



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL RETREAT HELD WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 2025, AT 4:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY HALL

Board Members: John Knoblock, Chair
Maura Hahnenberger
Adam Lenkowski
Mark Baer
Mike Marker
Meaghan McKasy
Sally Kaiser
Doug Tolman
Roger Borgenicht
John Adams
Del Draper
Kelly Boardman
Barbara Cameron
Sarah Bennett
Dennis Goreham
Brenden Catt
Danny Richardson

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
Ben Kilbourne, Community Engagement Coordinator

Others: Eva DeLaurentiis

OPENING

1. Chair John Knoblock will Open the Public Meeting as 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 4:10 p.m. and welcomed those present to the retreat.

1 **2. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the April 16,**
2 **2025 Stakeholders Council Meeting.**
3

4 **MOTION:** Sarah Bennett moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the April 16, 2025,
5 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Danny Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed with
6 the unanimous consent of the Council.
7

8 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL BUSINESS**
9

10 **1. (Action) The Council will Consider a Draft Letter Regarding the Proposed Parking**
11 **Expansion at Solitude Mountain Resort and Vote on Whether to Deliver the**
12 **Recommendation to the CWC Board.**
13

14 Chair Knoblock shared information about the letter included in the Meeting Materials Packet. He
15 explained that there is currently roadside parking in Big Cottonwood Canyon for the ski resorts
16 and backcountry use. This results in users walking on the road carrying skis and other equipment.
17 Additionally, vehicles pulling in and out can cause traffic to slow. Solitude Mountain Resort has
18 proposed a solution to the existing safety issues with a new parking lot. A parcel of land across
19 from Solitude Entry 2 was purchased near Old Stage Road. A permit will be needed from the
20 Town of Brighton in order to have parking in the area. The parking lot would result in the removal
21 of a vast section of aspen grove. Not everyone is thrilled with the idea. Chair Knoblock noted
22 that Solitude Mountain Resort is attempting to resolve existing issues, but the proposal could create
23 other problems.
24

25 A draft letter was written with the intention of forwarding it to the CWC Board. The letter suggests
26 that the CWC Board take a position in opposition of the Solitude Mountain Resort proposal. Chair
27 Knoblock pointed out that the Mountain Accord envisions fewer personal vehicles rather than an
28 expansion of parking to allow more personal vehicles in the canyon. In addition, cutting down the
29 aspen grove for a parking lot is troubling. There are concerns about visitors walking across the
30 road from the parking lot to the resort as well as watershed concerns. What is proposed seems to
31 be an imperfect solution. Del Draper asked whether roadside parking would be eliminated if the
32 parking lot is built. Chair Knoblock clarified that this is the intention, but the Conditional Use
33 Permit from the Town of Brighton would likely need to reference the elimination of roadside
34 parking for that to occur.
35

36 Adam Lenkowski expressed concerns that roadside parking could potentially continue, even if the
37 proposed parking lot was constructed. Chair Knoblock reiterated that the goal is to eliminate
38 roadside parking. However, there are still some unknowns associated with this proposal. It was
39 noted that at different times, the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) has indicated that
40 one of its goals is to remove roadside parking. The Mountain Accord also stresses the importance
41 of removing roadside parking to protect the watershed. However, replacing roadside parking with
42 more parking spots than would be removed does not align with the goals of the Mountain Accord.
43 According to the draft letter, there are 240 existing roadside parking spaces between Willow Fork
44 and Brighton Loop, but the proposed parking lot envisions a 593-stall parking lot, creating an
45 additional 353 spots.
46

1 Chair Knoblock explained that the letter asks the CWC Board to take a position against this
2 proposal, in part because the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment (“EA”) that is
3 underway with UDOT has not been completed at this time. If the UDOT analysis finds that off-
4 street parking should be built, then it would make this proposal more compelling. That being said,
5 the same issues would remain with respect to the aspen grove, the runoff from impervious surfaces,
6 and road crossing.

7
8 Barbara Cameron commented that the letter was extremely well written and mentioned that the
9 proposal goes against the General Plan for the Town of Brighton. She appreciates that this
10 statement was included in the letter and expressed support for forwarding the letter to the CWC
11 Board.

