



9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2026, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, ADVENTURE HUB, 1330 EAST CHAMBERS AVENUE, MILLCREEK, UTAH.**

- Present:** Maura Hahnenberger, Chair  
Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair  
Adam Lenkowski  
Barbara Cameron  
Becca Gerber  
Brendan Smith  
Brenden Catt  
Craig Williams  
Dan Zalles  
Dani Poirier  
Danny Richardson  
Del Draper  
Dennis Goreham  
Doug Tolman  
Ed Marshall  
Ella Abelli-Amen  
Hilary Arens  
Jen Melton  
John Adams  
Jonny Vasic  
Kelly Boardman  
Mark Baer  
Morgan Mingle  
Olivia Juarez  
Patrick Morrison  
Roger Borgenicht  
Scott Hotaling  
John Knoblock  
Meaghan McKasy
- Public:** Faith Scheffler

1 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
2 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
3 Will McKay, Communications Director  
4

5 **Opening**  
6

7 1. **Chair Maura Hahnenberger will Open the Public Meeting as the Chair of the**  
8 **Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission.**  
9

10 Chair Maura Hahnenberger called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council  
11 Meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.  
12

13 2. **Chair Hahnenberger will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the December**  
14 **17, 2025, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**  
15

16 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the December 17,  
17 2025, Stakeholders Council Meeting. Hilary Arens seconded the motion. The motion passed with  
18 the unanimous consent of the Council.  
19

20 **December Meeting Recap**  
21

22 1. **Chair Hahnenberger will Give a Recap of the December 17, 2025, Stakeholders Council**  
23 **Meeting.**  
24

25 Chair Hahnenberger summarized the Stakeholders Council Meeting from December 17, 2025. There  
26 were three major agenda items. The first was a review of past Stakeholders Council and  
27 subcommittee accomplishments. Those accomplishments were discussed and then there were  
28 Breakout Groups where Council Members brainstormed future initiatives. Chair Hahnenberger  
29 reported that later on in the current Stakeholders Council Meeting, there will be an activity where  
30 Council Members look through the initiatives identified during that portion of the meeting. Those  
31 initiatives will be prioritized and there will be a discussion about which subcommittees will address  
32 the brainstormed ideas. At the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, there was also a review of a  
33 Transportation System Committee letter about Little Cottonwood Canyon transportation. It was  
34 determined that the transportation letter would not move forward at that time. However, it is possible  
35 for the Transportation System Committee to bring it back to the Stakeholders Council in the future.  
36

37 Co-Chair Kurt Hegmann reported that there are new members on the Stakeholders Council. He asked  
38 that all new members introduce themselves. Faith Scheffler explained that she will take over for Ed  
39 Marshall on the Stakeholders Council. She represents Log Haven and runs the private events there.  
40 Brendan Smith stated that he is a Safety and Sustainability Manager at Solitude Mountain Resort. Jen  
41 Melton introduced herself and explained that her work focuses on sustainability at Alta Ski Area.  
42

43 **Council Administration**  
44

45 1. **Chair Hahnenberger will Review the New Structure for Stakeholders Council Meetings**  
46 **Moving Forward:**  
47

- 1           a.       **Stakeholders Council Meetings will Precede Board Meetings by About Three**  
2                   **Weeks and will Include Discussions about the Upcoming Board Meeting Agenda.**  
3  
4           b.       **Meetings will Continue to Feature Breakout Discussion Groups.**  
5  
6           c.       **The Stakeholders Council Chair will Recount Stakeholders Council Discussions**  
7                   **and Bring Issues to the CWC Board from the Stakeholders Council whether or**  
8                   **not there is a Formal Letter.**  
9  
10          d.       **Formal Letters Drafted and Voted on by the Stakeholders Council are Still an**  
11                   **Option, but they Need to be Drafted Before the Stakeholders Council Meeting at**  
12                   **which it would be Discussed and Voted on.**  
13

14 Chair Hahnenberger reported that the Stakeholders Council will have a new structure for meetings.  
15 She explained that the structure of these meetings has changed over time. There was a time where  
16 there were mainly subcommittee updates shared, but a shift was made to focus more on Stakeholders  
17 Council discussions. The new structure will strengthen the connection between what is happening at  
18 the Stakeholders Council Meetings and the CWC Board Meetings. Prior to all Stakeholders Council  
19 Meetings, the topics that will be discussed at the next CWC Board Meeting will be sent out.  
20

