



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD MONDAY, JULY 31, 2023, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST, MILLCREEK, UTAH.

Present: John Knoblock, Chair
Carl Fisher, Co-Chair
Barbara Cameron
Hilary Lambert
Kirk Nichols
Tom Diegel
Paul Diegel
Megan Nelson
Amber Broadway
Ed Marshall
Kurt Hegmann
Adam Lenkowski
Linda Johnson
Dave Fields
Mike Christensen
Nathan Rafferty
Mike Marker
Morgan Mingle
Roger Borgenicht
Dennis Goreham
Danny Richardson
Rusty Vetter
Kelly Boardman
Megan Nelson

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Intern

Opening

1. John Knoblock will Open the Stakeholders Council Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission.

Chair John Knoblock called the Stakeholders Council Meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

1
2 **2. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the June 21, 2023,**
3 **Stakeholders Council Meeting.**
4

5 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to APPROVE the June 21, 2023 Stakeholders Council Meeting
6 Minutes. Kirk Nichols seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
7 Council.
8

9 **3. Announcements:**
10

11 **a. Millcreek Shuttle Program Proposal Update.**
12

13 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, welcomed the new Stakeholders Council Members to the
14 meeting. She reported that a lot was happening within the Central Wasatch Commission ("CWC").
15 CWC Staff is currently writing a Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Proposal that will be delivered
16 to the Unita-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Office on August 8, 2023. Ms. Nielsen reported that the
17 Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP") grant will start construction in the upper portion of
18 Millcreek Canyon in 2025. District Ranger, Becke Hotze, approached the CWC about a Feasibility
19 Proposal for the U.S. Forest Service that would look into whether the National Environmental Policy
20 Act ("NEPA") should be pursued for a shuttle program in the Millcreek Canyon once the FLAP grant
21 construction started. She clarified that a Feasibility Proposal would include specific shuttle stops,
22 cost projections, and potential parking locations. Once the Forest Service received the Feasibility
23 Proposal, they would determine whether there was a desire to proceed and ask a third party to contract
24 for the shuttle-related NEPA work.
25

26 **b. Youth Council Call for Applications in August.**
27

28 Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC is creating a Youth Council for younger people interested in the
29 Central Wasatch. The Youth Council will be for people under the age of 30. She noted that a Mission,
30 Vision, and Goals document will be shared with the CWC Board on August 7, 2023, which was the
31 date of the next CWC Board Meeting. The call for applications would open in the third week of
32 August. Hilary Lambert was excited about the idea of a Youth Council. She asked who will supervise
33 the Youth Council during future meetings. Ms. Nielsen explained that CWC Staff currently includes
34 herself and a Community Engagement Intern. The CWC is currently going through a hiring process.
35 The proposed structure for staffing that had been approved by the CWC Board was to have an
36 Executive Director, Director of Operations, and Community Engagement Coordinator. With a staff
37 of that size, everyone will participate in some way but the main point person for the Youth Council
38 would be the Community Engagement Coordinator.
39

40 As for the interaction between the Stakeholders Council and the Youth Council, that had not been
41 concretely determined. However, there was a desire to have a lot of interaction between the groups.
42 Ms. Nielsen hoped that one representative from each Council would attend the other meetings.
43 Alternatively, there could be a specific Committee where the Stakeholders Council and Youth
44 Council work is shared. Those details were still to be determined. Ms. Nielsen reported that the goal
45 was to have the Youth Council convene for the first time in October 2023.
46

1 c. **Visitor Use Study Presentation of Final Data During August 7th Board Meeting.**

2
3 Ms. Nielsen reported that there would be a presentation related to the Visitor Use Study during the
4 August 7, 2023, CWC Board Meeting. That presentation would be related to the final data.
5

6 d. **New Staff Hiring Process and Timeline.**

7
8 Ms. Nielsen shared additional information about the CWC hiring process. She reported that the call
9 for applications yielded excellent applicants. A Selection Committee was formed, which included
10 current CWC Staff and CWC Board Members. The intention was to fill both the Director of
11 Operations and Community Engagement Coordinator positions. Ms. Nielsen hoped it would be
12 possible to have the new CWC Staff Members start in their roles on September 5, 2023.
13

