



9
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
11 **COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2024, AT 3:30 P.M. THE**
12 **MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE**
13 **ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST,**
14 **MILLCREEK, UTAH.**

15
16 **Present:** John Knoblock, Chair
17 Barbara Cameron
18 Bri Sullivan
19 Dan Zalles
20 Danny Richardson
21 Del Draper
22 Dennis Goreham
23 Ed Marshall
24 Grace Tyler
25 Joanna Wheelton
26 Kelly Boardman
27 Kirk Nichols
28 Linda Johnson
29 Maura Hahnenberger
30 Nathan Rafferty
31 Patrick Shea
32 Roger Borgenicht
33 Sarah Bennett
34 Tom Diegel

35
36 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
37 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
38 Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Intern
39

40 **Opening**

41
42 **1. Chair John Knoblock will Open the Public Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders**
43 **Council of the Central Wasatch Commission.**

44
45 Chair John Knoblock called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
46 Meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m. He noted that there were attendees both in person and
47 online. He briefly reviewed the items that were listed on the agenda.
48

1 **2. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the November 27,**
2 **2023, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**

3
4 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the November 27, 2023,
5 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Dennis Goreham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
6 unanimous consent of the Council.

7
8 **3. Announcements:**

9
10 **A. The Youth Council Met on January 10, 2024.**

11
12 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the newly formed CWC Youth Council met on
13 January 10, 2024. This was the second meeting. She explained that the Youth Council self-selected
14 into three different subcommittees consisting of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee; the
15 Events and Outreach Committee; and the Environmental Dashboard Education Committee. There
16 were 13 members on the CWC Youth Council currently but there were rolling applications. Anyone
17 interested between the ages of 16 to 30 was invited to apply.

18
19 **B. Ski Bus Bypass Service Update.**

20
21 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Ski Bus Bypass Service is up and running. Ski bus users who take the
22 ski bus from the Park and Ride lot in Sandy City on Highland Drive will have the opportunity for the
23 ski bus to be escorted from the Park and Ride lot to the Park and Ride lot at the mouth of Little
24 Cottonwood Canyon. She clarified that the Ski Bus Bypass Service was available on days when the
25 canyon was closed for avalanche mitigation or snow removal work. Last year was a heavy snow year,
26 so the service is available a lot, and reduced travel time by upwards of 30%. The hope was that the
27 Ski Bus Bypass Service would be just as successful this year as last year.

28
29 Chair Knoblock explained that the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) 953 bus was not available this
30 year. There was no bus from the north to Little Cottonwood Canyon. He had driven by the 6200
31 South Park and Ride lot earlier that day and noted that the lot was overflowing. There was a lot of
32 demand for buses and a strong desire to visit the canyons. As for the traction requirements, he
33 reported that no one had been checking vehicles for that when he went up the canyon recently.

34
35 **C. New Stakeholders Council Members.**

36
37 **i. Call for New Stakeholders Council Members.**

38
39 Ms. Nielsen reported that there are a few New Stakeholders Council Members. She asked Grace
40 Tyler and Bri Sullivan to introduce themselves. Ms. Sullivan explained that she was newer to the
41 Wasatch and had been in the area for a little over a year but had visited for a long time before that.
42 She was part of the running community, Women of the Wasatch, and was excited to contribute to the
43 Stakeholders Council. It would be worthwhile to hear what was happening in the area. Ms. Tyler
44 identified herself as the New Interim Executive Director for Save Our Canyons. She has been with
45 Save Our Canyons since 2017 where she started as the Communications Coordinator. She then
46 moved into the Development Director position. Ms. Tyler moved to Salt Lake City in 2008 to attend
47 Westminster College but grew up in Idaho. She fell in love with the Wasatch and had been in Utah
48 since 2008. It was wonderful that Save Our Canyons could continue working with the CWC.

