



2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD RETREAT
HELD FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2021 AT 9:00 A.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED
ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL ANCHOR LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED
BY UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-207(4).**

Present: Chair Chris Robinson
Mayor Mike Peterson
Mayor Erin Mendenhall
Mayor Jenny Wilson
Mayor Harris Sondak
Mayor Dan Knopp
Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
Councilor Jim Bradley
Councilor Marci Houseman
Councilor Max Doilney
Carlton Christensen, Ex-Officio

Staff: Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Associate Director
Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator

Others: Bobby Sampson
Abi Holt
Carl Fisher
Chris Cawley
Mike Weichers
Roger Borgenicht
Roger Bourke
Megan Nelson
N. Worel
Ned Hacker
Carolyn Keigley
Patrick Nelson
Catherine Kanter
Lisa Hartman
Ann Floor

1 **OPENING**

2
3 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the Board Retreat Plus Comment**
4 **on the Electronic Meeting, No Anchor Location, As Noted Above.**

5
6 Chair Christopher Robinson opened the CWC Board Retreat at 9:00 a.m.

7
8 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which
9 was as follows:

10
11 ‘I, as the Chair of the Board of Commissioners (the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch
12 Commission (“CWC”), hereby determine that conducting Board Meetings at any time during
13 the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of
14 those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the overall instances of COVID-
15 19 have diminished somewhat over the past several months, the pandemic remains and the
16 recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another
17 surge in cases, which could again threaten to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’

18
19 **CLOSED SESSION BEGINS**

20
21 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Begin a Closed Session for the Purposes**
22 **of Discussing the Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of**
23 **an Individual as Authorized by UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-205(1)(a).**

24
25 Chair Robinson explained that if a Closed Session was needed, it would be deferred to the end of the
26 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Retreat. There was no Closed Session.

27
28 **CLOSED SESSION ENDS**

29
30 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will End the Closed Session for the**
31 **Purposes of Discussing the Character, Professional Competence or Physical or Mental**
32 **Health of an Individual as Authorized by UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-205(1)(a) and**
33 **Reopen the Central Wasatch Commission Board Retreat.**

34
35 There was no Closed Session.

36
37 **BOARD RETREAT REOPENS**

38
39 1. **Commissioners Houseman and Knopp will Welcome Commissioners and the Public, as**
40 **well as Provide an Overview of the Retreat Agenda.**

41
42 Chair Robinson welcomed those present to the CWC Board Retreat. He reported that Mayor Knopp
43 and Councilor Houseman would provide an overview of the retreat agenda.

- 44
45 • **A “Welcome” Video will Play at the Commencement of the Retreat.**

46
47 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen played a brief welcome video for those present.

- 1 • **Commissioners Houseman and Knopp will Explain that the Retreat is not the Venue**
2 **for Discussion over the DEIS Specifically as well as Set Expectations and Goals for**
3 **the Retreat.**
4

5 Mayor Knopp explained that the intention of the CWC Board Retreat was not to discuss the Utah
6 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact
7 Statement (“EIS”). Instead, the focus would be on the future vision for the CWC. Councilor
8 Houseman felt that the discussions should consider how to alleviate the concerns of those who may
9 be skeptical about the role of the CWC and the ability of the CWC to get things done.

10 **FUTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION**

- 11 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Facilitate a Discussion Around the**
12 **Future and Function of the Central Wasatch Commission.**
13

14 Chair Robinson noted that several questions were posed to CWC Board Members, including how the
15 CWC should function, the future of the organization, expectations, and consensus. He felt there had
16 been a productive CWC Board Retreat two years ago, where those present decided to shift the focus
17 from the legislation and create committees: Short-Term Projects, Legislative/Land Tenure, and
18 Transportation. The last two years were spent studying mountain transportation options and
19 formulating opinions. The CWC Board agreed to the greatest extent possible and published the
20 Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document. Additionally, the CWC provided
21 written comments to UDOT on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. Chair Robinson
22 noted that the legislation was in fair shape. However, it was subject to final edits if and when there
23 was an interested sponsor. He felt the CWC Board had accomplished a lot over the last several years.
24
25

26 The CWC was now at a point where it was important to determine the plan of work moving forward.
27 It was also necessary to look at the value proposition for each of the member jurisdictions. Chair
28 Robinson discussed the issue of consensus and stated that the world was very divided. He liked the
29 Mountain Accord method of consensus because it required all members to agree. The CWC had
30 broad representation among the jurisdictions that surrounded and comprised the Wasatch. As a result,
31 a consensus was far more meaningful. Chair Robinson asked that each CWC Board Member take a
32 few minutes to answer each of the questions posed.
33
34

- 35 • **Should the Central Wasatch Commission remain as it is or shift in ways?**
36

