

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL**  
2 **MEETING HELD THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2019 AT 4:00 P.M., SALT LAKE COUNTY**  
3 **GOVERNMENT CENTER ROOM S1120, 2001 SOUTH STATE STREET, SALT LAKE**  
4 **CITY, UTAH 84190**  
5

6 **Present:** Chris McCandless (Central Wasatch Commission Chair), Greg Summerhays  
7 (President, Sandy Area Chamber of Commerce), Kurt Hegmann, John  
8 Knoblock (Mount Olympus Community Council, Trails Utah, Bonneville  
9 Trails Committee), Kirk Nichols (Evergreen Homeowners Association of Big  
10 Cottonwood), Paul Diegel, Mike Maughan (General Manager, Alta Ski Area),  
11 Matt Kirkegaard (Salt Lake City resident), Sarah Bennett (Trails Utah), Serena  
12 Anderson (Cottonwood Canyons Foundation), Jeremy Bendixon (Cardiff  
13 Canyon Owners Association), Troy Morgan (citizens of Big Cottonwood  
14 Canyon), Stetson West (Utah Backcountry Hunters and Anglers), Tom Diegel  
15 (Wasatch Backcountry Alliance), Mike Walker (a resident of the area in Little  
16 Cottonwood Canyon referred to as the triangle), Carl Fisher (Save Our  
17 Canyons), Megan Nelson (Nature Conservancy), Barbara Cameron (Big  
18 Cottonwood Community Council), Del Draper (President of the Nine Cabin  
19 Owners' Association), Brian Hutchinson (resident of Salt Lake County), Jan  
20 Striefel (League of Women Voters of Utah and Salt Lake City), Will  
21 McCarville (Utah Sierra Club), Dr. Kelly Bricker (Parks Recreation and  
22 Tourism at the University of Utah), Michael Braun, Ed Marshall, Randy Doyle,  
23 Pat Shea, Julia Geisler, Carolyn Wawra, Steve Issowits, Marian Wright (Salt  
24 Lake City Public Utilities, Carly Castle (Salt Lake City Public Utilities), Josh  
25 Bendixon (Cardiff Canyon Owners Association), Patrick Nelson (Salt Lake  
26 City Public Utilities), Lance Kovel (Wasatch Cache National Forest), John  
27 Thomas (UDOT), Dan Knopp, Annalee Munsee, Executive Director Ralph  
28 Becker, Deputy Director Jesse Dean, Communications Director Lindsey  
29 Nielsen, CWC Attorney Shane Topham  
30

31 **Via Telephone:** Randy Doyle, Pat Shea, Michael Braun, Ed Marshall, Carolyn Wawra, Julia  
32 Geisler, Steve Issowits  
33

34 **Excused:** Bill Malone, Dave Fields, Don Despain  
35

36 **A. OPENING AND INTRODUCTIONS**  
37

38 **i. Welcome – Chris McCandless, Chair, Central Wasatch Commission.**  
39

40 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Chair Chris McCandless called the meeting to order at  
41 4:04 p.m. and thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for their participation. The desire of the  
42 CWC was for the Stakeholders Council to help resolve questions and offer solutions plaguing the  
43 Canyons.  
44

1           **ii. Executive Director Ralph Becker will Conduct the First Meeting of the**  
2           **Stakeholders Council and Background Leading up to the CWC and Stakeholders**  
3           **Council.**

4  
5           **iii. Stakeholders Council Members will Introduce Themselves as Interest in the**  
6           **CWC Work.**

7  
8 Those present introduced themselves. Executive Director Ralph Becker remarked that he expected  
9 Stakeholders Council agendas to be very full going forward. There have been several basic start up  
10 functions for the group, many of which include discussion, presentation, or informational items.  
11 There are also action items needing to be addressed. The majority of the items to be discussed today  
12 did not relate to the substantive advisory work but rather to the functionality of the group.