1
2 Ms. Nielsen clarified that Ms. Tyler is not technically a member of the Stakeholders Council yet. To
3 become a formal member of the Council, that appointment would need to be approved by Resolution,
4 which would be done by the CWC Board in March 2024 at the next CWC Board Meeting. Between
5 now and the formal appointment, Ms. Tyler would be able to sit in on Stakeholders Council Meetings
6 and share comments but would not vote on any of the action items.
7

8 There were still other vacancies on the Stakeholders Council. The desire was to have a full
9 Stakeholders Council with 35 members. Currently, there are three open positions. Ms. Nielsen
10 reported that a call for applications would be released for the Stakeholders Council shortly. There
11 would be a review process with a Selection Committee that included CWC Staff and Stakeholders
12 Council leadership. The call for applications would open on January 19, 2024, and the call for
13 applications would remain open for three weeks. The call for applications would be shared across all
14 of the existing CWC communication platforms. She asked anyone interested to submit an application.
15

16 **D. Housekeeping (Conflict Disclosure Forms)**

17
18 It was noted that Conflict Disclosure Forms need to be submitted to CWC Staff.
19

20 **E. Stakeholder Announcements.**

21
22 Linda Johnson shared information with the Council. There were no further announcements.
23

24 **F. Thank You to Millcreek For Continuing to Host Meetings.**

25
26 Ms. Nielsen thanked Millcreek for continuing to host the Stakeholders Council Meetings.
27

28 **Retreat Update and Discussion**

29
30 **1. Stakeholders will Receive an Update on the January 8, 2024, Board Retreat.**

31
32 **a. The 2023 Annual Report is Attached for Review.**

33
34 Chair Knoblock reported that the CWC Board Retreat took place on January 8, 2024. It was the
35 second half of the Retreat as the first half was held in December 2023. The reason the Retreat was
36 separated into two parts was due to Board Member schedules. Chair Knoblock explained that the
37 second half of the Retreat focused on visioning exercises to create the CWC 2024 Strategic Plan.
38 During the CWC Board Retreat, there was a presentation on the 2023 Annual Report, which
39 highlighted some of the achievements throughout the year. After that, there were exercises to identify
40 the priorities of the CWC. Attendees brainstormed an ideal newspaper headline related to the
41 accomplishments of the CWC in the Cover Story Visioning Exercise. Following that exercise, there
42 was the Impact and Effort Exercise to determine how difficult it would be to focus on certain tasks.
43 Last, the Storyboarding Exercise took place where all of the different suggestions were voted on.
44

45 Chair Knoblock felt good about the suggestions that had been shared during the CWC Board Retreat.
46 There seemed to be a desire to ensure that Phase I of the Utah Department of Transportation
47 (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) moved forward.
48 Ms. Nielsen shared information about the first half of the CWC Board Retreat, where Stakeholders’

1 Council leadership discussed the Stakeholders Council with the CWC Board. She reiterated that the
2 first half of the Retreat took place in December 2023, although it normally takes place in November
3 each year. However, due to the municipal elections in Utah being pushed back a few weeks, the
4 Retreat was rescheduled to December to accommodate that. Ultimately, the Retreat was two parts.

5
6 The first half of the CWC Board Retreat included a discussion with the CWC Board and Stakeholders
7 Council leadership, which included Chair Knoblock and former Co-Chair of the Stakeholders
8 Council, Carl Fisher. There was discussion about the new structure of the Stakeholders Council at
9 that time and feedback from the CWC Board was received. There was largely a positive response to
10 the new structure. Ms. Nielsen encouraged the Council Members to listen to the recording of the
11 CWC Board Retreat if there was a desire to hear the full Council-related discussion. The second part
12 of the CWC Board Retreat was focused on strategic planning. The discussions focused on
13 transportation, namely ensuring the effectiveness and success of Phase I of the UDOT Little
14 Cottonwood Canyon EIS. There was a desire to define what success looked like. As a result,
15 transportation and transit work would be the main focus of the CWC work moving forward in 2024.

16
17 Chair Knoblock shared information about the Stakeholders Council Mini Retreat during the CWC
18 Board Retreat. He explained to the CWC Board that one of the takeaways was that the Council
19 wanted to ensure there was close alignment with the CWC Board. Council Members wanted to
20 provide meaningful input and benefit the organization. He informed the CWC Board that it would
21 be nice for the Council to hear from them every so often and receive suggestions on areas of focus.