37 Mayor Sondak believed that the CWC had been effective with short-term projects and he appreciated
38 the work done by the Short-Term Projects Committee. He suggested that the CWC continue to focus
39 its attention on the short-term projects as opposed to the larger picture issues.
40

41 Mayor Knopp felt the CWC needed to remain as-is. He noted that the organization has a voice if they
42 stuck together and shared intelligent recommendations.
43

44 Mayor Peterson explained that all organizations continued to grow and change over time. The
45 purpose of the CWC Board Retreat was to determine how the CWC should adapt and become better.
46 He was excited to see what would come out of the Retreat discussions.
47

1 Councilor Doilney stated that the composition of the CWC is solid and it made sense that the
2 organization represented different communities. He added that the weight of each individual voice
3 was made heavier through the CWC.
4

5 Mayor Mendenhall noted that the CWC process began before many current CWC Board Members
6 were in their roles. There had been a complicated and intense process related to consensus in the
7 Central Wasatch. Since the Mountain Accord was finalized six years earlier, there had been a lot of
8 changes politically and as it relates to decisions around land and water. She felt they were reentering
9 the circumstances that led to the need for the Mountain Accord process to begin with and suggested
10 that a consensus be reached about the Mountain Accord. Mayor Mendenhall believed it would be
11 worthwhile to discuss a third-party situational assessment. The assessment could help the CWC reach
12 a mutual understanding and come back to consensus. The situational assessment could be done
13 parallel to short-term projects, conversations with UDOT, and any other CWC work.
14

15 Mayor Silvestrini informed those present that he was on an airplane and would not be participating
16 in the CWC Board Retreat. However, he would be listening in as much as possible. He felt that the
17 organization still had a purpose.
18

19 Mayor Wilson believed the CWC needed to shift and get back to the central principles of the Mountain
20 Accord. It was also important to review the Mountain Accord and determine if anything had changed
21 since it was agreed upon. She noted that it was difficult for her to give the organization the time it
22 deserved given her regional role.
23

24 Councilor Bradley stated that this was a classic example of organizational development. He explained
25 that all organizations went through a struggle to define themselves and this was a healthy process.
26 The CWC should not remain as it was, because it needed to be dynamic and nimble enough to address
27 issues as they arose. If certain processes were no longer effective or efficient, it was important for
28 the organization to make necessary changes. Councilor Bradley believed the core strength of the
29 CWC was the fact that members cared about the canyons and the Wasatch. That laid a foundation.
30 Though members may have different views and ideas, having that solid foundation in place was
31 critical. The CWC needed to show that the organization cared, that they were willing to look at the
32 issues and that they were willing to explore potential solutions. He felt that CWC Board Members
33 should always be looking for ways to be as effective as possible.
34

35 Councilor Houseman appreciated the comments shared during the CWC Board Retreat thus far. She
36 noted that the exercise demonstrated that there were some commonalities between CWC Board
37 Members. Councilor Bradley had made a comment related to the “congregation of common interests”
38 and Councilor Houseman felt that needed to be figuratively added to the tenants of the Mountain
39 Accord. She believed it was easy to say no and much harder to find solutions. The role of the CWC
40 was to be a leadership voice that went after solutions. The leadership role of the CWC was to
41 influence, educate, inform, and chase solutions rather than to just say no to things. She hoped it would
42 be possible for the organization to find a way back to that.
43

44 Councilor Houseman discussed the organizational structure and stated that there were four phases:
45

- 46 • Forming;
- 47 • Storming;
- 48 • Norming; and

- Performing.

The CWC had passed through forming and were now in a storming phase. It was time to consider what norming would look like. For instance, whether the CWC would operate under consensus and what consensus would mean. There needed to be protocols and norms in place. This would ensure that every voice matters and every CWC Board Member has an equal opportunity to share their perspective. Councilor Houseman felt that performing as the CWC meant that the organization had an impactful influence and they were able to move important conversations forward.

Chair Robinson believed that the Mountain Accord and CWC needed to be dynamic and to shift as needed. He stated that the CWC Board Retreat was a healthy process for the organization.

Ex Officio Member, Carlton Christensen reported that in 1998 he was appointed with 12 other individuals to the Quality Growth Commission. At that time, there needed to be nine votes for something to be passed. Despite there being long discussions about statements and approaches when the nine votes were achieved, there was strength moving forward. He wanted to see more items move forward at the CWC level. Ex Officio Christensen stated that it would be difficult to bring different parties together and work out solutions without the CWC. If certain actions were not taken and coordination was not achieved, there could be issues for the canyons in the future. He felt there was a place for the Commission and that was the reason Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) was involved. He was appreciative of where the CWC was currently, but felt there might need to be a bit of refinement. Ex Officio Christensen hoped that the CWC Board Retreat led to some policy statements.