12
13 Ms. Cameron made a motion to forward the letter to the CWC Board and Dennis Goreham
14 seconded the motion. Chair Knoblock asked for additional discussion on the letter before the vote
15 was taken.

16
17 Comments were shared about the roadside parking that currently exists in the area. Chair
18 Knoblock confirmed that the Town of Brighton charges for roadside parking. Concerns were
19 expressed that taking away the roadside parking could take public money away and put it into
20 private hands. Sarah Bennett asked about the timeline. She wondered whether the intention is to
21 start construction next year. Chair Knoblock was not certain. Ms. Cameron reported that there
22 was a presentation made to the Planning Commission where it was turned down because there was
23 not enough information.

24
25 Doug Tolman reported that the Town of Brighton pays the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services
26 District to do the initial round of planning, but the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District
27 has not yet determined the application to be complete. It will not be handed over to the Planning
28 Commission until it has been determined to be complete. His understanding is that the main issue
29 is the fact that there would need to be access over land that is owned by Salt Lake City Public
30 Utilities and no signature has been received to build a road on that land. Kelly Boardman wanted
31 to know why this was not included in the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC
32 MAP”). She believed the point of the BCC MAP work was to look at the whole canyon and plan
33 for the needs. Chair Knoblock pointed out that the letter states this is premature relative to the
34 completion of the EA. The Big Cottonwood Canyon EA is slightly different than the BCC MAP
35 that was done in 2023.

36
37 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to FORWARD the letter written about Solitude Mountain
38 Resort’s Proposed Parking Lot on Old Stage Road to the CWC Board for consideration. Dennis
39 Goreham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

40 41 **2. The Council will Elect a Chair and Co-Chair.**

42
43 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, reported that the next item on the meeting agenda
44 relates to the election of a Chair and Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council. She expressed
45 appreciation to the current Chair and Co-Chair, John Knoblock and Tom Diegel, for their efforts

1 in leading the Council. Council Members took a moment to thank the current Stakeholders Council
2 leadership for their work.

3
4 Maura Hahnenberger has agreed to be Chair of the Stakeholders Council. The hope is that Morgan
5 Mingle will act as Co-Chair, but she has a meeting later in the day that will determine her
6 bandwidth. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that after reviewing the bylaws and the
7 Rules and Procedures document, a formal vote is not necessary at the Stakeholders Council level.
8 However, it is still possible to vote on this item, if desired by the Council, but she suggested waiting
9 until there is final feedback received from Ms. Mingle about her availability to serve in the Co-
10 Chair position.

11 12 **3. Incoming Members of the Stakeholders Council will Introduce Themselves.**

13
14 Ms. Kilpack reported that there is one incoming Stakeholders Council Member who will be
15 confirmed at the CWC Board Meeting on June 23, 2025. Eva DeLaurentiis is representing Summit
16 County. She introduced herself to the Stakeholders Council and explained that she is involved in
17 transportation planning. She is interested in Summit County being more engaged in the work of
18 the Council.

19 20 **RECOMMITMENT TO THE MOUNTAIN ACCORD**

21 22 **1. Members of the Stakeholders Council will Discuss and Re-Commit to the Goals of the** 23 **Mountain Accord.**

24
25 Ms. Nielsen explained that the retreat is a more informal meeting of the Stakeholders Council, as
26 it is being held outside. The intention is to encourage more casual interaction between Council
27 Members while still having retreat-focused discussions. There will be discussions about the
28 Mountain Accord, which is the foundational document of the CWC, as well as the Central Wasatch
29 National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCR”). Over the last few months, there
30 have been a few comments made from Council Members that there are questions about these
31 documents. That is the reason the items have been included on the Stakeholders Council Retreat
32 agenda.

33
34 Information about the Mountain Accord was shared with the Council. Ms. Nielsen referenced
35 SkiLink, which was a proposal for an over-the-ridge connection from the Wasatch Front to the
36 Wasatch Back. That SkiLink proposal was done without any input from the community, private
37 property owners, environmental interests, or recreational interests. Ralph Becker was the Mayor
38 of Salt Lake City at the time and he had not been consulted either. The Mountain Accord was a
39 collective community response to the large-scale threat of development that the SkiLink proposal
40 posed.

