

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL**
2 **MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M., COMMUNITY ROOM, 2277**
3 **EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH**
4

5 **Present:** Chair Greg Summerhays, Kirk Nichols, Brian Hutchinson, Will McCarvill, Jan
6 Striefel, Carl Fisher, Randy Doyle, Michael Braun, Barbara Cameron, Annalee
7 Munsey, Megan Nelson, Kurt Hegman, Carolyn Wawra, Sarah Bennett, Bill
8 Malone, Dave Fields, Del Draper, Dan Knopp, Bill Malone, Patrick Shea, John
9 Knoblock, Tom Diegel, Don Despain, Ed Marshall, CWC Attorney Shane
10 Topham, Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez,
11 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Intern Carly Lansche
12

13 **On the Phone:** Mike Marker, Steve Issowits
14

15 **Alternates:** Mike Maughan (Gus Gilman), Wayne Crawford (Pauline Crawford)
16

17 **Excused:** Kelly Bricker, Nate Furman, Troy Morgan, Matt Kirkegaard, Paul Diegel, Nate
18 Rafferty
19

20 **A. OPENING**
21

- 22 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
23 **Council (“SHC”).**
24

25 Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays called the meeting to
26 order at 3:07 p.m.
27

28 Chair Summerhays welcomed New Deputy Director Blake Perez. Mr. Perez reported that previously
29 he worked for the Salt Lake City Transportation Division as a Planner. Prior to that, he worked with
30 the Community Action Partnership of Utah, a small non-profit that helps low income families develop
31 assets. He looked forward to his work with the SHC.
32

- 33 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
34 **Wednesday, June 19, 2019.**
35

36 **MOTION:** Megan Nelson moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, June 19, 2019. Ed Marshall
37 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the SHC.
38

39 **B. TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AND PROCESS INFORMATION AND**
40 **DISCUSSION SESSION – 3:10-4:00**
41

- 42 **i. Executive Director Ralph Becker and UDOT Project Manager John Thomas will**
43 **Lead and Information and Discussion Session on the Little Cottonwood Canyon**
44 **Environmental Impact Statement, and the Cottonwood Canyons Action Plan.**
45

46 Executive Director Ralph Becker reported that when the SHC was formed, its primary task was to
47 work on transportation issues. The two primary areas of focus were identified as the Congressional
48 legislation and transportation issues coming out of Mountain Accord. Now was believed to be a good

1 time to bring the matter back to the SHC to engage in shaping transportation outcomes for the Central
2 Wasatch mountains. Efforts under way were described and included the Little Cottonwood Canyon
3 Environmental Impact Statement (“LCCEIS”). Mr. Becker explained that the Utah Legislature
4 appropriated \$66 million in 2017 to implement improvements in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This
5 year, the Legislature appropriated another \$13 million to acquire land in the gravel pit area at the
6 mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to help resolve the parking situation.

7
8 Mr. Becker explained that UTA also owns a lot at 9400 South and Highland Drive that was being
9 looked at. The LCCEIS began in 2018 and as it got under way, various ancillaries came to the
10 forefront. Last fall, UDOT, through Carlos Braceras who serves on CWC, asked if the CWC would
11 serve as a wrap around on various issues, including Big Cottonwood Canyon, to help with decision
12 making pertaining to the EIS and related issues. Over a period of a few months, they figured out how
13 to integrate the two processes.

14
15 At each meeting, the CWC devotes time to transportation issues. There has also been a great deal of
16 analysis pertaining to parking. Cottonwood Height has been actively involved in what should occur
17 with Wasatch Boulevard and Little Cottonwood Canyon Road leading into the canyon. The SHC will
18 play significant roles in shaping outcomes.

19
20 In response to a question raised, Mr. Becker stated that no action items were listed on the agenda so
21 no formal action would be taken tonight. Direction, however, could come forward. In order to take
22 action, a quorum of at least 18 members would need to be present.

