

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, JUNE 21, 2021, AT 3:30 P.M. VIA ZOOM**

**Present:**  Chair Chris Robinson, Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Mayor Jenny Wilson, Mayor Mike Peterson

**Staff:** CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson

**Others:** Casey Hill, Laura Briefer, Barbara Cameron, Will McCarvill, Catherine Kanter, Polly Hart, Deborah Case, catuscarlito, Carl Fisher, Mike Marker, Chris McCandless, “reconnecting”, Cyndy Sharkey, Alex Schmidt, “B”

1. **Open Central Wasatch Commission Executive Committee Meeting**
2. **Chair Christopher F. Robinson will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Board of the Central Wasatch Commission.**

Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order via Zoom at approximately 3:30 p.m.

The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Committee to make a determination, which was as follows:

‘Notice is hereby given that the Central Wasatch Commission will hold a meeting at approximately 3:30 p.m., or soon thereafter, on Monday, June 21, 2021. In view of the current COVID-19 pandemic, this committee meeting will occur electronically, without a physical anchor location, as authorized by Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207(4). The public may remotely hear the open portions of the meeting through live broadcast at the following link.’

1. **Stakeholder Council**
2. **Barbara Cameron and Will McCarvill, New Co-Chairs of the Stakeholders Council will Join the Committee at the Request of the Chair.**

Chair Robinson welcomed the new Co-Chairs of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council, Barbara Cameron and Will McCarvill. He reported that they were appointed at the last CWC Board Meeting after polling the Stakeholders Council Members.

Mr. McCarvill thanked the Executive Committee Members and CWC Staff for their hard work and commitment. He also thanked the CWC Board for appointing him as Chair of the Stakeholders Council and for providing him the opportunity to serve the CWC, various communities, the public, and the mountains. Mr. McCarvill explained that his intention was to keep the Stakeholders Council operating at the highest level. He planned to talk to all the Stakeholders Council Members individually about how to improve the way everyone worked together. He expected that the Vice-Chair, Ms. Cameron, would be a full partner and help to achieve those goals.

Ms. Cameron commented that it was an honor to be able to serve the Stakeholders Council. She wanted to make sure that each Stakeholders Council Member had a fair voice and vote. Ms. Cameron expressed her excitement about the new members that would be joining the Council in the future. Her aim was to work on trail, restroom, and transportation improvements. For instance, there could be less on-road parking and there could potentially be a bicycle lane up the canyons.

Ms. Cameron wondered if there was anything the Executive Committee would specifically like from the Stakeholders Council at the next meeting. Chair Robinson asked the Executive Committee Members to think about that question as the meeting continued. He noted that the Stakeholders Council met on a quarterly basis and wondered whether that was the appropriate frequency. That was something that Ms. Cameron and Mr. McCarvill could consider further.

1. **Member Appointments from Recommendation of Selection Committee and Reappointments.**

CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez, reported that there were seven Stakeholders Council Member openings. There had been a call for applications and that had remained open for one month. Approximately 26 different applications were received, and a Selection Committee was put together to review the applications. The Selection Committee included the following:

* Councilor Max Doilney.
* Mayor Mike Peterson.
* Dr. Kelly Bricker (previous Stakeholders Council Chair); and
* Jan Striefel (previous Stakeholders Council Vice-Chair).

The Stakeholders Council Member applications and resumes were reviewed at a Selection Committee meeting earlier in the month. Mr. Perez shared the Stakeholders Council Appointments and Reappointments Memo with the Executive Committee.

Mayor Peterson explained that he had been involved with the original selection of the Stakeholders Council. He applauded their efforts. He also applauded Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron for accepting leadership positions within the Stakeholders Council. Mayor Peterson discussed the Selection Committee process. The Selection Committee Members had the resumes of each applicant as well as a scoring sheet. Diversity of knowledge, overall experience, and the needs of the Stakeholders Council were all considered. He noted that there were also certain vacancies that needed to be filled. For instance, vacancies related to gender equity and transportation representation. The result was seven recommendations for appointment and three alternates.

