



9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) SPECIAL STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION OFFICES LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

- Present:** Will McCarvill, Chair  
Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair  
Patrick Shea  
Danny Richardson  
Kurt Hegmann  
Kirk Nichols  
John Knoblock  
Sarah Bennett  
Dennis Goreham  
Brian Hutchinson  
Nathan Rafferty  
Mike Marker  
Mike Doyle  
Troy Morgan  
Amber Broadway  
Carl Fisher  
Stuart Derman  
Maura Hahnenberger  
Roger Borgenicht  
Ed Marshall  
Dave Fields  
Del Draper  
Mike Christensen  
Jan Striefel  
Paul Diegel  
Tom Diegel  
Serena Yau  
Kelly Boardman
- Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy  
Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration  
Madeline Pettit, Community Engagement Intern

1  
2 **Others:** Brian Stillman  
3 Emily Putsch  
4 Keith Zuspan  
5 Ralph Becker  
6 Theresa Heinrich  
7 Kaye Mickelson  
8 Catherine Kanter  
9

## 10 **OPENING**

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

14 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He reported that the Central  
15 Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Special Meeting was a hybrid meeting.  
16

17 Co-Chair Barbara Cameron distributed information related to the U.S. Forest Service public outreach  
18 meetings. There would be meetings related to trails on December 7, 2022, at 5:00 p.m. and  
19 December 8, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. on Zoom. Co-Chair Cameron reported that the parking tickets in  
20 Brighton would be \$150 starting in December. The intention was to control some of the parking on  
21 the streets. She asked Stakeholders Council Members to share that information with relevant parties.  
22 Co-Chair Cameron informed those present that the ski buses will begin service on December 11,  
23 2022.  
24

### 25 **2. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council DRAFT** 26 **Minutes of Wednesday, October 19, 2022.**

28 Co-Chair Cameron noted that there was a reference in the October 19, 2022, Meeting Minutes to the  
29 Brighton parking tickets. Though the fee was originally thought to be \$175, she had since found out  
30 that the fee would be \$150. She asked that the clarification be made in the minutes.  
31

32 **MOTION:** The co-Chair moved to APPROVE the October 19, 2022, Stakeholders Council Meeting  
33 Minutes, as amended. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.  
34

## 35 **CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION BOARD RETREAT REPORT**

### 37 **1. Co-Chairs Barbara Cameron and Will McCarvill will Report on the Highlights and** 38 **Outcomes from the 11/10/22 CWC Board Retreat.**

40 Chair McCarvill discussed the CWC Board Retreat that took place on November 10, 2022.  
41 Stakeholders Council leadership attended the retreat to provide information to the CWC Board. He  
42 overviewed the information shared at that time. In the Situational Analysis conducted by Common  
43 Ground Institute (“CGI”), a question was raised regarding the Stakeholders Council. CGI interviewed  
44 a number of Stakeholders and Board Members. The results indicated that there was some  
45 dissatisfaction. Some members were frustrated with the meetings and found them to be “contentious,  
46 unproductive, with mistreatment of fellow Council Members or presenters.” There were also  
47 questions about the role the Stakeholders Council had within the CWC. For instance, whether the  
48 intention was for the Council to create its own priorities or receive direction from the CWC Board.

1  
2 Stakeholders Council leadership understood some issues needed to be addressed in 2022. That work  
3 would continue in 2023. It was important that all voices on the Stakeholders Council be heard. Chair  
4 McCarvill noted that sometimes the stronger voices were heard while others were not. There were  
5 some organizational ways to address this. He felt the Trails Committee and the Millcreek Canyon  
6 Committee were effective at listening to all voices. Chair McCarvill explained that there was some  
7 potential funding for a facilitator. This could be done at a regular meeting or there could be a more  
8 formal Stakeholders Council Retreat. The CWC Board Retreat had been productive and a similar  
9 event for the Stakeholders Council could be worthwhile.