23
24 UDOT Project Manager John Thomas referred to the LLCEIS and the Little Cottonwood Canyon
25 Transportation Action Plan (“LCCTAP”) and stated that a process is in place for both. It has been
26 posted on their website and is consistent with what they are doing. With regard to the LLCEIS, they
27 have received public comment and have found that there is significant interest. A scoping report was
28 compiled that includes a chapter that will be part of the EIS document and include an assessment of
29 the comments received. The scoping report was expected to be completed in September and available
30 to the public for review. Currently, they are working on a purpose and need chapter, which was
31 expected to be available in October. It will include draft screening criteria that will be used for
32 prioritization after they alternatives are developed.

33
34 Alternatives will be developed and refined based on the comments received. The alternatives will be
35 evaluated and are expected to be completed the winter or spring of 2020. A chapter on an aerial
36 transit system is in draft form. The intent was to lay out each alternative in a chapter so that
37 differences can be compared. They will then perform a screening of the alternatives after which they
38 will be prioritized. That was expected to be addressed one year from now. Through that process, a
39 preferred alternative will be selected for the draft EIS and put out for public comment and review to
40 be completed by the spring of 2021.

41
42 John Knoblock commented that there appears to be a two-step process with respect to how the \$66
43 million is to be spent versus the long-term transportation solution. Mr. Thomas responded that they
44 will be developing a long-term solution that may be phased over time based on funding, need, etc.
45 Mr. Becker commented that some of the decisions about transit systems may involve a combination
46 of modes and will depend on what transpires over the next 18 months. It was expected that decision
47 making for modes, parking, and tolling will move forward at the same time as the LCCEIS. He
48 explained that the EIS process is very well defined in law. The planning process is looser and will

1 not lead to final decisions like the EIS. It will, however, provide direction that will help the LLCEIS
2 move forward. The expectation was that in Big Cottonwood Canyon something specific will come
3 out of the LCCTAP work. There will likely be a proposal that will then move forward.
4

5 John Knoblock asked if there was an equivalent comment period section for the LCCTAP. His
6 understanding was that the \$66 million was aimed at Little Cottonwood Canyon and not Big
7 Cottonwood Canyon. He asked if there were preliminary solutions for Big Cottonwood Canyon such
8 as S curves, parking, etc. He suggested those types of projects get underway similar to what is going
9 on in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Thomas stated that the planning study gives them the flexibility
10 to get underway. Those efforts have been supported by the State from the \$13 million. There are
11 similar opportunities to recognize early actions that can be taken and that will be effective.
12

13 Mr. Thomas stated that four rounds were held prior to the EIS process. Brian Hutchinson recalled
14 that projects were identified and asked if they were considered early action items that they would be
15 able to weigh in on in more detail. Early action items were identified. Mr. Thomas stated that last
16 winter they put in a pilot of two high-T intersections and seemed to work well. This summer, they
17 will formalize them in a much safer configuration and do striping, grind the pavement down, glue in
18 reflective taping, and construct a permanent barrier.
19

20 SHC member Brian Hutchinson was concerned that some of the more dramatic improvements went
21 away and wondered if there could be further consideration of them. Mr. Thomas stated that the only
22 other early action item they were working on was the Y. They are adding a free right turn lane there
23 to improve that merge. Mr. Hutchinson stated that that specific project is of concern. Mr. Thomas
24 explained that it is on Forest Service Land and they are coordinating with them. It is also adjacent to
25 the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' historic park with whom they were working on visual
26 and other aesthetics.
27

28 Mr. Hutchinson asked if there was a provision for mass transit lanes and perhaps a high-T
29 configuration. Mr. Thomas stated that it is not going to Wasatch resorts and will be much shorter.
30 The purpose of the EIS was to perform a needs assessment. As alternatives are developed, that
31 information will come forward.
32

