



9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2021, AT 3:00 P.M. THE**
11 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**
12

- 13 **Present:** William McCarvill, Chair
14 Barbara Cameron, Vice-Chair
15 Annalee Munsey
16 Brian Hutchinson
17 Carl Fisher
18 Carolyn Wawra
19 Nate Furman
20 Del Draper
21 Ed Marshall
22 Jan Striefel
23 John Knoblock
24 Kurt Hegmann
25 Michael Marker
26 Michael Braun
27 Nathan Rafferty
28 Patrick Shea
29 Paul Diegel
30 Randy Doyle
31 Sarah Bennett
32 Steve Issowits
33 Tom Diegel
34 Erin Bragg
35 Alex Porpora
36 Mike Christensen
37 Kelly Boardman
38 Maura Hahnenberger
39 Roger Borgenicht
40 Hilary Lambert
41 **Not in attendance:** Christina Rodriguez
42 Megan Nelson
43 Mike Maughan
44 Troy Morgan
45
46

1 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
2 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
3 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
4 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
5

6 **Excused:** Kirk Nichols
7 Dennis Goreham
8

9 **1. Opening.**

10
11 **a. William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
12 **Council.**
13

14 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.
15

16 **b. William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic**
17 **meetings as Per Legislative Requirements.**
18

19 Chair McCarvill read the following statement:
20

21 ‘Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207-4, the Mountain Accord Stakeholders Council of the
22 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined that conducting Council
23 Meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks
24 to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the
25 overall instances of COVID-19 cases have diminished somewhat over the past few months,
26 the pandemic remains and the recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits
27 continued vigilance to avoid another surge in cases, which could again threaten to overwhelm
28 Utah’s healthcare system.’
29

30 **c. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholder Council**
31 **DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, July 21, 2021.**
32

33 Annalee Munsey noted that her name was not listed on the July 21, 2021, Stakeholders Council
34 Meeting minutes but was present at the meeting.
35

36 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, July 21, 2021, with the
37 addition of Annalee Munsey as a participant. Annalee Munsey seconded the motion. The motion
38 passed with the consent of the Council.
39

40 **d. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholder Council**
41 **DRAFT Minutes of Thursday, July 29, 2021.**
42

43 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, July 29, 2021. Sarah
44 Bennett seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1
2 **2. Jordan Smith USU/Visitor Use Study Presentation.**

3
4 **a. Dr. Jordan Smith will Provide an Overview of the Status of the CWC Visitor Use**
5 **Study and Answer Questions from Stakeholders.**
6

7 Vice-Chair Barbara Cameron believed that one of the main Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council accomplishments was the Visitor Use Study. Dr. Jordan Smith was present to provide additional information on the study. He introduced himself and explained that he runs the Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism at Utah State University. The program was created in 1998 by the Utah State Legislature to provide data to the Legislature and State Agencies as a way to guide the decision-making process for issues related to outdoor recreation and tourism. The bulk of the work could be characterized as visitor use monitoring and management. He noted that the Visitor Use Study fell into that category.

15 Dr. Smith overviewed what his presentation would entail. For instance:

- 17 • Outline the objectives for the Visitor Use Study;
- 18 • Provide an overview of Phase I of the Visitor Use Study;
- 19 • Provide an overview of the findings from Phase I; and
- 20 • Share additional details related to Phase II of the Visitor Use Study.

21
22 The purpose of the Visitor Use Study was to explore how outdoor recreation use and the associated impacts could be quantified and monitored over time within the canyons. The goal, particularly with the Phase I effort (the scoping process) was to identify a set of indicators that were collaboratively generated, grounded in the best available science, and reflected the unique needs and concerns of the diverse Stakeholders and managers of the canyons.

28 Dr. Smith explained that the vision for the project was to establish certain indicators, make sure they are scientifically grounded, are collaboratively informed with input from the CWC, and cover the ecological, social, and physical characteristics that define outdoor recreation settings within the Central Wasatch. He explained that the focus was on ecological, social, and physical characteristics as they emerged to define outdoor recreation settings over decades of research on outdoor recreation and management. Additionally, they are characteristics that define how federal land management agencies set desired conditions.