Chair Robinson noted that the memo also included a list of thirteen potential Stakeholders Council reappointments. Ms. Cameron commented that she had worked with all those members and felt they were outstanding contributors. She felt comfortable with their reappointment. Ms. Cameron had not worked with the potential new members but believed they had a lot of experience to bring to the Stakeholders Council.

Mr. Perez outlined the process moving forward. If the Executive Committee felt comfortable with the recommendations, CWC Staff would follow up with each of the potential appointments and reappointments to confirm their interest. Alternates would be added if there were any vacancies. The final list would be ready for the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting for formal approval. Chair Robinson commented that he would be in favor of the recommendations. Discussions were had about appropriate language for the motion.

**MOTION:** Mayor Peterson moved to accept the Selection Committee recommendation for the seven new CWC Stakeholders Council appointments, thirteen reappointments, and three alternates, as listed in the memo. The recommendation would be forwarded to the full CWC Board at the next CWC Board Meeting, scheduled for July 12, 2021. Mayor Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

1. **Mountain Transportation System Pillars Document Timeline.**
2. **Process Timeline; See Staff Memo.**

Chair Robinson reported that the next item related to the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker noted that when the CWC Board adopted the Pillars Document, there had been discussions about how to best move forward and distribute the document before the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) released their Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). It is scheduled to be released on June 25, 2021. CWC Staff had put together a list of suggested steps ahead of the expected release date:

* Send signed Pillars Document to UDOT (June 14, 2021).
* Send signed Pillars Document to Stakeholders Council (June 15, 2021).
* Share a Press Release with the Media (June 21, 2021).
* Participate in Meetings with State Leadership: Governor, State Legislative Leadership (week of June 21, 2021).
* Send Pillars Document to Congressional Delegation and Participate in Phone Calls/Meetings with Congressional Representatives (week of June 21, 2021); and
* Visit with Editorial Boards (week of June 21, 2021, or June 28, 2021).

Mr. Becker also shared some possible next steps with the Executive Committee:

* Staff and Jurisdictional Review of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS (estimated date of June 25, 2021).
* Stakeholders Council Discussion and Input to CWC on UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS (July 21, 2021, Stakeholders Council Meeting).
* CWC Transportation Committee Consideration of Comments on UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS (meeting date to be determined).
* CWC Board Consideration of Comments on UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS (June 25, 2021, to July 12, 2021, and August 2, 2021).
* Action Item on CWC Comments (July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting).
* Meetings with Pertinent Parties on CWC Comments related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS (dates to be determined); and
* Deadline for Public Comment related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS (August 9, 2021).

Mayor Jenny Wilson complimented CWC Staff on the suggestions and timeline. However, she noted that it may be difficult to meet with State Leadership, Congressional Delegation, and the media ahead of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS release date. She wondered whether it might be better to wait. If waiting was not preferred, Mayor Wilson had some concerns related to availability. She wondered how it would be possible to coordinate Executive Committee Members, so they were able to participate in those meetings and conversations. Chair Robinson noted that lobbyist, Casey Hill was present at the Executive Committee Meeting. He could share opinions about how to best approach State Leadership and the Congressional Delegation.

Mr. Hill felt it was important to consider what the CWC wanted to accomplish. For instance, if Executive Committee Members and CWC Staff felt that CWC input would critically shape how State Leadership and the Congressional Delegation saw the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS, it would be meaningful to meet with them prior to the release date. Otherwise, it may be best to wait and meet with them shortly after the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

Chair Robinson noted that the Stakeholders Council met quarterly. He was not comfortable with the next Stakeholders Council Meeting taking place on July 21, 2021. The deadline to share public comments on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was August 9, 2021, and the CWC Board would want input from the Stakeholders Council ahead of any public comment. He wondered whether the Stakeholders Council should convene before the July 12, 2021, Board Meeting to review the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

Mayor Wilson suggested that a meeting two or three weeks out with State Leadership and Congressional Delegation could be coordinated through Mr. Hill. Members of the Executive Committee could be invited and those that could make it would attend. She felt the Pillars Document would still be relevant at that time and noted that the discussions may be more robust due to the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. Chair Robinson wondered whether it would be best to try to set up those meetings ahead of the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting. Mr. Hill noted that there could be scheduling difficulties, especially with the Governor. However, he had reached out after seeing the Pillars Document and started working with the Speaker’s Staff. He was confident that the CWC could get a 10-to-15-minute meeting that week if desired. Alternatively, they could wait two to three weeks for a meeting.