13  
14 Mr. Becker would conduct the meeting since a Chair and Vice-Chair had not yet been appointed. He  
15 asked those present to consider the specific work of the Council, their role on the Council, and their  
16 background that brought them to this point. He explained that the Council will play a critical role in  
17 the success of the decisions of the CWC and forming the basis for the various jurisdictions in the  
18 Canyons. The immediate catalyst for the Council was the work of the Mountain Accord, which was  
19 an effort to get the community and major stakeholders and players together and come to a consensus  
20 with regard to important, long-term issues.

21  
22 The specific catalyst was Skilink, which was a proposal introduced by the congressional legislation  
23 to sell a corridor of land owned by the Canyons Ski Resort to Solitude to provide for lift service and  
24 other development. The request was to sell public lands for private use. There was a vehement local  
25 reaction that resulted in the congressional delegation backing off from the proposal over time. A  
26 group came together with regard to the proposals and decisions were being made that were not  
27 reflective of public opinion or the desires of the local community. The intent was to reach an  
28 agreement with regard to what should and should not take place and serve the various public interests.

29  
30 Over the next two years, the Mountain Accord tried to reach a consensus. Ultimately, all of the  
31 jurisdictions came together and signed an agreement. Part of the agreement called for the  
32 establishment of a coordinating and overarching governmental entity to help coordinate the  
33 responsibilities of the various jurisdictions. A new federal designation was established that became  
34 known as the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”).  
35 Congressman Chaffetz introduced that legislation in Congress. There was a hearing but it did not  
36 proceed further. In the meantime, the expectation was to establish the Central Wasatch Commission,  
37 which took much longer than anticipated. Mr. Becker was hired first as the Executive Director in  
38 June 2018 followed by Deputy Director Jesse Dean and Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen a  
39 few months later.

40  
41 The first task was to pursue the legislation initiated by Congressman Chaffetz. Hearings were held  
42 after which work proceeded on two or three drafts. In November, the Commission approved  
43 submission to Congress of the proposed legislation. Earlier in the fall, UDOT Director and CWC  
44 Board Member Carlos Braceras reported that UDOT was in the early stages of developing an  
45 Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) for Little Cottonwood Canyon. The CWC was invited to  
46 assume a co-leadership role on a Transportation Corridor Action Plan to include Big and Little  
47 Cottonwood Canyons and non-transportation specific ancillary issues. The CWC had been working  
48 with UDOT Project Manager John Thomas who was instrumental in resolving the Legacy Highway

1 parking dispute. In addition to being a transportation expert, he works on finding solutions to difficult  
2 circumstances.

3  
4 Mr. Becker reported that the Environmental Dashboard was also initiated by the CWC and was an  
5 outgrowth of the Mountain Accord to provide a central place for environmental information and  
6 analyses dealing with the baseline conditions. He referred to the draft legislation the CWC took action  
7 on in November and pointed out that the Stakeholders Council is an advisory body to the CWC Board.

8  
9 **B. PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND ACTION REGARDING UTAH OPEN AND**  
10 **PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT, GRAMA**

11  
12 **i. Presentation by CWC Counsel Shane Topham Regarding the Utah Open and**  
13 **Public Meetings Act, GRAMA and its Application to the Stakeholders Council.**

14  
15 Mr. Becker introduced CWC Attorney Shane Topham and described his efforts on behalf of the  
16 Commission. Chair McCandless thanked the members of the Stakeholder Council for their  
17 willingness to serve. Procedural issues were discussed. Mr. Becker explained that the issues will be  
18 handled like any formal governmental body. Meetings are recorded and minutes will be prepared.  
19 Every communication is subject to the Government Records and Management Act (“GRAMA”),  
20 which allows the public to ask for communications among the Stakeholders Council. Chair  
21 McCandless commented that responding to GRAMA requests take a lot of time and energy.

