



9

10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) HYBRID**  
11 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2022, AT**  
12 **3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA**  
13 **ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL**  
14 **COUNCIL OFFICES.**

15

16 **Present:** Will McCarvill, Chair  
17 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair  
18 Brian Hutchinson  
19 Carl Fisher  
20 Del Draper  
21 Dennis Goreham  
22 George Vargyas  
23 Jan Striefel  
24 Jennifer Eden  
25 John Knoblock  
26 Kelly Boardman  
27 Kirk Nichols  
28 Kurt Hegmann  
29 Maura Hahnenberger  
30 Megan Nelson  
31 Mike Christensen  
32 Mike Doyle  
33 Mike Marker  
34 Nathan Rafferty  
35 Patrick Shea  
36 Paul Diegel  
37 Roger Borgenicht  
38 Sarah Bennett  
39 Serena Yau  
40 Stuart Derman  
41 Troy Morgan

42

43 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy  
44 Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration  
45 Madeline Pettit, Community Engagement Intern

46

47 **Others:** Ralph Becker  
48 Steve Van Maren

1 Sandy Wingert  
2 Rusty Vetter  
3 Joanna Wheelton  
4

5 **Opening**  
6

7 **1. William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**  
8

9 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He reported that the Central  
10 Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Meeting was a hybrid meeting. Chair  
11 McCarvill informed those present that discussion items could be added to Stakeholders Council  
12 Meeting agendas if all necessary information was shared a minimum of two weeks beforehand.  
13

14 **2. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders' Council DRAFT**  
15 **Minutes of Wednesday, May 18, 2022.**  
16

17 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to APPROVE the May 18, 2022, Stakeholders Council Meeting  
18 Minutes. [REDACTED] seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  
19

20 **3. William McCarvill will Introduce New Stakeholders Council Members and Ask for a**  
21 **One-Minute Introduction From Each.**  
22

23 Chair McCarvill acknowledged two new members of the Stakeholders Council. Stuart Derman  
24 introduced himself and reported that he is the Executive Director of Wasatch Mountain Arts which  
25 puts on the Wasatch Mountain Film Festival each year. He has lived in the Salt Lake area for 10  
26 years and is heavily involved in the outdoor community. Mr. Derman was excited to join the  
27 Stakeholders Council.  
28

29 Mike Doyle reported that he serves as the New General Manager for Brighton Ski Resort. He took  
30 over the position on May 1, 2022. He looked forward to serving on the Stakeholders Council.  
31

32 **New Central Wasatch Commission Staff Structure**  
33

34 **1. Staff will Provide an Update on the New Staffing Structure and Present an Updated Staff**  
35 **Roles and Responsibilities Chart.**  
36

37 **2. Staff will Introduce New CWC Community Engagement Intern, Madeline Pettit.**  
38

39 Chair McCarvill reported that Ralph Becker and Kaye Mickelson recently retired from the CWC and  
40 there had been some adjustments made to the CWC Staff structure since then. The updated Staff  
41 Roles and Responsibilities Chart was shared. It outlined the division of tasks between Executive  
42 Director, Lindsey Nielsen and Executive Director, Blake Perez. It was clarified that Mr. Perez will  
43 act as the Executive Director of Administration and Ms. Nielsen as the Executive Director of Policy.  
44 They are responsible for maintaining the daily function of the organization. Ms. Nielsen stated that  
45 the Staff Roles and Responsibilities Chart is available on the CWC and the Utah Public Notice  
46 websites.  
47

1 Jan Striefel wanted to understand how the staffing decisions were made. Ms. Nielsen explained that  
2 the CWC Board and previous CWC Staff Members decided internally to interview both Ms. Nielsen  
3 and Mr. Perez for the vacant positions. The CWC Board determined that they would be able to  
4 sufficiently fill the roles vacated by Mr. Becker and Ms. Mickelson. John Knoblock wondered if the  
5 decision was budget driven. Mr. Perez did not believe that was the case.

6  
7 New CWC Community Engagement Intern, Madeline Pettit was introduced. She had been writing  
8 the blogs that were recently posted to the CWC website. She is a marketing student at the University  
9 of Utah, originally from southern California, and was excited to work in the organization.