- **Where should the Central Wasatch Commission be going?**

Mayor Sondak noted that the CWC provides a solid voice for various jurisdictions. He felt it was important to continue to play that role to the greatest extent possible. The fact that the organization had multiple jurisdictions coming together was an important function of the CWC.

Mayor Knopp stated that it was important to move past Little Cottonwood Canyon and look at the broader picture of mountain transportation. He stressed the importance of being able to solve some of the transportation problems that faced the area. Other than that, he felt the CWC was doing a great job with the short-term projects and the various committees.

Mayor Peterson believed there needed to be a certain level of communication and commitment by the member jurisdictions as the CWC moved forward.

Councilor Doilney stressed the importance of short-term projects. He felt it was the easiest way to build momentum for future success. He liked the idea of taking more bite-sized pieces and having more measurable successes, as it added to the credibility of the organization.

Mayor Wilson believed that one of the strengths of the CWC was the fact that members meet, know each other, and can share different perspectives. She felt that the CWC should continue to focus on short-term projects. For instance, the U.S. Forest Service had a lot of needs, and the CWC could be strategic with the short-term projects in order to fill in some of those gaps.

Chair Robinson stated that it was important to get back to basics and focus on why the CWC Board Members were part of the organization.

1
2 • **How are the Mountain Accord action items and expectations being fulfilled?**
3

4 Mayor Sondak felt that the transportation discussions and environmental protections were important.
5 He also stated that the legislation was a good idea if it was possible to find a sponsor.
6

7 Mayor Knopp stated that it was important for the CWC Board to read through the main charge of the
8 Mountain Accord. He made note of transportation concerns and reiterated that the CWC needed to
9 focus more on the mandate that came from the Mountain Accord.
10

11 Mayor Peterson believed the Mountain Accord was successful and there was consensus. He thought
12 that the Mountain Accord work should be the cornerstone of what the CWC advocated for.
13

14 Councilor Doilney noted that the Mountain Accord was the guiding principle and he did not see any
15 reason why the CWC would move away from that guidance.
16

17 • **Do we operate under consensus and what does consensus mean?**
18

19 Mayor Sondak believed that the goal of consensus was important for the CWC.
20

21 Mayor Knopp noted that it would not always be possible to get every single person to agree on every
22 single item. If one voice could stop everything, it would be impossible to move forward.
23

24 Mayor Peterson did not believe consensus meant that everyone agreed 100% on the exact same
25 principles. Instead, it meant that conceptually, there was consensus on certain things that could be
26 moved forward. Reaching some form of consensus was important to produce outcomes.
27

28 Councilor Doilney explained that consensus was an idealistic idea, but it could sometimes act as a
29 barrier to success. He felt the idea of a super-majority made sense. The CWC represented
30 communities as small as Brighton and as large as Salt Lake County. While CWC Board Members
31 may happen to agree on an item, they were each representing constituents. The needs of the
32 constituents were diverse and as a result, consensus would be difficult. Councilor Doilney believed
33 the CWC may need to consider going with the majority or supermajority.
34

35 Mayor Mendenhall disagreed that a majority was sufficient. There needed to be a shared agreement
36 about the CWC's role and values. She felt the pressures of the transportation proposals had distracted
37 and compounded the shifting premise of why the CWC existed. Mayor Mendenhall wanted to see
38 the CWC agree about what the Mountain Accord is.
39

40 Mayor Wilson did not believe it was always possible to have consensus. However, when it was
41 possible to reach consensus, there would be opportunities for the CWC to impact the Federal
42 Delegation, State Delegation, and constituents.
43

44 Councilor Bradley noted that there could not be an expectation that all members would always come
45 to the same conclusions. There would be differences due to various constituent opinions, location,
46 and political councils. He did not believe the CWC could expect unanimity. The Supreme Court
47 functioned well with Majority Reports and Minority Reports. Councilor Bradley felt the CWC should

1 think of ways to express differences in opinion when addressing important issues. He felt that could
2 be done in a way that was positive and could also increase the body of knowledge.

3
4 Councilor Houseman did not think that consensus meant everyone agreed. She had used various
5 consensus protocols in her professional field and consensus did not mean everyone agreed to the exact
6 same thing. It meant that the body came together to put the work above the individual personalities
7 in order to get things done. She believed that was what the CWC needed to do. It was important to
8 determine the norms and protocols that would take the organization from norming to performing.
9 Everyone trying to see things the same way had been a barrier and she liked the idea of following the
10 form that the Supreme Court followed, with Majority Reports and Minority Reports. That kind of
11 information could influence others and educate decision-makers.

12
13 Councilor Doilney agreed with an earlier comment about determining what consensus looked like.