21 Ahead of the current meeting, the Council Members received a list of topics that will be discussed at  
22 the CWC Board Meeting on April 13, 2026. The idea behind this approach is for the Stakeholders  
23 Council to take action or provide comments on topics that the CWC Board will be discussing.  
24

25 Chair Hahnenberger clarified that the Stakeholders Council can still bring forward ideas about topics  
26 that are not on the next CWC Board Meeting agenda. Those can be shared during the Stakeholders  
27 Council Updates portion of the meeting. Chair Hahnenberger reported that the timing is still being  
28 finalized for this new structure. She acknowledged that there was a short turnaround between Council  
29 Members receiving the CWC Board Meeting topics and the Stakeholders Council Meeting. During  
30 future Stakeholders Council Meetings, there will still be time for more general discussions, but how  
31 much time will be provided might vary depending on the CWC Board Meeting topics.  
32

33 **2. The Millcreek Canyon Committee has Disbanded. Its Work and Members will be**  
34 **Absorbed by Other Committees.**  
35

36 Chair Hahnenberger reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee has disbanded. This is something  
37 that was discussed previously, but at those times, it was determined that the Committee would remain  
38 to ensure there was a focus on the issues specific to Millcreek. Often in other subcommittee meetings,  
39 the discussions are more focused on Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon rather  
40 than Millcreek Canyon. However, it was recently determined that the Millcreek Canyon Committee  
41 will disband, and the Millcreek Canyon-specific issues will be discussed by the other subcommittees.  
42 As agendas are being created for each of the System Committees, she asked that issues related to  
43 Millcreek Canyon be considered or that time be allotted for some Millcreek Canyon discussion.  
44

1 **3. Staff will Review the Resources Available to the Stakeholders Council in the Shared**  
2 **Google Folder.**  
3

4 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, reminded Council Members that there are resources available  
5 in the shared Google folder. There is a folder titled “Stakeholders Council Resource Hub,” which  
6 includes a separate folder for each subcommittee. Committee Members can add items to the  
7 appropriate folder and collaborate there. Ms. Kilpack reported that there is another folder in the  
8 shared Google folder called, “Roster, Resources, and Information,” which has instructions on how to  
9 find Meeting Minutes and Meeting Materials. It also outlines the responsibilities of the Chair or Co-  
10 Chair and there is a recommendation template that can be used. This folder provides information  
11 about the Open and Public Meetings Act and also details the scope and expectations. In addition,  
12 there is a roster that has the name and contact information for each Council Member.  
13

14 **4. Conflict Disclosure and Other Annual Forms Must be Completed by June.**  
15

16 Ms. Kilpack reported that each year, Stakeholders Council Members need to fill out two forms. One  
17 is an acknowledgement of the Open and Public Meetings Act and the other is a Conflict Disclosure  
18 form. This is part of the CWC internal procedures to mitigate any potential conflicts of interest. She  
19 recently emailed the forms to Council Members, but also has physical copies available at the meeting.  
20

21 **Draft Board Meeting Agenda Discussion**  
22

23 **1. Council Members will Discuss the Agenda for the April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026, CWC Board Meeting.**  
24 **Agenda Topics are Included in Meeting Materials.**  
25

26 Chair Hahnenberger reported that the Stakeholders Council will next discuss the CWC Board Meeting  
27 agenda. She will summarize the items on the agenda and then the Council can consider whether there  
28 are important topics that have not been included on the agenda. At the next CWC Board Meeting,  
29 there are not a lot of action items scheduled, but there are several discussion items on the agenda.  
30

31 At the beginning of the CWC Board Meeting on April 13, 2026, there will be a presentation from  
32 Phoebe McNealy from the DIGIT Lab at the University of Utah. She will talk about the new Central  
33 Wasatch Dashboard landing page, which features an interactive map. There will also be information  
34 shared by the Funding Committee. Chair Hahnenberger reported that the Funding Committee has  
35 been looking into mechanisms to fund the CWC and created a matrix for membership contributions.  
36