36 It is important that anything done to monitor recreation use aligned with the way federal agencies, particularly the U.S. Forest Service, manage outdoor recreation uses across the Central Wasatch. Not only were the three categories of characteristics most appropriate, but they also fall within the Visitor Use Management Framework that was established by the Interagency Visitor Use Management Council. The Council was comprised of leadership from different federal agencies. One of the goals in the Visitor Use Management Framework was to provide consistency in the way that outdoor recreation was managed across federal lands.

44 Dr. Smith explained that the first phase of the Visitor Use Study included the following steps:
45
46

- 1 • Identify the potential indicators;
- 2 • Conduct Stakeholders interviews;
- 3 • Conduct a Legislative policy review; and
- 4 • Data review and extensive literature search.

5
6 Phase II of the Visitor Use Study would collect the actual data related to the indicators. That work
7 would begin over the next several months. The goal was to have data that characterized outdoor
8 recreation use as well as the potential impacts of outdoor recreation use. This would be done through
9 ecological, social, and physical indicators.

10
11 Dr. Smith reported that as part of Visitor Use Study Phase I, several steps had been completed. The
12 Utah State University team had done the following:

- 13
14 • Conducted a knowledge gap analysis of current outdoor recreation research and monitoring in
15 the entirety of the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache, with a particular focus on the Central Wasatch.
16 Additionally, gathered Stakeholder perspectives on key concerns and key indicators.
 - 17 ○ The literature review encompassed both peer-review literature as well as grey literature,
18 such as agency reports, to document what was known about outdoor recreation use and
19 the potential impacts in the Central Wasatch. The Stakeholder interviews were intended
20 to highlight any potential blind spots in the existing literature and any of the existing
21 data.
- 22 • Compiled all of the data to determine what was relevant;
- 23 • Conducted a Legislative and policy review to identify all legal and managerial processes and
24 standards that applied to managing outdoor recreation use in the canyons; and
- 25 • Compiled a complete list of potential indicators and completed a rigorous vetting process to
26 determine which indicators were established and robust, had been used in previous research,
27 had been used by management agencies to establish desired conditions, and had a logical
28 connection to recreation use as it occurred within the Central Wasatch.

29
30 The first step for Phase I was related to literature. Dr. Smith explained that Utah State University
31 compiled the peer review and grey literature related to the Central Wasatch, which was detailed in the
32 Interim Report. There was a lot of research, some of which was partially useful. However, a lot of the
33 research was not particularly useful for identifying indicators. Dr. Smith reported that the literature
34 related to the Central Wasatch was categorized into three categories:

- 35
36 • Cross-Sectional and Geographically Targeted Research:
 - 37 ○ Research that might have been completed to address a specific hypothesis or a specific
38 research question. The research was very geographically targeted, and the data was
39 typically collected for a short period of time.
- 40 • Long-Term and Geographically Misaligned Research:
 - 41 ○ Studies or data sets that had data that was longitudinal by comparison and went back
42 to the late 80s or 90s as it related to recreation use or access. However, the data was
43 collected at a geographic scale that was not meaningful to guide management actions.

- 1 • Contextual Information:
 - 2 ○ Literature that was not speaking to any primary data that was collected but was more
 - 3 discussing the evolution of the Central Wasatch and the policies or management of the
 - 4 Central Wasatch.

5
6 To supplement the literature, Stakeholders interviews were conducted. There were several common
7 themes throughout the interviews, such as:
8

- 9 • The need to balance use and development in the Central Wasatch to protect the ecosystem, the
- 10 watershed, and the diversity of experiences in the canyons;
- 11 • Concern that there was no clear data about how many people visited the Central Wasatch
- 12 annually, where those visitors were going in the canyons, how they recreated or experienced
- 13 the canyons, and what impacts those visitors may cause;
- 14 • There were misunderstandings about what a Visitor Use Study would do. For instance, that it
- 15 may be used to establish visitor use numbers for specific settings or specific dates.
- 16 Alternatively, that a Visitor Use Study may be used as a tool to restrict the number of users to
- 17 specific sites at specific times.