14 e. **Next Scheduled Council Meeting and Thank You to Millcreek for Hosting.**

15
16 Co-Chair, Carl Fisher, reported that the next scheduled Stakeholders Council Meeting is set for
17 September 25, 2023, at 3:30 p.m. The intent was to hold Stakeholders Council Meetings every other
18 month in Millcreek. He thanked Millcreek City for allowing the Stakeholders Council to use their
19 space to conduct the Stakeholders Council Meetings.
20

21 Ms. Nielsen reminded the New Stakeholders Council Members to return their Conflict of Interest
22 Disclosure Forms following the meeting. She stated that they need to be completed and submitted.
23

24 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL STRUCTURE AND MOUNTAIN ACCORD DISCUSSION**

25
26 1. **Mountain Accord 101.**

27
28 a. **Stakeholders Council Leadership will Provide an Overview of the Mountain**
29 **Accord.**

30
31 b. **CWC Staff will Provide an Overview of the Draft Mountain Accord Progress**
32 **Report.**

33
34 Chair Knoblock reported that Mountain Accord was identified as a priority based on the Avenue
35 Consultant's work during the Stakeholders Council Mini Retreat. Council Members expressed a
36 desire to be more closely tied to the Mountain Accord. The purpose of the CWC is to implement the
37 Mountain Accord and address issues within the Central Wasatch. Additionally, the Stakeholders
38 Council wants to have closer ties to the CWC Board. Chair Knoblock asked how many Stakeholders
39 Council Members are directly involved in the Mountain Accord process. Several hands were raised
40 in person and online. It looked like approximately two-thirds were involved.
41

42 There was a desire to share background information about the Mountain Accord for those who had
43 not been involved in the initial process. Co-Chair Fisher reported that the Mountain Accord process
44 began in 2012. He noted that a Wilderness bill was introduced into Congress three times, so the future
45 of the Wasatch was being considered then. That was where the Mountain Accord process started.
46 Leaders came together to work through existing and future issues. Chair Knoblock noted that a
47 Consultant was hired to assist and ultimately four Systems Groups were created including
48 environmental, transportation, economy, and recreation. There were several hundred people involved

1 in the various Systems Groups. The purpose of the groups was to think through ideal solutions for
2 the Central Wasatch. The four Systems Groups, along with the Executive Board, had discussions
3 about how to reach a consensus about a plan for the area and what would be best for the area in the
4 future.

5
6 Chair Knoblock reported that the Mountain Accord process lasted for approximately two years with
7 regular meetings held. The final Mountain Accord document included a lot of broad statements as
8 well as intended actions. There were several agreed-upon actions listed. Those were the items that
9 there was a desire to move forward as a result of the Mountain Accord work. A lot of mayors and
10 organizations had signed the document as there was a lot of support.

11
12 Co-Chair Fisher further discussed the Systems Groups. It was the responsibility of the group chairs,
13 in partnership with the Executive Board, to reach a consensus and create a cohesive document. Co-
14 Chair Fisher shared a scorecard that outlined the agreed-upon action items from the Mountain Accord.
15 The scorecard made it clear what had been done to address those items. One of the agreed-upon
16 action items was to establish the CWC, which was done. The CWC was envisioned as the place that
17 will drive those ideals and action items forward. There needed to be a group that would focus on the
18 work that would be done to ensure that the document made a difference.

19
20 Chair Knoblock reported that CWC Staff drafted the Mountain Accord Scorecard to capture the
21 intended actions from the Mountain Accord. There was information about who was responsible for
22 those items and their status. The CWC did a lot of work along the way but it was important to review
23 the Mountain Accord to ensure that the work is still a priority. He clarified that the scorecard is a
24 draft and had not yet been presented to the CWC Board. It is a working document, which means that
25 comments and suggestions can be provided by Council Members.