## 10 11 **Central Wasatch Commission Strategic Plan**

### 12 13 **1. Staff will present the CWC Strategic Plan for Stakeholders to Review and Discuss.**

14  
15 Mr. Perez reported that the CWC Strategic Plan was an outcome of the CWC Situational Assessment.  
16 The Consultant, Common Ground Institute, evaluated the Mountain Accord and the CWC at that  
17 time. The CWC Strategic Plan was built around the recommendations that came out of the CWC  
18 Situational Assessment. Interviews had been conducted with CWC Board Members, Stakeholders  
19 Council Members, and partners. The plan outlined steps for the upcoming year.

20  
21 The first section of the CWC Strategic Plan was the “Assessment of the Accord; Restatement and  
22 Recommitment of the Values and Principles from the Accord.” Mr. Perez explained that the CWC  
23 Board approved a Resolution related to the Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and  
24 Principles of the Mountain Accord in April 2022. The next section of the CWC Strategic Plan was  
25 titled “Specific Commitments and Negotiated Actions.” This included information about the Central  
26 Wasatch Compact, which was tabled for further development. Mr. Perez reported that the CWC  
27 Strategic Plan also outlined bullet points that overviewed the Purpose of CWC. The organization was  
28 a forum for multi-jurisdictions to come together and discuss solutions and actions related to the  
29 Central Wasatch. Mr. Perez stated that at the next CWC Board Retreat, there would be discussions  
30 about the vision, mission, and purpose of the CWC.

31  
32 The next section was “Governance Structure of the Central Wasatch Commission.” There were  
33 recommendations about how the CWC could better engage with the State and County. Mr. Perez  
34 reported that there was also a section related to the “Scope of Discretion and Authority Granted to  
35 Staff and Future Staffing Level.” At the end of the year, the CWC Board decided to move to two  
36 full-time employees and an intern. The plan also overviewed information about “Majority Voting,  
37 Weighted Voting, and Consensus Support.” The recommendation was that the default is a consensus.  
38 However, there was a mechanism to shift to a majority vote if two or three Commissioners asked for  
39 a majority vote rather than a consensus vote. The frequency of Meetings was also overviewed. Mr.  
40 Perez explained that the CWC Board would meet every other month starting this fiscal year. The  
41 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee would continue to meet monthly.

42  
43 Mr. Perez explained that the CWC Strategic Plan included a section related to “CWC Representation  
44 and Engagement with External Entities.” This had to do with updates from the U.S. Forest Service,  
45 Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), and other agencies. He noted that the organization  
46 was also looking into CWC participation on relevant Boards and Commissions. Funding Strategies  
47 were included in the plan as well. This included ongoing membership contributions, fundraising for  
48 specific projects, possible State appropriations, multi-year grants, and Federal funding. There was

1 also information related to the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez reported that there was some budget  
2 for the Stakeholders Council, which was \$2,000 for the fiscal year. He informed those present that  
3 Stakeholders Council leadership attended the monthly Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meetings.  
4 There was also a standing CWC Board Meeting agenda item to hear updates related to the  
5 Stakeholders Council.

6  
7 Carl Fisher noted that there might be issues with shifting to a majority vote if the language stated:  
8 “two or three.” He felt that it should be clear how many Commissioners would be needed to shift the  
9 vote from consensus to a majority. Mr. Perez offered to look into that matter.

## 10 **Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Service Fee Proposal Information**

### 11 **1. The Proposed Fee Structure for Specific Access Points in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache** 12 **National Forest Will Be Presented for Stakeholder Discussion.**

13  
14 Chair McCarvill reported that the Unita-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Service came out with a  
15 service fee proposal. He was not recommending that the Stakeholders Council reach a consensus and  
16 provide input at the current time. Mr. Perez reached out to Lance Kovel at the Forest Service, but a  
17 representative was unable to attend the Stakeholders Council Meeting. There were protocols about  
18 communication during a public comment period. Mr. Perez informed the Council Members that the  
19 public comment period was currently open. All of the information that was provided to the CWC  
20 from the Forest Service had been forwarded to Stakeholders Council Members. It was suggested that  
21 those present review the materials, access the story map, and submit comments. The public comment  
22 period would end in September 2022.  
23  
24  
25