37 The CWC Board will discuss the budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 as well as the budget surplus that  
38 exists in the current fiscal year. Chair Hahnenberger explained that there is currently a budget surplus  
39 and the proposal from CWC Staff is to use that for website redesign and the Short-Term Projects  
40 Grant Program. At the meeting, CWC Staff will provide an update on the recent Central Wasatch  
41 National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”) activities and there will be a  
42 discussion about carrying capacity in the canyons. Chair Hahnenberger noted that at the Stakeholders  
43 Council level, there was a previous discussion about carrying capacity and potential action items.  
44

45 After the carrying capacity discussion, the Stakeholders Council updates will be shared with the CWC  
46 Board. CWC Staff will then update the CWC Board on the Legislative Session. Chair Hahnenberger  
47 reported that the CWC received an appropriation of \$250,000, but the request related to a Millcreek

1 Canyon shuttle pilot program was not funded. Chair Hahnenberger asked if there are any additional  
2 items Council Members would like to be mentioned during the next CWC Board Meeting.

3  
4 Barbara Cameron asked about the CWCNCRA item on the CWC Board Meeting agenda. She wanted  
5 to know who would be presenting that information. It was reported that Executive Director, Lindsey  
6 Nielsen, will present the recent activities to the CWC Board. Ms. Kilpack reported that some key  
7 stakeholders have been meeting to discuss the CWCNCRA. Ms. Cameron thought it made more sense  
8 to postpone the CWCNCRA work for a few years, given what is currently happening in Washington.

9  
10 Discussions were had about the funding request made for a Millcreek Canyon shuttle pilot program.  
11 Ms. Kilpack reported that the request was for \$2.2 million for a three-year pilot program in Millcreek  
12 Canyon. Council Members considered whether the budget surplus could be used for some of the  
13 shuttle work. Patrick Morrison asked if the \$250,000 is a separate appropriation. Ms. Kilpack  
14 explained that the CWC requests money from the State each year. The request is normally around  
15 \$200,000. This year, the ask was much larger, as it included the request for a shuttle pilot program.  
16 The funding for the shuttle was not received, but \$250,000 was received for the organization.

17  
18 Additional clarification was requested for the CWCNCRA comments made by Ms. Cameron. She  
19 explained that the bill would likely be changed, and she is concerned about what those changes would  
20 include. She has concerns about the unintended consequences of moving forward with the CWCNCRA  
21 at this time. Ms. Cameron praised the Central Wasatch Symposium and believed that it is the strength  
22 of the organization at this time. Ed Marshall asked if there are CWCNCRA updates, such as a redraft.  
23 He also wanted to know if the Legislature has weighed in on the CWCNCRA more recently.  
24 Ms. Nielsen clarified that there is no new draft at this time. There will be a more robust update about  
25 the CWCNCRA shared at the CWC Board Meeting that is scheduled to take place on April 13, 2026.

26  
27 John Knoblock read something about the creation of a Millcreek State Park and asked for additional  
28 information. Doug Tolman reported that the State of Utah passes a State Resource Management Plan  
29 each year. Within that plan, there was a proposal to make a State Park in Millcreek Canyon. There  
30 is no binding Legislation, but the plan includes that as something to think about in the future.  
31 Mr. Tolman pointed out that there are more than 100 acres of land in the canyon that are privately  
32 owned.

33  
34 Meaghan McKasy addressed the comments shared earlier by Ms. Cameron. She understands the  
35 concerns that have been expressed, but if the CWCNCRA is the main focus of the organization, then it  
36 makes sense to continue to move forward with that. There are unknowns about what will happen in  
37 Washington and what will happen on a more local level. Taking steps back will not necessarily  
38 benefit the organization. If this is a priority, it makes sense to continue to explore a path forward.

39  
40 Ms. Nielsen explained that the intention of the new Stakeholders Council Meeting structure is for  
41 Council Members to know what will be discussed at the next CWC Board Meeting. It is possible for  
42 Council Members to attend the meeting, ask questions, and share comments. Mr. Marshall stated that  
43 for this new structure to be meaningful, the Stakeholders Council needs to have a better idea of what  
44 will be discussed at the next CWC Board Meeting. Without more specifics, it is difficult for Council  
45 Members to make informed comments. Ms. Nielsen noted that the new meeting structure does not  
46 have to continue if it is not something Council Members feel is beneficial. The switch was made in  
47 an effort to engage Council Members more in the discussions that are happening at the CWC Board  
48 level. The idea was to take some time to prepare them for those future discussions.