22  
23 Mr. Topham reported that he served as the legal advisor for the CWC Steering Committee from the  
24 time the CWC was formed and in March he was appointed as the CWC Attorney. Throughout his  
25 life, he has lived along the Central Wasatch and is honored to be involved in the process. He reported  
26 that the Interlocal Cooperation Act authorizes Utah’s governmental entities to join together and enter  
27 into interlocal agreements to jointly perform cooperative actions to benefit the public. Specific  
28 examples were given. One subset of interlocal cooperation agreements is when two or more  
29 governmental entities join together via an interlocal agreement to form another governmental entity.  
30 The new entity’s function is defined by an interlocal agreement, which has to be approved by the  
31 respective governing bodies. Once that occurs, it goes to the Lieutenant Governor’s office for review  
32 and approval of the new entity.

33  
34 In May of 2017, Salt Lake County, Sandy, Salt Lake City, and Cottonwood Heights negotiated and  
35 approved an interlocal agreement creating the CWC. It was approved by the Lieutenant Governor on  
36 June 29, 2017. Mr. Topham reported that the CWC is its own governmental entity and once created,  
37 became subject to certain requirements such as the Open and Public Meetings Act (the “OPMA”) and  
38 the Government Records Access and Management Act (“GRAMA”).

39  
40 Mr. Topham reported that participation in the public process is essential to democracy. With that in  
41 mind, in 1977 the Utah Legislature enacted the OPMA, which formalized the requirement that  
42 meetings of public bodies be announced publicly in advance and that meetings be conducted in the  
43 open. To assure the opportunity for public participation, the OPMA requires specific noticing  
44 requirements be met. An annual notice is required whenever a public body schedules meetings in  
45 advance over the course of a year. A meeting specific notice is required and must include the agenda.  
46 The notice must be posted at the CWC’s principal office or the building where the meeting is to be  
47 held, posted on the Utah Public Notice and CWC websites, and given to at least one newspaper in  
48 general circulation within the area of the CWC’s jurisdiction or to a local media correspondent.

1  
2 A topic not on the agenda can be raised and discussed during an open meeting but no decisions can  
3 be made until the following meeting where action has been properly noticed in advanced. If there are  
4 unforeseen circumstances that necessitate an emergency meeting, the best notice possible must be  
5 provided.  
6

7 The OPMA requires that every meeting be open to the public unless it is properly closed. There are  
8 key requirements for closing a meeting. The OPMA defines a meeting as the convening of a public  
9 body where a quorum is present. Even though the Stakeholders Council is a recommending body to  
10 the CWC, it must comply with the requirements of the OPMA. Although meetings are normally open  
11 to the public, an individual that tries to disrupt a meeting can be expelled with a two-thirds vote of  
12 the body after a determination is made that the disruption is material. Reasons for closing a meeting  
13 are specific and include:

- 14  
15 1. Discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of  
16 an individual.
- 17  
18 2. Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation.
- 19  
20 3. Strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property.
- 21  
22 4. Strategy sessions to discuss the sale of real property.
- 23  
24 5. Discussion regarding deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems.
- 25  
26 6. Investigate proceedings regarding allegations of criminal misconduct.

27  
28 Mr. Topham expected it to be unlikely that the Stakeholders Council will ever need to convene a  
29 closed meeting. If it appears that a closed meeting is necessary, legal counsel will be available to  
30 provide guidance.  
31

32 The OPMA also requires written minutes and recordings be kept for all meetings and certain closed  
33 meetings. The minutes and recordings for open meetings must include the date, time, and place of  
34 the meeting; the names of the members present; substantive matters proposed, discussed, or decided;  
35 a record of the votes taken; the name of each person who provided testimony; and any other  
36 information that a member requests be included in the minutes. The recording must be a complete  
37 and unedited record of the open portion of the meeting and must be made available to the public  
38 within three business days following the meeting. The written minutes must be made available to the  
39 public within a reasonable time period after the meeting. The recordings are public records for the  
40 purposes of GRAMA but the written minutes are the official record of what took place at the meeting.  
41

