

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS**
2 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M.,**
3 **COMMUNITY ROOM, 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**
5

6 **Present:** Chair Greg Summerhays, Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Michael Maughan,
7 Megan Nelson, Kirk Nichols, Ned Hacker (WRFC), Brian Hutchinson, Paul
8 Diegel, Barbara Cameron, Jan Striefel, Ed Marshall, Will McCarvill,
9 Annalee Munsey, Michael Braun, Randy Doyle, Don Despain, Pat Shea,
10 Sarah Bennett, Steve Issowits, CWC Attorney Shane Topham, Executive
11 Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications
12 Director Lindsey Nielsen, Intern Carly Lansche
13

14 **On the Phone:** Troy Morgan, Carl Fisher, Mike Marker, Carolyn Wawra, Kurt Heggman
15

16 **Alternates:** Dave Fields (Brian Brown), Tom Diegel (Scott Reichard), Julia Geisler
17 (Nate Furman)
18

19 **Excused:** Bill Malone, Del Draper
20

21 **A. OPENING**
22

- 23 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
24 **Council (“SHC”).**
25

26 Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.
27

- 28 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
29 **Wednesday, August 21, 2019.**
30

31 **MOTION:** Michael Maughan moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, August 21, 2019.
32 Michael Braun seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
33 Council.
34

35 **B. CAPACITY COMMITTEE**
36

- 37 **i. Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Provide an Update on the Progress of the**
38 **Capacity Committee.**
39

40 Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker reported that a meeting was held a few weeks prior and another was
41 scheduled for the following Wednesday. She was asked to provide a proposal for a capacity
42 analysis to the group for discussion and review. The document was to be sent out by staff the
43 following day. Comments and feedback were welcomed. Dr. Bricker stated that the committee
44 will review the document with a final draft to be presented to the SHC for review. She indicated
45 that she made a capacity presentation to Alta the previous week.
46

1 **C. MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE COMMITTEE**

2
3 **i. Stakeholder Brian Hutchinson will Provide an Update on Progress of the**
4 **Millcreek Canyon Committee.**

5
6 Brian Hutchinson indicated that the Millcreek Canyon Committee will hold their meetings the
7 third Monday of each month at the Millcreek City Hall. They broke up into groups and began the
8 development of ideas on the use of group dynamics and toll booth fee structure design. Concern
9 was expressed over equal enforcement of dogs versus bikes.

10
11 It was reported that the road was restriped with no modifications. The clarification of canyon
12 issues was also addressed. Most were addressed in the 2012 study, but they are now magnified.
13 It was suggested that they update that data. The issues included such issues as transportation,
14 overparking, and how a shuttle could relate to trail carrying capacity, trailheads, and trails. It was
15 suggested that more recent models be cited. They ultimately switched their focus to the importance
16 of establishing a revamped goal. Currently, the shuttle, even the pilot, have been postponed to an
17 unspecified date. It was agreed that in response to the Forest Service’s call for infrastructure-
18 related development they asked the Forest Service to describe what they believe the useful purpose
19 of the group is. That could include the National Conservation Recreation Area (“NCRA”),
20 updating the Forest Plan, and data collection and analysis.

21
22 Mr. Hutchinson stated that is clear that they need to continue the shuttle pilot education effort,
23 which includes the information gathering data analysis, controls on visitor deliveries, and equitable
24 access. It was clear at the meeting that these issues had not been sufficiently addressed. The
25 County is helping the Forest Service address their concerns with infrastructure. Mr. Hutchinson
26 suggested the Forest Service describe their idea of what the useful purpose of the group is. It was
27 evident that they need to continue pilot shuttle education efforts, which includes information
28 gathering and data analysis, controls on visitor deliveries, etc. At their meeting, it did not appear
29 that the issues had been sufficiently addressed. The County is helping with the Forest Service with
30 respect to their concern for infrastructure, which would consist of restrooms and parking if needed.
31 The County is supporting that effort and working to obtain a grant with a January submittal date.
32 It could, however, take five years for the funds to be received. They would not want to do anything
33 that would invite increased traffic without managing it. Their next meeting was scheduled for
34 October 15 at 4:00 p.m. at Millcreek City Hall.