41
42 One of the most worrisome components of the SkiLink proposal was that it would have forced the
43 sale of publicly owned land to a private ski development company called Talisker. That would
44 have set a troubling precedent. It was determined that a long-term plan was needed for the
45 sustainability of the four interdependent systems to maintain the mountains for years to come.
46 Chair Knoblock noted that there was also a desire to stop the court battles and come to community

1 consensus about the mountains. Before the Mountain Accord, a lot of proposals for change in the
2 mountains were happening in a piecemeal manner. No one was talking to one another about the
3 work. The Mountain Accord developed plans for the sustainability of the four interdependent
4 systems (recreation, environment, economy, and transportation), but also sought to collectivize the
5 planning efforts.

6
7 Ms. Nielsen explained that the Mountain Accord process brought experts together from the four
8 different systems. The transportation experts included representatives from UDOT, Utah Transit
9 Authority (“UTA”), Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”), and others. Those participants
10 were in the Transportation System Group. Experts from the Economy System Group included the
11 General Managers of all four Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts and others. The Environment System
12 Group included Save Our Canyons, Nature Conservancy, and others. The Recreation System
13 Group included Trails Utah, the International Mountain Bicycling Association (“IMBA”),
14 Wasatch Mountain Club, private property owners, and others. The full list of participants is on
15 the CWC website. Chair Knoblock noted that all of the Meeting Minutes from that time are also
16 available.

17
18 Between 2013 and 2015, the experts in each of the System Groups discussed what needed to be
19 done to make sure the system would function for years to come. The four groups worked
20 independently and then came together to discuss what was envisioned. That resulted in the
21 Mountain Accord Charter. Ms. Nielsen shared some of the items listed in the Mountain Accord,
22 including the following:

- 23
- 24 ○ Transit improvements in Parleys Canyon;
- 25 ○ Transportation improvements in the Cottonwood Canyons;
- 26 ○ Large-scale regional National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) analysis for
- 27 transportation and transit in the Cottonwood Canyons;
- 28 ○ Pilot a shuttle service in Millcreek Canyon;
- 29 ○ Comprehensive trail and cycling plan;
- 30 ○ Development of a program that would allow for the acquisition of private lands
- 31 from willing sellers for public ownership;
- 32 ○ The designation of a National Conservation and Recreation Area;
- 33 ○ Land exchanges to clean up the patchwork configuration of public and privately
- 34 owned land that exists in the Cottonwood Canyons;
- 35 ○ Facilitation of long-term and short-term special projects in the canyons; and
- 36 ○ The creation of a governmental entity to carry out the plans in the Mountain Accord.
- 37

38 Ms. Nielsen explained that the governmental entity that was created to carry out the Mountain
39 Accord is the CWC. She informed those present that this is the 10-year anniversary of the
40 Mountain Accord. Chair Knoblock noted that action has been taken on most of the items, but there
41 has not been a lot of progress on the land acquisition issue. Protection of the environment is
42 essential and he feels it is important to purchase private property and put it into public hands to
43 avoid unnecessary development. Additional discussions were had about the establishment of a
44 program for land acquisition. Chair Knoblock pointed out that there are a lot of options available,
45 but there has not been a formal process where the details have been finalized. There are willing
46 sellers within the CWC study area.

1
2 The Mountain Accord Charter was signed in August 2015 by a number of people, including some
3 Utah State Legislators at the time, all four Cottonwood Canyon ski resort General Managers,
4 Barbara Cameron, Kirk Nichols, and Ralph Becker. The signatures and signature pages are all on
5 the CWC website for review. Ms. Nielsen stressed how meaningful the Mountain Accord process
6 was. In 2017, the Interlocal Agreement that created the CWC was signed. In 2018, the first
7 members of CWC Staff were hired with Mr. Becker hired in May 2018 and Ms. Nielsen hired in
8 August 2018.