42 Closed meetings must be recorded unless they deal with the character and professional competence,  
43 or mental or physical health of an individual or if the discussion pertains to deployment of security  
44 personnel or devices. Written minutes of closed meetings are not necessary. Minutes and recordings  
45 of closed meetings are protected records under GRAMA and are subject to disclosure under court  
46 order. Enforcement of the OPMA also was discussed. Mr. Topham explained that the Attorney  
47 General and the County Attorneys have the right and obligation to enforce the OPMA. Private  
48 individuals can bring action to force compliance. Actions in violation of the OPMA are voidable by

1 a court if the lawsuit commences within 90 days following the date of the action. A member of a  
2 public body that knowingly or intentionally violates the requirements of a closed meeting is guilty of  
3 a Class B misdemeanor. Mr. Topham stated that public bodies are to receive training on the Act  
4 annually.

5  
6 Mr. Topham next reported that GRAMA is the State’s version of the Federal Freedom of Information  
7 Act and is based on two Constitutional rights. The first is the public’s right to access information  
8 regarding the conduct of the public’s business. The second is the right to privacy in relation to  
9 personal data gathered by the government concerning citizens. GRAMA also recognizes that there is  
10 a public policy interest in allowing the government to restrict access to certain types of public records.  
11 The purposes of GRAMA were described as follows:

- 12  
13 1. Promote the public’s right to easy, reasonable access of certain unrestricted public  
14 records.
- 15  
16 2. Specify the conditions in allowing restrictions to access to public records.
- 17  
18 3. Prevent the abuse of confidentiality of governmental entities.
- 19  
20 4. Provide guidelines for both exposure and restrictions on access.
- 21  
22 5. When the balance is even or the interest in restricting access equals the interest in  
23 giving access, access is provided.
- 24  
25 6. Establish fair and reasonable records management practices.

26  
27 Mr. Topham reported that all of the CWC’s records will be available to the public unless they can be  
28 properly denied under GRAMA because they are private, controlled, or protected. This includes  
29 emails and text messages. Since the CWC was formed, a number of GRAMA requests have been  
30 received. Depending on the scope of the request, responses can be very expensive and time-  
31 consuming.

32  
33 **ii. Action by Stakeholders Council to Accept Approach for Handling**  
34 **Communications.**

35  
36 Mr. Topham reported that because there are 35 members of the Stakeholders’ Council it will be  
37 important to comply with the rules. He explained that that telephone calls do not create a record that  
38 has to be maintained or examined. If electronic communications are necessary, it was requested that  
39 Council Members email rather than text and that all emails be copied to the address  
40 “stakeholder@cw.utah.gov. That way communications will be contained on the CWC’s server.  
41 Procedural issues were discussed. Staff evaluated the easiest way to track communications relative  
42 to the Stakeholders Council and the CWC, including advice on proper procedures. Mr. Becker stated  
43 that they have tried to determine what is most fair to the fair and the Council and erred on the side of  
44 making information public.

45  
46 **MOTION:** Kurt Hegmann moved to recognize the intent of the Stakeholders Council to follow the  
47 OPMA and GRAMA as a body. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
48 unanimous consent of the Council.

1  
2 **1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING CWC INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT**  
3 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL REQUIREMENTS**  
4

5 **i. Presentation by CWC Counsel Shane Topham Regarding the CWC Interlocal**  
6 **Agreement (ILA) and Stakeholders Council ILA Requirements.**  
7

8 Mr. Topham reported that the requirements for the Stakeholders Council are set forth in detail in the  
9 Interlocal Agreement. The convening of this body was anticipated several years ago when the  
10 Interlocal Agreement was being negotiated. Per the agreement, there are to be 28 to 35 stakeholders  
11 who were to be appointed by the CWC Board to four-year terms. With respect to the initial body,  
12 once a Chair has been appointed, half of the members will be given two-year initial terms. The other  
13 half will be given four-year terms so that all terms do not expire at the same time. There are, however,  
14 no limits on how many times a member can be reappointed to the Stakeholders Council. The Board  
15 also appoints a Chair and Vice Chair who serve two-year terms. The matter was discussed and the  
16 Board suggested potential names as Chair and Vice Chair for consideration by the Stakeholders  
17 Council.  
18