18
19 Dr. Smith emphasized that the Visitor Use Study could provide a better understanding of what
20 indicators to focus on, whether those indicators are high or low and how those indicators relate to
21 recreation use. For example, how water quality relates to the amount of recreation use taking place
22 close to that water. The Visitor Use Study was not intended to create specifically visitor numbers.
23 Management recommendations and guidance could be shared, but it could not state what a
24 management agency should do or what their desired conditions should be.
25

26 The second step for Phase I was to compile all of the existing data. Dr. Smith reported that five data
27 sources were particularly promising, which were as follows:
28

- 29 • United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) Forest Service National Visitor Use
- 30 Monitoring Program:
 - 31 ○ USDA Forest Service conducted a monitoring program, where every five years,
 - 32 visitation was monitored across the entire national forest. That had been done at the
 - 33 Institute of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism for the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National
 - 34 Forest since 2007. The data was not very useful when it came to establishing long-term
 - 35 monitoring priorities, since the data was collected in a way that collected information
 - 36 and statistics for the entire Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. That resulted in very
 - 37 few sites studied within the Central Wasatch.
- 38 • Central Wasatch Visitor Use Study;
 - 39 ○ The study was completed in 2015 as part of the Mountain Accord. The data collected
 - 40 was more robust, as the sampling area was the Central Wasatch. However, the study
 - 41 focused only on social indicators, such as visitor experience, social demographic
 - 42 characteristics of use, and activity profiles. As a result, the data was considered to be
 - 43 only somewhat useful.
- 44 • Salt Lake Climbers Alliance Surveys;
- 45 • Wasatch Backcountry Alliance and USDA Forest Service Trail Counters; and
- 46 • Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Traffic Counts.

1
2 The third step for Phase I related to the Legislative and policy review. The broad focus of the review
3 was to determine what mechanisms exist to monitor or manage recreation use within the canyons.
4 Dr. Smith noted that there was a lot of Legislation and policy guidance related to outdoor recreation
5 use. The Visitor Use Study team had looked at all of the different policies, planning guidance, and
6 ordinances that related to how outdoor recreation was provided, the qualities that should be provided
7 by outdoor recreation, and the potential impacts of outdoor recreation. He referenced documents from
8 the Forest Service (2003 Revised Forest Plan) and Salt Lake County (Wasatch Canyons General Plan).
9

10 The fourth step for Phase I was related to the indicator assessment. Outdoor recreation settings within
11 the canyons were categorized according to a variety of different site types:
12

- 13 • Trails;
- 14 • Areas around high elevation lakes;
- 15 • Backcountry campsites;
- 16 • Water bodies;
- 17 • Access points (such as parking areas); and
- 18 • Rock climbing areas.

19
20 The indicator types included ecological, social, and physical. A comprehensive list of approximately
21 30 indicators was compiled and each of the indicators were vetted based on rationale, robustness,
22 whether they were identified by interviewees, and if they were responsive to recreation use. In the
23 Interim Report, there were 17 indicators highlighted as being viable. They were broken out across the
24 different recreation setting types:
25

- 26 • Trails:
 - 27 ○ Informal trail proliferation and condition;
 - 28 ○ Trail condition;
 - 29 ○ Trail width; linear extent;
 - 30 ○ Trail condition class; linear extent; and
 - 31 ○ Trail depth (incision); linear extent.
- 32 • Areas around high elevation lakes:
 - 33 ○ Disturbed shoreline.
- 34 • Backcountry campsites:
 - 35 ○ Campsite proliferation; campsite number and location;
 - 36 ○ Campsite area; and
 - 37 ○ Campsite condition.
- 38 • Water bodies:
 - 39 ○ Water quality;
 - 40 ○ E. coli/coliforms; counting of indicator organisms;
 - 41 ○ Nitrate;
 - 42 ○ Dissolved organic Carbon;
 - 43 ○ Particulate Carbon;
 - 44 ○ Suspended sediment; and
 - 45 ○ Total dissolved Nitrogen.

- 1 • Access points:
 - 2 ○ Roadside vegetation disturbance;
 - 3 ○ Parking;
 - 4 ○ Developed and roadside parking use; and
 - 5 ○ Average time a car was parked.
- 6 • Rock climbing areas:
 - 7 ○ Routes that were used.