10  
11 Chair McCarvill liked when Stakeholders Council Members brought issues to the Council for  
12 discussion. During the CWC Board Retreat, he mentioned that the Transportation Committee and  
13 Legislative and Land Tenure Committee were active but there was not a provision for the  
14 Stakeholders Council to weigh in on their outcomes. He felt that needed to change. As a result, there  
15 were ongoing discussions about additional Stakeholders Council consultation. Chair McCarvill  
16 reported that the Stakeholders Council Meetings in 2023 would take place every other month rather  
17 than quarterly. Those meetings would take place during the months the CWC Board would not meet.  
18 This would allow the Council to forward items to the CWC Board or react to previous discussions at  
19 a Board level. He was not sure if there would be Stakeholders Council representation on the other  
20 CWC committees moving forward.

21  
22 The Stakeholders Council still lacked answers to questions posed at the last CWC Board Retreat  
23 including:

- 24
- 25 • What does the CWC Board expect of the Stakeholders Council?
- 26 • What is the Stakeholders Council doing right? What is the Stakeholders Council not doing?
- 27 What actions would be of value to the CWC Board?
- 28

29 Chair McCarvill believed there were some paths forward as a result of the latest CWC Board Retreat  
30 discussions. Both he and Co-Chair Cameron were excited for 2023. The last few months had created  
31 new opportunities for the Stakeholders Council to participate more and be further engaged. The new  
32 meeting schedule would mesh the Stakeholders Council more fully with the CWC Board.

33  
34 Co-Chair Cameron stated that the CWC Board Retreat was a productive face-to-face brainstorming  
35 event. It was determined that the Stakeholders Council could consider a similar event. She noted  
36 that the CWC Board Retreat was hybrid but she noticed that the online participants did not receive as  
37 much recognition or engagement as those who attended in person. CWC Staff conducted a storyboard  
38 exercise, where each person wrote down what they felt should be accomplished in 2023 and in three  
39 to five years. Themes included the Environmental Dashboard and the Federal Legislation. There  
40 was also support for transportation solutions. During the CWC Board Retreat, she learned that the  
41 Forest Service needed an expanded timeline for short-term projects. Executive Director of Policy,  
42 Lindsey Nielsen would investigate the notice and approval process for short-term projects moving  
43 forward. Some changes to that process may need to be made.

44  
45 CWC Board Members noted that resorts and commerce were an important part of the organization.  
46 Their views need to be respected and those individuals need to be engaged. Co-Chair Cameron

1 pointed out that a specific question was posed during the CWC Board Retreat about how CWC Board  
2 Members could support the Stakeholders. Some of the suggestions included:

- 3
- 4 • Highlight areas where there is agreeance;
- 5 • Be a forum for concerns and projects. Have a bottom-up flow;
- 6 • Allow CWC Board Members to request top-down directions. For instance, asking  
7 Stakeholders Council Members for additional Environmental Dashboard support;
- 8 • Shift the meeting schedule so there is a better working relationship between the CWC Board  
9 and the Stakeholders Council; and
- 10 • Increase the Stakeholder focus on different ways to raise money to buy inholdings and  
11 possibly create conservation easements.
- 12

13 Co-Chair Cameron added that CWC Staff was essential for the CWC Board and Stakeholders Council  
14 to coordinate. She appreciated the efforts of Ms. Nielsen and Executive Director of Administration,  
15 Blake Perez. Chair McCarvill explained that during the CWC Board Retreat, there were five subject  
16 areas included in the storyboarding activity. One of the five was the Stakeholders Council. There  
17 were now lists of ideas written by CWC Board Members. He had not reviewed all of the storyboard  
18 suggestions yet, but he would review those in the future. Stakeholders Council leadership would  
19 distill the comments and share them with the Council.

## 20

### 21 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### 22

#### 23 **1. Little Cottonwood Canyon Stakeholder Member.**

#### 24

25 Chair McCarvill reported that the Stakeholders Council would review a document proposed by  
26 Patrick Shea, "Recommendation of Practical Application and Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little  
27 Cottonwood Canyon." Mr. Shea explained that the document was a statement of facts.

28

29 Mr. Shea moved to approve the "Recommendation of Practical Application and Fiscal Responsibility  
30 Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon." Kirk Nichols seconded the motion. Discussions were had  
31 about the proposed motion. It was noted that suggested amendments had been sent out to the  
32 Stakeholders Council. Mr. Nichols presented an alternate motion to the Council. Mr. Nichols moved  
33 to amend the "Recommendation of Practical Applications and Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little  
34 Cottonwood Canyon" document. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The alternate motion was  
35 discussed by the Council. Mr. Nichols explained that he supported the original recommendation but  
36 wanted to make some amendments. The amendments would not change the nature of the document  
37 but would add explanations as to where the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") National  
38 Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") procedures fell short.