9
10 Ms. Nielsen reported that all Council Members have joined one or more System Committees. She
11 asked how the Mountain Accord and CWNCRRA further the goals of the different systems.
12 Ms. Bennett commented that there is so much to do and there are many worthwhile projects that
13 each of the System Committees is working on. In general, that work falls under the guidelines of
14 the Mountain Accord, but she has concerns that some of the smaller efforts do not plug into the
15 CWNCRRA in a meaningful way. Ms. Nielsen sees the Mountain Accord as a static document.
16 The CWNCRRA is somewhat the same, though every now and then, the CWNCRRA is redrafted in
17 response to community comments and feedback from stakeholders. It is her goal that there be a
18 new iteration of the CWNCRRA in the near future. She sees the CWC as doing two congruent
19 things: trying to stay as closely aligned to the Mountain Accord as possible and being responsive
20 to current needs. She feels it is possible for both of those actions to co-exist. Ms. Bennett believes
21 the system approach is working well, but sometimes worries that the CWNCRRA is not as relevant
22 to the smaller tasks. The CWNCRRA might actually discourage more achievable tasks from being
23 able to move forward.

24
25 Mr. Goreham pointed out that one of the reasons the Mountain Accord process occurred was
26 because there were piecemeal actions taking place. The Mountain Accord formed a consensus, so
27 when certain items moved forward, it was possible to move those forward with the Mountain
28 Accord items in mind.

29
30 Ms. Nielsen acknowledged that the CWNCRRA aims to do a lot. It is predicated on balance and
31 compromise. Mr. Goreham noted that if the CWNCRRA is achieved, it sets up a framework and
32 governance process that is currently missing. Ms. Nielsen reported that following the Mountain
33 Accord process, everyone walked away feeling like they got more than they gave, which is rare.
34 She understands the concerns expressed by Ms. Bennett that larger items like the CWNCRRA take
35 a lot of time. However, she feels the time that it takes is necessary. There is a desire to be open,
36 transparent, and responsive to the public. She stressed the importance of receiving feedback.

37
38 Mr. Tolman noted that at the last CWC Board Meeting, the Co-Chairs were there to share
39 information, but the CWC Board rushed them through the presentation, and not a lot was said. He
40 feels it is important that the CWC Board listen to the Stakeholders Council about the efforts being
41 made. Chair Knoblock pointed out that a lot of the CWC time is spent on administrative tasks and
42 procedural items rather than talking about actual issues. For example, time is spent addressing
43 staffing matters, the budget, and meeting schedules. Mr. Tolman asked Chair Knoblock to speak
44 to his experience at the last CWC Board Meeting where he was asked to only share a very brief
45 summary of the work done at the Council level. Chair Knoblock thought some administrative
46 issues could be worked through via email rather than spending the meeting focused on procedural

1 items. That would allow more time for discussion. Ms. Nielsen explained that there are reasons
2 the administrative items are handled at the public meeting. It is not possible to change that, but
3 she does want the Council to be heard.

4
5 Mr. Tolman suggested that the substantive issues be handled at the beginning of future CWC Board
6 Meetings rather than administrative matters. That way, when the Stakeholders Council Chair and
7 Co-Chair present, there will be adequate time provided to them. The Council has dedicated hours
8 of their time to talking through different ideas and concepts, but it does not feel like time is being
9 given at the CWC Board level to listen to the highlights. Ms. Nielsen reported that Stakeholders
10 Council leadership are Ex-Officio Members of the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting,
11 so it is also possible to have discussions at that level. In addition, CWC Staff attends all of the
12 meetings and is in constant contact with the CWC Board. There are many ways that
13 communication is happening.

14
15 A question was raised about what value the CWC Board perceives the Stakeholders Council adds
16 to the organization. If the CWC Board is not dedicating a lot of time to hearing Council updates,
17 then it could be that the CWC Board does not see the value in the work that is being done. It might
18 be worthwhile to ask the CWC Board for some feedback about the Stakeholders Council's efforts.
19 Ms. Nielsen reported that Council Members can attend CWC Board Meetings and share comments
20 during the public comment section of the meeting. Ahead of the last meeting, Ed Marshall sent a
21 letter to the CWC Board and then made a public comment. That used to happen a lot more often.
22 She encouraged those interested to attend CWC Board Meetings and share comments when
23 desired.