8
9 Dr. Smith explained that the indicators had been identified and it was important to make sure they
10 were the most appropriate as the study moved forward. The data collection would begin within the
11 next few months and there would be a full 12 months spent collecting data for the indicators. He stated
12 that the ultimate goal for Phase II of the Visitor Use Study was to take the indicators, quantify them,
13 determine what their levels were and then examine their relationships to use. Phase II was not just
14 about collecting the data on the ecological and physical characteristics within the canyons. It was also
15 about characterizing the amount of use and the distribution of use.

16
17 Trail counters, trail cameras, traffic counters, and mobile location data that was passively collected
18 through cell phones as users entered and exited specific areas of the canyons would be used to better
19 understand where use was happening and the amount of use that was happening. That data would be
20 overlaid with the ecological and physical indicators.

21
22 Patrick Shea wondered why members of the Council had not received a copy of the Interim Report
23 prior to the meeting. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker explained that CWC Staff had not seen
24 the report prior to the presentation. Mr. Shea felt it was important to look at certain indicator plants or
25 animals in the study and wondered what species would be used. Dr. Smith explained that the study
26 would primarily look at the amount of disturbed area around heavily used sites. There was also the
27 possibility of looking at invasive species along trail corridors as part of Phase II. That could likely be
28 done in the most heavily used areas. Vice-Chair Cameron suggested that Dr. Smith contact the
29 Cottonwood Canyons Foundation as they had done extensive research on invasives in the area.
30 Dr. Smith appreciated the suggestion.

31
32 Nate Furman reported that he represents the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance on the Stakeholders Council.
33 He reviewed the Interim Report and had concerns about climbers potentially being underrepresented
34 in the data. He also noted that the sampling sites in the report may not provide a true representation of
35 the data as some sites were sampled more than others. Mr. Furman asked Dr. Smith to speak about the
36 sampling strategy. Dr. Smith clarified that the sampling sites listed in the Interim Report were from
37 the Central Wasatch Visitor Use Study from 2015. The current Visitor Use Study proposed a more
38 comprehensive assessment of visitor use with a variety of different ways to measure recreation use.
39 The trail counters and mobile location data would provide comprehensive coverage of recreation use
40 beyond only sampling heavily used areas.

41
42 Kurt Hegmann asked for an overview of the water quality data. He wondered how far back the data
43 went and about the quality of the data. Dr. Smith explained that the data they were proposing to collect
44 would be used in conjunction with the recreation use data that was collected. Data would be collected
45 at regular intervals throughout 2022 to better understand the amount of use taking place at specific
46 locations as well as the water quality at those locations. For instance, the amount of use happening

1 within 200 meters of the high elevation lakes compared to the water quality at those high elevation
2 lakes. The data collected would make it possible to understand the relationship between the two.
3 Dr. Smith noted that there was some existing water sample data, but there were no measures of use
4 associated with that data.

5
6 Chair McCarvill appreciated the presentation and discussion. He recommended that Stakeholders
7 Council Members with specific questions for Dr. Smith contact him directly.
8

9 **3. Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Annual Report.**

10
11 **a. Barbara Cameron will Provide an Overview of the Stakeholders Council Annual**
12 **Report.**

13
14 **i. Committee Chairs will be Invited to Provide Any Additional Information**
15 **to Supplement the Annual Report.**
16

17 Vice-Chair Cameron overviewed the Stakeholders Council Annual Report. She reported that the
18 individual Stakeholders Council Member discussions had highlighted the fact that members wanted
19 to focus on achievable projects. She noted that one of the goals for the year was to continue with the
20 Stakeholders Council sub-committees. All of the sub-committees were reviewed.
21

22 The Millcreek Canyon Committee met regularly throughout the year. Their intention was to
23 continually monitor the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant process. Additionally, they
24 wanted to remain available to advise the CWC on issues related to Millcreek Canyon. Millcreek
25 Canyon Committee Chair, Paul Diegel, explained that the first public comment period for the FLAP
26 grant would take place between November 9, 2021, and December 9, 2021. The Committee intended
27 to share public comments. Those comments would need to be approved by the Stakeholders Council
28 and then the CWC Board. He noted that there was a narrow window of time to do that, and the
29 comments would need to be approved before the next scheduled Stakeholders Council Meeting. The
30 Committee would send out comments for review shortly.
31