39

40 The UDOT solution of building large parking lots deep within the congested area would add to the  
41 congestion rather than reduce the congestion. Building a gondola would also increase congestion,  
42 which would decrease the overall experience in the area. Mr. Nichols believed that the UDOT  
43 decision was not a good decision. He also felt it was an uninformed decision. There was one last  
44 opportunity to comment on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Final Environmental Impact  
45 Statement ("FEIS") preferred alternative. He explained that there would be a Record of Decision  
46 ("ROD") protest period. It was a qualified public input period, where comments could only be  
47 submitted from those who commented on the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") in the past.

1  
2 Mr. Nichols overviewed the proposed amendments to the “Recommendation of Practical Application  
3 and Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon” document. The “therefore”  
4 statements were shown in red. Chair McCarvill explained that the motions could be combined into  
5 one or there could be a vote on the original motion and alternative motion. Mr. Shea thought there  
6 should be a discussion about the matter. Chair McCarvill asked that Stakeholders Council Members  
7 clearly state whether comments were related to the original language or the suggested amendments.  
8

9 Brian Hutchinson had an additional amendment. Chair McCarvill clarified that it would need to be  
10 proposed at the next meeting because it was only possible to take action on what had been presented  
11 to the public. Any amendments needed to be submitted ahead of time. Mr. Hutchinson explained  
12 that it was a technical amendment and would not amend the actual intent. Chair McCarvill pointed  
13 out that Mr. Hutchinson could also suggest an amended motion of his own. Mr. Hutchinson  
14 referenced the, therefore, statement related to tolling. Instead of "tolling," he believed it should state,  
15 "canyon base tolling" for additional clarity. He also wanted to add a "transit-only lane at the base of  
16 the canyon." He explained that this amendment was related to the original motion.  
17

18 There were discussions about tolling. It was noted that UDOT chose tolling locations before the  
19 resorts with the idea that the tolling would only impact resort visitors. Those tended to be higher-use  
20 areas. This would allow other users to access areas below the resorts without being tolled.  
21 Mr. Hutchinson felt it was important to be consistent and reduce vehicles in all areas of the canyons.  
22 Tolling at the base of the canyon would encourage users to take transit. Paul Diegel believed the  
23 reason tolling would be implemented around the resorts was to offset concerns that the gondola was  
24 not an option for non-resort goers. Many Little Cottonwood Canyon visitors were not heading to the  
25 resorts. Resort users would have an alternative transportation plan with the gondola. Someone that  
26 was not heading to the resorts would not necessarily have an alternative, because not all buses stopped  
27 at all of the trailheads. Mr. Hutchinson stated that it was important to discourage single-occupancy  
28 vehicles in all areas. He wanted increased efficiency in the canyon.  
29

30 Dave Fields struggled with both motions. The amendment, as written by Mr. Nichols, felt more  
31 appropriate for something like an op-ed rather than a consensus-based group like the Stakeholders  
32 Council. Kurt Hegmann noted that if a tollbooth was placed halfway up the canyon, it would impact  
33 parking below that area and along the road. If there was tolling, he felt it should be at the base.  
34

35 The Council discussed the motions that were made. It was determined that the Council would vote  
36 on the motion made by Mr. Hutchinson to amend the “Recommendation of Practical Application and  
37 Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon.” The language would include, “canyon  
38 base tolling for single-occupant vehicles,” as well as a clause related to a transit-only lane at the  
39 canyon base. The first amendment would be voted on at the current time.  
40

41 **MOTION:** Brian Hutchinson moved to AMEND “Recommendation of Practical Application and  
42 Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon” and add “canyon base tolling for  
43 single-occupant vehicles” to the language. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. Vote on motion:  
44 Barbara Cameron-Aye; Kirk Nichols-Aye; John Knoblock-Abstain; Dennis Goreham-Nay; Will  
45 McCarvill-Aye; Mike Christensen-Aye; Dave Fields-Nay; Ed Marshall-Abstain; Mike Marker-Nay;  
46 Carl Fisher-Abstain; Paul Diegel-Nay; Del Draper-Aye; Stuart Derman-Abstain, Nate Rafferty-Nay;  
47 Troy Morgan-Aye; Amber Broadaway-Nay; Maura Hahnenberger-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Jan  
48 Striefel-Aye; Sarah Bennett-Abstain; Serena Yau-Abstain; Mike Doyle-Nay; Brian Hutchinson-Aye;

1 Danny Richardson-Aye; Pat Shea-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-Aye. The motion passed 13-to-7 with  
2 6 abstentions.