19 **ii. Action by Stakeholders Council Membership Recognizing Adherence to the**  
20 **Stakeholders Council ILA Requirements.**  
21

22 **(a) Mission and Role.**  
23

24 **(b) Consensus Objectives, Recommendations Approach.**  
25

26 Mr. Topham explained that the CWC is governed by its Board of Commissioners. As the policy-  
27 making body, they have the ultimate authority. The Stakeholder Council is advisory to the Board. In  
28 that capacity, the Council can consult with the Board or staff concerning technical issues. They can  
29 also gather information, conduct fact-finding, feasibility studies, and otherwise collaborate with  
30 broader constituencies within the CWC's jurisdiction in order to make suggestions,  
31 recommendations, and proposals. At least once annually, a joint meeting will be of the CWC Board  
32 and the Stakeholders Council and will serve as an opportunity to report on activities and prospects  
33 for future work.  
34

35 Under the CWC Interlocal Agreement, every member of the Stakeholders' Council must agree to the  
36 following:  
37

- 38 1. Support a consensus-based process for issues affecting the Central Wasatch  
39 Mountains.
- 40 2. Share information.
- 41 3. Be collaborative and allow others to express their opinions and viewpoint.  
42  
43  
44

1 **2. REVIEW OF STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL FAQ, RULES FOR ENGAGEMENT.**

2  
3 **i. Presentation by CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker Regarding Stakeholders**  
4 **Council Frequently Asked Questions and Rules for Engagement.**

5  
6 **(a) Guidelines for Interaction: Consensus, Dialog, Civility.**

7  
8 **(b) Public Comments and Involvement.**

9  
10 Mr. Becker explained that the approach established with the Mountain Accord that the CWC has  
11 adopted was to seek consensus to the extent possible with regard to decisions being made. With that  
12 being the focus going forward with the CWC, there has never been a vote that has not been unanimous.  
13 He recognized with the 35-member Council there will likely be times when all members do not agree.

14  
15 Carl Fisher commented that the Council is a body that is advisory to the CWC and they have  
16 implemented a standard. He felt it would be appropriate for the Council to employ that same high  
17 standard of engagement. He recommended they take a collaborative approach to decision-making  
18 and engagement in order to arrive at consensus-based decisions.

19  
20 Mr. Becker referenced page two of the FAQ document, which outlines the guidelines for engagement  
21 of the Stakeholders Council.

22  
23 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved that the Stakeholders Council work in accordance with the  
24 Interlocal Agreement requirements and the guidelines for engagement as set forth in the FAQ  
25 document. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion.

26  
27 Barbara Cameron commented that she sometimes feels like a consensus involves glossing over things  
28 that could be expressed. In the collaboration process, she asked if straw polls could be taken to move  
29 the discussion along and identify the issues. Mr. Dean stated that they will use technology and  
30 participate in straw polls during the process.

31  
32 In response to a question raised, Mr. Becker stated that meetings will follow Robert's Rules of Order.  
33 It was noted that with Robert's Rules, straw polls are not allowed. Mr. Becker stated that straw polls  
34 may not be needed and pointed out that the Chair can call for a vote in order to get a consensus.

35  
36 Sarah Bennett stated that with a group this size there will be subsets of ideas. She suggested  
37 maintaining the insight while trying to build the consensus.

38  
39 **AMENDED MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to amend his motion to provide for a minority report  
40 for areas where a broad consensus is not reached. Brian Hutchinson seconded the amended motion.

41  
42 In response to a question raised by Dan Knopp with regard to whether the intent is for all decisions  
43 to be unanimous, Mr. Becker stated that that is not expected but is a goal.