22
23 Tom Diegel wondered if the CWC Board was receptive to the suggestions that the Stakeholders'
24 Council leadership had shared. Chair Knoblock confirmed that the CWC Board had listened, but time
25 would tell whether any specific actions would come out of the discussion. He noted that Mayor Jeff
26 Silvestrini is now the CWC Chair. He would focus on communication with Mayor Silvestrini moving
27 forward. Ms. Johnson thanked CWC Staff for their work running the meetings and keeping things
28 organized. Their level of organization was especially apparent during the CWC Board Retreat.

29
30 There was discussion about communication with UDOT. Chair Knoblock noted that UDOT is in the
31 process of digesting the various lawsuits that had been filed in relation to the UDOT Little
32 Cottonwood EIS. There was a lot of uncertainty about what could move forward and what projects
33 were on hold while those lawsuits were handled. He noted that the Legislature appropriated \$150
34 million for transportation and transit improvements in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little
35 Cottonwood Canyon. No reference had been made to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.
36 Given the plain language of the legislation that had passed, there were still some options available.
37 If some of that \$150 million could flow towards the planning and design of transit stations or other
38 transportation projects, some forward progress could still be made, despite the UDOT lawsuits.

39
40 Chair Knoblock shared information about the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan ("BCC
41 MAP"). One of the suggestions there was to redesign the transit stations at Solitude and Brighton Ski
42 Resorts so the buses could move through more effectively to encourage use. Dan Zalles reported that
43 he had listened to the recording of the CWC Board Retreat. There was some discussion about the
44 Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act ("CWNCRA"). He got the sense
45 that the CWC Board wanted to see that move forward, but for that to happen, the Phase I transit
46 solutions needed to be implemented and examined. He wondered what the rationale for that was.
47 Chair Knoblock explained that in the past, the Chair of the Natural Resources Committee stated that

1 the CWNCRRA was unlikely to move forward until transportation issues were addressed. They wanted
2 to know that the transportation improvements were well underway before it was considered.

3
4 Ms. Nielsen added that the foundation of the CWC was the CWNCRRA. Everything that the CWC
5 did was in pursuit of the CWNCRRA. In order to pass Congressional Legislation, it was necessary to
6 get the State Delegation on board. The State Delegation was focused on transportation currently, so
7 that was where the focus of the CWC Board was as well. However, all of the actions that the CWC
8 took were in pursuit of advancing the CWNCRRA, as that was still a priority for the organization.

9
10 Ms. Johnson discussed previous comments made by Carlton Christensen with UTA. She believed
11 the Stakeholders Council or the Transportation Systems Committee needed to be involved in
12 transportation-related discussions. It was necessary to talk about the future of the canyons, given that
13 the amount of snow may decrease in the future and summer recreation was increasing. Chair
14 Knoblock noted that during the CWC Board Retreat, it was stated that the Stakeholders Council
15 Transportation Systems Committee and CWC Transportation Committee may have the same areas of
16 focus.

17 18 Systems Committee Discussions

19 20 1. Environment Systems Committee

21
22 **A. Met on December 12, 2023, and January 9, 2024.**

23
24 **B. Chair Kelly Boardman and Co-Chair Dan Zalles will Discuss the Committee's**
25 **Recent Activities.**

26
27 Environment Systems Committee Chair, Kelly Boardman, reported that the Environment Systems
28 Committee met on December 12, 2023, and January 9, 2024. She believed the Systems Committees
29 were running well so far. There was a lot of productivity and work was moving forward.
30 Ms. Boardman pointed out that the environment was the resource that provided for the economy,
31 provided recreation, and necessitated the need for transportation. With all of that in mind, she had
32 been doing her best to follow the other Systems Committee Meetings to see what was being discussed.
33 She felt it was important for there to be some level of coordination between the different Committees.

34
35 The Environment Systems Committee had shared comments via a letter that was unanimously
36 approved during the last meeting. The Committee felt the CWNCRRA was important and should be a
37 priority. Ms. Boardman did not know whether the CWC Board had replied directly to the Council or
38 the Committee. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the CWC Board received the letter, but had not responded
39 directly. Ms. Boardman reported that she had listened to the CWC Board Retreat recordings, and as
40 had been discussed, there seemed to be a transportation focus. She thought that made sense, but
41 stressed that the Environment Systems Committee still wanted the CWNCRRA to be a priority for the
42 CWC. She noted that the political climate could change, potentially impacting the CWNCRRA.