3  
4 Mr. Hutchinson moved to amend the “Recommendation of Practical Application and Fiscal  
5 Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon” and add a reference to a transit-only lane  
6 leading to the base of the canyon. Stuart Derman seconded the motion. There was discussion on the  
7 motion. Mr. Fisher believed the suggestion was essentially for a Wasatch Boulevard transit-only  
8 lane. As he recalled, the five-lane widened proposal had been recommended. He wondered whether  
9 the idea was for one of those lanes to be a transit-only lane or if an additional lane was proposed.  
10 Mr. Hutchinson clarified that he was not recommending that the footprint be increased. It was  
11 possible to work within the existing footprint and drive home the need to utilize transit. Danny  
12 Richardson read from the document, which stated “practical solutions could include such things as...”  
13 He felt the addition would be appropriate in that section. Mr. Hutchinson was supportive of that.

14  
15 **MOTION:** Brian Hutchinson moved to AMEND “Recommendation of Practical Application and  
16 Fiscal Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon” and add a reference to a transit-only  
17 lane leading to the base of the canyon into the language. Stuart Derman seconded the motion. Vote  
18 on motion: Barbara Cameron-Nay; Kirk Nichols-Aye; John Knoblock-Aye; Dennis Goreham-Aye;  
19 Will McCarvill-Aye; Mike Christensen-Aye; Dave Fields-Nay; Ed Marshall-Abstain; Mike Marker-  
20 Nay; Carl Fisher-Aye; Paul Diegel-Nay; Del Draper-Aye; Stuart Derman-Aye, Nate Rafferty-Nay;  
21 Troy Morgan-Nay; Amber Broadaway-Nay; Maura Hahnenberger-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Jan  
22 Striefel-Aye; Sarah Bennett-Nay; Serena Yau-Aye; Mike Doyle-Nay; Brian Hutchinson-Aye; Danny  
23 Richardson-Aye; Pat Shea-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-Nay. The motion passed 15-to-10 with 1 abstention.

24  
25 Chair McCarvill noted that the amendments suggested by Mr. Hutchinson passed and would be  
26 incorporated into the “Recommendation of Practical Application and Fiscal Responsibility  
27 Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon” document. The Council would now address the amendments  
28 suggested earlier in the meeting by Mr. Nichols. The only difference between the version of the  
29 amendments that was distributed to the Council and his current draft had to do with punctuation and  
30 capitalization. The intent of the amendments had not been altered in any way. Mr. Fisher did not  
31 have any issues with the proposed amendments. However, he felt the “therefore” statements should  
32 be at the bottom of the document rather than interwoven into each paragraph.

33  
34 Mr. Nichols reviewed the amendments with the Council. Mr. Shea did not believe it would be proper  
35 form for the document to have the “therefore” statements interwoven with the “whereas” statements.  
36 Mr. Nichols moved to amend the "Recommendation of Practical Application and Fiscal  
37 Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon" to add language as outlined in the "Adds and  
38 Therefores" document. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. The Council discussed the motion.  
39 Mr. Shea believed the proposal was a substitution rather than an amendment because parts of the  
40 "therefore" statements had been incorporated into each of the paragraphs. Mr. Nichols wondered if  
41 the best option would be to withdraw his motion. He did not want the language proposed by Mr. Shea  
42 to disappear. Chair McCarvill noted that a motion had been made and seconded. Mr. Nichols  
43 withdrew his motion.

44  
45 Chair McCarvill suggested that the Council vote on the motion originally made by Mr. Shea. He  
46 noted that there had since been amendments made to the language, per the motions from  
47 Mr. Hutchinson. Mr. Nichols could make a standalone motion after that vote.

