MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION ("CWC") STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2024, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 1330 EAST CHAMBERS AVENUE, MILLCREEK, UTAH.

Present:	John Knoblock, Chair
	Mike Marker
	Maura Hahnenberger
	John Adams
	Mark Baer
	Barbara Cameron
	Sally Kaiser
	Kelly Boardman
	Adam Lenkowski
	Hilary Lambert
	Roger Borgenicht
	Caitlin Curry
	Dan Zalles
	Danny Richardson
	Del Draper
	Ed Marshall
	Ella Abelli-Amen
	Hilary Arens
	Jonny Vasic
	Linda Johnson
	Meaghan McKasy
	Olivia Juarez
	Pat Shea
	Patrick Morrison
	Sarah Bennett
	Devin Weder
	Ian Reddell
Staff:	Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
	Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

Opening

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

Chair John Knoblock called the Central Wasatch Commission ("CWC") Stakeholders Council Meeting to order at approximately 3:38 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the September 18, 2024, Stakeholders Council Meeting.

MOTION: Barbara Cameron moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the September 18, 2024, Stakeholders Council Meeting. _____ seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Chair Knoblock welcomed new members to the Stakeholders Council, Olivia Juarez from GreenLatinos, Hilary Arens from Snowbird Ski Resort, and Ella Abelli-Amen from the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. He thanked them for their willingness to serve on the Council. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, noted that Ian Reddell has not been officially confirmed at this point, but will be at the next CWC Board Meeting. Mr. Reddell is from Solitude Ski Resort and will be replacing Amber Broadaway as the Council representative now that she is a CWC Special Advisor.

Ms. Kilpack reported that there is an issue with the audio and the virtual participants cannot be heard by those attending the meeting in person. She explained that CWC Staff will continue to work on this. For the time being, those interested in participating can leave a comment in the Zoom chat box.

Chair Knoblock asked that the meeting date item on the agenda be discussed first so there is a quorum.

Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment Presentation

1. Devin Weder from the Utah Department of Transportation will Discuss the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment.

Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") Transit Project Manager for the Cottonwood Canyons, Devin Weder, introduced himself to the Council. He shared information about the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment that is currently underway. There is a lot of traffic in the Cottonwood Canyons, especially during the winter months. This particular study will evaluate how to best manage the wintertime congestion in Big Cottonwood Canyon. It will specifically look at enhanced bus service, tolling, a mobility hub, and resort bus stops in Big Cottonwood Canyon.

Mr. Weder explained that the study area is from Wasatch and Fort Union up the canyon and around the loop to Brighton Resort. He shared a ski day chart to show the wintertime visitation and

discussed the growth seen throughout the canyon. As for what is expected to happen in the future, it is anticipated that there will be another million residents along the Wasatch Front by 2050. There has been a lot of growth already and more is expected in the future. Annually, there are more than three million visitors to both Cottonwood Canyons. Discussions were had about the charts shown.

Traffic count data was reviewed. A request was made to overlay the traffic data with the chart data. Mr. Weder confirmed that this can be prepared. Since 2019, traffic data has been collected at multiple points in both canyons. Vehicles and vehicle classes are counted. Work is being done with the ski resorts and the U.S. Forest Service. Additionally, the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has counts at the major trailheads. All of that data is being used to determine where people are going. Big Cottonwood Canyon is a little more limited, but there is a counter at the bottom and in the upper canyon. This means it is possible to determine whether someone has visited the upper canyon or not.

Chair Knoblock asked if the last data point indicates there were approximately 7 million people in the canyon for downhill skiing. Mr. Weder clarified that skier days are shown on the chart, which represents skier visits. Chair Knoblock asked how the seven million skier visits compare to the data collected for the Visitor Use. He stressed the importance of making data-driven decisions. Mr. Weder reported that UDOT has their own data counts for vehicles entering the canyon. The skier day data comes from the Forest Service. He explained that the resorts report information to the Forest Service. Linda Johnson asked whether the numbers shown include backcountry skiers, which was denied. Mr. Weder explained that the information shown relates to resort skiers. Del Draper believes the chart states there are 7 million skier days in both canyons with 3 million in Big Cottonwood Canyon.