26 Chair McCarvill indicated that he forwarded a question to Zinnia Wilson at the Forest Service. He  
27 wanted to understand if visitors who would not use the amenities at the trailhead still needed to pay  
28 the fees. For example, visitors who were only interested in hiking. That had been unclear in the  
29 materials. Chair McCarvill stated that there was a fee structure in place at Millcreek. Once that fee  
30 had been implemented, the canyon improved dramatically. He was in support of the fees, but they  
31 need to be implemented in a non-discriminatory way to ensure that everyone has access. Co-Chair  
32 Barbara Cameron reported that there were fee service areas in Big Cottonwood Canyon already, but  
33 the fee service areas were being reduced to \$10 for a three-day pass, \$20 for a seven-day pass, and  
34 \$60 for a season pass. She was concerned about the Silver Lake area since it was the only ADA  
35 access in the Unita-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. It would be beneficial if that area remained as a  
36 free-to-use area. She liked the idea of the fees otherwise.  
37

38 Chair McCarvill wondered if the fees collected would remain in the Unita-Wasatch-Cache National  
39 Forest area or if they would be added to a Forest Service pot of money. He noted that the Millcreek  
40 fees stayed in Millcreek. It would be worthwhile for the money to stay in the area.  
41

42 Mr. Knoblock noted that the Forest Service requirements were very specific in terms of what  
43 amenities needed to be at a parking lot that serviced a trailhead or recreation area to charge a fee. The  
44 Forest Service could not charge entrance fees or admission fees to a National Forest area. He  
45 explained that it needed to be done on a site-by-site basis according to the law.  
46

1 **Environmental Dashboard Fundraising and Outreach Plan Discussion**

2  
3 1. **Staff will Present a Fundraising and Outreach Plan for the Environmental Dashboard**  
4 **for Stakeholders to Review and Discuss.**

5  
6 Chair McCarvill reported that there was a need for ongoing funding for the maintenance of the  
7 Environmental Dashboard. To maintain the database, a Fundraising and Outreach Strategy for the  
8 Environmental Dashboard document had been created. Ms. Nielsen explained that this was a living  
9 document that would be added to over time. The spreadsheet had six different tabs that detailed the  
10 outreach and fundraising efforts that the CWC would undertake for the Environmental Dashboard  
11 maintenance. The first step in raising money for the Environmental Dashboard was to talk to people  
12 about the Environmental Dashboard. CWC Staff would visit member jurisdictions to present  
13 information about the project and answer questions. Additionally, there were opportunities to share  
14 the Environmental Dashboard with community organizations and applicable Community Councils.  
15 The goal was to do so before the end of the year.

16  
17 Ms. Nielsen noted that the Environmental Dashboard was seven years in the making. The Mountain  
18 Accord and CWC spent nearly \$500,000 amassing the data, translating it to a format that would work  
19 for all users, and posting it on the website. The organization was committed to providing that  
20 information in perpetuity, but maintaining and updating the data as necessary required ongoing  
21 funding. That was the reason a capital campaign had been started. Ms. Nielsen explained that the  
22 goal was to raise \$25,000 before the end of the year. In addition to speaking to member jurisdictions  
23 and community organizations, CWC Staff could also reach out to universities, non-profit  
24 organizations, and community foundations. There was a support tab on the Environmental Dashboard  
25 where individuals could contribute as well. Ms. Nielsen informed those present that the Fundraising  
26 and Outreach Strategy for the Environmental Dashboard document had been reviewed by the CWC  
27 Attorney. The organization was able to crowdsource funding for specific projects and it was  
28 appropriate to fundraise for the Environmental Dashboard.

29  
30 Co-Chair Cameron felt that other agencies and groups in Salt Lake Valley would benefit from the  
31 Environmental Dashboard as well. For instance, universities and Salt Lake County. A lot of the  
32 information was pertinent to the entire Salt Lake Valley. There was a lot on the Environmental  
33 Dashboard and she wondered if it would be possible to reach out to more widespread organizations  
34 to tackle the fundraising efforts. Co-Chair Cameron also wanted to know whether the Stakeholders  
35 Council would support a Committee related to the Environmental Dashboard. Maura Hahnenberger  
36 would use the Environmental Dashboard for some of her curriculum at the University of Utah in the  
37 coming year. It may be worthwhile to hear how that was working through a dedicated Committee.  
38 Carl Fisher noted that there could be an annual update and review for the Stakeholders Council.  
39 However, it could also be discussed at a Preservation Committee Meeting.