1 **MOTION:** Patrick Shea moved to APPROVE “Recommendation of Practical Application and Fiscal  
2 Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon” with the approved amendments. Danny  
3 Richardson seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Barbara Cameron-Aye; Kirk Nichols-Aye; John  
4 Knoblock-Aye; Dennis Goreham-Aye; Will McCarvill-Aye; Mike Christensen-Aye; Dave Fields-  
5 Nay; Ed Marshall-Abstain; Mike Marker-Aye; Carl Fisher-Aye; Paul Diegel-Aye; Del Draper-Aye;  
6 Stuart Derman-Aye, Nate Rafferty-Nay; Troy Morgan-Nay; Amber Broadaway-Nay; Maura  
7 Hahnenberger-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Jan Striefel-Aye; Sarah Bennett-Aye; Serena Yau-Aye;  
8 Mike Doyle-Nay; Brian Hutchinson-Aye; Danny Richardson-Aye; Pat Shea-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-  
9 Aye. The motion passed 20-to-5 with 1 abstention.

10  
11 Mr. Nichols moved to approve the seven points that were outlined in his “Adds and Therefore’s”  
12 document. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. There was discussion regarding the motion. John  
13 Knoblock pointed out that this document was very different from the one proposed by Mr. Shea. It  
14 essentially stated that the EIS was flawed. Mr. Nichols agreed that this was the last chance to look at  
15 the procedural methods used by UDOT. He felt it was more work to be done. It was clarified that  
16 the document would not take the place of the recommendation that had already been passed. It would  
17 be separate. Jan Striefel wondered if the document could be a letter that accompanied the other  
18 recommendation. Chair McCarvill explained that whatever passes at the meeting would be forwarded  
19 to the CWC Board for consideration and possible action. Though the document had initially been  
20 presented as a substitute or amendment to the language drafted by Mr. Shea, it was now being  
21 reviewed independently. The recommendation from Mr. Shea had already been voted on and  
22 approved by the Council.

23  
24 **MOTION:** Kirk Nichols moved to APPROVE the seven points outlined in the “Adds and  
25 Therefore’s” document. Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Barbara Cameron-  
26 Aye; Kirk Nichols-Aye; John Knoblock-Nay; Dennis Goreham-Aye; Will McCarvill-Aye; Mike  
27 Christensen-Aye; Dave Fields-Nay; Ed Marshall-Aye; Mike Marker-Aye; Carl Fisher-Aye; Paul  
28 Diegel-Aye; Del Draper-Aye; Stuart Derman-Aye, Nate Rafferty-Nay; Troy Morgan-Nay; Amber  
29 Broadaway-Nay; Maura Hahnenberger-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Jan Striefel-Aye; Sarah  
30 Bennett-Abstain; Serena Yau-Aye; Mike Doyle-Nay; Brian Hutchinson-Aye; Tom Diegel-Aye;  
31 Danny Richardson-Aye; Pat Shea-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-Nay. The motion passed 19-to-7 with  
32 1 abstention.

33  
34 **2. Salt Lake County Public Safety Stakeholder Memo.**

35  
36 Co-Chair Cameron reported that the Salt Lake County Public Safety Stakeholder Memo was a  
37 recommendation to support fire and emergency services in the canyons. Approximately \$647,000 of  
38 canyon funding would be deduced from canyon services. Two weeks ago, Chief Dominic Burchett  
39 from Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) presented a letter to the Salt Lake County Council asking that  
40 the money be reinstated. After speaking with Chief Burchett, Co-Chair Cameron found that since  
41 2013, Salt Lake County has subsidized approximately \$3.175 million for fire and emergency services.  
42 Emergency services included ambulances and paramedics. The current cost to provide fire and  
43 emergency services to the recreational canyons was approximately \$5.78 million. UFA proposed an  
44 increase of \$1 million for next year. There was a shortfall of \$1 million in the current year and it was  
45 being shared by the communities in the Unified Fire Service Area (“UFSA”).