Chair Robinson noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS would be released in four days. He felt the meeting would be more productive once they knew what was included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS relative to the Pillars Document. He was in favor of doing the press release to the media now and then convening another meeting of the Executive Committee. If possible, there could be a Stakeholders Council Meeting prior to the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting to review the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. Chair Robinson commented that he would like everyone to have a good working knowledge of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS by the next CWC Board Meeting. He would also like to have feedback from the Stakeholders Council at that time.

Mr. Perez shared a timeline with future dates for consideration. The dates were as follows:

* July 12, 2021: CWC Board Meeting. Would include an overview of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. CWC Staff would present what had been read to date and compare it to the MTS Pillars Document.
* July 21, 2021: CWC Transportation Committee Meeting and Stakeholders Council Meeting to exclusively discuss the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS; and
* August 2, 2021: CWC Board would finalize comments related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS ahead of the August 9, 2021, deadline for public comment.

Mr. Becker explained that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS would be several hundred pages in length. CWC Staff wanted to spend a lot of time reviewing it to ensure that they provided accurate and complete summaries to Commissioners and Committee Members. Laura Briefer left a comment in the Zoom chatbox. She suggested that it may be appropriate to invite UDOT to present the Draft EIS at the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting. Chair Robinson agreed. Mayor Peterson noted that Cottonwood Heights had already scheduled something similar with UDOT. It would make sense for the CWC to do the same. He felt it was important to see the results of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS to finalize the next steps. Additionally, it was important that the full CWC Board weigh in on how to proceed. Chair Robinson outlined a potential schedule:

* Invite UDOT to the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting.
* Wait to schedule meetings with State Leadership and Congressional Delegation until after the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting.
* Stakeholders Council Meeting on July 21, 2021; and
* Possible Executive Committee Meeting between July 21, 2021, and August 2, 2021.

Chair Robinson asked if there was a draft press release to overview. Mr. Becker explained that Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen had been working on the press release. CWC Staff could circulate it for review. Chair Robinson asked about the meetings with Congressional Delegation and visits with the Editorial Boards. Mr. Hill noted that he had not done anything with Congressional Delegation yet, but it would fall to his responsibility to schedule those meetings. Mr. Becker suggested scheduling a meeting for the week of August 2, 2021. That would allow there to be both the Pillars Document and CWC comments on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

Mayor Wilson agreed with the recommendation made by Mr. Becker. She noted that the CWC had spent a lot of time studying the different transportation alternatives, had worked through tough issues, and were united on several points. Being able to share the Pillars Document as well as some analysis on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS would be beneficial. Mayor Wilson did not want to wait too long but liked the idea of early August meetings.

Chair Robinson discussed the idea of meeting with the Congressional Delegation. He did not know how much they would care about the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS or the Pillars Document. The key component had to do with the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”). Chair Robinson felt the CWC should meet with the Congressional Delegation when they were ready to talk about the CWNCRA. They could share the Pillars Document and discuss what it said about the legislation. In addition, they could discuss what the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS said and share comments related to that. Mayor Wilson felt it would be best to have more general conversations as a next step. Chair Robinson commented that they could touch base and share updates with the Congressional Delegation.

The suggested steps were summarized. Chair Robinson noted that the first two items had already been completed. The press release would be released that week. Items related to meetings with State Leadership and Congressional Delegation, as well as visits with Editorial Boards, would be postponed until after the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting or after the August 2, 2021, CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Peterson felt that the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS would provide additional clarity about the next steps to take.