43
44 It was important to think about the canyon's capacity. Ms. Boardman explained that when planning
45 for transportation, it was necessary to consider how many people were desired in the canyons on any
46 given day. The desired capacity could impact the quality of the overall experience as well as what
47 was needed for emergency preparedness. The desired capacity could also impact the environment.

1 Ms. Boardman explained that the first area of focus for the Environment Systems Committee was the
2 CWNCR and the letter that had been submitted to the CWC Board. The second area of focus was
3 the Environmental Dashboard. Committee Members had been reviewing the Environmental
4 Dashboard to determine what could be done to improve the resource. There was a desire to determine
5 any data gaps that might exist and think about some possible additions. The Environment Systems
6 Committee had also reviewed the Visitor Use Study. It was an impressive study that looked at the
7 trail use. While it was a great start, Ms. Boardman pointed out that data for winter recreation was
8 lacking. For instance, data about the number of visitors who were skiing at the resorts. The
9 Committee wanted to see a winter supplement that looked at that kind of seasonal data. Having that
10 year-round data would ensure that the total number of visits was documented and better understood.

11
12 Dan Zalles reported that at the last meeting, it was determined that Committee Members would weigh
13 in on the existing Environmental Dashboard. Some suggestions were shared on a Google Document
14 and Committee Members were then asked to share comments and additional suggestions. At the next
15 meeting, a memo would be drafted based on observations about what the Environmental Dashboard
16 was missing. That could potentially move forward to the CWC Board in the future. It had also been
17 suggested that some key indicators be compiled on one page of the Environmental Dashboard.

18
19 Chair Knoblock discussed the 18-acre parcel at the base of Millcreek Canyon. There had been some
20 conversations about that in the past as well as discussions about potential funding for similar parcels.
21 He acknowledged that some audio issues were impacting the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Those
22 audio issues would be addressed so virtual participants could hear the discussions.

23
24 Chair Knoblock asked whether there were any comments about the suggestion made by Ms.
25 Boardman for a possible winter supplement to the Visitor Use Study. He knew that the ski resort
26 managers had spoken directly to Dr. Jordan Smith to point out where there were some inaccurate
27 numbers. Ms. Boardman wondered whether there were plans for a winter supplement already in the
28 works because it seemed like it was necessary to have that data when planning for transportation. She
29 explained that she worked in the canyons and had spoken to a lot of people there. It was important
30 to determine capacity numbers and what level of visitation was too much for the area. In Little
31 Cottonwood Canyon, it seemed that when there were more than 12,000 people in the canyon, it was
32 difficult for people to exit the canyon at the end of the day. She wanted to know if some capacities
33 could be established to determine what number started to cause complications.

34
35 Ms. Nielsen addressed the question about the winter-related data for the Visitor Use Study. She
36 pointed out that the resorts had visitor numbers. If there was a willingness from the resorts to share
37 that data, it could be incorporated into the Visitor Use Study. With the Visitor Use Study work that
38 has been done so far, the University of Utah team utilized the U.S. Forest Service protocol to collect
39 the data. Visitation to the proxy sites in the originally released Visitor Use Study had not been
40 properly weighted and showed a small amount of visitation to those sites. She clarified that the proxy
41 sites were essentially the ski resorts in the Cottonwood Canyons. The University of Utah team, the
42 ski resorts, and Ms. Nielsen had met to discuss the issue and reach a solution. Data was obtained with
43 proper weighting for visitation to the proxy sites. The numbers for those proxy sites were now where
44 they needed to be. She noted that the updated report would be released in the next few months.

45
46 Sarah Bennett reported that the Recreation Systems Committee felt there needed to be a more robust
47 consideration of winter activities and winter access. There needed to be a year-round approach. Chair
48 Knoblock pointed out that in the Mountain Accord, there was language about visitor use information

1 for transportation planning. The winter months were essential to consider in all transportation
2 discussions. Ms. Bennett informed the Council that there was a lot of use taking place year-round.