26
27 One item on the scorecard was to designate a National Conservation Recreation Area, which included
28 wilderness areas. Chair Knoblock reported that the Central Wasatch National Conservation
29 Recreation Area (“CWNCR”) would have included the wilderness areas as well as adjustments to
30 the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and land exchanges with the Forest Service and the Ski Resorts. Some
31 documentation was included that discussed what had been done and some of the barriers. The next
32 item on the scorecard related to the land exchanges between the Forest Service and Ski Resorts. He
33 explained that there was ultimately no desire to move forward with those exchanges. Ms. Nielsen
34 explained that the items being discussed were specifically called for in the Mountain Accord. Specific
35 items were identified by the Systems Groups as paths toward success. The CWNCR was originally
36 introduced to Congress in 2016, but there was not enough time, and the bill did not make it out. Since
37 that time, the bill had been through seven different redrafts, and over 1,000 public comments were
38 received. Part of the bill had to do with land exchanges between the Forest Service and four of the
39 Ski Resorts. There had been various iterations of the bill, but ultimately, the land exchanges had been
40 removed for administrative reasons and other environmental reasons.

41
42 Ms. Nielsen reported that another item on the scorecard was transportation improvements in the
43 Cottonwood Canyons. Since 2020, the CWC had been working on something called the Mountain
44 Transportation System (“MTS”). The Stakeholders Council was heavily involved in that process.
45 The Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) was recently completed and was
46 available to view on the CWC website. Transportation improvements in the Cottonwood Canyons
47 would continue to move forward as there was no end date to that work. Another scorecard item was
48 related to transit improvements in Parleys Canyon. That was yet to be a focus, but Ms. Nielsen

1 thought it was important for the Transportation Committee to identify improvements that could be
2 made there. As for a shuttle service in Millcreek Canyon, there was a Feasibility Proposal underway.

3
4 One of the items on the scorecard was to develop a comprehensive trail and cycling plan. Chair
5 Knoblock reported that the work was moving forward. There was a Stakeholders Council
6 subcommittee dedicated to trails, which was the Trails Committee. He noted that Salt Lake County
7 was working with the Forest Service and a Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan was underway. There had
8 been a number of public input sessions recently and that work was continuing to move forward. Ms.
9 Nielsen reported that the next item on the scorecard was to develop an Environmental Dashboard.
10 The CWC Environmental Dashboard was released in June 2022 after several years of planning and
11 work. The Environmental Dashboard was accessible via the CWC website. She encouraged all
12 Stakeholders Council Members to use the Environmental Dashboard, as it amassed all of the existing
13 data into one location. There was information about air quality, traffic counts, and historical trends.

14
15 Another item on the scorecard was to build a program for the acquisition of private lands with
16 environmental and recreational value. That was an action item under the Mountain Accord that had
17 not been addressed. There was potential for that to be addressed through the Stakeholders Council.
18 Chair Knoblock discussed the loop trail around Silver Lake. There was a large parcel of property on
19 the southwest corner of Silver Lake that was previously for sale and was now under contract.
20 Someone would build a large house there. There had been some missed opportunities. He felt
21 strongly that the appropriate acquisition of private lands was something that should be pursued.

22
23 The next action item on the scorecard related to the creation of a government entity comprised of
24 local officials. Ms. Nielsen explained that this had been achieved through the creation of the CWC.
25 She noted that another item on the scorecard was to identify long-term funding for programs and
26 systems in the Central Wasatch. That was something that CWC Staff would look into in the coming
27 months. As for special projects, that was something that the CWC had focused on and was
28 accomplished through the CWC Short-Term Projects Grant Program. She reported that several short-
29 term projects were awarded grant money each year through the Short-Term Projects Committee.