14
15 Mayor Mendenhall reiterated her comment about reentering the circumstances that led to the need for
16 the Mountain Accord process. She explained that it was not just due to the changes in political voices
17 that made up the CWC but also had to do with land exchange issues and water expansion. She
18 understood comments from other CWC Board Members about the desire to be productive and the
19 difficulty of reaching consensus on the day-to-day agenda items. However, it was important to reach
20 consensus about why each CWC Board Member was present and what the goals of the CWC were.
21 She felt that had fundamentally shifted over the last six years.

22
23 Councilor Houseman did not believe the CWC should get lost in the idea of consensus. That being
24 said, consensus did not necessarily mean that everyone agreed to one purpose and need. It was
25 important to recognize that every voice mattered and that it was okay to have different perspectives.

26
27 Mayor Mendenhall stated that in order for Salt Lake City to continue with the CWC, there needed to
28 be a consensus about what the Mountain Accord was. Additionally, the CWC needed to redefine
29 their commitments, because she did not feel that they were currently doing what was laid out in the
30 Mountain Accord. Moving forward, a majority vote may be sufficient for opinions on certain topics
31 or funding decisions, but there needed to be a consensus as it related to the Mountain Accord. It
32 would likely take a third party to unpack what each CWC Board Member expected, needed, and
33 wanted out of the Mountain Accord. Chair Robinson asked that the discussion on a situational
34 assessment continue after the remaining CWC Board Members shared their answers to the questions.

35
36 • **What does success look like for the Central Wasatch Commission?**

37
38 Mayor Sondak explained that a mark of success would be if the policymakers felt they needed to talk
39 to the CWC before they moved forward. If the CWC was recognized and acknowledged as a central
40 resource for policymakers, that would be a sign that the CWC had become successful.

41
42 Mayor Knopp believed success for the CWC would be to solve some of the transportation problems.

43
44 Mayor Peterson stated that success for the CWC had to do with producing something and having an
45 outcome. There had been concerns during the first two years that the CWC was very busy, but was
46 not producing anything. The committees, the creation of the MTS Pillars Document, the
47 Environmental Dashboard, Visitor Use Study, and short-term projects showed that the CWC was
48 making an impact. He felt that success meant continuing to find ways to do so.

1
2 Councilor Doilney felt that success looked like bite-sized pieces and small steps forward. Once there
3 were more accomplishments and successes achieved, it would be possible to tackle larger items.
4

5 Mayor Mendenhall believed the definition of success was for the CWC to come back to agreement
6 about what the Mountain Accord was. That would make it possible for the organization to operate
7 with consensus in the future.
8

9 Mayor Wilson felt that success looked like continued coordination and the ability to convene. She
10 was not certain that this needed to be done under the CWC and wondered whether there was an
11 opportunity for Salt Lake County to play a more direct role in the future. However, she was interested
12 to hear other CWC Board Member perspectives on the topic.
13

14 Chair Robinson viewed success as the jurisdictions and community as a whole receiving value for
15 their time and financial commitments to the CWC. He also believed it was important that the CWC
16 was able to operate on a sustainable basis.
17

18 • **Is it important to make a recommendation on MTS?**
19

20 Mayor Sondak felt the CWC needed to reach an understanding about what would best serve the
21 community as it related to transportation.
22

23 Mayor Knopp commented that the CWC should look 30 to 40 years down the road and start to make
24 positive changes related to transportation because the issues were not going to go away on their own.
25

26 Mayor Peterson believed that it was important for the CWC to make a recommendation on the MTS.
27 Wherever it was possible for the CWC to have influence, they should attempt to be heard.
28

29 Councilor Doilney believed that the CWC needed to make recommendations related to mountain
30 transportation. It was important that the voice of the organization was heard and that all of the
31 recommendations that were made carried weight.
32

33 • **What does the Central Wasatch Commission mean to you?**
34

35 Mayor Sondak noted that both Alta and Brighton were small, but they were in the center of things.
36 He appreciated having a larger voice thanks to the CWC.
37

38 Mayor Knopp agreed with Mayor Sondak and stated that Brighton had a bigger voice because the
39 CWC member jurisdictions were addressing issues together.
40

41 Mayor Peterson explained that he had been supportive of the CWC from the beginning because it
42 gave Cottonwood Heights a seat at the table where there could be influence. The CWC had been
43 valuable and he was interested to see how things would continue.
44

45 Councilor Doilney stated that it was nice to be able to speak with people on the Wasatch Front and
46 have them understand the impacts that certain decisions would have on Park City. He felt that
47 participation in the CWC had been beneficial to Park City and Summit County. They would need the

1 CWC more in the future as the population continued to grow. He noted that it was important to be
2 aware of the challenges facing different jurisdictions.