1  
2 Mr. Marshall asked if the Meeting Materials Packet for the CWC Board Meeting would be available  
3 to Council Members. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. She reported that the CWNCRRA has been  
4 discussed at the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee level in the past, and those meetings are public.  
5 The recordings and Meeting Minutes are available to all. As for the Meeting Materials Packet for the  
6 next CWC Board Meeting, all of that information will be posted on the Utah Public Notice website.  
7

8 Ms. McKasy noted that at the next CWC Board Meeting, the CWC Board will review and discuss the  
9 Draft Tentative Budget for the next fiscal year. She asked if the budget will be similar to the last  
10 fiscal year. Ms. Kilpack reported that it will be similar and there are no significant changes. There  
11 is a desire to redesign the CWC website, because it is slow, but there are no major changes proposed.  
12 She explained that the last budget year was tight and some planned project work was canceled as a  
13 result. Ms. Nielsen clarified that CWC Staff will not be advocating for a constricted budget because  
14 of the surplus. The surplus exists because of the efforts made by CWC Staff to reduce as well as  
15 certain projects that did not move forward. Ms. Kilpack added that the State appropriation in the  
16 current fiscal year was smaller than requested, so the Short-Term Projects Grant Program budget was  
17 cut back. That is the reason some of the budget surplus is proposed to be added to that program.  
18

19 Mr. Knoblock asked if there had been additional outreach to Salt Lake County about their  
20 participation in the CWC. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the CWC has asked the County about returning.  
21 Unless something changes, she does not anticipate Salt Lake County returning to the CWC this year.  
22

23 There was discussion about the Short-Term Projects Grant Program. Ms. Kilpack reported that for  
24 this fiscal year, there is a desire to disperse \$100,000. That is what will be requested of the CWC  
25 Board. The Short-Term Projects Grant Program covers various short-term projects that take place  
26 next year. There have been many applications received for the program. The amount was reduced  
27 to \$50,000 due to budget constraints, but with the surplus, it is possible to restore that to \$100,000.  
28

29 Dan Zalles wanted to understand how there was a budget surplus when there were so many budget  
30 cuts made. Ms. Nielsen reported that there were budget cuts made for the current fiscal year because  
31 Sandy City cut their contribution and the State appropriation received was less than requested. There  
32 was certain project work canceled and CWC Staff did not take raises in order to address the deficit.  
33

34 Ms. Kilpack shared additional information about the purpose of the CWC Board Meeting agenda  
35 review. Based on the feedback received, there was a desire for the Stakeholders Council to be more  
36 engaged with the CWC Board. Letting the Stakeholders Council know the CWC Board Meeting  
37 agenda topics ahead of time makes it possible to prepare ahead of that meeting. Council Members  
38 can attend CWC Board Meetings if there is a desire to learn more and make comments.  
39

40 Kelly Boardman expressed support for the new format of the Stakeholders Council Meetings, as it  
41 will create a stronger connection between the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. It will also let  
42 the Council know what is being discussed. Ms. Boardman liked that the CWC Board Meeting agenda  
43 includes a discussion on carrying capacity. Several well-written letters have come through the  
44 Stakeholders Council over the years and she wondered whether those materials could be presented to  
45 the CWC Board at the next meeting. As an example, previous Stakeholders Council Member, Mike  
46 Marker, wrote letters related to capacity and there was a lot of Council Member support for those.  
47

1 John Adams asked if it is possible to add to the CWC Board carrying capacity discussion or if it is  
2 preferable to listen to the discussion and plan a future Stakeholders Council discussion. Chair  
3 Hahnenberger reported that Stakeholders Council leadership is able to engage in the CWC Board  
4 Meeting discussions, but individuals on the Council can also attend the CWC Board Meeting. It is  
5 also possible to have additional Stakeholders Council discussions related to carrying capacity.

6  
7 Ms. Nielsen reiterated that the new agenda format was created to start Council discussions. Council  
8 Members expressed support for the new format where the CWC Board Meeting agendas are reviewed.

9  
10 **2. Council Members May Suggest Pertinent Topics not Covered by the Agenda for**  
11 **Stakeholders Council Leadership to Bring to the Board.**

12  
13 Chair Hahnenberger asked Council Members if there are topics that are not on the CWC Board  
14 Meeting agenda that should be brought forward by Stakeholders Council leadership. It was noted  
15 that a letter was forwarded to Stakeholders Council leadership, but Council Members did not receive  
16 the letter ahead of the meeting. She asked Ms. Boardman to provide some background information.