30
31 Ms. Nielsen noted that many items on the scorecard were in progress and many had been achieved.
32 That being said, some still needed to be explored and some were no longer being considered. Chair
33 Knoblock noted that the scorecard was still in a draft version. He encouraged Stakeholders Council
34 Members to look at the document, look at the Mountain Accord, and share feedback. Barbara
35 Cameron noted that there was a significant win that the CWC had accomplished, which was the
36 restroom facility maintenance. That was important work that the CWC had assisted with.
37 Additionally, the short-term projects made a significant difference to trails and other areas.

38
39 Co-Chair Fisher asked how many Stakeholders Council Members had revisited the Mountain Accord
40 document in the last few months. Several Council Members raised their hands. Stakeholders Council
41 leadership stressed the importance of returning to the Mountain Accord document semi-regularly.

42 43 **2. Committee Membership and Leadership Vote.**

44 45 **a. Stakeholders Council Leadership will Propose New Stakeholders Council** 46 **Committee Structure with Discussion and Possible Action from the Council.**

47
48 Chair Knoblock and Co-Chair Fisher were elected as Stakeholders Council leadership during the last

1 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Since that time, Co-Chair Fisher had reviewed all of the Mountain
2 Accord-related documents, including the most recent Stakeholders Council Mini Retreat information.
3 The main outcome of the Stakeholders Council Mini Retreat was that the Stakeholders Council
4 wanted to advance the Mountain Accord. It made sense to look into how to do that more effectively.
5 As he reflected on his participation in the Mountain Accord process, he thought that the Systems
6 Groups structure made the most sense. It allowed for innovation and collaboration.

7
8 Co-Chair Fisher liked the idea of Stakeholders Council Members utilizing their expertise within the
9 Systems Groups by sharing ideas. He wondered whether there was support for creating Stakeholders
10 Council subcommittees that reflected the previously existing Mountain Accord Systems Groups.
11 Rather than looking only at transportation in Big Cottonwood Canyon or Little Cottonwood Canyon,
12 there could be a broader lens. Transportation had environmental benefits and costs that needed to be
13 considered. Similarly, there were economic benefits and economic costs. It would be possible to
14 look at some of the larger ideas through the context of the Systems Groups and then those could be
15 discussed further during the Stakeholders Council Meetings that took place every other month.

16
17 The current Trails Committee was essentially doing the work that the recreation group would do.
18 However, there was not an economic group in place. The CWC had a Transportation Committee, but
19 that included CWC Board Members rather than Stakeholders Council Members. Co-Chair Fisher felt
20 it was important for the Stakeholders Council to have all four of the Systems Groups covered to
21 advance the Mountain Accord action items as a whole. Discussions were had about what that would
22 mean for the existing Stakeholders Council subcommittees. Co-Chair Fisher believed there needed
23 to be a discussion about that. He felt the best way to advance the Mountain Accord would be to return
24 to the Systems Groups, which worked well at that time. Chair Knoblock noted that the CWC had its
25 own Transportation Committee in place. He clarified that a Stakeholders Council Transportation
26 Systems Group would not replace the existing CWC Transportation Committee.

27
28 Council Members discussed the interaction between the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board.
29 Chair Knoblock reported that there had been discussions about whether a "bottom-up" or "top-down"
30 approach was best. If there were items that the CWC Board needed information on, it would be
31 possible for the Stakeholders Council to provide that information. Alternatively, it would be possible
32 for the Stakeholders Council to share new ideas with the CWC Board. He believed it was a two-way
33 street, where requests could be made of the Stakeholders Council and Stakeholders Council ideas
34 could be shared with the CWC Board. Co-Chair Fisher had often hoped that there would be better
35 direction received from the CWC Board. He wondered whether the Systems Groups structure might
36 lend itself to that outcome. Chair Knoblock asked whether there was Stakeholders Council support
37 to switch to the Systems Groups structure for the Stakeholders Council subcommittees. If there was
38 support, Council Members would join certain groups and leadership would be established.