24
25 Mike Marker did not feel the CWC Board is result-focused. A lot of time is spent on the process
26 and budget items. On the other hand, the Mountain Accord focused on deliverables, such as an
27 Environmental Dashboard and Millcreek Canyon shuttle. Certain items have moved forward or
28 are currently in progress, but there are a lot of items that have not been prioritized. The
29 Stakeholders Council seems to have become more activity-focused. While those activities add
30 value, he was not certain whether that kind of work moves the Mountain Accord deliverables
31 forward. There should be some kind of scorecard used to look at how well the organization has
32 focused on those items. He believes the organization should prioritize results and mentioned the
33 fact that Cottonwood Heights previously considered leaving the CWC. Mr. Marker acknowledged
34 that everyone is dedicated to the health and welfare of the study area, but he wants the Mountain
35 Accord deliverables to be the priority.

36
37 There was additional discussion about Cottonwood Heights. It was clarified that Cottonwood
38 Heights chose to remain with the CWC, but there were concerns that traffic issues in Cottonwood
39 Heights were not being addressed. It was pointed out that their focus was not on the success of
40 the canyons overall but on traffic within their city. Ms. Nielsen explained that the power of the
41 CWC is that the CWC Board makes decisions through consensus. Mr. Marker commented that
42 the CWC exists to implement the Mountain Accord and “implement” is an action word. The
43 Transportation System Committee struggles because while a lot of ideas are discussed, the
44 Committee does not have the power to implement those ideas. Ms. Nielsen noted that work is
45 done with a number of different entities, including UDOT, UTA, Salt Lake City Public Utilities,
46 and the U.S. Forest Service.

1
2 Ms. Bennett noted that the CWNCRRA is intended to be an umbrella with guidelines for what can
3 be done in each of the four systems. Chair Knoblock commented that the Mountain Accord called
4 for transportation improvements, but the CWNCRRA states that it will not inhibit any transportation
5 solutions. Ms. Nielsen clarified that not everything in the Mountain Accord is translated
6 legislatively in the CWNCRRA. As an example, the Millcreek Canyon shuttle is not included in the
7 CWNCRRA because that is something that can be worked on outside of that process. Transportation
8 improvements can also be handled outside of the CWNCRRA process. Mr. Tolman believes there
9 is frustration with the CWC Board not using the power that they have. Additionally, it sounds like
10 there is frustration that moving items from the Stakeholders Council to the CWC Board is not as
11 streamlined as it could be. He asked if there is a way the Council can better communicate with the
12 CWC Board.

13
14 Ms. Nielsen asked if there are any suggestions to make the Stakeholders Council better heard by
15 the CWC Board. Mr. Tolman thought it might be best to move the Stakeholders Council Report
16 higher in the agenda so the full amount of time can be allotted to that presentation. Ms. Nielsen
17 confirmed that this structural change can be made. It is also possible for the Council to forward
18 more letters.

19
20 A question was raised regarding what value the CWC Board believes comes from the Stakeholders
21 Council. Another question was asked about what the CWC Board has stated they would like to
22 see come out of the Council. Ms. Nielsen noted that there is clear value that the Stakeholders
23 Council offers the CWC. The Stakeholders Council was called for in the foundational Interlocal
24 Agreement that created the organization. The goal of the Stakeholders Council has always been
25 to bring together the various interests of the mountains to discuss issues and forward certain ideas
26 to the CWC Board. However, based on what she is hearing, it sounds like Council Members do
27 not feel valued enough. Ms. Nielsen explained that the work of the Stakeholders Council is
28 essential to the work of the CWC.

29
30 CWC Staff sees the value of the Stakeholders Council efforts. If there are specific suggestions to
31 better communicate that value to the CWC Board, it is possible to focus on that. Ms. Nielsen
32 reiterated that it is possible for Stakeholders Council leadership to participate in
33 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meetings. That Committee includes Mayor Jeff Silvestrini,
34 Mayor Erin Mendenhall, and Commissioner Christopher Robinson. Discussions were had about
35 communication with the CWC Board. Ms. Nielsen made it clear that the CWC Board respects the
36 work of the Stakeholders Council and is interested in what happens at the Council level.