33 Mr. Thomas commented that one of the needs that has been heard repeatedly is the lack of
34 communication. They were trying to address that and UDOT will be hiring a Canyon
35 Communications Specialist who will come on board in August. It is a pilot position for one year that
36 is intended to work with the ski areas, Unified Police Department ("UPD"), Alta, the Town Marshal,
37 the Forest Service and others who are charged with keeping the road open. This person will be a
38 resource and coordinate a common environment for communication. The intent is to coordinate
39 information so that all of the users have access to the information.
40

41 SHC member Dave Fields was grateful for the effort and stated that from Snowbird's perspective,
42 better communication is key. He believed that the data about travel times that is being implemented
43 is critical. He considered it to be a huge step in the right direction. Mr. Thomas stated that that is
44 near term. In the long-term that information will feed directly into the alternatives. When they begin
45 to develop alternatives, they can use real data.
46

47 Mr. Fields asked what will come out of the \$66 million and the burn rate. By 2021, he questioned
48 what is expected to be left excluding significant infrastructure. Mr. Thomas stated that by 2021, there

1 will be nothing left. They are spending a lot of money on various things including resources to obtain
2 the technical competencies they need. They are also spending on sensors throughout the valley to
3 estimate travel times, on consultants and equipment, and improvements such as the High-T and other
4 intersection improvements. He noted that the funds were allocated to one canyon and not both.

5
6 Mr. Thomas stated that they need to understand the gravel pit and the transit hub and determine
7 whether the allotted \$13 million can pay for that. They also need to know how big the parking stalls
8 should be. It was clarified that the High-T and the merge lane will both come out of the \$66 million
9 allocation. Mr. Becker commented that no one working on the project doubts that the \$66 million
10 will be adequate. Going to other sources for funding is anticipated as an outcome of the process.

11
12 Ed Marshall from Millcreek Canyon, asked if the Canyons Communications Specialist will benefit
13 the Cottonwood Canyons as well as Millcreek Canyon. The major problem with Millcreek Canyon
14 is excess demand for parking at the major trailheads on peak days. One of the solutions is to
15 communicate with people down the canyon to prevent congestion and improve public safety. One of
16 the main concerns of the Forest Service is the ability to respond to an emergency. Accidents occur at
17 the top of the canyon, which requires people to come down to make a call. Any improvement in
18 communication would be a major step forward.

19
20 SHC member Michael Braun asked Mr. Thomas to define the quarry parking lot. Mr. Thomas
21 estimated the size of the north parcel as 40 acres, which is separate from and much larger than the
22 Walker Development portion. They met with the developers to determine if they were interested in
23 having a discussion about a transit hub on their property but found that their site plans are fairly
24 restrictive. In the end, it was determined to not be compatible.

25
26 SHC member Carl Fisher's concern/frustration was that there have been several plans over the years
27 that included some tangibles. He understood the need for an EIS but some other processes that have
28 gone forward should be elevated and were recommended from past studies, collaborations, and
29 initiatives. Mr. Thomas stated that they are addressing the issue through the methods described
30 earlier, however, the NEPA process requires them to evaluate past plans and develop alternatives.
31 Mr. Becker explained that this is a new level of detail, sophistication, and analysis that has never been
32 approached before. Mr. Fisher asked if the EIS will be more efficient because of the process
33 described. Mr. Becker stated that it definitely will be. Much of the front end work that would
34 typically be done was preempted by the LCCTAP.

35
36 In response to a question raised by SHC member Dan Knopp, Mr. Thomas confirmed that the \$13
37 million is just for land acquisition. With regard to the sensors, the challenge is that they pick up a
38 random sample of Bluetooth readings of vehicles passing by. The traffic engineers have
39 recommended that they use another technology that would be more cell phone based. He noted that
40 they are trying to obtain better data.

41
42 SHC member Pat Shea commented that UDOT is proposing to create a fire hose without any
43 implication for the surrounding areas. Rather than a bucket that will hold all of the traffic, it has holes
44 in it and there will be leakage. He questioned how an EIS will stand up to public or judicial scrutiny
45 in that the impact has not been examined. Mr. Thomas explained that they are in the process of
46 identifying the needs. Mobility in the canyon is a challenge and to address that, they will be develop
47 alternatives. UDOT has not yet proposed anything. Mr. Shea asked if they included the impact on
48 the watershed. Mr. Thomas stated that they did as they relate to transportation.

