

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2022, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM**

**Present:**  William McCarvill, Chair

 Barbara Cameron, Vice Chair

 Brian Hutchinson

 Dave Fields

 Pat Shea

 Ed Marshall

 Mike Christensen

 Alex Porpora

 Amber Broadaway

 Annalee Munsey

 Carl Fisher

 Del Draper

 Dennis Goreham

 Jan Striefel

 John Knoblock

 Kirk Nichols

 Michael Marker

 Michael Maughan

 Paul Diegel

 Tom Diegel

 Maura Hahnenberger

 Kelly Broadman

 Randy Doyle

 Roger Borgenicht

 Sarah Bennett

 Nathan Rafferty

 Kurt Hegmann

 Troy Morgan

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

 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director

 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director

 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator

**Others:**  Ben McAdams, CGI Consultants

 Hannah Barton, CGI Consultants

 Steve Van Maren

**Excused:** Megan Nelson

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

Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He thanked Erin Bragg and Nate Furman for their service. Both had since moved on from the Stakeholders Council. Chair McCarvill explained that there needed to be 18 Stakeholders Council Members present to conduct business unless a change is being made to the Rules and Procedures.

1. **William McCarvill will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic Meetings 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 determines 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.

 The COVID-19 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 Stakeholders Council DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, January 19, 2022.**

**MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes from January 19, 2022. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1. **Common Ground Institute Presentation and Workshop.**
	1. **Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute (“CGI”) will Present and Lead a Discussion with Stakeholders on The Central Wasatch Compact.**

Chair McCarvill explained that all of the Stakeholders Council Members would have two minutes to share comments with Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute (“CGI”). The comments would be related to the canyons and the Central Wasatch Compact document.

Kirk Nichols was most concerned about the road and congestion in winter. He felt one of the solutions would be reservations and metered entry rather than construction. Mr. Nichols also expressed concern related to vehicular noise in the canyon year-round. Snowmobiles, motorcycles, trucks, and personal vehicles all made a lot of noise in the canyons, which is disruptive. Additionally, roadside parking is an area of concern. In the winter, it is a hazard for skiers and snowboarders, and in the summer, it is a hazard for bicyclists.

Mike Christensen had the same transportation concerns as were expressed by Mr. Nichols. However, he felt that a lot of time had been spent looking for a perfect solution when there are other options to move forward with. For instance, expanded bus service and year-round bus service could be implemented. That would make access to the canyons more equitable.

Chair McCarvill was pleased to see that the Central Wasatch Compact included language related to the growing population. It also made references to visitation and the need to measure and quantify the effects that visitation levels had on the environment. It was important to balance use and protection, and he was glad to see that addressed within the document.

Vice-Chair, Barbara Cameron, was proud of the fact that the Stakeholders Council had pushed forward on discussions related to management in the canyons. She was concerned that the Central Wasatch Compact had removed the word “restrooms,” and believed it should be added back to specifically address that concern and need. Vice-Chair Cameron had mixed feelings about certain portions of the Central Wasatch Compact. She felt that Paragraphs 3 and 4 could be removed because the intention of the paragraphs was not clear. Paragraph 6 had strong and specific language and she wanted to see that remain in the document. As for the listed outcomes, she liked all of them, with the exception of the second outcome, and felt that needed to be removed. The Central Wasatch Compact has strengths and weaknesses. A few thoughtful removals would improve the document overall.

Mr. McAdams asked to share background information before the Stakeholders Council Members continued to comment on the Central Wasatch Compact. CGI looked at the Mountain Accord and determined that it could be separated into two parts. The first part was largely focused on principles and values that the Mountain Accord signers felt should guide the decisions in the Central Wasatch. The second part of the Mountain Accord included specific and highly negotiated actions that the parties at the time felt should be taken in the Central Wasatch. CGI maintained the principles and values in the Central Wasatch Compact and made updates based on CWC Board Member input. The intention was to separate the specific actions from the principles.

Michael Maughan appreciated the collaborative process that was used when the Mountain Accord was developed. He recognized that since then, there have been a lot of changes. While he supported taking care of the environment, watershed, and sustainable recreation, some of the carryover language from the Mountain Accord that was now in the Central Wasatch Compact did not reflect the changes in positions that had occurred or the information that had been learned since then. He did not believe he could address everything that did not work for the ski areas within the allotted two minutes. Alta Ski Area could not support the Central Wasatch Compact as currently drafted. He had hoped there would be a process where the U.S. Forest Service, the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), Salt Lake City Public Utilities, and other Stakeholders in the canyons, could sit down and negotiate acceptable language.

Patrick Shea noted that ski companies have incremental growth. All of the ski lifts are not built at once, because it was important to fully understand the impacts of each decision. Mr. Shea believed that anything proposed in the Central Wasatch should be implemented incrementally.