3
4 Mr. Zalles noted that during the CWC Board Retreat, the impacts of the reservation system were
5 discussed. Some of the ski resorts currently have reservation systems in place on the weekends.
6 Based on the discussions, some CWC Board Members felt it had meaningfully addressed the
7 congestion. He wondered whether that was something that would be factored into any future data
8 collection or analysis. Ms. Nielsen clarified that new data would not be collected in the Visitor Use
9 Study process. Mr. Zalles wanted to make sure that all of the data used was relevant and applicable.
10 Ms. Bennett confirmed that the reservation systems were improving conditions. She thought it would
11 make sense to look at historical data from the time the Mountain Accord was drafted to the current
12 day. That kind of data would illustrate what had changed over the years since the Mountain Accord
13 was drafted and would highlight some of the trends. Chair Knoblock liked what had been suggested.

14
15 **2. Economy Systems Committee**

16
17 **A. Met on November 28, 2023.**

18
19 **B. Chair Dave Fields and Co-Chair Morgan Mingle will Discuss the Committee's**
20 **Recent Activities.**

21
22 Neither the Chair nor the Co-Chair of the Economy Systems Committee was present at the
23 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Ed Marshall was a member of the Committee and shared some
24 comments about the recent discussions. He reported that there had been some conversation about the
25 SHRED Act. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the recent Economy Systems Committee Meeting had
26 focused on the SHRED Act and the potential for Committee Members to present information about
27 that at a future Stakeholders Council Meeting. That presentation would essentially outline how the
28 SHRED Act would specifically impact the canyons that were within the CWC study area.

29
30 **3. Transportation Systems Committee**

31
32 **A. Met on December 11, 2023, and January 8, 2024.**

33
34 **B. Co-Chair Amber Broadaway will Discuss the Committee's Recent Activities.**

35
36 Transportation Systems Committee Co-Chair, Amber Broadaway, was not present at the Stakeholders
37 Council Meeting, but Danny Richardson offered to share highlights from the Committee. He reported
38 that there was a meeting in December where representatives from UTA and High Valley Transit
39 shared information. At that time, the Committee discussed the possibility of a Special Transit District.
40 There was some uncertainty about whether or not UTA would support something like that, but there
41 did not seem to be opposition expressed during the meeting. Mr. Richardson pointed out that this
42 was the second year that UTA had not provided previously existing service. There were concerns
43 about the current levels of service that were being provided by UTA.

44
45 Mr. Richardson reported that there had also been some discussion about the potential Millcreek
46 Canyon shuttle and the upper Canyon road work. Some interesting information was shared about the
47 Big Cottonwood Canyon resort parking reservation system for Solitude and Brighton. In the early
48 season, there was an average of 2.9 people per vehicle for private vehicles. Some interesting things

1 were happening with UTA, High Valley Transit, and the reservation systems at some of the ski resorts.
2 He believed that some positive changes appeared to be taking place.

3
4 Ms. Johnson stated that Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) was a good place to make
5 comments about transportation services because they allocated Federal money. According to Mr.
6 Christensen, Salt Lake City had formed a special taxing district and then paid UTA to service the
7 area. She was under the impression that it was appropriate to pursue that possibility. Chair Knoblock
8 believed it would make a difference whether there was an advocate at the Legislature level. Ms.
9 Nielsen thought the idea of a Special Transit District was exciting and was worth looking into further.

10
11 The Council discussed the purpose of UTA. Ms. Johnson pointed out that it was initially formed to
12 provide clean air in the valley, but that was not happening when there were personal vehicles parked
13 for miles waiting to move up the canyon. Mr. Richardson shared information about the UTA service
14 area and pointed out that it was more than just the canyons. Mr. Diegel reported that the Wasatch
15 Backcountry Alliance shuttle had been running successfully. There had been a technical glitch with
16 the reservations, but the shuttle was currently running on the weekends in Big Cottonwood Canyon
17 and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Wasatch Backcountry Alliance had been in touch historically with
18 UDOT about plowing the lots. Last year had been a challenging year for the plows, but this year,
19 things had been much better as there had not been as much snow. He discussed traffic in the area.