40  
41 **Committee Updates**

42  
43 1. **Leadership from the Millcreek Canyon, Trails, and Preservation Committee Will**  
44 **Provide Updates to the Stakeholders Council.**

45  
46 Chair McCarvill reported that the Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Tom Diegel, was not  
47 present. Del Draper spoke on behalf of the Committee. He explained that the main topic of discussion  
48 had to do with the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. The proposal was to use

1 predominantly federal money to improve the road. There had been a presentation on May 19, 2022,  
2 from the sponsors of that project. A lot of information was shared at that time. The plan was to spend  
3 \$19 million on the portion of the road from the winter gate to the end of the canyon. There were  
4 several proposals for what the road width could be, such as a 20-foot-wide road with no bicycle lane,  
5 a 23-foot-wide road with a bicycle lane, and a proposal for a bicycle advisory lane.  
6

7 The Millcreek Canyon Committee met after that presentation to discuss submitting a comment.  
8 Ultimately, the Committee decided not to submit comments as a Committee, because it would be  
9 difficult to reach a consensus and any comments would need to be approved by the Stakeholders  
10 Council and CWC Board. As a result, Millcreek Canyon Committee Members submitted individual  
11 comments. Mr. Draper reported that he submitted a comment. According to the figures presented,  
12 only 13% of vehicles went above the winter gate. In his comment, he wondered why the \$19 million  
13 was not being spent on the lower portion of the canyon, where 87% of traffic was. He did not feel it  
14 made sense to focus on an area with lower traffic levels. Now that the public comment period was  
15 over, the Committee was waiting to see what the next move was.  
16

17 Mr. Draper shared additional information related to Millcreek. He noted that a lot of construction  
18 had been taking place recently. A Rocky Mountain Power project was to underway place the power  
19 lines underground. Additionally, both the Rattlesnake trail and the new trail from Elbow Fork to Big  
20 Water were open. A temporary bridge was placed by the Forest Service near Elbow Fork to improve  
21 access to the trail while a permanent bridge was being explored. Mr. Draper recommended that  
22 Stakeholders Council Members visit the area.  
23

24 Trails Committee Chair, Mr. Knoblock, shared updates with the Council. He reported that he recently  
25 received an update from Chelsea Phillippe with the Forest Service. Salt Lake County was working  
26 in partnership with the Forest Service to do a Tri-Canyons Trails Master Plan. At the current time,  
27 data had been collected with the assistance of the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, Save Our Canyons,  
28 and other groups. The data related to the number of users on different trails as well as the status of  
29 user-created and Forest Service system trails. There would be public engagement efforts in the fall  
30 and the plan would be fleshed out during the winter months. Another round of public engagement  
31 would take place after that and by the end of 2023, the Tri-Canyons Trails Master Plan would be  
32 complete. Work could move forward in 2024.  
33

34 Mr. Knoblock added that the Forest Service had received input from the ski resorts. The Recreation  
35 Committee from Mountain Accord had wanted to see the ski resorts have more trails so visitors could  
36 recreate in places that had water, restrooms, and hardened surface parking. Mr. Knoblock also shared  
37 information about the Salt Lake City Public Utilities Watershed Management Plan. A number of  
38 outreach sessions had taken place in the spring. The revised Salt Lake City Public Utilities Watershed  
39 Management Plan would be done by the end of the year.  
40

41 There were several trails related projects taking place. For instance, half of the Silver Lake Boardwalk  
42 would be done in the fall. The other half would be done the following year. Mr. Knoblock stated  
43 that it would be exciting to see that project move forward. Trails Utah was working with Ms. Wilson  
44 at the Forest Service to see whether some grant money could be obtained. There was only enough  
45 money to do the actual boardwalk, but they wanted to resurface the trail portion and replace the wood  
46 retaining with rock retaining. Mr. Knoblock hoped that the Grandeur Peak Bonneville Shoreline Trail  
47 section would be built in the current year.  
48

1 Mr. Knoblock reported that he attended a webinar recently, which was called the Science of  
2 Sustainable Trails. He asked Stakeholders Council leadership to share the link to that webinar. Mr.  
3 Knoblock reported that Carly Lansche, the Trails Planner for Cache County was moving to the new  
4 Utah Division of Recreation. It would be interesting to see how that unfolded.