32 The Preservation Committee held meetings during the year. Vice-Chair Cameron noted that the
33 meetings were action-oriented and focused on the need for minority voices. The Preservation
34 Committee recently sponsored a field trip. Preservation Committee Chair, Carl Fisher stated that the
35 Committee was looking to learn more from the CWC Board Retreat and the Stakeholders Council, as
36 they have an exhaustive list of things that they would like to do. However, it was important that the
37 Committee be in alignment with the priorities of the CWC.
38

39 The Trails Committee met regularly throughout the year and focused on trails updates and
40 maintenance. Vice-Chair Cameron stated that the Trails Committee Vision Statement related to
41 promoting a trail system vision. She noted that the Trails Committee Chair is John Knoblock. Vice-
42 Chair Cameron reported that Mr. Knoblock encouraged Salt Lake County to become involved with
43 the Trails Master Plan and the Town of Brighton and the County to contribute. She was grateful for
44 his trail advocacy.
45

1 **4. Short-Term Projects Process and Status Presentation.**

2
3 **a. Barbara Cameron will Provide an Overview of the Central Wasatch Commission**
4 **Short-Term Projects Process and 2020 and 2021 Projects Status.**

5
6 **i. The 2022 Short-Term Projects Process is Set to Open in February 2022.**

7
8 CWC short-term project updates were shared. Vice-Chair Cameron shared a list that she and CWC
9 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen had worked on. It outlined the CWC funding for the last
10 two years. The list broke down the projects into two categories: completed and yet to be completed.
11 Most of the projects were complete and all of them fit somewhere within the Stakeholders Council
12 priorities, which included transportation, trails, and stewardship. Ms. Nielsen reported that she sent
13 out a matrix with information about all of the different projects.

14
15 The short-term projects that were part of the initial call for project ideas in 2020 were shared.
16 Ms. Nielsen explained that in 2020, the Short-Term Projects Committee funded eight projects:

- 17
- 18 • Bathroom maintenance in Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon;
- 19 • Bridge construction at Dog Lake via the Desolation Trail;
- 20 • Wag bag maintenance from Jacob’s Ladder to Lone Peak Trailhead;
- 21 • Chipping in Millcreek Canyon;
- 22 • Graffiti abatement;
- 23 • Utah Open Lands acquisition of acreage at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon;
- 24 • Gate Buttress anchor maintenance and trail work; and
- 25 • Desolation Trail maintenance work.

26
27 All of the 2020 short-term projects had been completed. Recently granted projects were reviewed:

- 28
- 29 • Trail work through the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation;
- 30 • Reroute at Jacob’s Ladder;
- 31 • Big Cottonwood Canyon geo sign replacement initiative;
- 32 • Cottonwood Canyons stewardship program through Utah Open Lands;
- 33 • Bonanza Flat Trailhead transit program;
- 34 • Cecret Lake interpretive signage update; and
- 35 • Willow Heights Pond beaver dam analog project.

36
37 Ms. Nielsen noted that a flow chart was prepared to visually illustrate the process that the Stakeholders
38 Council and CWC Board went through when the short-term grant process opened. She explained that
39 the short-term grant process opened in February or March each year. That included the release of
40 grant guidelines and criteria for submitting proposals. Applicants had until the end of March to submit
41 project proposals to the CWC. From there, the CWC Short-Term Projects Review Committee graded
42 the entire pool of proposals and forwarded a list of finalists to the CWC Short-Term Projects
43 Committee. That Committee met publicly to review the projects and selected the projects to be funded.
44 The leaders of the selected projects were notified, and the funding went through in June. After the
45 project began, the CWC asked for confirmation of the receipt of funds as well as a report from the
46 project leads once the projects were complete.

1
2 Michael Braun wondered why so much money was being spent on Forest Service projects. He felt it
3 would make more sense to speak to the Legislators and inform them that additional funding was
4 needed. Mr. Knoblock explained that the Forest Service money was generally distributed based on
5 area and not by population. With the high amount of use taking place in the Central Wasatch, the
6 Forest Service did not have enough money to handle the level of degradation that was taking place.
7 Additionally, forest fires had been significant and much of the Forest Service funds had been diverted
8 to fight forest fires. Those passionate about the resource had tried to fill in funding gaps where
9 possible. Mr. Braun appreciated all of the organizations for assisting. However, he felt it may be
10 beneficial to reach out to Legislators to discuss Forest Service needs.

