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**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2022, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM.**

**Present:**  William McCarvill, Chair

 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair

 Annalee Munsey

 Brian Hutchinson (arrived at 3:53 p.m.)

 Carl Fisher (arrived at 3:37 p.m.)

 Tom Diegel (arrived at 3:53 p.m.)

 Dave Fields

 Del Draper

 Ed Marshall

 Jan Striefel

 John Knoblock

 Kirk Nichols

 Megan Nelson

 Michael Marker (via email)

 Michael Braun

 Pat Shea

 Paul Diegel

 Randy Doyle

 Sarah Bennett

 Amber Broadaway

 Troy Morgan

 Erin Bragg

 Alex Porpora

 Mike Christensen

 Kelly Boardman

 Maura Hahnenberger

 Roger Borgenicht

 Dennis Goreham

 Hilary Lambert

Nathan Rafferty

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

 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director

 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director

 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator

**Others:**  Ben McAdams

 Hanna Barton

 Alex Schmidt

 Carolyn Keigley

**Excused:** Kurt Hegmann

 Nate Furman

 Carolyn Wawra

 Don Despain

 Mike Maughan

1. **Opening.**
2. **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 determine that conducting Stakeholders

 Council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a

 substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.

 Although the overall incidence of COVID-19 cases has diminished somewhat over the past

 several 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 again threaten

 to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’

1. **The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholder Council DRAFT Minutes of Tuesday, November 16, 2021.**

**MOTION:** William McCarvill moved to approve the November 16, 2021, Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1. **William McCarvill will Introduce New Stakeholders Council Member, Amber Broadaway.**

Chair McCarvill introduced New Stakeholders Council Member, Amber Broadaway. Ms. Broadaway was excited to join the Council. She identified herself as the New President of Solitude Mountain Resort. Ms. Broadaway is from Vermont but enjoys living in Utah. She has a background in environmental studies and looked forward to discussions about how to take care of the mountains while continuing to keep the guest experience at a high level. Chair McCarvill welcomed Ms. Broadaway and thanked Steve Issowitz, who previously served on the Stakeholders Council, for his work. Co-Chair Barbara Cameron stated that Ms. Broadaway had been a delightful addition to Big Cottonwood because she listens and is wonderful with people.

1. **Changes to the CWC Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures.**
2. **William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Lead a Discussion on the Proposed Changes to the Rules and Procedures that Would Apply for Both the Stakeholders Council and the Stakeholders Council Committees.**

Chair McCarvill shared the Rules and Procedures document with those present. He noted that Organization Section, C (7) currently states:

* Quorum and Voting: a majority of a Committee’s members shall constitute a quorum and actions of the Committee can be approved by a majority of a quorum.

Chair McCarvill felt that the wording was fine, and the intent was to state that the majority of the members present if there was a quorum, should allow business to move forward. He next read from the Meetings Section, E (1) and E (2), which stated:

* Voting: a quorum of Council Members must be present and vote in a public meeting for the Council to make a decision; and
* Any agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council for approval or recommendation to the Board for approval.

He suggested that E (2) be amended to state that an agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council present for approval or recommendation to the Board for approval. Without the addition of the word, “present,” it would be difficult for business to move forward. If Council Members are not present at the meeting, their vote was considered an abstention, which makes voting difficult. Chair McCarvill referenced issues during the last Stakeholders Council Meeting related to absences and automatic abstention votes.

Dave Fields mentioned an email from Carl Fisher. It was noted that a motion could be made that included the same verbiage that was in the email from Mr. Fisher. Chair McCarvill reported that the language proposed by Mr. Fisher was as follows:

* E (1): Voting: a quorum of Council Members must be present and vote in a public meeting for the Council to make a decision:
	+ A) Any agenda item must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the Council Members present for approval and recommendation to the Board, except as provided in Section 6 – Meetings, E (2)(B)
	+ B) For changes to the Council Rules and Procedures, a majority of the Council Members are required.

There was discussion about the proposed language. Nathan Rafferty explained that some of the Boards he served on have attendance requirements. He suggested that a similar requirement could resolve some of the issues the language aimed to address. Chair McCarvill did not want to implement too many changes too quickly, but he hoped to discuss attendance at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. He believed there should be some sort of attendance requirement because at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, 10 of the members were not present and it impacts the ability of the Council to vote on an item. Mr. Rafferty believed that attendance requirements may be a softer step forward than amendments to the Rules and Procedures language.

Michael Braun asked about the rules related to ethical conduct. He wondered if members of the Stakeholders Council might be associated with a business that had input in the form of lobbying or monies provided to an entity associated with the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) transportation alternatives. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker explained that there is a Conflict of Interest Statement, which was part of the rules of the Stakeholders Council. Additionally, there was a form that Stakeholders Council Members filled out for conflicts of interest. He asked that those present review that information as there were procedures in place.

**MOTION:** \_\_\_\_\_ moved to approve the language proposed by Carl Fisher via email, which would amend the Rules and Procedures document. Maura Hahnenberger seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council, with the exception of Nathan Rafferty, who voted Nay. The motion passed 24-to-1.