1
2 Michael Braun remarked that it was his understanding that the Forest Service has conducted bi-annual
3 and other detailed studies specific to capacity that relates to more cars on the road and the potential
4 for water quality affect or effect. They deemed a ridge-to-ridge environmental impact statement
5 unnecessary. Mr. Becker stated that that was consistent with his understanding. He had also heard
6 that their evaluation to date is that the impacts are manageable with what is being done currently.
7 One of the cooperating agencies in the EIS that has been intimately involved in the LCCTAP is Salt
8 Lake City Public Utilities. They are the primary entity with metro in protecting water sheds. UDOT
9 and the CWC have worked with them to evaluate watershed impacts from all of the transportation
10 improvement options that emerge and how to make sure that the watershed, which is the highest
11 priority in the canyons by federal and state law, is protected.
12

13 John Knoblock inquired about transportation impacts. Mr. Thomas stated that they evaluate the
14 potential for runoff. They have also worked with Metropolitan Water District (“MWD”) to review
15 their processes and identify their concerns. They also understand the chemical compositions of the
16 water and potential challenges. They are very willing to work with Salt Lake City Public Utilities
17 and the MWD has helped them understand the issues and solve some of the water quality problems.
18

19 Potential direct and indirect impacts were identified. Mr. Becker stated that the Forest Service has
20 methods for evaluating the number of restrooms needed at each parking area based on the number of
21 visitors.
22

23 Mr. Taylor stated that information will be made available once they receive it. They will also continue
24 the rounds. Once the purpose and need and screening criteria are available in September, they will
25 schedule meetings with small groups. That was expected to occur in September or October.
26

27 **C. MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE – 4:00-4:15**

28
29 **i. Subcommittee Lead Brian Hutchinson will Provide an Update on Progress the**
30 **Subcommittee made in June and July.**
31

32 Chair Summerhays reported that at the last meeting an advisory subcommittee was formed to study a
33 possible Millcreek Canyon shuttle system. The group has met at least once since then. Subcommittee
34 Lead Brian Hutchinson stated that they met as a small group the previous Monday. They analyzed
35 the study, which outlines the issues and potential actions that could reverse the degradation of the
36 canyon. The group identified the abundance of cars in the canyon as the main problem and
37 acknowledged that shuttle use is the priority. The concept was still being developed. The SHC
38 members were invited to weigh in.
39

40 Three possible courses of action were identified by Commissioner Bradley as:

- 41 1. Inaction.
- 42 2. Mitigation.
- 43 3. Dial back of in-canyon car parking to previous levels.
- 44
- 45

46 The subcommittee chose the final course of action and rejected the notion of in-canyon parking lot
47 expansion and road widening. A future UTA bus alignment, which may alleviate strain on park and
48 ride lots, may come online in the spring of 2020. It was suggested that they incentivize shuttle use

1 through toll booth fee restructuring. Crowd management mechanisms were also addressed. The need
2 for improved safety and rescue were also identified. The takeaway was to perhaps meet in small
3 working groups before the next subcommittee meeting scheduled for August 12 at 3:00 p.m. at
4 Millcreek City Hall.

5
6 The Forest Service plans to meet within the next two weeks to navigate restrictions. The timeline is
7 tight but doable with a September 1, 2019 target for a draft proposal. Funding decisions at the County
8 and UTA for the intended January 1, 2020 launch of Pilot A, which is winter/spring and Pilot B for
9 Summer/Fall will be made October 1 through December 1, 2019.

10
11 John Knoblock commented that one of the key components identified by the Forest Service was to
12 have a meeting to discuss permitting. It was noted that one of the options was to utilize the services
13 of a private shuttle company. Since it is on Forest Service land, a permit will be required. Before a
14 permit can be issued, NEPA would have to be completed. SHC member Hutchinson stated that it is
15 a County road and the fact that it is a pilot program may help them avoid certain hurdles.