39
40 Co-Chair Fisher reiterated that Stakeholders Council Meetings were held every other month. There
41 was a public comment portion of the meeting, but much of the discussions were not necessarily open
42 to members of the public. However, with the subcommittees, members of the public were able to
43 engage and participate more. That had been seen a lot with the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Ed
44 Marshall asked whether the transportation-related Systems Group would apply to all of the canyons
45 or if there would be a group that was unique to each one of the canyons. Co-Chair Fisher believed
46 the transportation group would have a systematic approach, like the Mountain Accord. There might
47 be a need for a deeper dive into a particular area, but the first step needed to be a review of the
48 Mountain Accord followed by potential updates that needed to be made to the document.

1
2 Mr. Marshall wondered whether there was a plan to update the Mountain Accord and if there was a
3 pre-determined process to do so. Co-Chair Fisher believed the process was laid out in the Mountain
4 Accord and the CWC Interlocal Agreement (“ILA”). Discussions were had about the current number
5 of Stakeholders Council Members. Chair Knoblock reported that there were 35 Stakeholders Council
6 Members and approximately 20 of those Stakeholders Council Members were present.
7

8 It was noted that proper staffing would be needed to address all of the different canyon issues in one
9 Systems Group. The Millcreek Canyon Committee seemed to have moved a lot of work forward
10 because it was more focused in nature. There was a belief that the issues were too significant to be
11 addressed in one group. Chair Knoblock acknowledged that there would be challenges with the
12 proposed approach. That being said, there was a desire for the Stakeholders Council to better interact
13 with the Mountain Accord work. The Systems Groups seemed to be a logical solution.
14

15 Some Council Members liked what had been suggested by Stakeholders Council leadership because
16 the Systems Groups would make it possible for the subcommittees to be more effective. The Systems
17 Groups would also make it possible to tackle some of the broader issues in a streamlined manner.
18 The Mountain Accord process had been very successful and it made sense to mirror the format of that
19 work. Dave Fields noted that there were a lot of outstanding Mountain Accord action items. So much
20 had changed since the Mountain Accord was drafted and that needed to be considered. There were
21 delicate compromises reached at the time, where there were wins and losses for everyone involved.
22 He was not sure how the Stakeholders Council would be able to tackle such a weighty task. Chair
23 Knoblock agreed with that but noted that it was important to at least start the conversations. Mr.
24 Fields thought the Systems Groups concept that had been proposed was worthwhile, but there were
25 other options to consider. He suggested dividing up the outstanding Mountain Accord items and
26 creating task-specific subcommittees to take on those individual action items. There would not be as
27 much flexibility for unanticipated future tasks, but it would address the Mountain Accord document.
28

29 Ms. Lambert liked the idea of task-specific subcommittees. There were 35 members of the
30 Stakeholders Council, which meant there were a lot of people who could contribute. The broader
31 Systems Groups may be more difficult to make work, especially since there was a lot of overlap.
32 There could be more specific work that tied back to the larger goals and projects. It would be better
33 to assign Council Members to more specific groups that had a narrower and more task-oriented focus.
34 She believed that would feel more manageable for Council Members. Co-Chair Fisher pointed out
35 that the scorecard was intended to assist with that. If the Systems Groups structure was adopted, then
36 Stakeholders Council leadership would work with the Chairs of the Systems Groups to prioritize the
37 action items from the scorecard list. It would apply deliverables to the Systems Groups.
38

39 It was noted that the Mountain Accord was an important document, but it had been a long time since
40 that document was created. A lot of things had changed since then. There were some concerns at the
41 thought of abandoning the Millcreek Canyon Committee entirely because the Mountain Accord had
42 not envisioned the FLAP grant work. Co-Chair Fisher felt it was essential to advance and implement
43 the goals of the Mountain Accord. Mr. Marshall was concerned about forming Systems Groups that
44 were not canyon specific. The proposal was essentially to shift from specific work to more generic
45 work. He believed that would be a step backward in terms of making progress. He stressed the
46 importance of having the Millcreek Canyon Committee so there was work specific to the canyon.
47

1 Ms. Cameron pointed out that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had done an excellent job and had
2 forwarded one of the agreed-upon actions in the Mountain Accord, which was a shuttle. She wanted
3 to see the Committee continue. On the other hand, she liked the idea of a broader transportation-
4 related subcommittee. There was a lot of additional transportation work to do. Other Council
5 Members liked the idea of having the four Systems Groups but agreed that specific issues, such as
6 the ones facing Millcreek Canyon, should have their own separate subcommittees. Co-Chair Fisher
7 pointed out that it was important to have a manageable number of subcommittees in place.