3
4 Chair Robinson explained that the Mountain Accord and CWC had provided a lot of value to Summit
5 County in ways that were not able to be added to a ballot sheet.

6
7 **2. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Continue Facilitating the Discussion**
8 **around the Future and Function of the Central Wasatch Commission.**
9

10 Chair Robinson allowed time for CWC Board Members to continue discussions related to the future
11 and function of the CWC. Mayor Peterson stated that it was important to move things forward.
12 Allowing one person to veto everything could be problematic. He felt it made sense to determine
13 where there was consensus and build from there. Mayor Peterson agreed that a simple majority for
14 the Mountain Accord would be problematic. However, in terms of day-to-day items, he felt there
15 needed to be discussions about how to move forward as a group when an absolute consensus was not
16 possible. There could be a certain level of consensus that allowed the CWC to move forward.

17
18 Mayor Sondak agreed with earlier comments by Mayor Mendenhall that the CWC needed to be on
19 the same page about the organization and the Mountain Accord. On the other hand, he agreed with
20 Mayor Peterson that on day-to-day issues, there may not be consensus, because individuals had
21 different points of view. While it was necessary for CWC Board Members to unanimously agree that
22 recommending solutions for transportation issues was an important purpose of the CWC, it was not
23 necessary for CWC Board Members to unanimously agree about specific transportation modes.

24
25 Chair Robinson noted that there had been consensus on the CWC Governing Document. He also
26 pointed out that the CWC had not been able to keep all of the parties that signed the Mountain Accord
27 active. For instance, there was no State leadership involved. The idea of going back to basics and
28 having a third-party look to see what parts of the Mountain Accord could still be agreed upon made
29 sense. Chair Robinson agreed that there should be consensus on the Mountain Accord, but the day-
30 to-day decisions could have a Majority Report and Minority Report.

31
32 Mayor Knopp asked that the expectations of the Mountain Accord be shared with those present. CWC
33 Deputy Director, Blake Perez shared information related to the Mountain Accord. Mayor Knopp felt
34 it was important to remind CWC Board Members what was initially agreed upon. Councilor
35 Houseman noted that Mayor Mendenhall made an earlier comment about being out of alignment with
36 the Mountain Accord. She wondered whether someone could point out where the CWC was out of
37 alignment. Chair Robinson did not believe the CWC was out of alignment, but there may not be as
38 much of a commitment to the Mountain Accord as there was previously.

39
40 Mayor Mendenhall stated that Alta Ski Lifts had walked away from the land exchange component in
41 the Mountain Accord. That was the premise for additional water conversations with Salt Lake City.
42 Alta Ski Lifts was still asking for more water, but they had walked away from what was established
43 through the Mountain Accord. Chair Robinson noted that another divergence from the original
44 Mountain Accord was the fact that there was no current State involvement. Councilor Houseman
45 understood the examples but noted that the Commission had not acted in a way that was out of
46 alignment with the principles of the Mountain Accord.

1 Mayor Mendenhall explained that the reason for the CWC was to implement the Mountain Accord.
2 The actual Commission had not diverged from the Mountain Accord, but the premise of the CWC
3 had shifted. She felt the organization was compromised until they returned to a shared understanding
4 and recommitted to the intention of the Mountain Accord. Councilor Houseman understood what
5 Mayor Mendenhall was saying. However, she did not believe that the CWC was out of alignment
6 with the Mountain Accord. She welcomed the opportunity to revisit the decision that Alta Ski Lifts
7 had made, but the Commission and the work that had been done should not be brought into question.
8

9 Councilor Doilney could see where Mayor Mendenhall was coming from, because it did not seem
10 that enough weight had been given to environmental protections, which were listed in the Mountain
11 Accord, during the transportation discussions. It seemed to take a back seat. Councilor Doilney did
12 not believe the CWC had left the Mountain Accord altogether, but it seemed that there was some
13 room for improvement. Chair Robinson felt that it would be appropriate to revisit the Mountain
14 Accord and see whether any adjustments may need to be made in the future.
15

16 Mayor Wilson believed that the CWC needed to go back to the specifics of the Mountain Accord.
17 While all of the CWC Board Members supported the Mountain Accord, it was important to look at
18 how things had changed. For instance, the use levels in the canyons had increased significantly.
19 Mayor Wilson also pointed out that each of the member jurisdictions had different priority lists to one
20 another. She stressed her commitment to water quality and noted that it would be followed by
21 preservation, transportation, and economy. That ranking may be different for other CWC Board
22 Members based on the unique needs of their constituency.
23