5  
6 George Vargyas noted that one question had been brought up by Mr. Diegel at a previous Millcreek  
7 Canyon Committee Meeting. He had wondered whether there were any insights from Stakeholders  
8 Council leadership on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement  
9 (“EIS”) proposal. For instance, whether the Stakeholders Council would provide comments or  
10 feedback. Chair McCarvill believed it would be best to wait until it was released. It would likely be  
11 an item on the October 2022 Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda. The Council could then discuss  
12 whether it was appropriate to take a position on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.

13  
14 Mr. Vargyas wanted to make the Council aware of the permit expiration in Cardiff Fork that occurred  
15 in May 2022. That provisional use permit that allowed public access over private lands and private  
16 land owners to go over public lands in Cardiff Fork had expired. There were a lot of unknowns about  
17 what access would look like in the coming winter.

18  
19 Preservation Committee Chair, Mr. Fisher, reported that the Preservation Committee had not met  
20 recently. He did not feel the CWC Board had been clear about what they wanted to work on as it  
21 pertained to topics of interest to the Preservation Committee. He believed the Committee needed  
22 guidance as it moved forward. However, there may be discussions about the Environmental  
23 Dashboard in the future. Mr. Fisher believed the Legislation should be a CWC priority. Chair  
24 McCarvill stated that Mayor Erin Mendenhall agreed to focus on the Legislation.

## 25 26 **CWC Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan Update**

### 27 28 **1. Staff Will Provide an Update to Stakeholders on the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility** 29 **Action Plan and Timeline.**

30  
31 Chair McCarvill reported that the CWC wanted to move forward with the Big Cottonwood Canyon  
32 Mobility Action Plan. Mr. Perez explained that last year, during the Legislative Session, there was  
33 an appropriations request for \$10 million for Big Cottonwood Canyon. Unfortunately, none of that  
34 came through. There had been discussions with Representative Gay Lynn Bennion. Mr. Perez stated  
35 that the Transportation Committee of the CWC Board had been brought back to focus on Big  
36 Cottonwood Canyon. The original intent was to make another appropriations request. However,  
37 there was a recommendation from UDOT to hire a consultant and develop the Big Cottonwood  
38 Canyon Mobility Action Plan. The outcome of the work would provide a near, mid, and long-term  
39 plan for mobility, transit improvements, mobility hubs, and roadway improvements.

40  
41 The Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan would also look at potential funding sources and  
42 the level of National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) analysis needed. The plan would move  
43 things forward until UDOT and the Forest Service completed the NEPA work. Mr. Perez reported  
44 that the request for proposal (“RFP”) draft had already been viewed by the Transportation Committee  
45 and the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. It would be presented to the CWC Board on August 1,  
46 2022, for approval. After that meeting, the RFP could be released. It would be open for  
47 approximately one month. The CWC would be the project manager and the goal was to have a  
48 consultant under contract by mid-September or early October.

1  
2 Mayor Dan Knopp shared information with the Council. He reported that a bridge was installed down  
3 at Cardiff. There would be a new trail that would go from the parking lot at Cardiff towards the Donut  
4 Falls trail. By the end of the season, there would be a new boardwalk going through the meadow.  
5 Mayor Knopp explained that powerlines were being buried in Brighton as well. There had been major  
6 traffic delays related to that work but the roads would be clear on weekends. He explained that there  
7 had been discussions about tightening up traffic control zones.

8  
9 Mayor Knopp discussed the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan RFP. CWC Staff and the  
10 Transportation Committee originally planned to ask the Legislature for money that would go towards  
11 transportation solutions in Big Cottonwood Canyon. That had been discussed with UDOT and a  
12 process had been laid out to ensure that everything was done correctly. UDOT asked that money be  
13 raised and a consultant be hired to create an overview of what could be done in Big Cottonwood  
14 Canyon as a way to address transit needs. The consultant would also look into funding opportunities.  
15 The Town of Brighton had committed \$100,000 to the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan.  
16 The town and residents were in support of this endeavor. Mayor Knopp reported that each ski area  
17 had donated \$15,000 each and Cottonwood Heights had donated \$15,000. It had been requested that  
18 the CWC donate \$10,000. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee was in support of that, but it still  
19 needed to be approved by the full CWC Board.

