staff  
34 and Executive Committee should form the next CWC Board Meeting. He outlined several questions  
35 that had been raised during the conversation:

- 36  
37
- Do we have consensus on the problem for which we are seeking a solution?
  - How can we profitably use our next CWC Board Meeting to come up with additional consensus recommendations?
- 38  
39  
40

41 He noted that a comment had been left in the Zoom chat box to state that UDOT was not interested  
42 in a vote or a poll. They wanted to know the reasons why one alternative may be preferred versus the  
43 other. Chair Robinson addressed comments related to buses and explained that it was unrealistic that  
44 UDOT could have interim buses and then move to a different transportation mode. This would be a  
45 half-billion-dollar investment. There were interim steps, such as tolling, paid parking, and travel  
46 demand management strategies that could be employed before any concrete decisions were made.  
47 However, it did not appear that interim steps were currently being considered by UDOT.

1 Chair Robinson felt it would be beneficial to determine how to best inform CWC Staff and the  
2 Executive Committee ahead of the CWC Board Meeting scheduled for the week of August 23, 2021.  
3 Mayor Mendenhall agreed with Ms. Briefer that it was important to clarify the problem that the CWC  
4 was trying to solve. This could be done at the beginning of the meeting. She noted that the problem  
5 the CWC was trying to solve would not necessarily be the same as the problem that the UDOT Little  
6 Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was trying to solve.

7  
8 Councilor Houseman shared a consensus-building exercise with the CWC Board called Fist-to-Five.  
9 Rather than voting yes or no, the exercise asked participants to share their degree of support. For  
10 instance, a closed fist would be an absolute no and a five would be complete support. Participants  
11 would be able to show their level of support from a fist to a five. Councilor Houseman explained that  
12 the exercise tended to be more helpful for moving towards consensus because it was not a yes or no  
13 answer but a gradation. It would allow participants to observe one another and see that they might  
14 be closer to consensus than originally assumed. Chair Robinson stated that it was an interesting idea  
15 but could be time-consuming. CWC Staff would need to consider how to implement the exercise.

16  
17 Mayor Knopp noted that there had been previous comments about the transportation alternatives only  
18 benefiting ski resorts. He reminded Commissioners that the transportation alternative was not being  
19 built for the ski resorts. It was being built for the people that wanted to visit the ski areas and spend  
20 time in Little Cottonwood Canyon. He believed that needed to be considered.

21  
22 Mayor Peterson expressed concerns about how the next meeting would be managed. He wondered if  
23 anything could be done in the interim of that meeting by CWC Staff. He suggested that each  
24 Commissioner could submit bullet points that stated a position. This information could be  
25 consolidated and presented during the meeting. Mayor Peterson felt this approach would make it  
26 possible to better understand where the CWC Board was as a whole.

27  
28 Chair Robinson felt that was a good idea. He asked those present to raise their hand if the body that  
29 they represented would issue or had already issued a statement related to the UDOT Little  
30 Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS before August 23, 2021. Chair Robinson noted that nearly everyone  
31 raised their hand. He commented that it would be helpful to see those official positions at the next  
32 meeting. Additionally, he wondered whether it would be possible for CWC Staff to put together a  
33 short questionnaire for Commissioners that would address the following:

- 34  
35
- Please articulate the problem you believe we are trying to solve with the MTS.
  - How would you improve each of the UDOT preferred transportation alternatives?
- 36  
37

38 Chair Robinson stressed that the questionnaire should be concise. The results could be tabulated and  
39 discussed at the next meeting. He believed the results would be similar to the Stakeholders Council  
40 and there would not be a consensus for either buses or a gondola. Executive Director, Ralph Becker  
41 felt the CWC Board needed to build upon what had already been agreed to in the MTS Pillars  
42 Document. Based on the feedback from the Commission and Chair Robinson, the discussions at the  
43 next meeting could relate to the problem that the CWC was trying to solve. The following question  
44 could also be discussed during the CWC Board Meeting:

- 45  
46
- How can the CWC build on the MTS Pillars Document and comment specifically on the  
47 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS as it relates to what should be included or how  
48 the decision should be handled more broadly?



1  
2 Mr. Becker noted that CWC Staff could work with Chair Robinson and the Executive Committee on  
3 questions to send out to the CWC Board. Chair Robinson reiterated that he wanted to keep things  
4 simple. He made note of an earlier comment by Councilor Houseman related to new information  
5 gathered from reading the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. He wondered whether one  
6 of the questions could be related to new takeaways from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft  
7 EIS. Chair Robinson thanked the Transportation Committee for starting the discussion on the UDOT  
8 Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS and helping to frame the next steps.

9  
10 **5. Environmental Dashboard: Commissioner Jim Bradley will Provide an Update on the**  
11 **Status of the Work Plan Underway.**  
12

13 Councilor Bradley reported that the Environmental Dashboard project was still in progress. CWC  
14 Staff was working closely with the University of Utah team to be able to put the information that had  
15 been accumulated to date online. He noted that there was a resolution included in the Meeting  
16 Materials Packet from ESRI that outlined services to the CWC. From May 6, 2021, through May 5,  
17 2022, ESRI was donating license rights and a maximum of 40 hours of technical support for a total  
18 donation of \$17,323.29. ESRI had also submitted a contract where CWC would assume responsibility  
19 for the cost of the HUB as of May 6, 2022. The quote was for approximately \$10,700.