35
36 Ed Marshall elaborated on some of the comments made by Mr. Hutchinson and stated that Salt
37 Lake County Transportation Program Manager, Helen Peters, who attended the meeting along with
38 Ranger Bekee Hotze, made it clear that what they had heard was correct and that it would be four
39 or five years and possibly more before they would be ready to do a shuttle. The problem that
40 presents is that the purpose was to work on the Millcreek Shuttle. That begs the question of what
41 their purpose is. Mr. Marshall explained that the Forest Service manages 91% of the land in
42 Millcreek Canyon. They came to the conclusion that the next step should be to ask the Forest
43 Service what the group could do that they would find useful in determining how they are going to
44 manage the National Forest. John Knoblock offered to try to arrange a meeting with Ranger Hotze.

1 **D. CWC STAFF REPORT – 4:25-4:35**

2
3 **i. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide a Brief Overview of the**
4 **Work CWC Staff Accomplished or Made Progress with During August and**
5 **September.**
6

7 Executive Director Ralph Becker explained that the intent of tonight’s meeting is to gather input
8 on the most recent draft. He noted that a lot of comments have been received and two public
9 meetings have been held thus far. The transportation arena was also moving forward. Much of
10 the activity was taking place behind the scenes because UDOT and its consultants are performing
11 much of the analysis.
12

13 Staff had been working on short-term transportation solutions. The CWC has played a leading
14 role because there are numerous entities involved. There have been four meetings with UTA, the
15 General Managers of the ski resorts, UPD, and various cities who are represented, and they have
16 reviewed possible options with respect to what can be done immediately to reduce traffic
17 congestion. Mr. Becker reported that Solitude issued a bold Transportation Plan that includes
18 transportation for employees and a parking pay system to disincentivize single-occupant vehicle
19 use to reduce the number of vehicles going up and down the canyon.
20

21 Work on the environmental dashboard was ongoing with presentations having been made by the
22 University of Utah through Digit Lab. They were on schedule to complete much of the first phase
23 of the work by the end of the year.
24

25 Pat Shea asked how the environmental dashboard will be funded after the initial phase is
26 completed. Mr. Becker explained that so far, the CWC has been funding the project. The CWC
27 operates on a fiscal year and is funded through the middle of next year. There is a strong
28 commitment from the Board to keep that work going. The level of funding is always subject to
29 the annual budgeting process.
30

31 Mr. Shea suggested utilizing a toll booth as a revenue source. Mr. Becker explained that the funds
32 collected from the Millcreek Canyon toll booth go almost entirely to the Forest Service and are
33 used for facilities development and improvement. He explained that tolling is very much part of
34 UDOT’s work on the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“LCCEIS”)
35 and the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Action Plan (“CCTAP”). They are conducting an
36 in-depth study of various types of tolling options. It was recognized that that work is not likely to
37 produce a substantial revenue stream. It was noted that the studies are being done through UDOT’s
38 consultants HDR.
39

40 In response to a question raised, Mr. Becker reported that the previous Monday they had the
41 opportunity to take the Legislature on a tour of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. The group
42 included the Natural Resources Interim Committee and a new legislative body called the
43 Federalism Commission. A meeting of the Federalism Commission was scheduled for the
44 following day that the CWC will be participating in. It was to take place at the State Capitol at
45 1:15 p.m. in Room 445.
46

1 Pat Shea referenced Solitude’s website and asked if they have access to any of the data generated
2 with respect to parking. Mr. Becker explained that a link was being posted to their page. Solitude
3 has conducted its own analysis and would need to be contacted directly. Steve Issowits stated that
4 much of the data is aimed at making a change.

5
6 Brian Hutchinson commended Solitude for making such a bold move but was concerned about
7 whether the County, Stakeholders Council, or the State is willing to support it and the skiers who
8 will look for mass transit. Mr. Becker explained that a table is available on the website showing
9 the short-term transportation measures and when they might be implemented. He acknowledged
10 that it has been the topic of intensive discussion.

11
12 **E. OPEN DISCUSSION**

13
14 Michael Maughan reported that in response to a previous question raised, earlier in the week a
15 meeting was held with UTA to consider changing bus routes and putting busses more into service.
16 The schedules were reviewed but it was determined that funding was not available to make the
17 \$150,000 in changes. It was noted that the changes would only be from the base of the canyon to
18 resort site. Potential modifications were being considered that would reduce the cost.

19
20 Mr. Issowits remarked that from Solitude’s perspective, a great deal went into the decision. The
21 main objective was to reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicles. Vice-Chair Bricker asked
22 if the situation would be monitored this year to compare this year to previous seasons. Mr. Issowits
23 indicated that they will have more real data on it going forward.

