**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2021, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**

**Present:**  William McCarvill, Chair

Barbara Cameron, Vice Chair

Nate Furman

Kurt Hegmann

Brian Hutchinson

John Knoblock

Carolyn Keigley

Don Despain

Hilary Lambert

Carl Fisher

Erin Bragg

Alex Porpora

Mike Christensen

Kelly Boardman

Maura Hahnenberger

Roger Borgenicht

Dennis Goreham

Paul Diegel

Patrick Shea

Dave Fields

Michael Braun

Del Draper

Sarah Bennett

Megan Nelson

Christopher Robinson

Steven Issowits

Ed Marshall

Patrick Nelson

**Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director

Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director

Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director

Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator

**OPENING**

1. **William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. **William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic Meeting as Per Legislative Requirements.**

Chair McCarvill read the following statement:

‘Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207‑4, I as the Chair of the Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined that conducting Stakeholder Council Meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Although the overall incidents of COVID-19 cases have diminished somewhat over the last couple of months, the pandemic remains and the recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another surge in cases, which could then threaten to overwhelm Utah’s health care system.’

1. **The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholder Council DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, April 21, 2021.**

**MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Minutes from Wednesday, April 21, 2021. Del Draper seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1. **The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, April 28, 2021.**

Vice Chair Barbara Cameron noted that page 7 of the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes from Wednesday, April 28, 2021, referenced a substitute motion from Patrick Shea. A voice vote was taken and the results were 12 aye, 11 nay, and 6 abstentions. Vice-Chair Cameron noted that the minutes stated that the motion passed 12-to-11. She believed the minutes should read that the motion failed because there was not a majority of yes votes. There were 29 Stakeholders Council Members present at the meeting. The Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures document, on Page 5, Section 6, Article E (2) states:

* Any agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council for approval or recommendation to the CWC Board for approval.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Cameron moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes from Wednesday, April 28, 2021, with an amendment to state that the substitute motion did not pass as there was not a majority of affirmative votes. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion.

Chair McCarvill asked for discussion on the motion. Mr. Shea noted that a resolution is a statement of principle and not a course of action. He felt it was important to represent that the majority of Stakeholders Council Members that were present and voted wanted to support the resolution. Vice-Chair Cameron noted that because there were six abstentions, there was not a majority vote in favor of the resolution. Chair McCarvill believed the minutes reflected the intention of the Stakeholders Council. The 12-11-6 vote was an indication of where the Stakeholders Council stood. Brian Hutchinson believed the issue warranted more investigation into Robert’s Rules of Order. His interpretation was that the majority voted ‘aye’ on the motion.

Vice-Chair Cameron noted that what constitutes a majority was identified in the Rules and Procedures document. If the Stakeholders Council wants to change what constituted a majority, that could be done in the future. She explained that a majority vote is over half of all present Stakeholders Council Members and the vote did not meet that requirement. Mr. Hutchinson commented that that is one interpretation of the language in the Rules and Procedures.

Chair McCarvill noted that there was some uncertainty about whether Vice-Chair Cameron had read the Rules and Procedures accurately. He asked CWC Staff for input. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker, felt that the language was fairly straightforward. If Stakeholders Council Members want different language in the Rules and Procedures document, they have the right to recommend that to the CWC Board. CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen, shared the Rules and Procedures section that related to voting.

Chair McCarvill noted that there had been a motion, a second, and discussion. He called for a vote on the item. Annalee Munsey and Brian Hutchinson asked to abstain from the vote. Michael Braun asked for further discussion. He noted that the Rules and Procedures Document states that any agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council. 12 is greater than 11 and is greater than 6. Vice Chair Cameron reported that there were 29 Stakeholders Council Members present at the meeting. As a result, a majority of the vote would be 15. Mr. Braun commented that the issue was moot as the process had moved forward already. Chair McCarvill tabled all further discussion and brought the item back for a vote.

**MOTION:** Vice-Chair Cameron moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes from Wednesday, April 28, 2021, with an amendment to state that the substitute motion did not pass as there was not a majority of affirmative votes. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. Brian Hutchinson and Carl Fisher voted Nay. Annalee Munsey abstained from the vote. The remaining 27 Stakeholders Council Members voted Aye. The motion passed.

**STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEMBER WELCOME**

1. **New Members of the Stakeholders Council will Briefly Introduce Themselves.**

Chair McCarvill reported that there are several new members of the Stakeholders Council. He asked that each member introduce themselves.

Erin Bragg reported that she resides in Oakley, Utah, and is currently taking part in a seasonal position in Anchorage, Alaska related to long-term ecological monitoring. She attended Graduate School at the University of Utah and received an Environmental Humanities degree. Additionally, Ms. Bragg was in the process of obtaining a Graduate Certificate from Utah State University in the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).

Alex Porpora serves as the Executive Director of the Utah Society for Environmental Education who works with education providers as well as local, City, and State agencies to help forward the field of education through best practices, training, an annual conference,awards, and advocacy on behalf of the field of environmental education. Ms. Porpora resides in Salt Lake City and was delighted to join the Stakeholders Council.

Mike Christensen resides in Salt Lake City in the Rose Park neighborhood. He is a recent graduate of the University of Utah City and Metropolitan Planning Master’s Program. Additionally, he has a Graduate Certificate in Sustainability from the University of Utah. Mr. Christensen reported that he serves as the Executive Director of the Utah Rail Passengers Association and looked forward to sharing input on some of the different ways public transit could be improved within the Wasatch Canyons.

Kelly Boardman has a degree in Urban Planning from the University of California San Diego and a Masters’ Degree in Geography from the University of Utah. She had worked previously as an Environmental Planner and done watershed management plans in the State of Utah. Ms. Boardman was currently working in the ski industry. She serves as the Head Coach for the Freeride Team at Solitude and worked there full-time. Ms. Boardman noted that she resides in the Top of the World neighborhood and has lived in Cottonwood Heights for 24 years.

Maura Hahnenberger commented that she has lived in Salt Lake County for 20 years and currently lives in the Sandy Hills area. She had a Ph.D. in Atmospheric Science from the University of Utah and was currently an Associate Professor in the Geosciences Department at Salt Lake Community College. Ms. Hahnenberger had a strong interest in education related to climate change, air quality, and water within Utah. She is a skier, hiker, and climber and loves the canyons.

Roger Borgenicht resides in Salt Lake City in the Lower Avenues and was Co-Chair of Utahns for Better Transportation, which was instrumental in getting the Legacy Parkway as a parkway and continuous bicycle trail. He has been very involved in transit and active transportation activities. Mr. Borgenicht was very excited to be part of the Stakeholders Council.

Dennis Goreham reported that he is the Conservation Director for the Wasatch Mountain Club. He is a Geographer and ran the State of Utah’s GIS program for 20 years. He retired approximately 10 years ago. Mr. Goreham moved to Utah in 1978 and has been hiking, climbing, bicycling, and skiing in the Wasatch ever since.

Hilary Lambert was the incoming CEO of the Wasatch Mountain Institute, an educational non-profit focused on the intersection of recreation and field science education. The aim was to get students from the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back to experience immersive overnight outdoor education and recreation experiences in the Wasatch as well as develop an understanding of where their water comes from. It also provides students with tools to recreate responsibly and be interested in the future of the Wasatch Mountains. Ms. Lambert has a Masters’ Degree in Curriculum and Instruction and experience in education. Additionally, she is an avid skier, hiker, and climber in the canyons.

Chair McCarvill noted that he and Vice Chair Cameron would be calling all new Stakeholders Council Members to personally welcome them to the Stakeholders Council. Calls would also be made to existing Stakeholders Council Members to determine how they feel the Advisory Council is working. Some of those calls had already been made. Chair McCarvill noted that there had been interesting and informative conversations with those he had spoken to thus far.

**LCC DEIS DISCUSSION**

1. **Stakeholders will Make General Comments on the DEIS.**
2. **Comments will be Limited to Two Minutes Each.**

Chair McCarvill noted that discussions will take place related to the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) and how it matches with the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document. Each member was allotted approximately two minutes. If that was not an adequate amount of time for discussion, he was prepared to set up a separate Stakeholders Council Meeting related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS so everyone could be heard.