16
17 Ed Marshall commended Mr. Hutchinson for getting the pilot study going. It is needed and they
18 support it provided that it is done properly and focuses on the real problem and not ancillary problems.
19 He noted that the major problem in Millcreek Canyon is different from the problem in the Cottonwood
20 Canyons. There are no ski resorts, no avalanche control, and he had his wife are the only two
21 residents. They see things firsthand and have a good handle on what the problem is. They see about
22 20 trips up and down the canyon per week and about 1,000 per year. They have never witnessed a
23 traffic delay except under certain circumstances such as road construction or tree trimming, exiting
24 at the toll booth, or if a group leaves the picnic grounds and trails at the same time. The problem is
25 not traffic congestion or the number of cars in the canyon and is parking on days of peak demand.
26 The problem is particularly severe at the top .4 mile of the canyon near the Big Water Trailhead.
27 Traffic congestion can occur there due to the lack of parking. The Forest Service has tried to alleviate
28 this in the past year by putting in a trail from the lowest overflow parking lots to the top. This has
29 done a tremendous job of eliminating conflict between cyclists and motorists.

30
31 Mr. Marshall suggested the focus be on the parking issues on peak days, which will help alleviate
32 other problems such as better aesthetics in the canyon, better user experiences, fewer bicycle
33 problems, better safety, and better access to trailheads. He stated that those will come as a natural
34 result of mitigating the parking problem. Mr. Marshall wanted the Council to understand that the
35 problem is very different from what exists in the Cottonwood canyons and requires a very different
36 solution.

37
38 In response to a question raised, it was estimated that there are approximately 18 summer homes in
39 the canyon. There are also homes at the top of the canyon, most of which are on Forest Service land.

40
41 Brian Hutchinson commented that a major component of the shuttle program is the management of
42 routes. This is an issue identified by the Forest Service. They do not want to create a situation where
43 there are issues on trailheads. They also need to address the dynamic between different visitors.

1 **D. CREATION OF SHC SUBCOMMITTEE ON VISITOR CAPACITY – 4:15-4:25**

2
3 **i. Dr. Kelly Bricker will Lead a Subcommittee on Visitor Capacity in the Central**
4 **Wasatch.**

5
6 Mr. Becker reported that at the last meeting there was a suggestion that a second advisory
7 subcommittee be established to look at how to best evaluate the capacity issues. Dr. Bricker will
8 continue to be engaged in order to provide the best information and results on capacity and how to
9 best incorporate them into decisions going forward. The matter was to be formalized as an action
10 item at the next meeting.

11
12 A determination of interest was determined. Those interested in being involved in the Visitor
13 Capacity Subcommittee were identified as Carl Fisher, Will McCarvill, Kurt Hegman, Don Despain,
14 Tom Diegel, Kirk Nichols, Annalee Munsey, Dave Fields, Michael Maughan, and Pat Shea. CWC
15 staff will follow up with those expressing an interest.

16
17 **E. CWC STAFF REPORT – 4:25-4:35**

18
19 **i. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide a Brief Overview of the**
20 **Work CWC Staff Accomplished or Made Progress with During June and July.**

21
22 Mr. Becker reported that staff continued to work diligently on all fronts. With regard to the
23 Environmental Dashboard work, they have a signed Interlocal Agreement and leaders at the
24 University of Utah will begin their work very soon. The legislation continued to be worked on. A
25 two-tiered initial review was planned by some of the jurisdictions involved in specific items in the
26 legislation. Many of the changes are technical and organizational in nature. A quick review will take
27 place among some of the jurisdictions and lead stakeholders. It will then go out for public review
28 with a 30-day period for public comments.

29
30 Mr. Becker indicated that there has been ongoing discussions with members of the delegation and
31 others. They will continue to work with them on the best time to have the bill ready and introduced
32 for consideration in this Congress. An update was provided on the transportation items, which are on
33 the timetable for decision making.