8
9 Ms. Nielsen read comments left in the Zoom chat box. Kurt Hegmann stated that it would be best if
10 there was one method by which sorting and organizing was done. Amber Broadway believed the
11 proposal had been made to reorganize the subcommittees because it would benefit the Stakeholders
12 Council overall. She wondered whether the Systems Groups represented the way that current
13 Stakeholders Council leadership felt they would best be able to accomplish their leadership goals.
14 Chair Knoblock believed it was a way to ensure that everyone was included and actively participating.
15 There were a lot of members who did not participate in the Trails Committee or Millcreek Canyon
16 Committee. This would ensure that all Council Members were participating appropriately. Mr.
17 Marshall pointed out that there could be a requirement that each Council Member participate on a
18 subcommittee. Each member could choose the subcommittee that most interested them.

19
20 Stakeholders Council leadership asked that there be a show of hands to determine whether there was
21 support for the Systems Groups or not. There could be additional discussions about how to best move
22 forward based on those results. Ms. Nielsen explained that if there was a desire for official action,
23 then a motion and vote could be made. If there was no desire for official action, a casual vote would
24 be appropriate. Discussions were had about a potential motion for the Systems Groups. Ms. Cameron
25 made a motion to adopt a hybrid structure with Systems Groups and other more focused
26 subcommittees. Mr. Marshall believed the concept needed additional thought. There was an
27 opportunity for Stakeholders Council leadership to do more work and receive feedback. Ms.
28 Broadway stressed the importance of focused discussions so there could be meaningful contributions.

29
30 It was suggested that Stakeholders Council leadership receive additional feedback from Council
31 Members via email. Based on the results of those communications, it would be possible to determine
32 the best path forward for the subcommittees. Ms. Nielsen noted that final action could not be taken
33 outside of the public meeting, but there could be some sort of communication outside of the meeting.
34 Ms. Lambert hoped that it would be possible to decide on the structure during the current meeting.
35 The follow-up action for each Council Member could be to communicate their top two interests in
36 terms of the subcommittees. It was important to start to form the Systems Groups. Discussions were
37 had about the high-level work, which would be covered by the Systems Groups, and more detailed
38 work, which would be covered by subcommittees like the Millcreek Canyon Committee. There was
39 value in looking at things broadly as well as in a more detailed manner.

40
41 Morgan Mingle introduced herself as one of the new Stakeholders Council Members. She thought it
42 would be worth considering short-term subcommittees to define short-term priorities and having more
43 focused action groups to execute those priorities. The idea of the Systems Groups was to determine
44 what was actionable based on the current conditions. It might be a happy medium if those groups
45 were considered short-term subcommittees that would identify priorities. The action-focused
46 subcommittees would be the more detailed subcommittees such as the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

Tom Diegel discussed the Mountain Accord process. During that time, the discussions were very high-level and broad. His understanding was that the CWC was formed to take those broad determinations and take action in a more detailed manner. The Mountain Accord process started approximately 10 years ago and not a lot of progress had been made. He thought a more detailed approach would be best. Taking another step back to look at the issues more broadly might delay action. Co-Chair Fisher explained that he hoped that the process would result in action. He felt it was important for the issues facing the area to be considered by all Council Members.

Ms. Nielsen read additional comments from the Zoom chat box. Paul Diegel pointed out that the Millcreek Canyon Committee was formed in part because there was a perception that Millcreek Canyon was being neglected due to the high priorities of the other canyons. The Feasibility Proposal for the Millcreek Canyon shuttle would not have occurred if Millcreek Canyon was on the agenda of an overall transportation subcommittee. Mr. Hegmann noted that if Little Cottonwood Canyon ended up having a gondola in place, the transportation issues elsewhere would become very different. Additional discussions were had about the motion that had been made and what was proposed.