John Knoblock believed that the road widening for a bus lane would have a larger watershed impact than the gondola. The gondola seemed less likely to cause potential impacts to the watershed, which was listed as a priority in the MTS Pillars Document. Mr. Knoblock mentioned the last pillar, related to forwarding the legislation, and noted that he did not know that UDOT could do anything about that. He referenced the tolling stations and stated that if single-occupant vehicles were removed from the road, many other issues may resolve themselves. In terms of visitor capacity, a gondola system could stop loading cars and with the enhanced bus alternative, the variable tolling cost could be increased significantly to reduce the number of vehicles.

Del Draper reported that he drives up and down Little Cotton Canyon regularly. In his experience, that road works 99% of the time and there are only 15 to 30 days per year that it does not work. He noted that the real issue is traffic on Wasatch Boulevard rather than in the canyon itself. Mr. Draper wondered if there was room in the process for incremental changes to be made. For instance, start with tolling to see how much that reduced vehicles on the road. He did not believe a dedicated bus lane in the canyon would be needed but rather the issues on Wasatch Boulevard should be addressed first. It would make sense to work on more incremental solutions rather than to focus on a $600 million solution. Additionally, Mr. Draper believed UDOT had created a false equivalency between the gondola and the enhanced bus alternative because so much environmental damage would take place from the road widening. The same was true with dollars. Both of the alternatives would cost approximately the same amount. However, the bus alternative would not cost as much if the road was not widened.

Mr. Shea reported that he sent a request to Ms. Nielsen and CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez at the beginning of the meeting. The request was to discuss a possible resolution. He commented that with controversial subjects, a procedure often begins to delay the process rather than getting to the heart of the issue. Mr. Shea explained that the resolution questioned the need to spend $186 million on road widening, $86 million on snowsheds, and $99 million for two transit hubs. He felt that if there was some kind of money available at the City or State level, it could be used to maintain some kind of trust fund for Little Cottonwood Canyon or Big Cottonwood Canyon instead. Mr. Shea did not agree with the spending high amounts of money to benefit two ski resorts, some State Legislators, and other public officials who would profit from the gondola.

Mr. Perez noted that the email from Mr. Shea had been received at the start of the meeting. It would be up to Chair McCarvill and Vice-Chair Cameron whether they would like to present that resolution. Chair McCarvill suggested that the meeting continue as planned. If there was additional time at the end of the meeting, the resolution could be looked at by the Stakeholders Council. Chair McCarvill noted that whatever was presented would not be actionable at the current meeting and could not be voted upon as it was not on the official Stakeholders Council agenda.

Ms. Lambert commented that there is not much difference between the UDOT enhanced bus service alternative and the enhanced bus service in peak period with the shoulder lane alternative. The mobility goals were the same, both had snowsheds, both increased reliability, and both decreased the travel time from the no-action alternative. Ms. Lambert pointed out that the transportation time was shorter for the enhanced bus alternative that had not been selected as a preferred alternative by UDOT than it was for the gondola alternative. She felt it would be beneficial to recommend that UDOT reconsider that alternative. Ms. Lambert agreed with other Stakeholders Council Members that incremental changes, such as tolling and snowsheds, could be the best way to proceed. Once a gondola is built or a road widened, it cannot be undone.

Carl Fisher appreciated Ms. Lambert’s comment related to the enhanced bus alternative that did not include road widening. He reported that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS discussed the benefits of the avalanche sheds, which only amounted to approximately 6 to 11 days. It was important to note that the avalanche sheds were included with both the enhanced bus alternative as well as the gondola alternative. Mr. Fisher believed it was important to remember that there were certain controlling mechanisms that helped to protect the watershed. For instance, there was a level of control on the road. If another mode of transportation was introduced, it would be much more difficult to protect the watershed. He agreed with other comments that the existing infrastructure in the canyons had not been used to the highest degree possible. Mr. Fisher felt that a phased or incremental approach would be better.

Ms. Hahnenberger expressed concerns that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS had a very narrow focus. Some of the transportation alternatives would shift the traffic issues and visitor use issues to Big Cottonwood Canyon instead. It was important to consider both Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon as well as how the chosen transportation alternative would impact the nearby communities and existing transportation systems.

Ms. Porpora referenced the idea of year-round transit service in the MTS Pillars Document. The way that busing was currently laid out, it was intended to prioritize the winter days. However, she felt it was important to take a step back and consider accessibility. Ms. Porpora commented that she was in favor of an incremental and phased approach. She also noted that it was important to look into how to incentivize people to use an alternate mode of transportation.