Mr. Weder shared information specific to Big Cottonwood Canyon. 7,200 vehicles are going uphill on a peak day currently. Based on projections, by 2050, that number will grow to 8,750 with 90% of traffic going to Solitude Entry 1 or above. That means 10% of visitors are not heading to a resort area. The peak times are 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. to date. There is no clarity about what the peak times will look like in the future. The road can currently only handle 1,000 to 1,200 vehicles per hour. A question was asked about the current number of vehicles on the road during peak hours. Mr. Weder stated that it is around 1,000 vehicles per hour. More people may want to visit the canyon, but the road can only handle so many vehicles. Approximately half of the vehicles are entering the canyon during the peak hours. The remaining vehicles are spread out throughout the day. Weekend versus weekday data is considered, but during the winter months, peak days are almost always on a weekend.

Council Members asked what UDOT is attributing the growth since 2016 to. It sounds like growth to 2050 is being forecasted based on more residents in the Salt Lake Valley, but there is a desire to understand what the previous growth is attributed to. Mr. Weder explained that there is no claim made about what caused the growth since 2016, but that level of growth was taken into account.

Mr. Weder reported that there is high demand for the bus service during the peak winter months. The demand for the bus service has increased every year, with the exception of the COVID-19 pandemic. Even in the year after the pandemic when the bus service was more limited, it was still in high demand. That is the reason buses are being considered because there is still clear demand

for that service. The existing average travel times were shared. Mr. Weder reported that uphill, the travel time is approximately 26 minutes. In the future, if no action is taken, it is estimated there will be an uphill travel time of approximately 48 minutes with a downhill travel time of approximately 49 minutes.

Mr. Weder explained that the study will look at bus service with buses leaving the mobility hub every five to 10 minutes. For context, there is currently 30-minute bus service available. The Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment will also look at resort bus stops. Those are envisioned as heated, enclosed buildings where it is possible to access lockers and restrooms. There is also a desire to look into improvements to existing bus stops in the canyon. For example, pullouts so the bus can pull off the road as well as meet Forest Service requirements, such as restrooms.

As for the mobility hub, the intention is to have something sized correctly so people can park their vehicles and access a bus. The mobility hub is proposed to be located at the current gravel pit. Mr. Weder discussed tolling and explained that it is seen as an incentive to use the bus. The idea is to have a toll that will start below Entry 1 and will apply to anyone driving past that point. A question was asked about communication with the resorts on incentives and disincentives. For instance, how all the different incentives and disincentives stack, such as paid parking at the resorts. Mr. Weder noted that human behavior is a lot harder to model. UDOT cannot charge people to park, but he believes parking reservations and paid parking at the resorts impact traffic levels. There has been a reduction in traffic because of the implementation of the reservation system. UDOT is focusing on controlling what they can control. Mr. Weder explained that tolling will only be in place when the road is not functioning properly. If the road is functioning well, then tolling will not be needed.

Chair Knoblock asked if it is possible to propose free bus service. It might be possible to appropriate funding so the Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") ski bus is free for all. This is something that could encourage changed behavior. Mr. Weder reported that the Legislature has already set up the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Investment Fund, which is approximately $20 million per year. Part of that money has gone into funding the study and money has been set aside for this work.

A question was asked about improvements to existing bus stops. Big Cottonwood Canyon has a lot of backcountry skier use, so there is a desire to understand what is envisioned as part of the improvements and what will happen to some of the other places people are seeking access to year-round. Mr. Weder explained that winter use is the focus in this case. Currently, the intention is to look at existing bus stops, clear them environmentally, and make sure they meet UTA and Forest Service requirements. If there are suggestions to look at other locations, those can be shared. UTA and Forest Service requirements for the stops include ADA access and safe road crossings.

Mr. Weder reported that the scoping phase is currently underway, so there have not been in-depth conversations with the ski resorts at this point. Those can occur once the scope is finalized. Ms. Kilpack noted that there are some questions from virtual meeting participants. One attendee asked if it is possible to see both the numbers used for the projections and the formula used for the projections. Mr. Weder confirmed this and explained that those will be released with the

documents. Ms. Kilpack read another question, which was about the mobility hub at the gravel pit. There were concerns that the location would create traffic issues on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Weder reported that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") cleared a grade-separated interchange on Wasatch Boulevard. What is contemplated is projected to be able to serve the demand in the peak hour for vehicles coming in and out without creating congestion across Wasatch Boulevard.

Ms. Kilpack read another question from an online participant, which was about whether or not the tolling will be automated. Mr. Weder confirmed that this is the plan. He is not sure that it will be addressed in the study, as the study will focus more on the impacts of tolling rather than implementation. However, the plan is to have something automated to avoid traffic backups.