17  
18 Ms. Boardman reported that she spoke to Mike Maughan, the General Manager of Alta Ski Area  
19 yesterday, and he gave his blessing for the Alta Ski Area letter to be distributed to the Stakeholders  
20 Council and CWC Board. Alta Ski Area met with the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”)  
21 at the beginning of January. There were discussions about their plans to move forward with Phase I  
22 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). The Phase I work  
23 includes enhanced busing and tolling. After that meeting, there was a letter written by Alta Ski Area  
24 to UDOT. It pointed out items not included in Phase I that could make travel in Little Cottonwood  
25 Canyon safer and more efficient. Ms. Boardman explained that after sharing the letter with Chair  
26 Hahnenberger, she received a template used for communication with the CWC Board.

27  
28 Ms. Boardman used the template to create a letter to the CWC Board related to refinements to Phase  
29 I of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. The drafted letter lets the CWC Board know about  
30 the Alta Ski Area letter and discusses transportation improvements in Little Cottonwood Canyon.  
31 She explained that the letter asks the CWC Board to review the Alta Ski Area letter and evaluate how  
32 the suggestions might impact member jurisdictions. The letter also asks the CWC Board to weigh in  
33 so there can be robust and efficient travel improvements that serve communities. Ms. Boardman  
34 clarified that there is excitement that UDOT is moving forward with the Phase I work, but as the plan  
35 advances, she hopes UDOT will listen to the feedback provided by Alta Ski Area and others.

36  
37 The draft letter includes some of the points raised in the Alta Ski Area letter. For instance, the plan  
38 does not address slick roads. Ms. Boardman explained that slick roads impact mobility on SR-210  
39 more than the number of vehicles on the road. There is a request that Little Cottonwood Canyon have  
40 dedicated snowplows stored up canyon to improve snow removal efficiency. In the Big Cottonwood  
41 Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”), there is a plan to have dedicated snowplows stored up  
42 canyon, so it makes sense for that to be considered in Little Cottonwood Canyon as well. The letter  
43 also mentions the gridlock that happens when the main line between Snowbird and Alta is closed. It  
44 requests more avalanche mitigation to keep that open and flowing at the end of the day as people  
45 leave Alta. In addition, there is a mention of the traction law needing to be clear and enforceable.

46  
47 Another point mentioned in the letter is that in order to increase ridership, bus service has to be  
48 efficient. There could be express buses to the Alta Ski Area in order to encourage more employees

1 and visitors to take the bus. Additionally, the letter asks that bus stops be placed in locations  
2 convenient to visitors and employees. Another suggestion has to do with the mobility hub at the  
3 gravel pit north of Big Cottonwood Canyon. There should be a plan for a satellite hub near the mouth  
4 of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Ms. Boardman noted that there was information about tolling provided  
5 in the letter. Alta Ski Area shared information about parking reservations, which have been effective  
6 in limiting vehicles. Parking reservations have addressed the culture of competition for parking  
7 spaces. Ms. Boardman pointed out that this still happens at Snowbird. On one of the last powder  
8 days, there were vehicles lined up at 6:30 a.m. to find a parking spot in the area, but reservations can  
9 address this.

10  
11 The last suggestion included in the letter has to do with merging systems. Alta Ski Area feels that  
12 the current merging systems need to be reevaluated to maximize the flow as vehicles exit the canyon.  
13 The current system allows vehicles to exit the parking lots lower in the canyon while impeding flow  
14 from up canyon. Ms. Boardman reported that these are some of the main items the Alta Ski Area  
15 letter highlighted as not being included in the Phase I plans. The hope is that UDOT will include  
16 them. The letter was presented to the Environment System Committee and has now been shared with  
17 the Stakeholders Council. She hopes the CWC Board will consider the outlined suggestions.

18  
19 It was clarified that the Environment System Committee looked at the Alta Ski Area letter during a  
20 recent meeting, but did not review the draft letter from Ms. Boardman. However, the letter from Alta  
21 Ski Area included the points that are included in the draft letter. Ms. Boardman reported that the  
22 request is for the CWC Board to consider whether these suggestions from Alta Ski Area make sense  
23 or might be valuable for the member jurisdictions. Additional suggestions can be shared as well.