Mr. Braun stated that the effectiveness of any transit solution in the canyons would be dependent upon whether or not there was high-capacity, high-frequency transit from elsewhere in the valley to the canyons. That was missing from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

1. **Nate Furman, Member of the Stakeholders Council will Provide Information Pertaining to DEIS Proposed Alternative Impacts on Climbing Areas in the Central Wasatch.**

Nate Furman reported that he is a Stakeholders Council Member and also serves on the Board of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance. Some of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance personnel took time to determine where the potential roadway widening and gondola would affect climbing resources. The gondola would affect 35 boulders and 142 problems. The enhanced bus with road widening would affect 29 boulders and 131 problems. Mr. Furman shared maps to illustrate how each alternative would impact the climbing resources in the canyon.

It was noted that the gondola would not cause the destruction of climbing resources. However, it would dramatically impact the overall user experience. The road widening could cause more destruction to the climbing resource as some boulders would be eliminated. Mr. Furman explained that climbing had grown in popularity. As a result, there were more climbers utilizing natural and irreplaceable resources. Since both alternatives would impact the user experience and the ability to recreate, users would start to congregate around boulders that were less impacted by the transportation alternatives. There would be more people than usual around the remaining boulders.

Mr. Furman noted that the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance did not support the gondola alternative or the enhanced bus with road widening alternative due to the changes that would occur to the natural resources. He offered to share his email address in the Zoom chat box for any Stakeholders Council Members that wanted to discuss the information further. Chair McCarvill thanked Mr. Furman for his informative presentation. Additional Stakeholders Council Member comments were shared about the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

Mr. Hutchinson commented that the enhanced bus alternative was encumbered by unnecessary road widening and there were many other obstacles within that option that made it expensive and less popular. He reported that during the Transportation Committee Meeting earlier that day, UDOT stated that tolling would take place at the entrance of ski resorts. That would still invite cars up the canyon and make the transit option less appealing. Mr. Hutchinson discussed the importance of equal access to the canyons. Those without a vehicle, without access to a vehicle, or who were unable to spend time waiting in traffic lines were unable to access the canyons. He felt there needed to be some set guidelines and rules for UDOT as it related to equal access.

Chair McCarvill noted that CWC Chair Christopher Robinson was present at the Stakeholders Council Meeting. CWC Chair Robinson thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for continuing to dedicate time to the transportation discussions and to the CWC. He also welcomed the new members to the Stakeholders Council.

Mr. Braun believed the MTS Pillars Document was very comprehensive. He asked Mr. Becker whether the CWC Board had ever taken a vote on the five transportation alternatives presented by UDOT. Mr. Becker reported that there had not been a vote on each specific option, but there had been more than a dozen discussions related to the different options. It was apparent that there was a split among CWC Board Members as it related to a transportation preference. CWC Chair Robinson explained that the CWC operated under the principle of consensus. At no time had the CWC Board reached a consensus on any of the transportation modes. The MTS Pillars Document was intended to state that the CWC Board had been unable to reach a consensus on a specific transportation alternative but there were several areas where consensus was reached.

Mr. Braun noted that what he heard from the Stakeholders Council was that neither of the two transportation alternatives was appropriate. He commented that the Granite Community Council had been able to come up with an opinion about what would be best for Little Cottonwood Canyon and had been able to share that. While he felt the work done by the CWC Board was important and the MTS Pillars Document was robust and clear, he wondered when the CWC Board would make a clear decision. CWC Chair Robinson explained that the CWC Board needed to speak with a united voice. The CWC Board wanted the Stakeholders Council to evaluate the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS and forward their recommendation.

Steven Issowits stated that there had been a lot of great comments. He noted that the ski resorts had implemented reservations and paid parking but he did not believe that had solved all of the transportation issues. Mr. Issowits referenced the comments shared by Mr. Braun. While the CWC was a consensus group, it did not seem that there was a lot of consensus happening due to a lack of balance. He stressed the importance that everyone works together to achieve more balance.

**MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**

1. **Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Provide an Update on the Work of the Committee to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had spent the last four or five months talking to Salt Lake County, Millcreek City, and the U.S. Forest Service about the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant and the proposed work in Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Diegel noted that the Committee had been providing input on the design direction and were monitoring the progress of the grant.