Additional discussions were had about the traffic volume near the mobility hub. A question was asked about traffic projections in different scenarios. Mr. Weder is not certain that the exact models mentioned have been done, but that intersection is already in design. Two lanes should be able to handle the traffic levels because currently, there are no backups on the through movements.

Ms. Johnson asked about the location of the proposed tolling. She also wanted to know if there will be tolling in addition to paid parking at the ski resorts. Mr. Weder explained that UDOT is not in control of what the ski resorts choose to do with their parking. UDOT works well with the ski resorts and there is no desire to penalize businesses or visitors. The tolling will generate revenue, but the reason behind the toll is not to generate revenue. He clarified that the idea of tolling is to encourage visitors to take transit instead of using personal vehicles. Tolling will only be put in place when the road is not functioning. Currently, it is anticipated that it will be placed just below Solitude Entry 1. He encouraged Council Members with concerns about that location to submit a formal comment.

Chair Knoblock assumed there would be a digital sign at the mobility hub to share the cost of the toll. Mr. Weder reported that some electronic message signs have already been installed. Fort Union Boulevard does not have a sign currently and there might need to be one placed there as well. Visitors will be informed when tolling is happening. One of the reasons to have the toll at Solitude Entry 1 is to avoid impacting users who may not be served by the bus system. Having this toll in place doesn't mean it will always happen, but that it will be possible. There are a lot of restrictions from the Federal Government about what can and cannot be done. There needs to be specific clearance obtained to implement a toll. It is possible to put a toll in place to manage congestion, but UDOT can't prevent people from entering the canyon. UDOT does not have the authority to state that a certain limit has been reached, but it is possible to restrict access for certain safety reasons.

Mr. Weder reported that there needs to be an air quality analysis for the mobility hub. It is a large enough generator of bus trips that the analysis is necessary. In terms of water quality, that will also be examined to determine what impacts there will be. Chair Knoblock asked if there is any information to share about the feasibility of electric buses. Mr. Weder reported that diesel buses will be cleared because that is the highest bar with respect to emissions. Electric buses have been looked at, but the communication from UTA and other partners is that the buses are not quite there

yet. It is possible that there could be electric buses used in the future, but right now, diesel will be cleared.

UDOT is currently in the scoping phase. The pre-scoping has already been done. Mr. Weder explained that scoping will take place during fall and winter. Once the scoping period is complete, the environmental study will take place. All of the comments will be reviewed, the alternative will be refined, environmental impacts will be analyzed, and the environmental document will be published. The hope is that by Fall 2025 there will be a document completed. There will then be public hearings and another comment period at that point. The decision will be made in Winter 2025. After the decision is made and released, it will be possible to start the implementation process. Mr. Weder reported that all of these details are available on the website for additional review.

Council Members wanted to understand the difference between an environmental study and an EIS. Mr. Weder explained that environmental study is a general term. In this phase, the class of action will be determined. Class of action can be a Categorical Exclusion, EIS, or Environmental Analysis. UDOT believes this will be an Environmental Analysis, which is the medium version of an environmental study. On the other hand, an EIS is a full-blown three to five-year study process. In this case, if there is a decision of significant impact, then the EIS process would need to take place.

November 13 to December 13, 2024, is the public comment period. Mr. Weder explained that the comments shared during the Stakeholders Council Meeting so far are not considered official comments. Anyone interested in submitting an official comment can do so. There is a form on the website and it is also possible to submit comments by phone, email, and mail. He encouraged everyone to submit a comment. Chair Knoblock asked if there is a way the process can consider additional improved valley bus stops to reduce traffic heading to the mobility hub. Mr. Weder explained that there does not need to be an environmental study to serve the mobility hub.

Chair Knoblock wondered whether some of the $20 million from the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Investment Fund could potentially be invested into UTA for buses. Mr. Weder explained that the Legislature appropriates that money how they choose to. Discussions were had about the money needed for the projects that are anticipated as part of this process. Mr. Weder explained that there is approximately 70% of the funding needed. A question was asked about when UDOT will engage with UTA. Mr. Weder reported that he speaks to UTA regularly, but it is not something that needs to be done through the environmental process. The mobility hub will simplify a lot. Mr. Weder shared information about different modeling scenarios and the road function.

Ms. Kilpack read a question from an online participant, which had to do with what was learned from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS process. Mr. Weder explained that UDOT feels that there was as much outreach as possible during the EIS process and it is believed that the process was done correctly. The current process is not happening during the COVID-19 pandemic, so it is possible to do more in-person presentations. A question was asked about the timeline and funding for the mobility hub. Mr. Weder believes it will be approximately two years once there is

implementation. Funding is available for the mobility hub. There are currently negotiations underway for the land.