24  
25 Chair Hahnenberger asked if the Stakeholders Council is being asked to approve the letter so it can  
26 be presented to the CWC Board, which was confirmed. Council Members wanted to know if the  
27 letter had to be sent as it is currently drafted, but it was indicated that there could be some discussion,  
28 and then changes could be made to the letter. Del Draper made a motion to approve the draft letter  
29 and Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. Discussions were had about the motion and the letter.

30  
31 Mr. Zalles noted that there are some complexities to consider, such as the nature of a parking  
32 reservation system. There are different types of reservation systems. As an example, some  
33 reservation systems involves payment. On the other hand, there are free parking reservation systems  
34 in place as well. Mr. Zalles pointed out that the Alta Ski Area letter was written with the needs of  
35 that ski resort in mind. Snowbird might not agree with all of the suggestions that have been made.

36  
37 Olivia Juarez asked what is known about the environmental impacts of a satellite hub. Ms. Boardman  
38 reported that there is a bus stop there already, so she does not know that anything would need to be  
39 built. It would need to be incorporated into the bus route and schedules. Ms. Juarez had reservations  
40 about including the term “satellite hub” without knowing more. She agrees that it would be beneficial  
41 to enhance Little Cottonwood Canyon transportation solutions, but has concerns about the proposal.  
42 Ms. Boardman explained that the draft letter used language shared by Alta Ski Area. It is possible to  
43 change some of the wording to mention using the bus stop and existing network at the mouth of Little  
44 Cottonwood Canyon rather than referencing a satellite hub. There was support for this change.

45  
46 Dani Poirier reported that Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has had a few conversations with  
47 Mr. Maughan as well about their wish list items in Phase I. Overall, there is support for the  
48 suggestions, but she would like to see the Stakeholders Council amend this letter to also focus on

1 dispersed users. Right now, the focus of the letter is on resort users, so it would be meaningful to  
2 broaden the scope.

3  
4 Ms. Poirier suggested adding language about the revised White Pine bus stop. There should be some  
5 mention of express bus lanes to White Pine. As far as the language about a bus stop at the existing  
6 network, there could be language added to clarify that this should be a mobility hub for bus stops.  
7 There is some fear that money put into a mobility hub at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon could  
8 easily turn into resources for a future gondola. Ms. Poirier likes the idea of snowplows being stored  
9 in the canyon, but that will only be beneficial if the plows are out earlier. When it comes to the  
10 reservation system, she suggested that there be more transparency about what is envisioned.

11  
12 Ms. Kilpack noted that suggestions can be shared verbally. If there is Council Member consensus,  
13 then there can be work done to finalize the language after the Stakeholders Council Meeting.  
14 Ms. Poirier reiterated her suggestions. The bus stop at White Pine should also include express bus  
15 service to ensure efficiency. It should also include an equitable merge point. Mr. Knoblock expressed  
16 appreciation for Ms. Boardman and her efforts, but he is opposed procedurally to having something  
17 brought before the Stakeholders Council to review, amend, and approve within one meeting. Items  
18 like this should be submitted at least two weeks before a meeting for Council Member review. As  
19 for Council Member suggestions, he has previously discussed single-occupancy vehicles with UDOT.  
20 If there were restrictions on single-occupancy vehicles, it would reduce parking needs and traffic.

21  
22 Additional discussions were had about the proposed White Pine language. Ms. Poirier explained that  
23 part of the Phase I work has to do with the White Pine lot, so what is proposed is possible.  
24 Ms. Boardman noted that there can be another section added to the letter with requests from the  
25 backcountry community. She does not want there to be confusion about what has come from Alta  
26 Ski Area and what has come from the Stakeholders Council. When it comes to a hub at Little  
27 Cottonwood Canyon and the concerns that it could become a starting point for a gondola, it makes  
28 sense to point out that the infrastructure is already there in Sandy and it is far enough from the mouth  
29 of the canyon that it would not be a gondola hub. Mr. Adams suggested that the language be clarified.

30  
31 Ms. Kilpack asked Council Members to think about what there is a desire to achieve before the  
32 Council moves to the next agenda item. Mark Baer echoed the comments shared earlier by  
33 Mr. Knoblock and noted that there were two Transportation System Committee Meetings where a  
34 draft letter was discussed before being forwarded to the Stakeholders Council. He likes the letter that  
35 has been shared, but feels it needs some additional work. Mr. Baer asked about the Alta Ski Area  
36 comments made about tolling. He asked if there is empirical evidence behind the statement that  
37 tolling will not reduce the number of vehicles in the canyon. Parking reservations seem to be a  
38 different issue than tolling, and he suggested that those be separated out. A comment was made about  
39 the contents of the letter and the fact that there are certain statements made without evidence provided.