44  
45 **VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1 **3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF**  
2 **THE STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL.**

3  
4 **i. Presentation by CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker Regarding Stakeholders**  
5 **Council Selection Process, Proposed Selection of Chair Greg Summerhays and**  
6 **Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker.**  
7

8 Mr. Becker reported that the Interlocal Agreement calls for the appointment of a Chair and Vice Chair  
9 by the CWC Board. The issue was brought forward after a series of views regarding potential  
10 candidates proposed by the Executive Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission. The Board  
11 felt that rather than take action at their meeting that they make a recommendation for the Council to  
12 consider, discuss, and ultimately make a recommendation on.

13  
14 **ii. Discussion and Action by Stakeholders Council Membership Recommending**  
15 **Chair and Vice-Chair to the CWC.**  
16

17 Mr. Becker recognized that this is a very diverse group so as the makeup of the Stakeholders Council  
18 was considered and adopted, they involved people from all sides of the issue. When addressing the  
19 issue of who would be best to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair they would not want someone with  
20 specific interests to serve as Chair. They instead looked for people who are not embedded in a specific  
21 issue. The Board settled on several individuals who were interviewed and ultimately made a  
22 recommendation to the Council for consideration. Brad Summerhays was recommended to serve as  
23 Chair and Dr. Kelly Bricker as Vice-Chair. The desire was to appoint individuals who can help guide  
24 the discussions and decision making in an objective manner.  
25

26 Dr. Bricker stated that she is a professor and Director of the Parks Recreation and Tourism Program  
27 at the University of Utah. She has been involved in matters of outdoor recreation and nature-based  
28 tourism for many years. She moved to Salt Lake City 11 years ago but has been affiliated and known  
29 about the Canyons since she was in college. She is committed to issues of sustainability and is  
30 involved with non-profit organizations outside of the University that looks at ways to sustain quality  
31 environments, economics, and cultural values. Dr. Bricker and her husband formed a whitewater  
32 rafting company in Fiji and lived there for four years. She is very active and loves the outdoors. She  
33 also teaches and conducts research about the outdoors. She is very committed to the idea of the  
34 Stakeholders Council and looked forward to making great decisions for the future.  
35

36 Greg Summerhays was born and raised in Utah and spent most of his career working for WCF  
37 Insurance in public relations. Over the past two years, he has served as the President of the Sandy  
38 Area Chamber of Commerce. They are a regional chamber and represent businesses across the  
39 Wasatch Front. He stressed the need to balance the desire to bring more people to the area to preserve  
40 the canyons while encouraging tourism. He wanted to get involved in the Stakeholders Council  
41 because of his love for the canyons. He was involved in the Mountain Accord and looked forward to  
42 being engaged going forward.  
43

44 Dan Knopp expressed his support for Mr. Summerhays and Dr. Bricker but was concerned about the  
45 Board giving overly strong direction. He hoped that there would be two-way communication going  
46 forward. Mr. Becker stated that their intent was not to have a group that would be controlled for an  
47 outcome. The intent of tonight's meeting was to address organizational work in order to be productive  
48 and engaged going forward. He noted that the Board is open, welcoming, and engaging. They look



1 forward to a robust decision-making process and for the Council to give them the best opportunity to  
2 make good decisions.

3  
4 In response to a question raised by Barbara Cameron, Dr. Bricker stated that in 2012 the University  
5 conducted a small study to understand visitor views for the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. The  
6 intent of the study was to determine where people are using access points. Mr. Summerhays stated  
7 that he had not been involved in any previous studies.

8  
9 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to recommend the appointment of Greg Summerhays to serve  
10 as Chair and Kelly Bricker as Vice-Chair of the Stakeholders' Council. Dan Knopp seconded the  
11 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

#### 12 13 **4. OTHER STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

14  
15 Mr. Dean stated that for the next meeting they will meet in a different space with more technical  
16 capabilities. Once staff has finalized a location they will communicate that to the Council Members.  
17 The meeting schedule, however, would remain the same. Meetings were to be held the third  
18 Wednesday of every month after the first Thursday. A full agenda will also be provided moving  
19 forward. Issues to be addressed at the next meeting were reviewed.