Ed Marshall asked who will receive the revenue from the tolls and if that revenue has been earmarked for any particular uses. Mr. Weder reported that it is not earmarked currently, so something will need to be determined. The money would come to UDOT and then the Legislature and Transportation Commission would make a determination about where that money would be spent.

Mr. Weder was asked about his awareness of the CWC Environmental Dashboard. He confirmed that he has seen it, but he is not sure whether or not it will be used during this process. As for whether or not the traffic data that UDOT has used in their analysis could be added to the Human Element of the Environmental Dashboard, he believes that is possible, but there would need to be discussions. He shared information about the models created and the different consultants UDOT has used.

Chair Knoblock asked if there is a way to broaden the scope to look at the area a little bit more holistically. It might make sense to have increased bus service from 9400 South so there are not as many vehicles driving across to access the mobility hub. Mr. Weder suggested that this comment be submitted so it can be formally considered. Right now, that is not included in the scope.

Chair Knoblock thanked Mr. Weder for his presentation and for answering Council Member questions. Mr. Weder offered to leave contact details and asked Council Members to submit comments.

Board Retreat Discussion

1. Staff will Discuss the November 1, 2024, CWC Board Retreat.

Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the CWC Board Retreat took place on November 1, 2024. The intention was to reorient participants to the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act ("CWNCRA"). There were small group discussions with positive outcomes. The CWC Board Retreat document included in the Meeting Materials Packet was from the retreat facilitator. Some of the key discussion points were pulled out for inclusion in the document.

Mixed Breakout Groups

Due to the time, it was suggested that there be one Mixed Breakout Group discussion as opposed to the two that were originally on the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda. Ahead of the discussions, CWC Staff asked that the Action Item on the meeting agenda be discussed and voted on.

Both discussion prompts were read aloud and the Council decided which one would be considered during the current meeting. It was determined that the focus will be on the first set of questions.

1. **Discussion Prompts:**

   a. **How Does the Transportation System Affect and Support the Other System Groups in the Central Wasatch? How do the Other System Groups Affect and Support Transportation?**

   b. **How Can the Transportation System Positively Impact, and Best Fit Into, the Larger Central Wasatch System and Its Other Components?**

Ms. Nielsen reported that there will be one Breakout Session held during the current Stakeholders Council Meeting. The tables that participants are sitting at will make up the different groups. Council Members spent approximately 15 minutes reviewing the transportation system-related questions.

Mixed Breakout Group Reports

1. **Each Breakout Group will Summarize their Discussions for the Stakeholders Council.**

Following the Breakout Session, a report was shared from each of the groups. Chair Knoblock reported that transportation provides access, which makes it possible to enjoy recreation. That also impacts the economy. The transportation system allows restaurants to have customers and ski resorts to have visitors. It also makes it possible for visitors to enjoy the area. Having solid transportation in place can improve environmental conditions by reducing the number of personal vehicles in the canyons. A better transportation system can also alleviate parking problems and overflow. The Transportation System Committee and Millcreek Canyon Committee review ongoing processes. That involvement provides another layer of oversight. The economy impacts transportation by tax revenues generated. It is an incentive for the roads to be maintained well. He pointed out that some might argue the transportation system negatively impacts the environment due to visitation levels. Discussions were had about the Forest Plan and the Mountain Accord. Chair Knoblock recommended that Council Members read those documents on a semi-regular basis.

Danny Richardson reported that his group discussed Millcreek Canyon and the potential shuttle. That shuttle could be a catalyst for other transportation projects. With the Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP") grant, the upper portion of Millcreek Canyon will be the focus, but the lower portion of the canyon will not be done until later. The FLAP grant does not specifically talk about a shuttle, but there are some other potential funding sources. There are also some parking options. The group also discussed several transportation alternatives, such as a connection between the canyons.

The third group discussions were shared. There were comments made about transportation being a driver in the canyons. Without an effective transportation system, it can be difficult for the other systems to work effectively. Having a transportation system can provide economic and recreation opportunities. The group also discussed the mobility hub potentially being a location for small

businesses. The impacts of a more robust transportation system need to be taken into account. A wider approach is needed to effectively understand how a transportation system will work.