37
38 Meaghan McKasy believes that the Stakeholders Council is vital to the structure of the
39 organization. However, while two-way communication is important, it is also necessary to
40 recognize that there is a hierarchy in this process. One way to have positive communication within
41 this structure is to define what everyone needs. Asking the CWC Board about the best way to
42 present the work done at the Stakeholders Council level could be beneficial. Understanding how
43 to best communicate all of the hard work that the Stakeholders Council has done would be
44 meaningful for all involved.

1 Ms. Bennett struggles with the disconnect between the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board.
2 Ms. Nielsen asked if there is support for the process that has been in place for the last several years,
3 with Stakeholders Council leadership sharing information with the CWC Board. Ms. Bennett
4 suggested that a representative from each of the System Committees be included in the
5 presentation.
6

7 Chair Knoblock asked whether there is a way to streamline the administrative portions of the CWC
8 Board Meetings so there is more time for discussion of substantive issues. Ms. Nielsen asked
9 whether the Stakeholders Council leadership feels heard and valued when presenting at the
10 meetings. Chair Knoblock stated that he feels heard and valued, but there is no discussion about
11 what has been presented. It is more of a report and then the CWC Board says thank you for sharing
12 the report. Council Members discussed the letter that was passed earlier in the Stakeholders
13 Council Retreat.
14

15 Ms. Nielsen recapped the retreat conversation so far. It sounds like there is a desire to establish a
16 different way for the Stakeholders Council to interact with the CWC Board. Mr. Tolman explained
17 that he is not opposed to the existing structure and believes it can work well as long as both parties
18 are doing their best to make the most of it. That being said, it is possible to inform the CWC Board
19 that at the last two meetings, there was not a lot of time set aside for the Stakeholders Council
20 Report and ask if there is a way to better present the information. Ms. Nielsen noted that the
21 process of forwarding letters from the Stakeholders Council to the CWC Board was recently
22 memorialized in writing. Based on Council Member feedback, it appears there is a desire to see
23 both parties utilize the existing communication systems that exist but more frequently and in a
24 better way.
25

26 Chair Knoblock noted that the Mountain Accord called for certain actions and the CWCNCRA is
27 one of those actions. There was a scorecard created by CWC Staff. It would make sense to refer
28 to that on a semi-regular basis. Outside of the Mountain Accord items, the CWC can help resolve
29 issues in the canyons as those issues arrive. This includes items like the parking lot proposal from
30 Solitude Mountain Resort, opposition to the Parleys mine, snow plowing, and other types of
31 projects. It might make sense to include a list on the CWC website that highlights the other actions
32 taken. Ms. Nielsen noted that there are certain items highlighted on the CWC website already,
33 such as the Ski Bus Bypass Program, the Central Wasatch Dashboard, and the Central Wasatch
34 Symposium.
35

36 Chair Knoblock shared a comment about the recent Transportation Committee Meeting held at the
37 CWC Board level. It was a very short meeting despite the fact that the Committee had not met in
38 quite some time. Transportation is a significant issue in the canyons, so he was surprised by the
39 short meeting length. Chair Knoblock wondered whether it is possible to encourage more dialogue
40 at the CWC Board level. He stressed the importance of there being more substantive discussions.
41 Ms. Cameron noted that the Transportation System Committee has some out-of-the-box ideas that
42 have not been heard by the Transportation Committee. It was suggested that some of those items
43 be shared. Mr. Marker believes there should be a way for the System Committees to know whether
44 they are on track and are working on items that the CWC Board is interested in considering and
45 pursuing.
46

1 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Chair and Co-Chair of each subcommittee are the ones who set the
2 agendas. The Chair and Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council work with CWC Staff to set the
3 agendas for the Stakeholders Council Meetings. CWC Staff fills different roles at different times,
4 but when working with the Stakeholders Council, there is largely a coordination role. While it is
5 possible to ask the CWC Board what they want from the Stakeholders Council, in the past, their
6 response has been to continue doing what they are doing. This includes being responsive to issues
7 that are pertinent to specific interests, discussing those issues with other Council Members, and
8 bringing something to the CWC Board for consideration or action. She does not see an issue with
9 the current process but acknowledged that there seems to be some frustration from certain members
10 of the Council.