Chair McCarvill asked for more information on the FLAP grant. Mr. Diegel explained that it was a grant that provided transportation updates. The last he heard, all that remained was for the County to sign off on the agreement for the FLAP grant. It would include the area from the Winter Gate to Upper Big Water and would have lane widening, rearranging, restriping, parking lot rearrangements, and some enhancements for visitor experience at the trailheads. The total project value was $19.6 million and the intention was that this could be the first phase of two. Salt Lake County and the Forest Service planned to apply for a second phase to continue the work.

Mr. Hutchinson was not in support of the development. He felt the proposal would dramatically alter the character of the upper part of Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Hutchinson believed the issue warranted wider consideration from the CWC. The original intention was to look at bathrooms and infrastructure in order to ready the canyon for a shuttle system. The FLAP grant project included road widening and straightening as well as wall reinforcement. Mr. Draper reported that the Forest Service believed the road improvements could take place with a categorical exclusion to NEPA. There would be one public outreach meeting.

Mr. Knoblock added that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had been told that the road was failing. It was not built with the proper foundation underneath and it was slumping down into the creek. The road needed to be rebuilt to last long-term. 24-feet was proposed. Mr. Knoblock wondered whether there should be 11-foot traffic lanes or whether the traffic lanes should remain at 9-feet-wide and include the addition of a 4-foot bicycle lane. Many of the Millcreek Canyon Committee Members wanted there to be a bicycle lane with the narrower road in order to prevent vehicle speeds from increasing and to accommodate cyclists.

Ed Marshall stated that the FLAP grant program was strictly for transportation and access. It was never intended for infrastructure, so projects like restrooms and trailhead improvements were not allowed under the program. The FLAP grant was currently waiting to have matching funds come in from local sources. Originally, the project area was going to be from Elbow Fork to the top of the canyon. The engineers for the FLAP grant decided that they would like the area to go down further, which added quite a bit of additional cost. While the FLAP grant amount would be increased, there was also a need for a greater contribution from the local community.

**TRAILS COMMITTEE UPDATE**

1. **John Knoblock Chair of the Trails Committee will Provide an Update on the Committee Work Completed to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

Mr. Knoblock, Chair of the Trails Committee, reported that the main goal of the Committee was to review, comment, and be participants in a County-wide Trails Master Plan process. However, at the last meeting, Martin Jensen with Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation stated that he did not have the staff or budget available to take that on. Mayor Jenny Wilson said that she was taking funding for that plan under consideration for the 2022 budget.

Brighton was required by law to do a General Plan. As part of their General Plan process, Mayor Dan Knopp wanted to include a Trails Master Plan for Brighton. Zinnia Wilson, the Trails Manager with the Forest Service, said that the Forest Service would like to be partners to ensure that whatever trails plan was developed by Brighton would be actionable. The Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (“MSD”) would be hired to lead the planning process. That work would tie into the Forest Service trails inventory process. The Forest Service was currently trying to clean up and color code a trails inventory map that was dedicated to the user-created trails in the Central Wasatch. Mr. Knoblock explained that the inventory would determine:

* Which user-created trails could potentially become official trails;
* Which user-created trails should remain as user-created trails; and
* Which user-created trails went through sensitive areas and should be eliminated.

The Trails Committee had also tried to expand the list of family-friendly hikes and determine what needed to be done to fix certain trails so they could become family-friendly. This would ensure that Silver Lake and Donut Falls were not the only family-friendly attractions.

Patrick Nelson noted that he had just heard about the Brighton Trails Plan a few days earlier. He stressed the importance of trails maintenance and hoped that it would be considered in the process. Additionally, Salt Lake City Public Utilities needed to finish its Watershed Management Plan. The current timeline for the Watershed Management Plan was next summer. Chair McCarvill agreed that trail maintenance was a critical issue to think about.

**VISITOR USE COMMITTEE UPDATE**

1. **Annalee Munsey and William McCarvill, Chair and Co-Chair of the Visitor Use Committee will Provide Updated Information.**
2. **Information on the Contracting of Utah State University to Complete Phase I of the Visitor Use Study is Available on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

Ms. Munsey, Chair of the Visitor Use Committee, shared background information related to the Committee. She explained that the Stakeholders Council created the Visitor Use Committee in January 2020 and it included 12 members from the Stakeholders Council. At that time, Dr. Kelly Bricker was on the subcommittee and presented a prospectus for a Visitor Use Study that included two phases. Since that time, the Committee had explored funding options for the study.