24
25 Mr. Hutchinson asked if zip code data will be collected so that UTA can determine how they can
26 best provide service. Mr. Issowits indicated that he would address that issue with their IT
27 personnel. Mr. Maughan reported that currently, the ski resorts fund about 85% of UTA ridership
28 so that data will be available. Mr. Issowits agreed that with the data on bus ridership and from the
29 app, they will have a good idea of where riders are coming from.

30
31 Dave Fields offered to share information from Snowbird on the Rideshare app. He reported that
32 there were 5,400 downloads of the app with 7,400 total carpool, van, and bus rides. The total
33 carbon offset was approximately 22,000 pounds, which equates to 1,100 gallons of gasoline not
34 consumed and nearly 11,000 pounds of coal not burned. Mr. Fields considered that to be hopeful
35 data based on half of the season. He considered Solitude’s actions to be a step toward exacting
36 change.

37
38 Mr. Maughan remarked that the challenge is determining if there really was a change. Alta
39 implemented carpool parking last year. They filled those spaces but could not determine if they
40 actually changed behavior or simply provided preferred parking for people who were already
41 carpooling.

1 **F. WCRA COMMENT AND DISCUSSION FORUM**

2
3 Mr. Becker described the procedure for the small group discussions and explained that each group
4 will have a scribe and facilitator. Input was sought on the legislation. Four documents were made
5 available including the following:

- 6
7 1. A guide to the legislation.
8 2. A draft of the legislation dated 8/19/19.
9 3. A map showing the area and designations proposed in the legislation.
10 4. A currently land exchange map.

11
12 Mr. Becker acknowledged that many of those on the SHC are members of entities and
13 organizations and this exercise is not a substitute for their comments. Communications Director
14 Lindsey Nielsen reported that the comment period has been open for about one month. Tomorrow
15 would be the last day to submit comments. In addition to this afternoon's exercise, there were
16 other options for submitting comments such as through a comment form on the CWC website,
17 written comments can be postmarked to the CWC offices or emailed directly to the comments
18 email address or to staff directly.

19
20 Mr. Nielsen explained that any members of the public wishing to participate in the small discussion
21 groups were welcome to do so. Each table was assigned a moderator to facilitate the conversation
22 in addition to a scribe. Mr. Becker stated that following the discussion each group would report
23 on their discussion.

24
25 Michael Braun indicated that he submitted questions to the Board specific to the origin and nature
26 of the land exchanges. He asked if there were any answers to those question relative to the fact
27 that in the bill there are 19 pages dedicated to various issues and 10 pages specifically to private
28 entity land exchanges. That was of concern to him. Mr. Becker explained that several pages are
29 dedicated to land exchanges and the process is complicated. Many pages address issues such as
30 following the equal value exchange requirements and adhering to administrative and NEPA
31 processes. They are not exempted if and when Congress authorizes the exchanges. Much of it is
32 standard language that reflects what the public has communicated from early on in the Mountain
33 Accord process. They want to make sure that if there are land exchanges, there are opportunities
34 for public comment and that the process is transparent and open. Much of the process is
35 administrative in nature and is laid out in the legislation. In addition, each ski area has a land
36 exchange proposal authorization that varies from ski area to ski area. The most recent draft
37 included a great deal of consolidation.

38
39 Mr. Maughan explained that the ski areas began an administrative land exchange with the Forest
40 Service. As of two months ago, that process ended with one of the reasons being valuation
41 differences. Mr. Becker stated that some of the provisions in the draft were to address specific
42 issues. In some cases, it may not be worth pursuing an exchange because there would not be
43 enough base area to be obtained. The latest version of the bill was expanded to specify that the ski
44 areas may opt to acquire other private lands to include in the exchange.

1 It appeared to Mr. Braun that the ski resorts have a stranglehold on the NCRA because land
2 exchanges, specifically for the ski areas, are being outlined in federal legislation when in fact, it
3 can be done in another manner. The ski permit areas have already been removed from the NCRA
4 Act. The reality is that the majority of the Act is not land exchanges. Mr. Becker was not aware
5 of any major land exchange involving public lands in the last 20 years that did not include a
6 Congressional authorization. He explained that there is a Congressional stamp of approval
7 conceptually for a land exchange that makes an enormous difference in whether it gets done. He
8 pointed out that administrative exchanges are very rare.

9
10 The group broke into their small groups for one hour after which they reported on the main points
11 of their discussions.