MOTION: Barbara Cameron moved that the Stakeholders Council ADOPT a hybrid structure with Systems Groups and other more focused subcommittees. ____ seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Ed Marshall-Nay; Linda Johnson-Nay; Dave Fields-Nay; Paul Diegel-Nay; Amber Broadaway-Nay; Nathan Rafferty-Nay; Barbara Cameron-Aye; Danny Richardson-Aye; Mike Marker-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Dennis Goreham-Aye; Adam Lenkowski-Aye; Tom Diegel-Aye; Rusty Vetter-Aye; Kirk Nichols-Aye; Megan Nelson-Aye; Mike Christensen-Aye; Kelly Boardman-Aye; Hilary Lambert-Aye; John Knoblock-Aye; Carl Fisher-Aye; Morgan Mingle-Abstain. The motion passed with 15 positive votes, 6 votes opposed, and one abstention.

Mr. Tom Diegel noted that with the Millcreek Canyon Committee, there were emails sent out in between meetings. He believed it was possible to share information with others in between meeting dates here as well. He asked Stakeholders Council leadership to make revisions and add further clarity about the subcommittees. Chair Knoblock suggested that Council Members sign up for one of the four Systems Groups via email. This would ensure that the work would continue to move forward. From there, it would be possible to schedule those meetings sometime next month. The Council discussed the Open and Public Meetings Act and appropriate communications. Refining the process and moving things forward was appropriate, but votes needed to be made during meetings. As for the Chair appointments for the Systems Groups, those would be determined at a later date.

UDOT ROD DISCUSSION

1. Stakeholders Council Leadership will Provide an Overview of the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") Record of Decision for the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS with Discussion and Possible Action from Stakeholders.

Chair Knoblock shared information about the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") Record of Decision ("ROD") for the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). The ROD stated that the recommendation was for the Gondola B option. However, that was referred to as the third phase. The first phase would implement improved bus service and focus on transit centers. There was also a desire to look for a bus provider, but there was not a lot of clarity about that. It would not necessarily be Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") handling the additional bus service. The first phase would also use some of the \$150 million from the Legislature for potential tolling.

1 The intention was to inspire visitors to use transit rather than personal vehicles. On popular dates,
2 the toll could be enacted to encourage transit use. When there were no traffic issues, there may not
3 be a toll in place. Chair Knoblock explained that all of those details still needed to be finalized.

4
5 Co-Chair Fisher reiterated that there were three phases referenced in the ROD. The first phase was
6 focused on buses and tolling. The second phase related to road improvements and the third phase had
7 to do with the implementation of a gondola. Some resources from UDOT were included in the
8 Meeting Materials Packet for Council Member review. He wondered whether the Stakeholders
9 Council wanted to take some sort of action on the ROD or share an opinion with the CWC Board.

10
11 Mr. Nichols reported that UDOT had chosen not to do a citizens appeal and only through litigation
12 would UDOT respond. He expressed concerns with this approach. Additionally, he was concerned
13 that this was the only time it was possible to litigate for failures of NEPA. Mr. Nichols reiterated that
14 there was a need for a citizen's appeal and a need to meet the NEPA requirements. He wanted the
15 CWC to consider writing a letter and making a public statement about those failures. Chair Knoblock
16 noted that the Stakeholders Council could not directly communicate with the Wasatch Front Regional
17 Council ("WFRC") or UDOT, but the Council could make a recommendation to the CWC Board.