24 Mayor Wilson explained that the complexity of the different member jurisdictions impacted the
25 ability for the CWC to align. As a result, it was difficult to move forward efficiently. She stressed
26 the importance of narrowing down the common elements in a way that was tangible and would move
27 items forward. Mayor Wilson stated that the organization was well-intentioned, but she questioned
28 the effectiveness. She asked about the timeline and costs associated with a situational assessment.
29

30 Mayor Knopp felt that transportation was the most important thing for the CWC to look at. One of
31 the biggest problems with water quality had to do with the amount of traffic in the canyons. There
32 was now 25% more traffic in the canyons than there was three years earlier. If the transportation
33 problems were not solved, it would be to the detriment of the watershed and water quality. Mayor
34 Knopp also discussed the land exchanges. He explained that most of the land exchanges had been
35 axed when the Forest Service realized that most of the land to be exchanged were mining claims and
36 had areas with unknown composition. The ski areas had not backed out of the land exchanges. It
37 was the Forest Service that decided not to follow through.
38

39 Mayor Sondak explained that the categories in the Mountain Accord, such as legislation, land
40 exchanges, transportation -and conservation were seen as worthwhile at the time. Since then, he had
41 learned that a lot of those issues were outside of the purview of the CWC because they required
42 participation from specific entities. Mayor Sondak made note of the increased population in Utah. It
43 was important to deal with that growth in a long-term and sustainable way. Mayor Knopp stated that
44 while there was continued growth in the area and tourism was a significant part of the economy, it
45 was the job of organizations, policymakers, and local government to manage that growth.
46

47 Chair Robinson stated that the Mountain Accord had a large Board with 30 different members,
48 including representatives from environmental groups, trails advocates, ski resort representatives, and

1 local governments. He felt that what might be missing from the CWC was the representation of non-
2 elected voices and State leadership. Chair Robinson wondered whether the CWC Board Members
3 were interested in taking another look at the CWC structure to ensure that it was as effective as
4 possible. He posed the following questions to those present:

- 5
- 6 • Should the CWC consider reconstructing the Commission to have more than just elected
- 7 officials and Ex Officio members?
- 8 • Should the CWC have more representation, including from State leadership?
- 9 • If the CWC were to do a facilitated review of the Mountain Accord, would it be possible to
- 10 get some of the original representatives back to the table and recommitted to the process?
- 11

12 Councilor Bradley felt it was dangerous territory to think about reconstructing the governing body of
13 the CWC. He noted that the CWC had a common purpose and the membership had always considered
14 that in their actions. There needed to be a common theme and philosophy that all members agreed
15 to. Opening up membership could compromise that. While he understood that influence was needed,
16 it would be difficult if those with influence were not on the same page as the rest of the Commission.
17 Chair Robinson wondered whether the role of the CWC was to be advisory, to influence, to educate,
18 and to inform. Ex Officio Christensen shared his previous experience with those present.

19
20 Mayor Mendenhall believed that a third-party situational assessment may reengage the State. It was
21 clear that they were not interested in aligning with the CWC currently, but the situational assessment
22 could create an opportunity for them to participate further. The assessment could also examine what
23 the CWC Board should look like. However, she felt it was important to recalibrate the CWC to the
24 principles of the Mountain Accord before the CWC structure was changed. Mayor Peterson felt it
25 was necessary to determine whether all CWC Board Members were committed to moving forward.

26
27 Chair Robinson reiterated that a successful organization is one that is sustainable. That meant there
28 needed to be sustainable funding. He pointed out that every year, the CWC had to justify its existence.
29 As a result, it made sense to go back to those who signed the Mountain Accord to determine whether
30 they still believed in the accord and whether they were willing to recommit to the principles and goals.
31 The purpose of the CWC was to implement the Mountain Accord.

32
33 Discussions were had about the best time to take a break. Chair Robinson asked that all CWC Board
34 Members return at 12:15 p.m. to continue the discussions. He stated that the second portion of the
35 CWC Board Retreat would involve the creation of a specific and actionable plan.

36
37 **BREAK**

38
39 **FUTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION**
40 **(CONTINUED)**

41
42 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Continue Facilitating the Discussion**
43 **around the Future and Function of the Central Wasatch Commission.**
44

45 Chair Robinson explained that during the break he had spoken with CWC Staff to put together some
46 proposals based on the previous discussion points. He shared the proposals:

- 47
- 48 • The CWC undertake a third-party situational assessment that would focus on the following:

- 1 ○ Refinement and recertification of the Mountain Accord;
 - 2 ▪ Ensure that the Mountain Accord was up to date and reflected current thinking.
 - 3 If approved, recertify the Mountain Accord as the CWC charter.
- 4 ○ Recommit to the Mountain Accord, as amended;
- 5 ○ Review the organizational structure of the CWC;
 - 6 ▪ Use the situational assessment to determine whether the CWC had the right
 - 7 structure to accomplish the mission of implementing the Mountain Accord.
- 8 ○ Ensure that the right managerial structure was in place.
- 9 ● Hold a joint Executive Committee and Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting on
- 10 November 15, 2021, to create a Draft request for proposal (“RFP”) for a third-party facilitator;
- 11 ● Share the RFP with the CWC Board at the December 2021 CWC Board Meeting;
- 12 ● Issue the RFP and spend the first half of 2022 focused on the situational assessment.