Chair McCarvill appreciated all of the issues that were brought up by Council Members. He explained that one of the goals that he and Co-Chair Cameron discussed was making sure all of the Rules and Procedures listed in the document are efficient and effective.

1. **Committee Structure, Members, and Leadership Information.**
2. **William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Lead a Discussion on Stakeholders Council Committee Structure, Membership, and Leadership.**

Chair McCarvill asked that the current Committee structure, membership, and leadership continue until the April 2022 Stakeholders Council Meeting. He explained that at that time, there would be more information about timelines and dates. For instance, whether the timelines for the subcommittees were based on the calendar year or on the CWC Board date of approval. A list of Stakeholders Council appointment terms would also be shared with the Council Members.

1. **Common Ground Institute Presentation and Workshop.**
2. **Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute will Present and Lead a Workshop with Stakeholders.**

Chair McCarvill introduced Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute (“CGI”). Mr. McAdams explained that the CWC Board asked that a situational assessment of the organization take place. There had been a request for proposal (“RFP”) process and CGI was selected to facilitate a path forward. He reported that Ms. Barton worked with him at Salt Lake County and at his Congressional Office. He had asked her to continue to work with him at CGI. Mr. McAdams stated that he started CGI as a way to build consensus around difficult public policy issues. As a result, it felt natural to respond to the RFP. He believed a good process would ensure that good decisions were made about the Central Wasatch.

Mr. McAdams reported that the CWC Board asked CGI to complete the situational assessment by March 1, 2022. There was a tight deadline and work was moving forward aggressively. CWC Staff sent out documents to Stakeholders Council Members prior to the Stakeholders Council Meeting. He asked that comments related to those documents be shared during the meeting or following the meeting. Mr. McAdams provided his email address for those present.

The first document shared was a copy of the Mountain Accord. Mr. McAdams noted that many of the Stakeholders Council Members were involved in drafting the Mountain Accord back in 2015. He asked all Council Members to review the document and answer the following questions:

* What aspects of the Mountain Accord are still relevant?
* What aspects of the Mountain Accord need to be changed or updated?
* Will you reaffirm a commitment to the guiding principles in the Mountain Accord?

Mr. McAdams stressed the importance of engagement from the public and from Stakeholders. A draft survey was distributed to members of the Stakeholders Council prior to the meeting. He hoped that those present would share the finalized survey within their networks. It was important to allow a larger number of people to provide input. The intention was to finalize the survey and have it ready to send out on January 24, 2022. Mr. McAdams noted that early feedback about the survey revealed a desire for more open-ended questions. Some additional open-ended questions would be added but it was also important to have questions that were easy to tabulate. In addition to the multiple choice questions, there would be boxes to add qualitative input.

Hilary Lambert noted that Question 8 was the only open-ended question. She wondered if the idea was for there to be a paragraph response. Mr. McAdams confirmed this. The intention was for the multiple choice questions to be at the beginning of the survey and the open-ended questions to be asked towards the end. Ms. Lambert suggested that Question 8 include certain trends as well as a comment box for additional clarification. Mr. McAdams believed the question still needed some work. The intention was to leave it open-ended so there was an opportunity for people to raise concerns and share comments.

Ed Marshall reported that he is a resident of Millcreek Canyon and a strong supporter of all the uses of the canyon. He felt it was important to be as inclusive as possible. For instance, in Question 3, all of the uses listed are physical activities but there were different types of uses to consider. Ms. Barton reported that the survey had been refined since the draft was shared with the Council Members. For instance, Question 3 now includes more options, including playing in the snow, cycling, camping, picnics, sightseeing, and being a lover of the canyons. The intention was to be more inclusive. Any additional options for that question could be shared via email.

John Knoblock suggested that some of the questions include ranked-choice instead of multiple choice. He also believed Question 9 and Question 12 should include space to write in additional comments. Paul Diegel agreed that ranked choices would make sense for some of the questions. It may lead to more effective results. Mr. McAdams liked the suggestion.

Chair McCarvill was interested in the relationship between the CWC and the other institutions across the valley. While there was some relationship between the Forest Service and the CWC, he did not have a real sense of where the organization fit in with other entities. Mr. McAdams wanted to find a way to encapsulate that on the survey. He noted that the CWC was beneficial because it gave a voice to all of the Stakeholders. Speaking collectively allowed the CWC to have a larger voice. He hoped that the comment made by Chair McCarvill could be revisited.

Brian Hutchinson noted that the Stakeholders Council represented a minority of Salt Lake County. He stressed the importance of access and asked that the survey be shared beyond the current composition of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. McAdams stated that one of the goals was to receive a broad level of input. He asked Mr. Hutchinson to create a question specifically related to access. Mr. Hutchinson agreed to do so following the Stakeholders Council Meeting. He would also share a list of organizations that had larger representation.