20  
21 There were no set determinations about what the transit solutions would look like. Mayor Knopp  
22 explained that what he wanted to see was a transit center at Entry 1 of Solitude so buses did not have  
23 to go into the parking lot at Solitude. He wanted to see another transit center at Brighton. The transit  
24 centers would have restrooms and lockers, with minimal parking at the Solitude location. Mayor  
25 Knopp wanted to see the Solitude transit center become a trailhead for Willow Heights Trail during  
26 the summer months. For various reasons, a restroom was not possible at the trailhead for Willow  
27 Heights. Adding one up the road would add another 1,000 feet of trail, but it would also lessen the  
28 grade substantially and make for a better trail overall. There was also a desire to have two lanes of  
29 traffic and a bus lane all the way around Brighton Circle.

30  
31 Transit solutions in Big Cottonwood Canyon would not be as complicated as Little Cottonwood  
32 Canyon. Mayor Knopp explained that the issue was that Big Cottonwood Canyon did not appear on  
33 any agency programming and so the work was not moving forward. For example, Wasatch Front  
34 Regional Council (“WFRC”) did not have Big Cottonwood Canyon on their five-year program.  
35 UDOT did not have Big Cottonwood Canyon on their five-year program either. Big Cottonwood  
36 Canyon had the same problems that Little Cottonwood Canyon had, but the problems in Big  
37 Cottonwood Canyon would be easier to solve. Mayor Knopp wanted to see the issues addressed.

38  
39 Mayor Knopp explained that while there were some existing ideas about how to address transit in Big  
40 Cottonwood Canyon, nothing was set in stone. The intention was to remove visitors from vehicles  
41 and encourage bus use in Big Cottonwood Canyon. It would be extremely difficult to implement a  
42 high-capacity transportation mode at the bottom of the canyon. As a result, there could not be trains  
43 or gondolas. It made sense to focus on making transit, like buses, work better.

44  
45 Patrick Shea wondered if there would be a proposal to have tolling in Big Cottonwood Canyon.  
46 Mayor Knopp confirmed this. He believed there needed to be tolling at the bottom of the canyon.  
47 That would be the most effective way to reduce the number of personal vehicles on the road.  
48 Mr. Fisher could think of three or four instances where consultants were hired in the past to move

1 forward transportation plans, but progress was still extremely slow. He was not sure if hiring a  
2 consultant for the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan was the best approach. Mayor  
3 Knopp appreciated the feedback. After speaking to UDOT, this was the best option. He did not want  
4 to hire a consultant and then have the plan sit and do nothing. He intended to move the work forward.  
5 That was the reason the plan would also focus on funding opportunities.

6  
7 Mr. Fisher asked Mayor Knopp if he felt UDOT had enough trust from the public. He had spoken to  
8 several residents who were nervous about UDOT given the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.  
9 Mayor Knopp understood the concerns. He did not necessarily believe that UDOT would be the lead  
10 agency on the Big Cottonwood Canyon work. They would most likely be involved in some capacity,  
11 but the specifics were not determined yet. That was the benefit of the plan.

12  
13 Mr. Shea wanted to know if the consultant would come up with a budget for the work. He felt that  
14 there needed to be a realistic budget that would be followed. Mayor Knopp explained that the  
15 consultant would create an overview. Basic budget numbers would be put together, but all of that  
16 information would need to be fleshed out further. Due to the way the construction market was  
17 currently, there was no way to determine an exact budget for the work. Mayor Knopp felt strongly  
18 that the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan was important.

#### 19 20 **Open Comments**

21  
22 Brian Hutchinson noted that there had been a discussion in the Zoom chat box about motorized access.  
23 There were issues in Big Cottonwood Canyon related to snowmobiles and cat ski operations in  
24 Cardiff. He wondered whether it would be possible to add that to the next Stakeholders Council  
25 Meeting agenda in October 2022. Chair McCarvill confirmed this.

26  
27 Co-Chair Cameron thanked Joanna Wheelton for her work with the Wildflower Festival. There were  
28 over 1,000 visitors each day. She felt the festival was a wonderful way to reach the public.

#### 29 30 **Adjourn Meeting.**

#### 31 32 **1. William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

33  
34 **MOTION:** [REDACTED] moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Kurt Hegmann  
35 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

36  
37 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, July 20, 2022.*  
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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