13
 14 Chair Robinson explained that there would be some changes to the CWC Board due to elections. The
 15 situational assessment would allow new members to come in at a foundational level and fully
 16 understand both the Mountain Accord and CWC. He added that the December 6, 2021, CWC Board
 17 Meeting would set in motion the governance for 2022 as the Executive Committee would discuss the
 18 various committees and appointments on November 15, 2021. Chair Robinson asked for feedback
 19 related to the proposals and the suggested timeline.

20
 21 Mayor Sondak felt the discussions at the CWC Board Retreat were beneficial and believed a
 22 situational assessment could be useful. However, he was concerned that some of the members of the
 23 original Mountain Accord would not recertify the accord. The CWC needed to anticipate that
 24 possibility and consider how to move forward if that happened. Chair Robinson noted that there was
 25 a risk that some may not recommit to the Mountain Accord, but the mission of the CWC was to
 26 implement the Mountain Accord and there was benefit in knowing where others stood. He reported
 27 that the Mountain Accord had been committed to by a diverse group. That work was now being
 28 implemented by the CWC through nine elected officials and one Ex Officio appointee. The
 29 recommitment to the Mountain Accord needed to be done on a broader scale.

30
 31 Chair Robinson did not believe that a rewrite of the Mountain Accord would be necessary. The accord
 32 was the culmination of many years of work, which resulted in a signed document that influenced the
 33 work of the CWC. The Mountain Accord had been agreed to, but six years later, it was time to revisit
 34 the document. He pointed out that many CWC Board Members stated earlier that they felt CWC
 35 success meant accomplishments and outcomes. It would be difficult to implement anything without
 36 renewed support for the Mountain Accord. Chair Robinson explained that he would strategize with
 37 CWC Staff to determine how to move forward with the situational assessment. It may involve inviting
 38 other parties that were previously involved with the Mountain Accord.

39
 40 Councilor Doilney stated that the collective voice of the CWC could deliver a message to those with
 41 power and authority to make certain decisions. It was important for the CWC to work together to
 42 come up with the right message as it related to recommitment to the Mountain Accord. The CWC
 43 needed to clearly define what they were asking others to recommit to. Councilor Doilney made note
 44 of the growing population and the need to achieve critical goals.

45
 46 Mayor Wilson liked the proposals shared by Chair Robinson and felt the steps were tangible. She
 47 explained that she would ask her staff to look at the Mountain Accord through the lens of her
 48 constituency. For instance, if something could be accomplished by Salt Lake County, through a

1 partnership, or whether that work could be done through the CWC. Mayor Wilson encouraged other
2 CWC Board Members to do the same thing for their constituencies. Each CWC Board Member
3 needed to understand the individual priorities for their constituency as well as their own view of the
4 Mountain Accord. Chair Robinson noted that all CWC member jurisdictions gave time and money
5 to participate. However, participation in the CWC did not force member jurisdictions to sacrifice
6 anything else, such as advocating for special interests. It was not a question of either/or.

7
8 Mayor Peterson was conceptually supportive of the proposals. He wondered whether the
9 effectiveness of the CWC would be lessened if larger entities, such as Salt Lake City and Salt Lake
10 County chose not to participate at the same level. Chair Robinson believed it was premature to
11 forecast the withdrawal of any parties. He suggested that the CWC move through the proposed steps
12 and see what came out of the situational assessment. Mayor Mendenhall clarified that her intention
13 and desire was for Salt Lake City to remain a part of the Mountain Accord and the CWC. They had
14 a lot at stake with the watershed and she felt that a group based on a shared intention was the best
15 way for Salt Lake City to proceed.

16
17 Mayor Wilson shared some of her priorities, such as the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS
18 process as well as Federal Legislation. She wanted to move the needle forward on some of those
19 priorities and felt it was important that the CWC was able to help her do so. Chair Robinson reiterated
20 an earlier comment from Councilor Bradley. The members of the CWC were the biggest strength of
21 the organization because they cared deeply about the area.

22
23 Chair Robinson asked for feedback about the joint Executive Committee and Budget/Finance/Audit
24 Committee Meeting on November 15, 2021, and the presentation of a draft RFP at the December
25 2021 CWC Board Meeting. There were no objections. Councilor Houseman assumed there would
26 be further conversations about the budget for the situational assessment. Chair Robinson explained
27 that there would be discussions related to budget at the joint meeting as well as the CWC Board
28 Meeting.