The Committee and CWC Staff recommended that Phase I be funded by the CWC. The CWC Board approved funding for Phase I of the study. The Visitor Use Study Work Group was created to provide input on the request for proposal (“RFP”) and to review the submissions. The Visitor Use Study Work Group consisted of Stakeholders Council Members, CWC Board Members as well as Patrick Nelson and Helen Peters. Input on the RFP was provided, it was posted and many responses were received. A decision was made in March 2021 and a consultant was selected. The contract was approved in April 2021 for Utah State University to handle Phase I. The RFP also mentioned Phase II. Ms. Munsey noted that the intention of Phase I was to answer the following:

* What key indicators do we need to pay attention to and what data about recreation use in the canyon currently exists?
* What are the most appropriate ecological, physical and social indicators for distinct types of recreation settings within the canyons?
* What indicators should be prioritized in Phase II of the project to most effectively guide management decisions and investments in outdoor recreation infrastructure throughout the canyons?

Ms. Munsey reported that Phase I was nearly complete and the consultant had prepared a Phase I Draft Report. On July 28, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. there would be a CWC Visitor Use Indicator Development Workshop, where the consultant, Dr. Jordan Smith, would discuss the report.

The funding for Phase II of the Visitor Use Study was currently being evaluated. Ms. Munsey reported that the proposed cost was $288,212.64. It was recently reported that there was an opportunity to collaborate with the Forest Service on the social aspect of the Visitor Use Study. If the CWC approved the collaboration, it could save as much as two-thirds of the costs that had been allocated to the social aspects of the study.

Ms. Munsey noted that the Visitor Use Committee supported looking at all aspects of use in the canyon: social, recreational, economic, and ecological. The Visitor Use Committee recommended reconvening in November 2021 to reevaluate the need for the Committee. A recommendation would be made to the Stakeholders Council during the January 2022 meeting. Mr. Becker added that the State appropriated $95,000 to help the CWC with the cost of the Visitor Use Study. They were very appreciative and it had made a notable difference.

**PRESERVATION COMMITTEE UPDATE**

1. **Carl Fisher and Megan Nelson, Chair and Co-Chair of the Preservation Committee will Provide Updates on Committee Meetings and Direction.**

Mr. Fisher reported that the Preservation Committee had met twice. The Committee had been unable to meet recently due to scheduling conflicts. However, certain members of the Committee were working on issues related to diversity and inclusion. There had been some outreach to minority organizations to try to better understand their perspectives on the issues confronting the Wasatch. It was important that all users of the canyon felt included, engaged, and heard.

Additionally, the Preservation Committee wanted to hear from other leaders around the region. The Committee was trying to line up speakers from Leave No Trace Center for Outdoor Ethics and The Sawtooth Society but it had been difficult for their schedules and the Preservation Committee Member schedules to align. Mr. Fisher hoped that another meeting would take place within the next month or so.

**CWC STAFF UPDATE**

1. **Staff will Provide Information on Other Areas of CWC Work.**
2. **Environmental Dashboard.**

Chair McCarvill reported that CWC Staff would provide updates related to other areas of CWC work. Ms. Nielsen shared information about the Environmental Dashboard. She reported that they were in the midst of creating template pages, which would be workshopped and reviewed by the Environmental Dashboard team at the University of Utah. The data amalgamation was moving along well. Ms. Nielsen noted that one of the elements, soils, was nearly done with the data amalgamation. The current focus was trying to determine how to best get the information into a consumable format for everyone that wanted to use it. She explained that there would be a large span of user groups that would need to be able to use the Environmental Dashboard.

1. **Short-Term Projects.**

Ms. Nielsen shared information related to short-term projects. She reported that in the last fiscal year, the CWC allocated funding for six short-term projects and entered into partnerships with organizations such as Alta Ski Lifts for some sign restoration around the Cecret Lake area, the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance for the Jacob Ladder reroute project, and the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation for their preservation sustainability initiative, which would hire trails crews to provide trails maintenance throughout the tri-canyon area.