Mr. Fields wondered if it would be possible to use the survey to ask about the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”). For instance, if the Federal Legislation was not realistic, what other means could be used to achieve some of the same goals outlined in the CWNCRA. Mr. McAdams made note of the suggestion and stated that it was a good topic for discussion. There may be multiple means and tools to achieve the same objectives. Sarah Bennett felt it was important to value the work that was being done. Mr. McAdams believed Mr. Fields had raised a good point about multiple tools that could achieve CWC objectives. Additionally, Ms. Bennett raised a good point about the need to break down objectives into smaller sub-objectives and to achieve them through different means. Mr. Fisher believed there was a focus on rolling back environmental protections. The organization should also look at what could be taken from the development side of the equation rather than just the conservation side.

Mr. McAdams did not expect the situational assessment would resolve some of the larger issues. However, he believed there would be a process in place to more effectively work through disagreements. Mr. Knoblock explained that one of the frustrations was that a lot of CWC meetings were spent dealing with administrative and procedural issues. He wanted to see more action being taken. Mr. Knoblock suggested that the agreed-upon actions from the Mountain Accord be listed and ranked by Stakeholders Council Members and CWC Board Members. That ranked list would determine what should be prioritized and moved forward.

Pat Shea wondered if there would be any follow-up by phone or email to encourage people to complete the survey. Mr. McAdams explained that this was an opportunity to solicit broad public input, which would then be tabulated and shared with the CWC. The information would be helpful and informative but would not be considered statistically significant. It would include qualitative and not quantitative information.

Mr. McAdams discussed the path forward. He wanted to hear about how Council Members felt the Stakeholders Council performed. Tom Diegel stated that it had never been clear to him whether the Stakeholders Council was an advisory group or whether the Council was a sounding board where the CWC presented ideas. He wanted some clarity about the role of the Council. Mr. McAdams noted that those concerns could be addressed during conversations with the CWC Board. He also posed questions related to the future of the CWC:

* Does the CWC add value to our ability to make good decisions about the Central Wasatch?
* What is the path forward for the CWC? Should it continue? If so, in what direction?

Mr. Shea noted that there was a lot of discussion about procedures and rules. As a result, not a lot of decisions were made. He suggested during the recent Trails Committee Meeting that an ombudsman may be beneficial to facilitate the organization in the future. Without someone in that role, he believed there would be a lot of meetings but not a lot of follow through.

Mr. Fisher noted that Chair McCarvill and Co-Chair Cameron had done one-on-one interviews with Stakeholders Council Members recently. The results of those interviews were synthesized and could provide necessary information about the Council to CGI. He also felt it was important to better understand what the CWC wanted the Stakeholders Council to advise them on. Tom Diegel stressed the importance of better understanding the relationship between the CWC, Stakeholders Council, UDOT, and the Forest Service. He wanted to have a better sense of what the roles, responsibilities, and relationships between those entities were. Co-Chair Cameron pointed out that the Trails Committee and the Short-Term Projects Committee had engaged the Forest Service. While there was work being done with those larger agencies, it would be beneficial to engage with UDOT more in the future.

Mr. McAdams noted that the survey was not final. The intention was to finalize it by January 24, 2022, and send it out. Any additional feedback could be shared via email following the Stakeholders Council Meeting. He added that the Mountain Accord was a foundational document, but also an aspirational document. He asked those present to review the Mountain Accord and provide feedback. Additionally, any ideas about a path forward could be shared. There would be individual discussions with CWC Board Members and a CWC Board Meeting in February. The final assessment and recommendations would be presented at the March CWC Board Meeting. Chair McCarvill hoped that the situational assessment would provide additional direction for the Stakeholders Council. He was optimistic about the process.

1. **Short-Term Projects.**
2. **Lindsey Nielsen will Provide Information on the 2022 Short-Term Projects Program.**

Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen shared information about the 2022 Short-Term Projects program. Short-Term Projects applications could be submitted between March 7, 2022, and April 4, 2022. There were guidelines and criteria listed as well as information about the timeline and worksheets that would need to be filled out by applicants. Ms. Nielsen reported that there was $50,000 in the budget for Short-Term Projects in 2022. Previously funded projects were listed on the CWC website and could be reviewed. Ms. Nielsen shared the link.

Mr. Shea asked how the projects would be judged. Ms. Nielsen explained that the proposals would be judged the same way they had been previously. CWC Staff would receive the initial group of proposals and weigh them against set criteria. For instance, whether the project was short-term and could be completed within one calendar year and if it satisfied one of the four tenants of the Mountain Accord. From there, a list of finalists would be sent to the Short-Term Projects Committee. She was uncertain who would be on the Short-Term Projects Committee that year, but it would be comprised of CWC Board Members. Mr. Shea wondered if someone could be selected by Stakeholders Council leadership to be an Ex-Officio Member of the Short-Term Projects Committee. Ms. Nielsen stated that she would share that request once the appointments had been made to the Short-Term Projects Committee.

Chair McCarvill thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for their participation in the meeting.

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

**MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved to adjourn. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.
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