18
19 Mr. Nichols made a motion that the Stakeholders Council send a letter to the CWC Board. Danny
20 Richardson seconded the motion. Discussions were had about the motion. Co-Chair Fisher suggested
21 an amendment to the language. He asked that the Secretary of Transportation, Forest Service, and
22 the Secretary of Agriculture be referenced within the motion language as well. This was accepted.
23 Ms. Broadway asked whether Stakeholders Council leadership had vetted the letter to determine that
24 the information presented was accurate. Chair Knoblock denied this. Co-Chair Fisher noted that the
25 letter was consistent with other items that the Stakeholders Council had voted on recently. It was
26 noted that this was a recommendation to the CWC Board, who could fine-tune the wording if desired.
27 Mr. Nichols explained that he was a professor of outdoor recreation studies and could provide
28 additional information and resources to Ms. Broadway if that was something that she needed.

29
30 **MOTION:** Kirk Nichols moved that the Stakeholders Council send a letter to the CWC Board
31 recommending that the CWC submit a protest letter to the Federal Highway Administration
32 ("FHWA"), Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT"), Secretary of Transportation, Forest
33 Service, and Secretary of Agriculture, and suggest they also issue a public statement:

- 34
35 1. Protesting the release of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS ROD without a citizen's
36 administrative appeals process, leaving litigation as the only communication.
37
38 2. Recommending a supplemental EIS due to the failures to follow NEPA as represented by the
39 following points:
40
41 • Failure to complete a Central Wasatch Programmatic EIS covering the Central
42 Wasatch congestion before starting a project-level Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.
43 NEPA requires that the geographically accumulated, connected, and similar
44 foreseeable past actions and environmental effects be studied together;
45 • Failure to use an accurate Purpose Statement. UDOT described qualities of the road
46 to be the purpose. In reality, the purpose of the road expansion is to move more people
47 more efficiently onto the public land. By describing the qualities of the road as their

purpose, UDOT avoided studying the impacts of a million people and their vehicles in Little Cottonwood Canyon;

- Failure to study the affected environment because of selecting too small of a study area in the EIS. This allowed UDOT to ignore all congestion leading to SR-210;
- Failure to recognize and study the latent demand of current canyon users, which is a much greater magnitude than population growth;
- Failure to recognize that a gondola violates the intent of the roadless rule, which is to stop segmenting the designated road into smaller and less functional units.

Danny Richardson seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Ed Marshall-Aye; Linda Johnson-Aye; Dave Fields-Nay; Paul Diegel-Aye; Amber Broadway-Abstain; Nathan Rafferty-Nay; Barbara Cameron-Aye; Danny Richardson-Aye; Mike Marker-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Dennis Goreham-Aye; Adam Lenkowski-Aye; Tom Diegel-Aye; Rusty Vetter-Aye; Kirk Nichols-Aye; Megan Nelson-Aye; Mike Christensen-Aye; Kelly Boardman-Aye; Hilary Lambert-Aye; John Knoblock-Abstain; Carl Fisher-Aye; Morgan Mingle-Aye. The motion passed with 17 positive votes, 2 votes opposed, and two abstentions.

Linda Johnson suggested that in the future when there was a proposal like this, it be submitted to the Council Members ahead of time for full review so that all of the information could be vetted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Steve Van Maren asked whether he had missed the report on the Visitor Use Study. Ms. Nielsen reported that it would be presented to the CWC Board during the CWC Board Meeting on August 7, 2023. The Visitor Use Study would be integrated into the Environmental Dashboard.

STAKEHOLDERS OPEN COMMENT

Mr. Tom Diegel referenced a previous Resolution where there was a request for the issues at Cardiff Fork to be addressed. He shared an update about that situation. There were logs placed across the road, fences, and landowners trying to prevent others from utilizing the land. That did not last long as the fencing had been placed on public land. The Forest Service had told the nearby property owners to remove that. He reported that the Forest Service had planned to survey the area but determined that it would be too expensive at a District level. However, the Regional Office wanted to do a boundary survey there. He would share additional updates as those become available. Mr. Diegel encouraged Council Members to look at the latest FLAP grant design that had been released.

CLOSING

1. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders Council Meeting.

MOTION: _____ moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Linda Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:35 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 Monday, July 31, 2023.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____