20 21 **4. Recreation Systems Committee**

22 23 **A. Met on December 14, 2023.**

24 25 **B. Chair Sarah Bennett and Co-Chair Barbara Cameron will Discuss the** 26 **Committee’s Recent Activities.**

27
28 Recreation Systems Committee Chair, Ms. Bennett, shared information about the Committee's work.
29 Some time was spent reviewing the original Mountain Accord document as well as the Idealized
30 Systems Report. Several Committee Members had been involved in the Mountain Accord efforts for
31 many years. Ms. Bennett reviewed some of the high-level goals for the Committee:

- 32
- 33 • Better access to recreational opportunities, especially more dispersed access to address
- 34 overcrowding in both winter and summer;
- 35 • Diversity of opportunities;
- 36 • Year-round free or low-cost transportation (shuttles, buses, rideshare);
- 37 • Increased safety (road cycling, parking, communication, signage);
- 38 • Stronger consideration for sustainable and adaptable infrastructure;
- 39 • Increased trail connectivity;
- 40 • Improved signage, communication, and education;
- 41 • Address restroom needs;
- 42 • A more robust look at winter season needs (trail access and recreational access).
- 43

44 Ms. Bennett explained that the Committee had discussed who the recreation opportunities were being
45 created for. Increasingly, it was important to think about the more casual visitor. She felt it was
46 necessary to create opportunities that took into consideration smaller time windows and different
47 ability levels. She noted that transportation, environment, and recreation all overlapped extensively,

1 so all of the Systems Committees needed to communicate with one another. Ms. Bennett discussed
2 signage and the ability to communicate with recreators who utilized the resource. There were blank
3 kiosk signs in the Central Wasatch as well as signs that were degraded and illegible. No
4 communication or poor communication was an issue that appropriate and clear signage could address.

5
6 Some potential tools for achieving those high-level goals were shared. Ms. Bennett reported that the
7 CWNCRRA was the highest-level policy consideration. Underneath that was a Transportation Plan
8 for all seasons. She noted that the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan and the Salt Lake City Watershed
9 Management Plan were both slated to be released in the next few months and would be discussed by
10 the Recreation Systems Committee at that time. Another high-level goal was an Education Plan,
11 which was something that would be rolled into a Signage Plan, as there were opportunities to
12 communicate about trail etiquette, watershed protection, resource protection, natural history, and
13 human history. That knowledge would enrich the time that was spent outdoors. The intention was
14 to enhance stewardship, which a Communication, Education, and Signage Plan could address.

15
16 Other options included a Road Cycling Plan and a Remnant Lands Inventory. The latter would
17 include recommendations for some private inholdings in a public lands matrix or small parcels that
18 did not have a role in a bioregional plan but could be critical to create a secondary or tertiary access
19 point or a trail re-route. Looking at some of the lands originally considered in the Mountain Accord
20 and then some of the other private parcels was something that the Committee could do in the future.

21
22 Ms. Bennett noted that a Connectivity Plan had to do with connecting trails and infrastructure to
23 resources outside of the CWC study area. To achieve the goal of better access and more dispersed
24 access, it was necessary to look at connections to trails and recreational connections that were just
25 outside the study area. Another action could be a comprehensive Restroom Plan. Some of the action
26 items that have come forward from the Committee discussions so far included the following:

- 27
- 28 • Road striping for bicycles;
- 29 • Widening bicycle lanes;
- 30 • Identifying turn lanes;
- 31 • Identifying places where road cyclists could gain confidence and a higher degree of safety;
- 32 • Developing a prioritized mountain bicycle trail list;
- 33 • Inventorying remnant lands within the CWC study area;
- 34 • Designing and implementing a Signage Plan.
- 35

36 There was a member of the Recreation Systems Committee who developed a Transit to Trails Plan
37 for the Cottonwoods, similar to what Park City was doing with the Transit to Trails to Bonanza Flat.
38 Emily Salle and her fellow grad students had written a transit plan for the Cottonwoods that had been
39 submitted to UTA. There had also been discussions with UDOT about that plan as well. Ms. Bennett
40 reported that there was a desire to review that plan at a Committee level and receive more input.