29 30 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

31 32 **1. Stakeholders Advisory Council Chair and Vice-Chair, William McCarvill and Barbara 33 Cameron will provide an overview of the work and accomplishments of the Stakeholders 34 Council during 2021.**

- 35
36 • **Commissioners will discuss the future function of the Stakeholders Council.**

37
38 Chair Robinson introduced the Vice-Chair of the Stakeholders Council, Barbara Cameron. Ms.
39 Cameron explained that Stakeholders Council Chair, Will McCarvill was unable to attend the CWC
40 Board Retreat, but he had prepared an agenda for the discussions. Ms. Cameron shared the
41 Stakeholders Council Annual Report and overviewed some of the accomplishments of the Council,
42 such as the Visitor Use Study. Stakeholders were excited about that study and were grateful that the
43 CWC Board had decided to move it forward.

44
45 Ms. Cameron discussed the Stakeholders Council subcommittees. She explained that the Millcreek
46 Canyon Committee was chaired by Paul Diegel and was interested in working with the Forest Service
47 and County on Millcreek-specific issues, such as signage and conflicting user groups. The Federal
48 Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) was also a concern for the Committee. The Preservation Committee

1 was chaired by Carl Fisher and had recently sponsored a field trip. Committee Members gathered
2 with Forest Service and watershed officials to view a recent fuels reduction project. The goal of the
3 Committee was to invite guest speakers to share information and to focus on actionable projects. The
4 Trails Committee was chaired by John Knoblock and there was a lot of collaboration between
5 agencies. All of the committees met monthly and were doing remarkable work. Ms. Cameron noted
6 that the Stakeholders Council wondered how actionable items discussed at the Committee level could
7 come to fruition. For instance, whether they should be presented as short-term projects or whether
8 Commissioners and CWC Staff would assist with projects, such as restrooms at trailheads.

9
10 Ms. Cameron reported that Stakeholders Council surveys had been conducted in July 2021.
11 Stakeholders Council Members believed the meetings had been helpful, but they felt there was a lack
12 of direction from the CWC Board about how the Stakeholders Council could be the most useful. In
13 terms of consensus, the Stakeholders Council wanted to have Majority Reports and Minority Reports
14 in order for all Stakeholders Council Members to feel heard.

15
16 Member priority recommendations were shared with the CWC Board. Ms. Cameron explained that
17 they had asked Stakeholders Council Members what they wanted to accomplish in 2022. The full
18 table was included in the Meeting Materials Packet, but some of the highlights included:

- 19
- 20 • Transit:
 - 21 ○ The need for incremental expansion of public transit;
 - 22 ○ Explore the possibility of valley transit hubs.
- 23 • Visitor Use Study;
- 24 • Trails and Trailhead Infrastructure;
- 25 • Public Education and Outreach.
- 26

27 Ms. Cameron asked what the CWC Board expected from the Stakeholders Council. Chair Robinson
28 stated that over the next six months, he would like to see the Stakeholders Council work with the
29 CWC Board on the situational assessment. Mayor Knopp noted that the CWC was able to obtain a
30 broader body of knowledge due to the different perspectives on the Stakeholders Council. He
31 suggested that the Board give the Council specific items to discuss in order to receive additional input.

32
33 Mayor Peterson was impressed by the Stakeholders Council Report. He believed the Stakeholders
34 Council was all about collaboration and there would be an opportunity over the next six months to
35 partner with them as it related to redefining and reassessing the Mountain Accord. Mayor Wilson
36 thanked Ms. Cameron and the Stakeholders Council for their engagement. She felt the Stakeholders
37 Council should look at their work through the lens of the Mountain Accord.

38
39 Councilor Houseman thanked Ms. Cameron for her work. She appreciated the survey and the
40 intention to pull together a list of priorities. In order to make effective decisions, it was essential to
41 hear many different voices and then determine the general patterns. The Stakeholders Council was
42 valuable because it provided key insights and additional information. Chair Robinson asked that the
43 Stakeholders Council subcommittees continue. In the first several months of the new year, the CWC
44 Board would ask for engagement from the Stakeholders Council related to the situational assessment.
45

1 **ADJOURNMENT BOARD RETREAT**

2
3 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC Board Retreat.**

4
5 Chair Robinson believed that the CWC Board Retreat had been productive. He appreciated the work
6 done by CWC Staff and thanked those present for their participation.

7
8 **MOTION:** Councilor Houseman moved to adjourn the CWC Board Retreat. Mayor Mendenhall
9 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

10
11 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Retreat adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Retreat held Friday, November 5, 2021.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____