34
35 Mr. Becker reported that staff has settled into their new office space and are bearing the fruits of being
36 next door to the Wasatch Front Regional Council. They are interacting with them and they are
37 providing assistance.

38
39 John Knoblock asked for an update on the status of the land trades. Mr. Becker stated that they have
40 made deals with Snowbird and there has been ongoing discussion, work, and evolution of what the
41 land exchanges may look like. Mr. Becker explained that as the Forest Service conducts their
42 analysis, they are identifying issues. Some can be addressed easily while others are more challenging.
43 A lot of work has also been done on valuation. They present a new set of challenges for how to make
44 it fair for everyone. They have also looked at ways to address that. Mr. Becker stated that some
45 changes will be seen in the next draft of the legislation related to exchanges. It will continue to be a
46 work in process.

1 Randy Doyle agreed that it is a very complicated issue. Dave Fields reported that the ski resorts hired
2 an appraiser to give them an idea of what the valuation would be. It was a difficult task given that
3 there are not many real estate transactions going on in Little Cottonwood Canyon, especially
4 involving these lands. What came back was a wide discrepancy in value of \$1,500 to \$2,500 per acre
5 for mountainside lands. Snowbird has about 1,000 acres that were purchased as mining claims. Based
6 on the estimated value, the lands in the village would appraise based on whether there is available
7 water. He noted that it has to appraise at the highest and best use, which is a hotel with a value of
8 \$250,000 to \$500,000 per acre. The Forest Service has researched the matter with their Legal
9 Department and identified several concerns. In addition, there is a lot of mining history in Little
10 Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Fields pointed out that the Forest Service would like to have the ski resorts
11 take ownership of lands they are already utilizing. He agreed that the land trade issue is not dead but
12 there are numerous factors at play and it is getting more complicated.

13
14 Michael Braun asked Randy Doyle if he was aware of the McAllister Conservancy Fund working on
15 300 acres on the Great Western property. He was not aware of it. Mr. Becker stated that two members
16 of the CWC serve on the Quality Growth Commission Board, which is overseeing the McAllister
17 Conservancy Fund. They are involved in the work being done with the CWC legislation. He noted
18 that it would not be covered in the Act and will involve a standard land acquisition.

19
20 Tom Diegel stated that he is with the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. His understanding was that the
21 land exchanges can occur independent of the legislation. Mr. Becker confirmed that that is the case
22 and stated that administrative exchanges are possible. The norm is to get some sort of congressional
23 authorization because there is an affirmation of the public benefit.

24
25 Mr. Becker updated the SHC on the legislation and stated that they are still working toward
26 introduction of the bill. They have strong support and a commitment from the member representing
27 the area to move the legislation forward.

28
29 Mr. Becker was asked if he foresees, specific to the land exchanges, that in the future they could have
30 a repeat of the Snow Basin land exchanges. Mr. Becker did not. He explained that in the Snow Basin
31 land exchanges, in anticipation of the Olympics, the owner of Snow Basin used all of the political
32 muster he could generate to get a congressionally mandated land exchange that also included a NEPA
33 waiver. No one would consider that relative to these land exchanges.

34
35 Pat Shea commented on improper land exchanges and stated that before 1997, it was possible for a
36 BLM Regional Forester or District Manager to arrange an exchange. He thought it was naïve for the
37 SHC to believe that something similar could not happen here. He suggested they be on guard about
38 possible machinations in Washington, D.C. He asked staff to provide the SHC at the beginning of
39 each meeting with an update on the budget. As an advisory group he thought it was important for
40 them to know where the dollars are.

41
42 Mr. Becker displayed a copy of the budget and stated that the CWC adopted a budget with revenues
43 coming from the participating members and an appropriation of each jurisdiction. The total for this
44 year, pending final minor revisions, will be about \$840,000. The only exception is that UDOT is
45 contributing, as part of the work they are doing with the CCTAP, \$50,000 per year to the CWC to
46 help cover costs associated with the work on transportation. The budget was available for public
47 review.