41
42 Recreation Systems Committee Co-Chair, Barbara Cameron, noted that there had been a lot of
43 discussions about signage and transportation. The Mountain Accord discussed improving transit
44 service to trailheads, so the plan shared by Ms. Salle was important for the Committee to discuss.
45 Ms. Cameron noted that at the end of the Mountain Accord process, there was no Ikon Pass or
46 reservation system. It was clear that some things had changed since the Mountain Accord discussions
47 had taken place. As for the quality of the experience, the reservation system has made a notable

1 difference so far. Visitors were starting to realize that the reservations made sense, which she was
2 excited about. The traffic during the day was much better already as a result of the reservation system.

3
4 Ms. Cameron reported that there had been a briefing from UTA. It was stated that Big Cottonwood
5 Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon had five buses each running on a regular schedule. However,
6 this year, UTA added something called exception buses. Those buses were not on the public schedule
7 but were added on weekends, holidays, and for every forecasted storm. For December, UTA counted
8 66,000 passengers. Last year in December, there were only 55,000 passengers. In 2022, which was
9 a normally staffed year where there were no bus cuts, there were 70,000 passengers for December.
10 With 66,000 passengers this December, UTA was close to transporting as many passengers as they
11 did before the UTA canyon staffing was cut. According to UTA, the larger buses and the exception
12 buses had made a significant difference.

13 14 **5. Millcreek Canyon Committee**

15 16 **A. Met on January 16, 2024.**

17 18 **B. Chair Tom Diegel and Co-Chair Del Draper will Discuss the Committee’s Recent** 19 **Activities.**

20
21 Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Mr. Diegel, shared information about the recent
22 Committee work. He reported that there had been a lot of discussions about the Federal Lands Access
23 Program (“FLAP”) grant and the efforts from CWC Staff related to a potential Millcreek Canyon
24 shuttle program. Initially, the Millcreek Canyon Committee was told that the parking options were
25 limited, but some parking options had since been identified, which eliminated that shuttle issue. That
26 being said, there were still some challenges when it came to obtaining funds for the National
27 Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) work and the implementation of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle.

28
29 Mr. Diegel reported that there was an 18-acre parcel near the mouth of Millcreek Canyon that had
30 been put up for sale by a private party. It had been listed for a few months and some low offers had
31 been received so far. The owner was amenable to some sort of conservation easement, but the parcel
32 was still for sale, so there was uncertainty about what would happen with the parcel in the future.

33
34 Mr. Marshall was a member of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and had initiated conversations
35 about some fire mitigation work along the road. The Forest Service was amenable to that work. Mr.
36 Diegel thanked Mr. Marshall for his efforts in moving those conversations forward and focusing on
37 that.

38 39 **Appointment of Stakeholders Council Co-Chair and Committee Members**

40 41 **1. The Stakeholders Council will Determine a Co-Chair.**

42
43 Ms. Nielsen reported that former Stakeholders Council Co-Chair, Mr. Fisher, was no longer with the
44 organization. As a result, there was a vacancy that needed to be filled. An email was sent out in early
45 January to all Stakeholders Council Members asking for nominations for a Co-Chair. In that email,
46 it asked that those who wanted to be removed from consideration communicate that to CWC Staff.
47 Mr. Diegel had agreed to serve as Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council. For that appointment to
48 occur, there would need to be a vote of confidence from the Council. She clarified that this was not

1 necessarily a formal vote. It was noted that Stakeholders Council leadership served for two-year
2 terms. She explained that the terms started in July 2023 and would last until July 2025.

3
4 The Chair and Co-Chair crafted the agendas for the bi-monthly Stakeholders Council Meetings in
5 consultation with CWC Staff. Additionally, the Chair and Co-Chair served as members of the CWC
6 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. The reason for that was to ensure there was an open line of
7 communication between the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. The Executive/Budget/Audit
8 Committee Meetings happened each month. In addition, the Chair and Co-Chair ran the Stakeholders
9 Council Meetings. Stakeholders Council leadership also served as the main point of communication.
10 For instance, if Council Members had questions or concerns, it would be appropriate to reach out to
11 them. Ms. Nielsen reported that Stakeholders Council leadership also attended CWC Board Meetings
12 when possible as well as the CWC Board Retreat, where the Stakeholders Council Report was shared.