Additionally, there was a partnership with Utah Open Lands to partially fund two projects for the season: the Bonanza Flat Trailhead Transit Program and the Cottonwood Canyons Stewardship Program. The transit program was a shuttle service from Park City to some of the most heavily trafficked trails in the Wasatch Back. The stewardship program was a Utah Open Lands staff-administered user survey, which was intended to inform the land managers of the various uses. Lastly, there was a partnership with the Utah Geological Association and the Town of Brighton to replace some existing geological interpretive signage in Big Cottonwood Canyon.

Ms. Bragg asked about the Utah Open Lands transit program. She wondered whether there was a condition as part of that grant that vehicles would need to be removed from the road. Ms. Nielsen explained that there were no conditions included with the short-term projects grant.

1. **Transportation Committee.**

Mr. Perez shared updates related to the Transportation Committee. He reported that the MTS Pillars Document had been developed and was sent to UDOT shortly before the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was published. The Transportation Committee had met earlier that day to start to craft a direction on a potential comment document to UDOT ahead of the September 3, 2021 deadline for comments related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. Mr. Perez anticipated that there would be one more meeting before that deadline in order to refine any document comments that were developed.

Mr. Perez noted that part of the State appropriations were for the bus bypass service. The CWC had been working with the local police departments, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), and UDOT on implementing the bus bypass service for the upcoming season. The concept was that on trigger days (weekends and heavy snow days) the local police department would provide an escort service for the buses, in areas where it was deemed safe and appropriate, in order for those buses to bypass congestion and get up to the ski resorts faster. Progress was being made related to that service.

Vice-Chair Cameron added that the Transportation Committee had discussed tolling in the most recent meeting. Vince Izzo from the UDOT EIS team reported that if Little Cottonwood Canyon was tolled then Big Cottonwood Canyon would be tolled as well. The toll gantry would be placed at lower Solitude and lower Snowbird to allow backcountry access to the lower canyon without tolling. Additionally, Mr. Izzo reported that there likely would not be anything in place for five years. It would take a year or so to obtain funding from the Legislature and there would be a few years needed for the installation of the chosen transportation alternative.

1. **Legislative/Land Tenure Committee.**

Mr. Becker shared updates related to the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee. He reported that many Stakeholders Council Members participated in the development of the Central Wasatch National Conservation Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”) Act. A fifth draft was put out for public review in October 2020. Many comments were received and those comments had been summarized. Mr. Becker reported that a Legislative/Land Tenure Committee Meeting would take place on August 18, 2021. The Meeting Materials Packet would include a summary of the comments as well as potential changes to the Legislation. The intention was to bring the Legislation back to the CWC Board in the next few months. As decisions were being made about transportation, one of the pillar conditions would be ready for congressional consideration.

**OPEN DISCUSSION**

Mr. Shea had shared his one-page resolution in the Zoom chatbox. He believed the Stakeholders Council was looking at smaller things but was avoiding some of the larger fundamental questions. He suggested that the Stakeholders Council allow time for everyone to review the resolution, edit it, make comments and ask questions. Then there could be another meeting before the end of August to discuss the resolution or any substitute motion. Mr. Shea felt the resolution would be a good catalyst for discussion. Mr. Fisher noted that the meeting would need to happen before the end of July 2021 because the next CWC Board Meeting was scheduled for early August.

Chair McCarvill felt that it was important to have a balance between discussion and information during the meetings. The Stakeholders Council was currently meeting quarterly and he believed it was difficult to fit both the discussion items and informational items into one meeting. Chair McCarvill wondered whether there was a preference to prioritize discussion time or information time. He asked Stakeholders Council Members to think about that and share feedback within the next several days. He also asked Stakeholders Council Members to consider whether they were willing to hold another meeting to further discuss the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

Mr. Fisher felt the subcommittees were doing great work. It was good to hear updates related to each committee but he suggested that only the action items committees planned to bring to the full CWC Board be shared. The Meeting Minutes were available and all meetings were open and available to listen to or participate in. Mr. Fisher believed that might provide additional time during the actual Stakeholders Council Meetings to discuss other items.

**ADJOURN MEETING**

1. **William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as the Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

**MOTION:** \_\_\_\_\_\_ moved to adjourn the Stakeholders Council Meeting. \_\_\_\_\_ seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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