12
13 Intern Carly Lansche reported that their group discussed the following:

- 14
- 15 • The lack of baseline data and potentially outlining a need to define capacity and visitor
- 16 experience within the legislation.
- 17 • Ensuring access to canyon residents.
- 18 • Specific permit holders on federal lands and making sure that they are accommodated and
- 19 not impacted by the bill.
- 20 • Map modifications impacting permit areas for ski resorts.
- 21 • Preparing for future impacts such as the Olympics.
- 22 • What should and should not be allowed in White Pine Canyon.
- 23 • Transportation corridor segments and what can be done to prevent transportation in
- 24 connection with the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).
- 25 • Land exchanges defining parcels possibly before it goes to the legislation so that the public
- 26 has the opportunity to vet and view them.
- 27 • Wording confusion changes were addressed specifically.
- 28 • Land exchange issues.
- 29

30 Deputy Director Blake Perez reported that their group discussed the following:

- 31
- 32 • Bonneville Shoreline Trail wilderness retractions and wanting a reason articulated for
- 33 wilderness boundary retractions within the bill as well as reference or reasoning for the
- 34 retractions.
- 35 • Adding Brighton town limits to the map. It was noted that Brighton will become a town
- 36 on January 1, 2020. The desire was for the maps to reflect that.
- 37 • A comment was made that this seemed like this was a good trade-off between environment
- 38 and ski resorts.
- 39 • The bill seemed to be helping them prepare to meet the demand. Funding was critical and
- 40 there should be an assurance that the funding is in the bill.
- 41 • Removing the boundaries was perceived as a positive change to the map.
- 42 • It is important to pursue land exchanges and benefits the environment and businesses.
- 43 • In terms of the climbing community, there should be the inclusion of fixed anchor
- 44 replacement.
- 45 • Specific uses in the canyons need to be more clearly articulated.

- 1 • It is important to identify winter and summer-based recreation in order to pursue funding.
- 2 • Protections need to be in place for Salt Lake County for Millcreek Canyon Road.
- 3 • Language should be reinserted from the October draft pertaining to private property.
- 4 • Facilitation of the protected right-of-way.
- 5 • Implementation of a 100-foot right-of-way throughout the Cottonwood corridor.
- 6 • To Section 4, Line 341, the boundary modifications should be identified for shared use
- 7 recreation access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

8
9 Ned Hackett reported that their group discussed the following:

- 10
- 11 • Water quality protection.
- 12 • Satisfaction with wilderness areas should include protection of the Town of Alta and
- 13 Grizzly Gulch.
- 14 • Determine whether the legislation addresses ski area interconnects.
- 15 • Transparency of the map for the public to view. Improvements to the map were suggested.
- 16 • A question was raised as to when the bill was to go before the DOT and EIS for the canyons.
- 17 • The bill addresses specific transportation options and there was some question as to
- 18 whether it should include all of the options. It was clarified that the bill does not exclude
- 19 any particular type of transportation option.
- 20 • There was concern that more emergency exit access is needed for the canyons.
- 21 • Brighton should be included on the map.
- 22 • Define the word “base” within the language.
- 23 • Adequate parking at facilities.
- 24 • The need to identify more funding.
- 25

26 Dr. Kelly Bricker reported that their group discussed the following:

- 27
- 28 • Some of the language does not include other corridors. Assurance was desired to make
- 29 sure that Millcreek and I-80 are identified.
- 30 • Helicopters and private versus commercial use. Language should be added to address the
- 31 private side, which seems to be increasing.
- 32 • Vague terminology was identified such as “mountain transportation” and should be better
- 33 clarified. The concept of visitors and residents should also be expanded upon.
- 34 • More detail should be added to land exchanges to ensure that ownership is identified.
- 35 • More language should be added with respect to the interlink/ski link concept.
- 36 • Support was expressed for the idea of a capacity study.
- 37 • Use language similar to that in Visitor Use Management.
- 38 • Concern was expressed about enforcement between private and public lands and how that
- 39 might be addressed.
- 40 • There was opposition about whether Utah is getting control of federal lands and it is now
- 41 being taken away.
- 42 • The issue of local plans and what is included.
- 43 • It was suggested that the construction of parking areas be prohibited in the canyons.
- 44

45 Ms. Nielsen thanked the groups for their feedback and invited written additional comments.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

G. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Chair Summerhays moved to adjourn. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately 5:01 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, September 18, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____