1. **CWNCRA Discussion.**
2. **Committee will Discuss Next Steps for the Federal Legislation.**

Mr. Becker explained that a draft of the CWNCRA had been released last October and received public comment. Those comments had been summarized and were available on the October 27, 2020, Draft of the Bill. Those comments were then further condensed by topic. There had been discussions between Chair Robinson, Mayor Wilson, and Mr. Becker about how to best proceed given the public comments. For instance, should the comments be brought back to the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee for review or should the comments be brought to the CWC Board.

Catherine Kanter and Mr. Becker had spent several hours reviewing the comments on the last draft and looking at potential changes to consider. There was still a bit more work to do on that. Mr. Becker noted that the comments received from the public all contained issues that had been considered in past drafts. It was a matter of whether the CWC Board wanted to make an adjustment to the Bill based on the most recent round of comments. Additionally, other areas had been identified that could be added to the Bill. Those potential additions were based on the events that had taken place over the last year and a half. Mr. Becker noted that it could be brought to the CWC Board or the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee, based on Executive Committee direction.

Ms. Kanter felt there might be some benefit to taking the comments to the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee. She believed the Committee would be able to condense information down further and reduce the amount of time the CWC Board would need to spend on the discussion. Ms. Kanter also noted that the next month or so would be dedicated to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. As a result, there would likely be time for the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee to review the CWNCRA comments. Chair Robinson agreed. He wanted to see the Committee review the CWNCRA once more. It was important not to crowd the July 12, 2021, CWC Board Meeting.

Chair Robinson wondered whether the Stakeholders Council should weigh in on the Draft Bill as well. Mr. Becker explained that the Stakeholders had reviewed it at a previous Stakeholders Council Meeting. Mayor Wilson was okay with the idea of having the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee review the CWNCRA one more time. However, she stressed the importance of having direct engagement with Congressional Delegation. Chair Robinson noted that the full CWC Board could focus on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS for the time being. There could be one more review by the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee before the discussion was continued at either an Executive Committee or CWC Board level.

1. **Future Format of CWC Board, Committee Meetings.**
2. **Discussion and Timeline on Future Formats (Virtual, In-Person, Hybrid) of CWC Board and Committee Meetings.**

Discussions were had about the future format for meetings. Executive Committee Members determined that the meetings would remain virtual until the November 2021 CWC Board Retreat. There would be discussions at the CWC Board Retreat to discuss next steps and the future meeting format. Chair Robinson noted that the virtual meetings eliminated commutes and allowed members to come and go as needed. He felt that had been helpful as it related to meeting participation.

1. **Visitor Use Study.**
2. **Hybrid and Funding Strategies; Minutes of 6/14/21 Meeting.**

Mr. Becker reported that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee had spent time discussing Phase II of the Visitor Use Study. Another meeting was scheduled for June 23, 2021. Mr. Perez explained that at the June 7, 2021, CWC Board Meeting, there had been interest in a hybrid proposal for Phase II of the Visitor Use Study. CWC Staff had spoken to the Utah State University team, and they were open to that idea. The Budget/Finance/Audit Committee and Visitor Use Study Work Group had gotten together to discuss the hybrid model and funding strategies on June 14, 2021. Those Meeting Minutes had been sent out to the Executive Committee for review. During that meeting, there were some unanswered questions and a follow-up meeting with Dr. Jordan Smith from Utah State University had been scheduled. Dr. Smith would answer any outstanding questions related to the methodology. Mr. Perez believed there would be more direction and a recommendation following that meeting.

1. **CWC Board Retreat.**
2. **Discussion About a Potential November CWC Board Meeting.**

Mr. Becker explained that the CWC held a CWC Board Retreat each year. Last year, the CWC Board Retreat was held virtually due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The retreat was normally held in either November or December. This was done to accommodate any new members on the Commission following elections. Mr. Becker posed several questions to the Executive Committee:

* Should the CWC Board Retreat be held in person this year?
* If so, should we reserve a place to hold the retreat?