20  
21 **6. Stakeholders Council: Co-Chairs Will McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Report on**  
22 **July 21, 2021, Stakeholders Council Quarterly Meeting and July 29, 2021, Special**  
23 **Meeting Called by the Chair.**  
24

- 25 • **Draft Minutes of the Two Meetings Have Been Distributed to Commissioners**  
26 **Electronically.**  
27

28 Chair Robinson reported that the Stakeholders Council held a Special Meeting on July 29, 2021. Mr.  
29 McCarvill explained that there had been a regular Stakeholders Council Meeting on July 21, 2021, to  
30 discuss the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. During those conversations, it did not  
31 appear that much progress was being made. He did not want there to be a vote on a preferred  
32 alternative as it was clear that the Stakeholders Council was divided. Instead, the Special Meeting  
33 was held and Stakeholders Council Members were challenged to share improvement suggestions that  
34 could mitigate the effects of the transportation alternatives.

35  
36 There were 26 Stakeholders Council attendees at the Special Meeting. Mr. McCarvill reported that  
37 the attendees broke out into three different facilitated groups. The goal was to write down as many  
38 improvements for the bus alternative and as many improvements for the gondola alternative as  
39 possible. He noted that 20 minutes was provided for each alternative. After the breakout groups, the  
40 regular Zoom meeting resumed. Mr. McCarvill, along with Co-Chair Barbara Cameron and CWC  
41 Staff cleaned up the list of improvements to remove opinion, disparaging remarks, or repeated  
42 suggestions. The Stakeholders Council Members were then asked to rank the improvements.

43  
44 Each Stakeholders Council Member was sent the list shortly after the Special Meeting of the  
45 Stakeholders Council. They were asked to vote for their top eight improvements related to the bus  
46 and gondola alternatives. All responses were due by 12:00 p.m. the next day. Mr. McCarvill reported  
47 that 21 responses were received and due to some technical issues, some were submitted via email.  
48 The results had been organized into a Draft Report for the CWC Board to consider.

1  
2 Chair Robinson thanked the Stakeholders Council for their work. The CWC Board needed time to  
3 review the Draft Report in greater detail but it was another important data point. Chair Robinson  
4 pointed out that the Stakeholders Council represented a wide variety of ideas and special interests.  
5 Brainstorming positive suggestions for transportation alternatives was a benefit. He commented that  
6 there would be another CWC Board Meeting the week of August 23, 2021. That would provide the  
7 Commissioners with time to study the Draft Report. He thanked Mr. McCarvill for his efforts.  
8

9 Mayor Sondak thanked Mr. McCarvill. He noted that there had been a Community Listening Session  
10 in Alta the previous week. The two transportation alternatives proposed by UDOT were not very  
11 attractive to Alta. He noted that the suggestions related to incremental change were consistent with  
12 the majority feeling in his community. Councilor Doilney believed it was helpful to hear from the  
13 Stakeholders Council in this way as they represented a diverse group of opinions. It was important  
14 to ensure that whatever recommendations the CWC made would benefit the greatest number of people  
15 and honor the environment. Every bit of information that the CWC Board was able to obtain from  
16 the greater community was essential. Councilor Doilney thanked Mr. McCarvill for the Draft Report.  
17

18 Councilor Houseman commented that she was a big fan of solutions-oriented collaboration. She  
19 appreciated the approach taken by Mr. McCarvill. Councilor Houseman believed that the CWC  
20 Board was unified on the fact that there were pros and cons to each of the two UDOT preferred  
21 alternatives. However, the Stakeholders Council had chosen to focus on how to strengthen each  
22 alternative in an actionable manner. She felt that was an excellent approach. Mayor Peterson felt the  
23 Draft Report provided useful information that should be taken into account at the next meeting. Chair  
24 Robinson thanked CWC Staff for coordinating the Special Meeting of the Stakeholders Council.  
25

## 26 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

27  
28 Chair Robinson opened the public comment period. He reported that there had been three written  
29 comments submitted from John Knoblock, Roy Crandall, and Matthew Lindon.  
30

31 *John Knoblock* made note of a comment shared by Salt Lake City Watershed Manager, Patrick Nelson  
32 at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting. Mr. Nelson said that actions needed to follow words when  
33 it came to protecting the watershed. Reliable funding was needed for maintenance of the restrooms  
34 and trails in the CWC area. Mr. Knoblock noted that the Forest Service was vastly underfunded,  
35 especially considering the number of users in the Central Wasatch. He urged all members of the  
36 CWC to work with the Forest Service and other partners in order to provide some much-needed  
37 operations and maintenance funding.  
38