20  
21 Mr. Becker suggested that comments be sent to the Chair and Vice-Chair with respect to items to be  
22 included on the agenda. He asked that staff be copied on any emails so that they can provide support.  
23 He noted that this year they broke the tipping point on transportation issues in the canyons. He  
24 clarified that the work of the group is both the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back with Summit  
25 County and Park City represented on the Commission. The issues will be very narrowly focused on  
26 decisions that UDOT will be making with respect to Little Cottonwood Canyon and broadly focused  
27 on a range of issues related to the canyons such as tolling. It was recommended that the Council take  
28 on intensive review of a range of transportation and ancillary issues short-term, medium-term, and  
29 long-term.

30  
31 Long term, the Council was asked to consider what makes the most sense for the right modes in the  
32 canyons, or mix of modes, and how that will best be reflected. Thanks to the generosity and decisions  
33 of UDOT, they will have an opportunity to bring in expertise to help them all learn and ultimately  
34 make the best decisions.

35  
36 Pat Shea reported that he spoke to John Thomas earlier in the day who indicated that UDOT's  
37 amendment to the EIS will not include a visitor capacity analysis. His understanding was that the  
38 CWC was going to be asked to approve the amendment at their February meeting before the Council  
39 has the opportunity to let their opinions be known. Mr. Becker invited any member of the Council  
40 with issues to bring them directly to the Board. He noted that the agenda had not yet been finalized  
41 for the February meeting. He pointed out that an EIS includes the assessment of social and  
42 environmental impacts.

43  
44 John Thomas stated that the concern pertains to the carrying capacity of the canyon. As UDOT looks  
45 at possible transportation solutions, they consider the forest land, the use of the parking lots and  
46 trailheads. They then try to make sense of what future growth will look like and determine where  
47 transportation fits in the discussion.

1 Pat Shea commented that the Stakeholders Council was formed to give advice. He understood  
2 UDOT's perspective and thought they would regret it in the future if they do not now take the  
3 opportunity to be inclusive about the impact transportation will have in the canyons. Mr. Becker  
4 recommended that Council Member Shea and anyone else make suggestions about the direction of  
5 the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS going forward and also specify the intent of the Transportation  
6 Corridor Action Plan that the CWC will co-lead with UDOT. He expected the Stakeholders Council  
7 to be heavily engaged in both.

8  
9 The matter was to be discussed further at a future meeting. Mr. Becker stated that there have been a  
10 plethora of studies, plans, and decisions over the past 10 to 12 years that are relevant and that  
11 information will be made available to the Council. Mr. Dean stated that staff has prepared a file that  
12 will be placed in a central location containing past studies and various information. He thought it  
13 would be beneficial for all to have a collective understanding of the work that has been done in the past.

14  
15 Sarah Bennett asked if they would be able to entertain issues relating to lands immediately adjacent  
16 to the study area. Mr. Becker stated that to date the CWC has determined to stick with their  
17 geography. If, however, there is something that is adjacent that directly affects the area, they would  
18 consider it. Council Member Bennett was thinking of Emigration Canyon and stated that potential  
19 restrictions to access for hiking or biking will have an immediate impact. Mr. Becker stated that  
20 issues will likely be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

21  
22 Annalee Munsey asked how far in advance meeting materials will be distributed. Mr. Dean stated  
23 that they are planning to distribute materials the Monday before meetings. Staff will distribute  
24 meeting materials as early as possible. Mr. Becker stated that they want to get materials out but they are often  
25 still being prepared closer to the date of the meeting. The complicated noticing process was described.  
26 Council Member Munsey felt that if participants have time to read the materials, they come better  
27 prepared. Greg Summerhays asked that the Council Members commit to reading the materials prior  
28 to meetings.

29  
30 **5. ADJOURNMENT**

31  
32 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at approximately  
33 6:05 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholder Council Meeting held Thursday, January 17, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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