Sarah Bennett noted that a lot of information sharing was done. The group discussed the complexities of the different canyons. The Mountain Accord was created to look at things comprehensively, holistically, and sustainably. The way things are being looked at now is far more fragmented. Ms. Bennett noted that there are a lot of plans to move people into the canyons, but there must be a plan in place for emergency preparedness. It is important to think about unexpected situations, such as acts of nature, wildfire, avalanches, and so on. Consideration should be given to emergency scenarios.

The online group participants shared a summary of their discussion. Meaghan McKasy explained that transportation is seen as a drive. Any system that is designed without thinking through the impacts on other systems is destined to fail. The transportation system can impact the quality or type of recreation experience and the flexibility to partake in different recreation. It is possible to concentrate the locations where people are recreating or strategically dilute the recreation experience through transportation. From an environmental perspective, transportation makes it possible to remove visitors from areas that necessitate additional protections. The flexibility and frequency of transportation is important. It is essential to think about shuttles to address smaller trailheads. A system can be designed to bring people to the canyon, but that doesn't necessarily mean it should.

Mixed Breakout Groups

1. Discussion Prompts:

a. What Existing Transportation/Transit Projects Could the CWC Plug Into?

b. What New Transportation/Transit Projects Could the CWC Spearhead?

c. How Can the Stakeholders Council and its Transportation System Committee Help these Projects Move Forward?

The second set of questions was not discussed during the meeting.

Mixed Breakout Group Reports

1. Each Breakout Group will Summarize their Discussions for the Stakeholders Council.

The second Mixed Breakout Group discussion did not take place due to time constraints.

2025 Meeting Dates

1. Stakeholders will Determine their 2025 Meeting Dates.

Chair Knoblock asked Council Members about the possibility of holding quarterly Stakeholders Council Meetings rather than bi-monthly Stakeholders Council Meetings. He asked that there be a discussion about meeting dates for the new year. One of the functions of the CWC Board and Stakeholders Council is relationship building and convening. The Mountain Accord process started because there was not a lot of conversation happening between the different system advocates. He personally believes that even though bi-monthly meetings require more time from Council Members, it is meaningful to convene. Relationship building is an important function of the CWC. Ms. Johnson pointed out that there is a lot happening right now and a lot of planning underway. She feels it is important to meet. Ms. Nielsen explained that the Council can continue on a bi-monthly schedule, but there is a desire to check in and make sure that the meeting schedule makes sense for members.

Ms. Nielsen noted that the Stakeholders Council subcommittees will continue to meet on either a monthly or bi-monthly basis. As for the Stakeholders Council, the frequency of meetings can be determined by Council Members. Ms. Nielsen reminded Council Members that this past year, the month of the Stakeholders Council Meeting has been the month preceding the month of the CWC Board Meeting. That was done on purpose so any recommendations from the Council could be reviewed by the CWC Board in a timely manner. Discussions were had about the frequency of meetings moving forward. For instance, if it should be every six, eight, or twelve weeks. It was suggested that Council Members consider the success of the meeting frequency from the past year. Some Council Members pointed out that the meetings often run out of time and it is not possible to discuss everything that there is a desire to discuss. That should be a consideration when it comes to the meeting frequency for the year ahead.

A question was asked about the time of the Stakeholders Council Meetings. Ms. Nielsen reported that the set time is 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. It can be changed if there is a desire to do so, but that time has historically worked the best for meeting participants. It was suggested that meetings run from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. instead. Chair Knoblock asked that there be a vote on the meeting schedule. There were nine Council Members who would prefer quarterly meetings, but the majority wanted to remain with the bi-monthly meeting schedule. It was determined that the meetings will be bi-monthly.

Committee Membership and Leadership

1. Stakeholders May Request to Join Systems Committees:

a. Millcreek Canyon Committee.

There were no requests to join the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

b. Environment System Committee.

i. Ella Abeli-Amen, Olivia Juarez

It was noted that Ms. Abeli-Amen and Ms. Juarez will join the Environment System Committee.

c. Transportation System Committee.

There were no requests to join the Transportation System Committee.

d. Recreation System Committee.

There were no requests to join the Recreation System Committee.

e. Economy System Committee.

i. Mike Marker, Hilary Arens

It was noted that Mike Marker and Ms. Arens will join the Economy System Committee.

2. Announcement of Any Committee Leadership Changes.

a. Committee Chair/Co-Chair Terms Expire in February.

Ms. Kilpack reported that subcommittee Chair and Co-Chair terms will expire in February 2025. It is possible to serve two consecutive terms, but that is something for Council Members to think about.