39 *Roy Crandall* commented that during the last ski season, Vail Resorts closed National Forest Access  
40 from the Park City ridgeline. Letters had been written to Vail Resorts executives but had no impact.  
41 Mr. Crandall explained that a petition had been put together and was published online. That petition  
42 received over 1,800 signatures and the story was picked up by local and Salt Lake City news stations.  
43 There was a lot of public and media interest, but Vail Resorts continued to ignore concerns and  
44 requests to provide input. Mr. Crandall noted that longtime backcountry skier and 45-year veteran of  
45 the outdoor industry, Charlie Sturgis, had also been engaged, but he was unable to secure a meeting  
46 date. A letter had been sent to the CEO of Vail Resorts, Robert Katz, which was ignored. National  
47 Forest Access from the Park City ridgeline was an important issue. Mr. Crandall asked the CWC to  
48 make securing permanent National Forest Access from the Park City ridgeline a priority.

1  
2 *Matthew Lindon* wanted to know whether the CWC Board could address current and future access to  
3 the National Forest Access from the Park City ridgeline. The 9990 access gate was closed by Vail  
4 Resorts and the proposed access gate at Peak 5 was further from the boundary, more inconvenient,  
5 and potentially dangerous. Mr. Lindon believed there needed to be more solutions-oriented direction  
6 in order to handle this issue. There was significant demand for access to the ridgetop lands on the  
7 Park City side in both summer and winter. That access had been eliminated or highly restricted.

8  
9 Chair Robinson was grateful that Mr. Crandall and Mr. Lindon had raised the issue as it was of great  
10 importance to the community. He asked Mr. Becker to make note and follow up on the comments.

11  
12 *Carl Fisher* appreciated the transportation conversations that had taken place earlier in the CWC  
13 Board Meeting. He reported that at the Special Meeting of the Stakeholders Council, he mentioned  
14 the need to determine the question that the transportation solution was trying to answer. Additionally,  
15 he noted that there had been conversations in the past about the idea of carless canyons and moving  
16 towards that in the future. Mr. Fisher explained that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS  
17 stated that the gondola would require over 30 acres and 7,000 parking spots at the mouth of Little  
18 Cottonwood Canyon to deal with that. He felt that was a massive burden at a very congested location.  
19 Mr. Fisher commented that UDOT cared about getting skiers to ski resorts and there were very few  
20 other values that would come from building a gondola in the canyons. He encouraged the CWC  
21 Board to think about the many different values related to the canyons as skiing was a singular value.  
22 It was important to look for dynamic, diverse solutions that protected the canyons, water quality, and  
23 wildlife populations and also served many users, and removed people from their vehicles.

24  
25 *Brian Hutchinson* applauded the CWC Board Members for highlighting the nuance behind the  
26 transportation decision. He had sat in on the previous Transportation Committee Meeting and had  
27 some concerns related to UDOTs purpose and need being the sole driver for decision-making. During  
28 that meeting, it was mentioned that a handpicked group from UDOT would make the ultimate  
29 decision on a transportation alternative. Mr. Hutchinson also found that to be concerning. He  
30 discussed what was taking place in Millcreek Canyon. There were certain infrastructure needs and  
31 that had turned into the pursuit of the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant, which would  
32 realign the road, widen the road, increase speed limits and increase vehicle volumes in the canyon.  
33 He felt the CWC Board should fully review what was being discussed for Millcreek Canyon.

34  
35 There were no further comments. Chair Robinson closed the public comment period.

### 36 37 **ACTION ITEMS**

- 38  
39 1. **The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-10 Approving an Agreement with ESRI, Inc.**  
40 **for Environmental Dashboard-Related Services and Acknowledging ESRI’s Donation**  
41 **of \$10,700 in License Rights and Technical Support. (Continuation of Requested Action**  
42 **from July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting). Written Memo Regarding Back Story to this**  
43 **Item Plus the Corrected Resolution Included in the Packet Sent to Commissioners**  
44 **Electronically.**

45  
46 **MOTION:** Councilor Bradley moved to approve Resolution 2021-10. Mayor Peterson seconded the  
47 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1 **2. The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-16 A Resolution Concerning Visitor Use**  
2 **Study.**

3  
4 **MOTION:** Councilor Houseman moved to approve Resolution 2021-16, as amended. Mayor Knopp  
5 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

6  
7 **ADJOURN BOARD MEETING**

8  
9 Chair Robinson asked whether there were any additional Commissioner comments. Mayor Peterson  
10 thanked each of the various Committee Chairs for their efforts. Chair Robinson echoed that comment  
11 and also thanked CWC Staff for their continued work.

12  
13 Mayor Sondak had a question related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. There was  
14 information related to tolling, which stated that the residents of the canyons would be exempt from  
15 the tolls. He was surprised by that suggestion and was interested to hear how that could be done.  
16 Chair Robinson noted that there was information related to tolling included in the Meeting Materials  
17 Packet. He asked that CWC Staff follow up on the concern raised by Mayor Sondak.

18  
19 **MOTION:** Mayor Mendenhall moved to adjourn the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Knopp seconded  
20 the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

21  
22 The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Monday, August 2, 2021.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_