The CWC Board Retreat would include discussions related to MTS decisions, how to move forward with Congressional Legislation, and discussions about the CWC. Mr. Becker explained that planning would need to begin shortly if the CWC Board Retreat would be held in person. Chair Robinson asked about the elections. He wondered who was running again. Mr. Becker reported that the following members were running:

* Mayor Mike Peterson.
* Councilor Marci Houseman; and
* Mayor Harris Sondak.

Mayor Wilson liked the idea of the CWC Board Retreat taking place in November. She preferred an in-person retreat but wanted to see it consolidated to one day rather than two. Mayor Peterson agreed that the CWC Board Retreat should be in-person. He felt that the in-person meeting would be critical. It was important to allow enough time to articulate expectations, goals, and how to best move forward. Chair Robinson agreed. He did not think the CWC Board Retreat needed to be split into two days. For instance, there could be a working lunch and the retreat could end in the early evening.

Mr. Becker commented that CWC Staff could begin looking at potential dates for the CWC Board Retreat. He wondered whether it would be worthwhile to look at a place like The Homestead Resort so members could break away from their offices and regular routines. Chair Robinson felt that would be fine but noted that there may be other meeting spaces to consider as well. Mayor Wilson offered assistance in identifying a location in Salt Lake County. Discussions were had about potential meeting rooms. Chair Robinson noted that The Homestead Resort was nice when they were staying overnight for a two-night retreat. It may not be necessary if the retreat was just one day. He suggested that they use the Cottonwood Heights facility and have food brought in.

CWC Staff would look into the logistics. Mr. Becker noted that there was one date in November that would be a conflict. Salt Lake City was hosting the National League of Cities City Summit from November 17, 2021, to November 20, 2021. The CWC Board Retreat would have to avoid that weekend, but they could look at other dates in November. Mayor Wilson noted that she had a trip planned for November 11, 2021. Mr. Becker offered to look into potential dates.

1. **Committee Comments.**

Chair Robinson referenced an earlier question from Ms. Cameron. She wondered whether there was anything the Executive Committee would specifically like to see from the Stakeholders Council at the next meeting. Mr. Perez commented that the priority would be to receive comments and feedback on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. That would also be the first meeting with the new leadership positions in place. As a result, some time would be spent engaging with Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron. Each quarterly meeting of the Stakeholders Council also included time for each subcommittee to share updates and information.

Mr. Perez noted that at the CWC Board Retreat in 2019, there had been discussions about the direction of the Stakeholders Council. Those types of discussions could be incorporated into the CWC Board Retreat for 2021 as well. Chair Robinson asked if Stakeholders Council Members would be invited to the retreat. Mr. Perez noted that the Co-Chairs and Chairs of the subcommittees would be invited.

Chair Robinson wondered whether Mr. McCarvill or Ms. Cameron had any thoughts to share about the meeting frequency of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. McCarvill felt that it was hard to keep momentum when meetings took place quarterly. However, he wanted to speak to new and current members of the Stakeholders Council to see what they thought about the meeting frequency. Ms. Cameron noted that the subcommittees were very productive and did not lose momentum. She liked the combination of quarterly Stakeholders Council meetings with more intense subcommittee work.

Discussions were had about future Executive Committee Meetings. Chair Robinson felt there should be another meeting in between the July 12, 2021, and August 2, 2021, CWC Board Meetings. He suggested holding another meeting after the Stakeholders Council met on July 21, 2021. Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron would be able to share interview findings at that time. Mr. Perez reported that there was an Executive Committee Meeting scheduled for July 19, 2021. He wondered whether that meeting date should be pushed back. Chair Robinson confirmed this and shared some potential times and dates to meet. CWC Staff would coordinate with the Executive Committee Members to finalize the rescheduled Executive Committee Meeting date.

1. **Adjournment.**

The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:57 p.m.
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