1 Pat Shea asked how much is being paid for consultants and requested information on their contract
2 iterations. Mr. Becker stated that they have on contract their attorney Shane Topham at a cost of
3 \$75,000 per year. A portion of that budget goes toward GRAMA requests. Dave Sanderson helps
4 with budgeting, payroll, and expenditures at a cost of \$800 per month. A D.C. lobbyist is on contract
5 this year at a cost of \$60,000 per year. It was noted that an independent audit also needs to take place
6 each year at a cost of under \$10,000.

7
8 Tom Diegel commented that at the first meeting Mr. Thomas introduced the decision lens project,
9 which seemed to have promise for a group of this size. He wanted the SHC to be advisory in nature
10 rather than simply absorb information. Mr. Becker stated that they will be using decision lens who
11 are now under contract with UDOT and will be working with the SHC and the CWC. The intent is
12 to expedite the process and ensure that all input is included and considered in the recommendations
13 that go forward. A presentation was to be made to the CWC on August 5.

14
15 John Knoblock commented on the three Ts identified by Barbara Cameron and wondered why having
16 well maintained toilets is such a significant issue. With regard to trails, he and Sarah Bennett
17 continued to push forward. He was not sure if there was an additional benefit to having a trails
18 advisory subcommittee of this body but suggested it be considered. He had heard from Patrick Nelson
19 that this year they are doing a revision to their Watershed Management Plan. He wanted to find out
20 more about that before it is finished. He hoped there was a way for them to be part of that. He noted
21 that the CWC map shows that their area of jurisdiction extends through Parley's Canyon. With
22 respect to recreation, it is something that is relatively untapped and there may be a way to encourage
23 more recreation in there to move pressure off of the Central Wasatch.

24
25 Mr. Becker stated that the Salt Lake City Watershed Plan is just getting started and Salt Lake City
26 Public Utilities will have a robust public involvement process. He noted that Salt Lake County is also
27 in the final stages of completing a Resource Management Plan. He supported establishing a trails
28 advisory subcommittee as part of the SHC.

29
30 Barbara Cameron commented that a lot was done with the three Ts and reported that the toilets should
31 go in with the trail. The hope was that there will be a Trails Committee with the fundamental concern
32 being the watershed and toilets. She also asked where the Environmental Dashboard fits in.
33 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen stated that there is a line item in 2018-2019 budget as well
34 as the 2019-2020 budget for the Environmental Dashboard. That line item was entered in July of last
35 year by the CWC Board. With approval of the most recent budget, the line item was increased to
36 address the needs of the labs at the University of Utah to bring the project to life and online by the
37 middle of next year.

38
39 Dan Knopp reported that the Silver Lake project opened their new facility on July 6.

40
41 Carl Fisher commented on the trails piece and stated that the forest plan does not allow for new
42 trailheads and new trails in part because there is no funding for stewardship of the existing trails.
43 Building more trails that are in disrepair without stewardship will only exacerbate the problem. The
44 intent of the legislation is to put a plan in place for both funding and stewardship and implement a
45 plan. He saw the trails discussion as part of the management plan for the legislation. He suggested
46 they think about where they want to concentrate people and have those types of amenities throughout
47 the Wasatch.

1 With regard to the funding piece, he stated that small things can add up with regard to funding for the
2 area. He pointed out that when an annual public lands pass is purchased from the Forest Service at
3 the Salt Lake Ranger Office, \$50 of the \$80 purchase price remains here rather than going to the
4 Treasury which is the case when a pass is purchased elsewhere. He suggested that constituents be
5 encouraged to purchase passes from the Salt Lake Ranger District.

6
7 **F. OPEN DISCUSSION 4:30-5:00**

8
9 **G. ADJOURNMENT**

10
11 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to adjourn. Don Despain seconded the motion. The motion
12 passed with the unanimous consent of the SHC.

13
14 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
15 5:02 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 Wednesday, July 17, 2019.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____