Action Items

1. (Action) Consideration of a Letter Drafted by the Transportation System Committee to the CWC Board Concerning the Study of Baseline Conditions in the Tri-Canyons.

Chair Knoblock reported that the Action Item on the agenda is a proposal coming out of the Transportation System Committee. The Committee wanted there to be better baseline data on the conditions in the tri-canyons. Essentially, there is a desire to understand why people are entering the canyons. That can be useful information for future transit and transportation planning. The Visitor Use Study that was done by Utah State University followed the Forest Service protocol on visitor use studies, which had more to do with trailhead survey satisfaction than specific visitation types.

The Transportation System Committee is asking that a vote be taken on the letter drafted and included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Chair Knoblock believes the format might need to be altered slightly before it is presented to the CWC Board, but the letter asks for their advice and consent to move forward with the collection of additional data. The function of the Stakeholders Council is to collect and analyze data, but the Council does not have budgetary authority to spend

CWC funds without CWC Board approval. There might be some data collection that can be done in-house or with partner organizations. Alternatively, a third party might be needed to create a credible baseline report. Chair Knoblock noted that this data request was also mentioned by the Recreation System Committee.

The Baseline Study Letter from the Transportation System Committee was shared and reviewed. Ms. Nielsen explained that the Stakeholders Council will vote on whether or not to advance this letter to the CWC Board. If advanced, the CWC Board will review it at the meeting on December 2, 2024.

Discussions were had about the letter and the baseline data proposal. It was noted that this kind of data can be useful for future decision-making processes. Ms. Bennett stated that the Recreation System Committee has also discussed this kind of baseline data. To accommodate all of the different recreational activities that are happening in the canyons, there needs to be more granular information about the types of activities that are going on, the locations where use is happening, and so on. That information can inform future grants and transportation decisions. This seems like necessary data.

Chair Knoblock believed the Baseline Study Letter should include an introductory paragraph that specifically states the Council is asking for advice and consent to move forward with this. The next step would be to identify a process where the Council can establish the necessary budget. At that point, it will then be possible to come back to the CWC Board with a funding request. Ms. Nielsen explained that the recommendation from the Stakeholders Council to the CWC Board can be brief. Ms. Bennett thought it might be wise to identify some possible ways to gather the information.

Chair Knoblock asked who would like to advance the letter to the CWC Board and ask for CWC Board support to move forward with collecting more granular visitor use data about the Central Wasatch. Ms. Bennett asked if the letter would be revised. Ms. Kilpack explained that based on the Council discussion, the Baseline Study Letter would be revised to include an introductory paragraph.

MOTION: John Knoblock moved to FORWARD a Letter Drafted by the Transportation System Committee to the CWC Board Concerning the Study of Baseline Conditions in the Tri-Canyons, with the inclusion of an introductory paragraph. There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of those present. Those not present at the meeting are considered abstentions.

Staff Announcements

1. Stakeholders Council Membership Updates.

There were no additional membership updates shared.

2. Central Wasatch Symposium on January 9-10, 2025.

The Council Members were reminded that the Central Wasatch Symposium will take place on January 9 and 10, 2025. Tickets are available and Terry Tempest Williams is the keynote speaker.

3. Youth Council Announcements:

a. The Outdoor Film Festival was a Success.

The CWC Youth Council Outdoor Film Festival took place and was a success.

b. Tabling Opportunities.

The CWC Youth Council is looking into different tabling opportunities.

c. Other.

There were no additional updates shared.

4. Next Board Meeting is December 2, 2024.

The next CWC Board Meeting will take place on December 2, 2024.

5. Thank You to Millcreek for Continuing to Host Our Meetings.

CWC Staff thanked Millcreek for hosting the Stakeholders Council Meeting.

Stakeholders Open Comment

A question was asked about the CWC Legislative Field Trip that took place earlier in the fall. Ms. Nielsen reported that there was lower attendance than what the organization hoped there would be, but it was a meaningful experience for those who were able to attend. There were presentations from representatives of the different systems. As for the CWC Board Retreat, that went well and the CWC Board engaged in small group discussions, similar to what has been done during Stakeholders Council Meetings. During the retreat, there were also conversations about the CWNCRA. For example, what needs to be renegotiated and a timeline. The Meeting Minutes from the retreat are available for review.

Closing

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

MOTION: Linda Johnson moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders' Council Meeting held on Wednesday, November 20, 2024.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: _____