13
14 The Rules and Procedures did not state that there needed to be a formal motion for appointment of
15 leadership, but that there needed to be a vote of confidence. If the Council felt more comfortable
16 making a formal motion, that could also be done as the agenda allowed for action to be made.
17 Ms. Johnson suggested that the Stakeholders Council indicate their approval that Mr. Diegel serve as
18 the Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council. All of the Council Members present expressed their
19 support.

20
21 **2. Stakeholders will Indicate Whether They Would Like to Join a Subcommittee of the**
22 **Stakeholders Council.**

23
24 Ms. Nielsen noted that there were new Stakeholders Council Members who needed to join a
25 subcommittee. Additionally, there might be other Council Members who want to join other Systems
26 Committees. She reported that the Meeting Minutes needed to formally memorialize Council
27 Members approving additions to the subcommittees. Ms. Sullivan wanted to join the Millcreek
28 Canyon Committee and the Recreation Systems Committee. It was noted that Mr. Zalles wanted to
29 be on the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Ms. Tyler asked to be added to the Environment Systems
30 Committee and the Transportation Systems Committee. Patrick Shea wanted to be added to the
31 Economy Systems Committee and Joanna Wheelton wanted to be added to the Environment Systems
32 Committee. There were no further additions to the Stakeholders Council subcommittees.

33
34 **January Discussion Prompt**

35
36 **1. Discussion Prompt:**

- 37
38 a. **How would you facilitate communication and collaboration among the Systems**
39 **Committees?**
40
41 b. **What relevant projects would benefit from the work and expertise of multiple**
42 **committees?**

43
44 Chair Knoblock explained that the idea was to have a discussion prompt at the end of each
45 Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda. He read the January discussion prompt questions aloud:

- 46
47 • How would you facilitate communication and collaboration amongst the Systems Committee?

- What relevant projects would benefit from the work and expertise of multiple committees?

Mr. Richardson asked if the Meeting Minutes from each of the Systems Committees were shared with Council Members. Ms. Nielsen clarified that the Meeting Minutes were posted on the Utah Public Notice website and were publicly available for review. It was noted that the Meeting Minutes could also be sent out to Council Members if that would make the review process easier.

Mr. Diegel thought it might make sense for the Chairs of the Systems Committee to have discussions with one another or pay attention to the other meeting schedules. It was also possible for Committee Members to sit in on different meetings or listen to the recordings afterward. That could be a formal or informal process, but it was a good way to understand what the other Systems Committees were working on. Ms. Johnson believed it was important for Council Members to review the Meeting Minutes from the other Systems Committee Meetings. She asked that the meeting dates be sent out to Council Members via email so those interested in sitting in on those meetings could attend.

Ms. Boardman shared a comment about the second discussion prompt question. She believed that the CWC Board was focused on what the Systems Committees should be focused on. When it came to transportation, everyone needed to pay attention to what was happening so it was possible to share comments. Chair Knoblock reminded those present that all of the CWC meetings were open and public. Council Members were able to attend those meetings and listen to discussions. It was also possible for attendees to share comments during the public comment period.

Ms. Nielsen thanked the Stakeholders Council for all of their hard work and dedication. She wanted to make sure that Council Members were receiving the emails from the CWC. Those emails were the best and most direct way to communicate with Council Members. She asked all Council Members to pay attention to emails from CWC Staff and to check their junk mail folder. Ms. Nielsen reported that discussion prompts would be included on every Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda moving forward. She asked that Council Members think about how the different Systems Committees could work together to be as effective as possible. Chair Knoblock explained that the subcommittees intend to get things done. It was important to determine the needs and take action.

Mr. Diegel reported that Dea Theodore from the Salt Lake County Council had convened three different committees to talk about issues in the Wasatch. One of the committees was related to public lands, one had to do with fire mitigation and land management, and the other related to water resources. He thought that was something the Council should be aware of as it might be possible to participate in some manner. Chair Knoblock felt it would be beneficial to receive updates about that.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

1 **Closing**

2
3 1. **Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders' Council Meeting.**

4
5 **MOTION:** Tom Diegel moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. _____ seconded
6 the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7
8 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:27 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 on Wednesday, January 17, 2024.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____