11
12 It was reiterated that it is possible to ask the CWC Board about the best ways to present these
13 issues. There is also a desire to receive feedback on what the Stakeholders Council has been doing.
14 Chair Knoblock pointed out that the Stakeholders Council is advisory to the CWC Board. The
15 CWC Board includes a lot of elected officials, but those elected officials do not have authority
16 over the Forest Service, UDOT, UTA, and others. There are some limitations at that level as well.
17 Chair Knoblock pointed out that it is possible to discuss matters at the Council level and submit
18 comments on an individual level. He shared an example related to tire inspection in the canyons.
19 It is possible to be effective and take action on an individual level, even when it is not done
20 formally through the CWC.

21
22 Ms. Nielsen thanked the Council Members for their feedback and noted that there is not a lot of
23 time left in the Stakeholders Council Retreat. She suggested moving forward with the other agenda
24 items.

25 CWNCRA Q&A

26 **1. Members will Discuss and Engage in a Q&A About the Central Wasatch National** 27 **Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”).**

28
29
30
31 There was discussion about the CWNCRA. Mr. Marker asked if there was support from the ski
32 resorts for the CWNCRA. Ms. Nielsen reported that in the original iteration, there were land
33 exchanges. The exchanges traded publicly owned land at the base area out of public ownership
34 and to the resorts in exchange for mountainside land. It also included water allocation for
35 snowmaking activities and for culinary development in some cases. After those land exchanges
36 and the wins for the ski resorts, the ask was for the ski permit use area boundary to be fixed. It
37 was a win for the environmental community as well as the ski resorts. While those land exchanges
38 fell away over the years for a variety of reasons, she does not necessarily believe those
39 conversations are over.

40
41 Ms. Cameron reported that the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan will be released for public comment
42 in July. She is excited to see what will come from that and asked Council Members to share
43 comments.
44

ACHIEVEMENTS AND GOALS DISCUSSION

1. Members will Discuss the Past Achievements and Future Goals of the Stakeholders Council.

Ms. Kilpack reviewed some of the past accomplishments of the Stakeholders Council. She reported that the Stakeholders Council formed the Visitor Capacity Committee, which shaped the Visitor Use Study. The Stakeholders Council initiated a Central Wasatch Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop recently in conjunction with creating a survey designed to gather feedback on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. Those efforts have informed some improvements that are currently underway.

The Stakeholders Council has focused on the Millcreek Canyon shuttle concept and has kept that matter in front of the CWC Board. The Council also composed a letter to the CWC Board concerning public access to Cardiff Fork. The CWC Board received that letter and issued a Resolution in support of collaboration to reach a solution for public access. The Stakeholders Council drafted a comment on the Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP") grant for Millcreek Canyons and the CWC Board forwarded that on for consideration. There are a lot of tangible outcomes from the Council's work.

The Stakeholders Council spent the remaining time in the Stakeholders Council Retreat discussing future goals. There was a suggestion shared for a Capacity Study and a comment made about the importance of having an established capacity in the canyons. Without having a determined capacity, many of the decisions that are being made are short-term in nature. Chair Knoblock noted that the challenge is that the CWC does not have direct influence over the land managers or transportation managers. If the CWC were to establish capacity numbers, those numbers might not be accepted by the land and transportation managers. Additional discussions were had about capacity in the canyons.

It was suggested that each subcommittee create a recommendation for the CWC Board that would further the Mountain Accord in a way that is not currently being done. The recommendations could be presented to the Stakeholders Council and a decision could be made to forward those on. Chair Knoblock shared information about the creation of the Mountain Accord. At that time, there was a desire to build relationships and resolve issues without competing legislation and lawsuits. The fact that all of these different interest groups can now have discussions is a meaningful outcome.

Ms. Kilpack presented Chair Knoblock with a small token to thank him for serving as the Chair.

STAKEHOLDERS OPEN COMMENT

There were no additional comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

1
2 **CLOSING**
3

4 **1. Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders Council Retreat.**
5

6 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Retreat. Danny
7 Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
8

9 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Retreat adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Retreat held Wednesday, June 4, 2025.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____