11
12 Patrick Nelson thought it would be interesting to discuss Forest Service funding in a more substantial
13 fashion. He explained that there had been significant decreases in all aspects of the Forest Service
14 budget, with the exception of fire. In fact, the recreation budget had been decreased by 36% in the
15 current year. To address growth and the different trails that users wanted, more money was needed.
16 Mr. Nelson felt there should be a better way to move forward collaboratively. Sarah Bennett agreed.
17 She noted that Salt Lake County had provided funding to the Forest Service but there was still more
18 to be done. It made sense to speak with Legislators and representatives about the Forest Service
19 budgetary needs.

20
21 **5. CWC Stakeholders Interview Results.**

- 22
23 a. **Leadership will Provide an Overview of the Compiled List from Stakeholders**
24 **Covering Preferred Action Items for 2022.**
25
26 b. **Stakeholders Council Leadership will Present to the CWC Board During Its**
27 **November 5 Retreat.**
28

29 Stakeholders Council Members were asked to share additional thoughts related to their comments on
30 the compiled list of preferred action items for 2022. Michael Marker believed a lot of time was spent
31 chasing solutions when the Council did not understand the problem. He noted that the Council was
32 busy with activities but was not dealing with the core problems. For instance, funding short-term
33 projects as opposed to taking larger steps to solve the ongoing Forest Service funding issues. He felt
34 it was important to determine how the CWC could make a significant lasting impact. In addition,
35 Mr. Marker commented that the CWC Board could benefit from having more Stakeholders Council
36 involvement in the Visitor Use Study discussions.

37
38 Mr. Diegel made note of issues the Millcreek Canyon Committee had run into. He explained that
39 several issues were identified and outlined, but since the Committee did not have authority, the
40 suggestions made did not appear to be moving forward. He stated that it was important to clarify what
41 authority the CWC had and what the CWC could realistically accomplish.

42
43 Jan Striefel commented that the Visitor Use Study could be used with the UDOT Little Cottonwood
44 Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). However, she felt it would likely have more value
45 for the management plan once Legislation was passed. Ms. Striefel explained that she was

1 disappointed in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS and did not think it represented the best
2 interests of the canyons.

3
4 Vice-Chair Cameron believed that restrooms needed to be a priority because they were the first step
5 toward transit. To have an effective transit system in place, there needed to be appropriate amenities
6 for users. She asked the Stakeholders Council to consider requesting funding for the Cardiff restroom.
7 The last restroom that was upgraded was done when Salt Lake County donated \$300,000 for the
8 restroom in Silver Lake. Cardiff also needed upgrades and it would be possible to ask the CWC Board
9 to consider splitting the cost of that restroom upgrade. The Forest Service already had a plan in place
10 for the work, but funding was needed.

11
12 Erin Bragg was curious about the Trails to Transit program that took place over the summer. She
13 heard it was successful but was curious to see some metrics.

14
15 Chair McCarvill commented that the Stakeholders Council was intended to gather information and
16 provide input to the CWC Board. He wondered whether it would be possible for the Council to create
17 a white paper that discussed the status of an issue. He shared possible examples:

- 18
19
- Enforcement issues:
 - Who was responsible for enforcement throughout the Central Wasatch?
 - Who has authority in each area of the Central Wasatch?
 - Educational stewardship:
 - What does education look like in Salt Lake Valley?
 - What are the various school boards doing?
- 20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Chair McCarvill felt it was important to determine the weaknesses and create specific solutions. The
27 white papers could be presented to the CWC Board along with a list of recommendations. Hilary
28 Lambert noted that a few organizations were doing similar work. It would be beneficial to reach out
29 to them about a possible collaboration.

30
31 Alex Porpora commented that there needed to be a continued emphasis on signage updates, as a lot of
32 the signs were outdated. She also believed it was important to think about environmental education
33 and how visitors accessed outdoor spaces. Ms. Porpora agreed with the work put forth by the
34 Preservation Committee in terms of understanding equitable access to outdoor spaces.

35
36 Mr. Hegmann noted that there was a common theme underlying almost every single comment made
37 during the meeting, which was funding. As a result, he felt it was important to move forward with
38 tolling. He also noted that it could benefit the traffic and use levels.