John Knoblock wanted to hear more about what would happen with the list of intended actions. A lot had changed since the Mountain Accord was signed. He thought that the Central Wasatch Compact would not only restate the principles and values but would also look at the details of the intended actions. It would be good to see what actions listed in the Mountain Accord had been completed or worked on and what was still outstanding. Mr. Knoblock noted that the words, “must occur in conjunction with,” were troubling, because it is difficult to get everything to happen at the same time. Action should be taken as opportunities arise.

Amber Broadaway felt that the nine-day turnaround time for comment was too short for such an important piece of written material. Additional time would have been beneficial. She also hoped that the survey results would have been shared and discussed to better inform future decisions about the Central Wasatch Compact. Ms. Broadaway was concerned about language that mentioned the interconnectedness of decision-making. She did not want to see transportation and environmental concerns put on hold due to some of the more difficult pieces.

Ed Marshall stressed the importance of homeowner representation in the Central Wasatch Compact. The CWC should not be in the business of taking or downsizing property and there needed to be some assurances included in the action items. Mr. Marshall had suggestions for Sections 3, 5, and 7 of the intended outcomes listed in the Central Wasatch Compact. Those suggestions were included in a Memorandum that he had written. He also pointed out that certain sections of the Central Wasatch Compact were not transparent and made references that would not be understood without insider background information. Additionally, the introductory paragraph on Page 1 of the document focused solely on recreational users. It did not say anything about the people who lived and worked in the canyons. He suggested that be amended.

Michael Marker was surprised that the Central Wasatch Compact did not acknowledge the situational changes that had taken place in the seven years since the Mountain Accord was signed. Many of those changes were acknowledged at a CWC Board level and should also be mentioned in the document. He agreed with the comments shared by Mr. Marshall and stated that homeowners should be recognized in the Central Wasatch Compact. Mr. Marker explained that since UDOT and the Forest Service had jurisdictional control over the CWC project area, both entities needed to be at the table. Lastly, he stressed the importance of a shared vision for the CWC. He felt that a lot of the difficulties reaching consensus had to do with the lack of a clearly defined vision. The principles and values were important, but a shared vision was needed.

Sarah Bennett was pleased to re-read some of the agreed-upon principles and values but noted that there had been a lot of change since some of the initial ideas were set forth. She was concerned that those changes were not addressed in the Central Wasatch Compact. There were also many diametrically opposed views and visions amongst the Stakeholders Council, CWC Board Members, and partners who had committed to the Mountain Accord. As a result, it seemed ineffective to state that no piece could move forward without another. She felt that a lot of the CWC efforts were taking root and were growing organically. Wherever progress was able to be made, it needed to be made, without trying to tie everything together.

Tom Diegel explained that he was on the Stakeholders Council as a representative of the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. He was confused about the Central Wasatch Compact process. It seemed like a lot of the items that were discussed in the Mountain Accord were ignored or pushed aside. For instance, items that were important to the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, like locking in the resort boundaries. He felt there were a lot of platitudes taking place and there was no real sense of direction. He wanted to better understand how outstanding issues would be addressed. Just because the Mountain Accord had been redlined out of the Central Wasatch Compact did not necessarily mean that the issues should be overlooked. Mr. Diegel pointed out that there was no mention of UDOT and the Forest Service in the document.

Kurt Hegmann stated that he represents the Mill D Cabin Owners Association. The document was good in terms of the values section but where the actions section talked about transferring lands, he felt there should be the inclusion of the word “voluntary,” otherwise it could sound a little heavy-handed. He shared information about the train in Zermatt, Switzerland, and explained that the area is similar to the Wasatch. Mr. Hegmann stated that the trails are being heavily used and it may be beneficial to separate the hikers and the bicyclists at some point. There were a lot of solvable issues in the Central Wasatch, and it was important to take action.

Chair McCarvill asked Mr. McAdams about the next steps for the Stakeholders Council, the CWC, and the Central Wasatch Compact. Mr. McAdams clarified that the Central Wasatch Compact was not meant to replace or amend the Mountain Accord. The Mountain Accord would remain as a separate document. Mr. McAdams explained that the Mountain Accord set out values and specific strategies, where the Central Wasatch Compact was a restatement of the broad principles. There were still specific actions that needed to be taken. However, those action steps would fall to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. The Central Wasatch Compact was simply a statement of the values and principles that the organization was based on.

Mr. McAdams noted that the CWC asked CGI to complete its work by March 1, 2022. That was the reason the work focused on the value statements. He and Ms. Barton had conducted over 40 interviews as part of the Situational Assessment and there were 170 responses to the survey. That data would be anonymized and then made available for review. The comments made during the current Stakeholders Council Meeting would be summarized and shared with the CWC Board. In early March, the CWC Board would decide whether the Central Wasatch Compact was a statement of values that should be adopted or whether additional changes needed to be made.