40  
41 Ms. Boardman reported that in the second paragraph of the letter, it mentions reading the attached  
42 letter for more details. The Alta Ski Area letter is several pages long. The bullet points included in  
43 the draft letter are a high-level summary. Council Members further discussed the letter. It was noted  
44 that tolling should be considered with transit, because they will be implemented together. The  
45 statement about tolling not reducing the number of vehicles in the canyon is not backed up with data,  
46 but it also does not consider the implementation of tolling along with transit improvements.

1 A question was asked about whether Alta Ski Area is submitting this letter separate from the draft  
2 letter. It was clarified that Alta Ski Area had already submitted its letter to UDOT. The request is  
3 for the CWC Board to read the Alta Ski Area letter and provide comments to UDOT if there is  
4 anything relevant to member jurisdictions. The procedural concerns were reiterated. Several  
5 members of the Stakeholders Council wanted more time to review the letter before forwarding it to  
6 the CWC Board.

7  
8 Ms. Poirier asked if it would be feasible for Council Members to receive the Alta Ski Area letter as  
9 well as the letter that was drafted. It could be shared, and then Council Member comments could be  
10 provided outside of the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Chair Hahnenberger confirmed that it is  
11 possible to add these to Google Drive so Council Members can provide comments. As for a virtual  
12 vote, that is not something that can be done. Ms. Kilpack reported that a Special Meeting can be  
13 scheduled. Council Members asked for additional information about a vote. Ms. Kilpack stated that  
14 there needs to be a simple majority in order for something to move forward to the CWC Board.

15  
16 Chair Hahnenberger explained that there could be a Special Meeting held if the Stakeholders Council  
17 feels there is an urgent need to have this letter shared with the CWC Board at their next meeting.  
18 There is no public comment deadline, because there is no public comment period at this time. There  
19 might be other ways to share this information with the CWC Board for consideration. Citizens in the  
20 CWC Board Member jurisdictions could always share the Alta Ski Area letter and some comments.  
21 There are quarterly meetings of the Stakeholders Council, so if there is a desire for the drafted letter  
22 to be considered at the CWC Board level, another meeting would need to be scheduled.

23  
24 Based on the conversation, some Council Members are not comfortable moving forward with a vote  
25 at the current Stakeholders Council Meeting. There could be a motion made to table this letter. The  
26 letter can be shared with Council Members in the Google Drive folder so there can be comments  
27 provided outside of the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Discussions were had about a motion.  
28 Ms. Boardman encouraged comments about the letter to be shared outside of this meeting. It is  
29 possible to restructure the letter if that is desired by the Stakeholders Council. The letter can include  
30 feedback from Alta Ski Area, Snowbird, and the backcountry community. Chair Hahnenberger  
31 reported that there will be work done with Ms. Boardman, so the materials will be shared with Council  
32 Members.

33  
34 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to TABLE the Stakeholders Council Letter to the CWC Board  
35 related to Refinements to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Phase I Implementation Plans.  
36 [REDACTED] seconded the motion. Del Draper voted Nay, and Patrick Morrison abstained from the vote.  
37 The motion passed.

### 38 39 **2026 Stakeholders Council Initiatives Brainstorm**

- 40  
41 1. **Council Members will Review the Notes and Ideas from their Discussions at the**  
42 **December 17, 2025, Meeting and Identify Feasible Initiatives for Each Committee to**  
43 **Lead.**  
44  
45 a. **What Ideas and Initiatives Identified During the December 17, 2025, Meeting are**  
46 **within the Role and Power of the Stakeholders Council to Accomplish?**  
47

1 i. **Which Committee(s), if any, would be Best Suited to Lead Each of these**  
2 **Initiatives?**

3  
4 b. **What Ideas and Initiatives Identified During the December 17, 2025, Meeting are**  
5 **within the Role and Power of the CWC Board and Staff to Accomplish?**  
6