39
40 Maura Hahnenberger discussed environmental justice and equity. She felt that it was mentioned in
41 documents occasionally but not as regularly as she would like to see. It was important to consider the
42 people using the canyons and ensure that any changes made to the canyons did not create more
43 injustices in equity. Additionally, education needed to be equitable.

44
45 Brian Hutchinson felt that the Stakeholders Council needed to focus on the purpose and need statement
46 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. He also noted that the Stakeholders Council needed

1 more representation. This was being discussed by the Preservation Committee but until the actual
2 Stakeholders Council has proper representation, it would be difficult to fully understand the problems
3 in the canyons. The Stakeholders Council needed to be rebuilt so that it represented various age
4 groups, socio-economic groups, and ethnic groups throughout the valley.

5
6 Tom Diegel noted that it was unclear what influence the Stakeholders Council had on the CWC and
7 what influence the CWC had on UDOT. Transportation in all three canyons was the root of a lot of
8 the issues discussed by the Stakeholders Council. It would be beneficial to obtain more clarity about
9 the level of influence and authority. Mr. Diegel noted that Josh Van Jura had stated that CWC input
10 was being considered by UDOT, but that had not been reflected in the UDOT Little Cottonwood
11 Canyon EIS. It would be helpful to better understand the roles.

12
13 Carl Fisher reminded the Council that the CWC was all about the implementation of the Mountain
14 Accord. However, it felt that very little was being done regarding environmental stewardship. There
15 were many opportunities to expand recreation throughout the Central Wasatch and to expand
16 transportation, but little was being done as it related to the environmental components. Preservation
17 and environmental stewardship should be prioritized.

18
19 Vice-Chair Cameron explained that additional comments from Stakeholders Council Members could
20 be submitted until November 1, 2021. The comments would then be shared at the CWC Board Retreat.
21 She noted that there were several trends in the submitted comments and the comments voiced during
22 the current Stakeholders Council Meeting, such as:

- 23
- 24 • Additional funding is needed;
 - 25 • Comprehensive transportation plans should include Big Cottonwood Canyon;
 - 26 • An expanded UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS scope should be considered;
 - 27 • Public education and outreach should be a focus;
 - 28 • Trail improvements required funding and support from many partners;
 - 29 • Enforcement should be studied;
 - 30 • Restroom upgrades were needed; and
 - 31 • Relationship building with agencies would be beneficial.
- 32

33 There were also some common questions posed in the comments:

- 34
- 35 • What is the problem to be solved?
 - 36 • What is the role of the CWC?
- 37

38 Chair McCarvill explained that he and Vice-Chair Cameron would try to condense the comments
39 down into consistent themes. They would not have a lot of time to present at the CWC Board Retreat
40 and it was necessary to condense the information down to the core issues. He and Vice-Chair Cameron
41 would work on a draft comment document next week. It would be shared with Council Members for
42 final comments and review.

43
44 Chair McCarvill made note of the earlier discussion related to the Millcreek Canyon Committee. In
45 order for the Committee to provide public comments on the FLAP grant process, the Stakeholders
46 Council would need to approve the comments and the CWC Board would need to approve the

1 comments. There may need to be a special meeting of the Stakeholders Council to review the
2 Millcreek Canyon Committee comments. If appropriate, the Stakeholders Council would approve the
3 comments ahead of the CWC Board Meeting.

4
5 Final comments were shared by Stakeholders Council Members. Ms. Hahnenberger noted that there
6 seemed to be a lot of interest in education, but there wasn't a sub-committee dedicated to that work.
7 She suggested that a sub-committee could be created to focus on education. Mr. Knoblock noted that
8 funding was a significant issue. The Central Wasatch was a county-wide resource and it would be
9 helpful if Salt Lake County were willing to increase its funding levels. He believed the Council should
10 continue to push in that direction.

11
12 Chair McCarvill stated that it had been a productive meeting. He thanked Council Members for all of
13 their input. He and Vice-Chair Cameron would work on condensing the comments and a draft version
14 would be sent out to Council Members for review ahead of the CWC Board Retreat.

15
16 **6. Adjournment.**

17
18 **MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved to adjourn. Michael Marker seconded the motion. The motion passed
19 with the unanimous consent of the Council.

20
21 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:03 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, October 20, 2021.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____