Carl Fisher liked the general idea of the Central Wasatch Compact. However, he felt it needed to be shortened and convey a vision for the Wasatch rather than simply be a recommitment to the Mountain Accord. He also felt the document needed to resonate with the community as a whole. There was an imminent threat to the canyons in the Central Wasatch. Mr. Fisher reported that there were transportation discussions related to Little Cottonwood Canyon, there was a transportation plan being looked at for Big Cottonwood Canyon, there was a road widening and engineering project being proposed for Millcreek Canyon, and there was a 700-acre mine being proposed in Parleys Canyon. He was concerned that there were not enough environmental actions taking place. That work needed to be prioritized.

Paul Diegel noted that there was one component of the CWC that was not discussed enough, which was the jurisdiction of the CWC and the extent to which the organization could implement change. He explained that suggestions had been made to the Forest Service in the past, based on research and user input, but the reception had been lackluster. There needed to be a mechanism in place that would allow the CWC to take action and achieve what they wanted to achieve.

Brian Hutchinson felt it was beneficial to distill the Mountain Accord document down to the basic components. He believed that the Central Wasatch Compact would benefit from specific measurements of success. Mr. Hutchinson explained that his biggest concerns for the Central Wasatch had to do with the environment and equitable access. The success of equitable access should not be based on the level of commerce that occurred in the canyons or nearby communities, but it should be based on the ability of people of all backgrounds to reach the canyons from various destinations in the valley. He did not believe the Stakeholders Council or CWC Board membership was representative of Salt Lake Valley and felt there needed to be more diversity.

Dennis Goreham disagreed with the comment shared by Vice-Chair Cameron earlier in the meeting. He did not believe Paragraphs 3 and 4 should be deleted. Those were two of the strongest parts of the Central Wasatch Compact. He did not feel that everything needed to be done in conjunction but noted that a trust level was built through the Mountain Accord. That trust level was lost when individuals pursued independent interests without considering how those choices would impact some of the broader actions and goals.

Alex Porpora liked the inclusion of climate change in the Central Wasatch Compact. Her concerns related to access. She felt this document was an opportunity for the organization to be visionary, but it didn’t quite do that. It was important to understand how the CWC would bring people together as champions of the Wasatch Mountains. Additionally, she felt this was an opportunity to think more about community engagement. For instance, was the CWC engaging the community enough through focus groups and listening sessions, in addition to the surveys. Ms. Porpora understood that time was of the essence in this matter, but without significant public input, it would be difficult to make decisions and understand the values in the community.

Randy Doyle noted that a lot of work had gone into the Mountain Accord. Since then, many things had changed, and some actionable items were not practical anymore. However, some of the actionable items in the Mountain Accord were still practical and possible. He was afraid that by separating the Mountain Accord and the Central Wasatch Compact, the organization would fail to move forward. He believed that the public wanted to see action being taken by the CWC.

Chair McCarvill thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for sharing feedback on the Central Wasatch Compact. He asked if there were any general comments. Mr. Fisher reported that Save Our Canyons had been working with a coalition of location organizations to develop a Community Benefit Agreement related to the Olympic Games. It was not a referendum against the games. He explained that the agreement addressed the importance of environmental protections, employing local workforces, and the utilization of past venues. It also discussed homelessness. Mr. Fisher suggested that the Stakeholders Council look at the agreement in the future and consider taking action. It could then be forwarded to the CWC Board for consideration.

Mr. Knoblock asked for additional details about the CGI scope of work. It sounded like reviewing the intended actions from the Mountain Accord was not within the scope of the contract. Mr. McAdams noted that many on the Stakeholders Council were involved with the Mountain Accord. That process started in 2012 and the Mountain Accord document was signed in August 2015. He felt the ongoing mission of the CWC was to engage Stakeholders at all levels of government and work to find solutions that would maintain the delicate balance of the Wasatch and preserve the values and principles stated in the Mountain Accord. A recommitment and restatement of those values and principles was a good starting place. The ongoing work of the CWC was to implement those values through specific actions. The CWC Board would determine what path the Central Wasatch Compact took. It could be adopted at the next CWC Board Meeting or further refined.

Mr. Shea did not believe all of the comments and survey results needed to be anonymized. He also felt it was important to pause and fully understand what the Central Wasatch Compact was committing to. Mr. Shea suggested that the document be called the Central Wasatch Environmental and Economic Compact instead of the Central Wasatch Compact, so there would be an added focus on environmental preservation.

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

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

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

***I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, February 23, 2022.***

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes

T Forbes Group

Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_