7 Chair Hahnenberger reported that at the Stakeholders Council Meeting on December 17, 2025, there  
8 was a brainstorming exercise related to initiatives. She read the questions that will be discussed  
9 during the current Breakout Session. Ms. Kilpack instructed Council Members attending the meeting  
10 in person to break into groups. The online meeting participants will form a separate group. There is  
11 one sheet in the middle of each table where it is possible to take notes during the discussion. In  
12 addition, there is the December 17, 2025, Stakeholders Council Discussion Summary document. She  
13 asked Council Members to extract the identified goals and determine the appropriate subcommittee.  
14

15 2. **CWC Staff will Communicate the Outcomes of this Exercise to Committee Chairs to**  
16 **Discuss in Subsequent Committee Meetings.**  
17

18 After the group discussions, there will be communication with the Chair of each subcommittee. There  
19 will be information about outcomes of the exercise shared, which will inform future meetings.  
20

21 The 2026 Stakeholders Council Initiatives Brainstorm took place from 5:02 p.m. to 5:20 p.m.  
22

23 Chair Hahnenberger reiterated that the outcomes of the discussion will be collected and  
24 communicated to the Chair of each subcommittee. Individuals on different subcommittees are  
25 welcome to bring forward relevant items for Committee Member discussion. She added that  
26 subcommittee leadership now meets on a quarterly basis. This will make it possible to see what other  
27 subcommittees are working on and determine where there can be more subcommittee collaboration.  
28

29 **Next Steps**  
30

31 1. **Council Members will Review any Interim Action Items and System Committee Work**  
32 **to be Done after this Meeting.**  
33

34 Chair Hahnenberger reported that the Phase I letter will continue to be worked on following the  
35 Stakeholders Council Meeting. It will be distributed to Council Members for review. All of the  
36 subcommittees also have various projects that are continuing to move forward. She asked if there are  
37 other items that should be considered before the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. Mr. Morrison  
38 reported that the Recreation System Committee has started to plan in-person recreation outings. There  
39 is an invitation extended to all Council Members who are interested in attending those outings.  
40

41 **Staff Announcements**  
42

43 1. **The Next Stakeholders Council Meeting will be on June 3, 2026.**  
44

45 It was noted that the next Stakeholders Council Meeting will take place on June 3, 2026.  
46

1 **2. The Next CWC Board Meetings will be on April 13th, May 4th (Brief Budget Hearing),**  
2 **and June 22nd.**

3  
4 Council Members were reminded that the next CWC Board Meeting will take place on April 13,  
5 2026. There are also CWC Board Meetings scheduled for May 4, 2026, and June 22, 2026. Ms.  
6 Kilpack clarified that the May 4, 2026, meeting is not a full meeting, but a short Budget Hearing. As  
7 for the June 22, 2026, CWC Board Meeting, she will have a list of agenda topics ready for the  
8 Stakeholders Council to review at least one week before the scheduled Stakeholders Council Meeting.  
9

10 **Stakeholders Open Comment**

11  
12 Mr. Marshall reported that there was a buyer found who is committed to carrying out the legacy of  
13 Log Haven. He is retiring with Margo Provost and this will be his last Stakeholders Council Meeting.  
14 It has been a privilege to serve on the Stakeholders Council and he thanked other Council Members  
15 for their collaboration. Ms. Scheffler will replace him on the Stakeholders Council. She has been the  
16 wedding and events coordinator at Log Haven for the last 25 years and is remaining as an owner.  
17

18 Ms. Juarez announced that over this semester, she has been associated with the University of Utah's  
19 Environmental Humanities program doing a literature review and oral history project on Hispanic and  
20 Latino heritage and history in the Central Wasatch area. She will share a preview of this project  
21 during a presentation on April 2, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. She encouraged Council Members to attend.  
22

23 Ms. Boardman asked about inviting other subcommittees to assist with the behavior modification  
24 survey campaign that has been discussed at the Environment System Committee level. She reported  
25 that the Committee is working on a behavior modification survey and the hope is that other  
26 subcommittees might also be interested in participating in this work. There will likely be a separate  
27 meeting related to this, so an invitation can be sent out to Council Members in the future. It was noted  
28 that the Recreation System Committee discussed this recently and would like to participate.  
29

30 **Closing**

31  
32 **1. Chair Hahnenberger will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders Council**  
33 **Meeting.**

34  
35 **MOTION:** Olivia Juarez moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Ed Marshall  
36 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.  
37

38 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:28 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, March 18, 2026.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_