46  
47 UFA data showed that calls for emergency services in the canyons were disproportionately attributable  
48 to the estimated four million annual visitors to the canyons. Cutting costs would result in a decrease

1 in service and service levels. For instance, the Fire Station in Big Cottonwood could be closed and  
2 service calls could be taken by Station 116 on Wasatch Boulevard or Station 110 on Fort Union.  
3 Alternatively, the funding could be shared among the UFSA members as it was currently being done.  
4 However, it seemed unfair that there are 285,000 residents in the UFSA area that would pay the extra  
5 amount that benefits the canyon recreation areas. Co-Chair Cameron explained that it was possible  
6 for there to be a separate assessment for Brighton and Alta to make up the difference but the residents  
7 in Brighton and Alta are currently paying their portion of the costs to receive UFA services. It seemed  
8 that the additional burden created by visitors to the canyons should be shared equally by all who  
9 enjoyed the canyons and could require emergency services.

10  
11 Co-Chair Cameron moved that the Stakeholders Council ask the CWC Board to urge the Salt Lake  
12 County Council to provide funding that would cover the shortfall and restore the \$674,000 for  
13 emergency services in the canyons. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. Mr. Hegmann assumed that a  
14 large portion of the costs were related to search and rescue efforts. If that were the case, tolls at the  
15 mouth of the canyon could recover those costs. Alternatively, there could be a tax on ski tickets. Del  
16 Draper was in favor of the motion. A lot of people use the canyons that do not reside in the canyons.  
17 Those visitors should be paying a larger share of the emergency services. It was a complex issue.

18  
19 Mr. Fisher explained that when Brighton was working to incorporate in 2018, there was an agreement  
20 that Brighton would not pursue its own land use authority, in recognition that the Cottonwood  
21 Canyons and Wasatch Mountains were a regional resource and the community deserved a say in the  
22 land use activities that were taking place in the watershed. He felt that Brighton had reneged on the  
23 promise made to include the public in land use planning. Brighton worked to reduce stream setbacks,  
24 which impacted the stream corridors, water quality, and environmental viability of the streams. Co-  
25 Chair Cameron clarified that the town had not reneged on anything in the Foothills and Canyon  
26 Overlay Zone (“FCOZ”). The stream setbacks are 100 feet, like elsewhere in the canyon. There was  
27 a desire to get a handle on short-term rentals and for dark sky amendments to the FCOZ. It was  
28 important to preserve the watershed and that was a continued commitment for Brighton.

29  
30 Mr. Knoblock was in support of the motion. The vast majority of the calls for emergency services  
31 are from people in the valley and beyond that come to visit Salt Lake County. Salt Lake County  
32 benefits from those visitors. Those who use the services should support the services. He believed  
33 that Salt Lake County should help pay for the services in Brighton. Dennis Goreham wondered what  
34 the rationale for the cut was and asked Catherine Kanter to speak on the issue. Ms. Kanter explained  
35 that she serves as the Deputy Mayor of Regional Operations at Salt Lake County. She agreed that  
36 this is a complex matter with a long history. Her recollection was that in 2021, during the Legislative  
37 General Session, as part of the negotiations over Senate Bill (“S.B.”) 157, Brighton asked for land use  
38 authority to be given to them. At that point, Mayor Jenny Wilson communicated to Mayor Dan  
39 Knopp that it could jeopardize the canyon's contribution.

40  
41 Ms. Kanter noted that there were strong opinions on both sides of the issue. She acknowledged that  
42 there is merit on both sides and reiterated that it is a complicated issue. In the Salt Lake County  
43 Mayor’s Proposed Budget, which is a proposed budget that would be deliberated by the Council, it  
44 was recommended that there be no reduction in the level of contribution for fire and emergency  
45 services costs for the first six months of 2023. That six months would allow additional questions to  
46 be asked and additional information to be uncovered. For instance, what Brighton currently pays and  
47 how that compares to what municipalities in similar resort communities are paying.  
48



1 It was important to determine whether there was a justification for Brighton to pay more than what  
2 the town is currently paying. If the determination was that Brighton was paying their fair share, there  
3 need to be conversations about who would continue to handle the shortfall. Salt Lake County needed  
4 time to do its due diligence and have additional conversations. This would ensure that an informed  
5 decision was made. It was possible that the Council would come back during the June budget  
6 adjustment and modify whatever was approved in December 2022. Ms. Kanter believed the  
7 recommendation presented by Co-Chair Cameron was premature. She recommended that the  
8 Stakeholders Council wait to see what happens moving forward before passing anything.

9  
10 Ms. Kanter noted that it was suggested that the County is acting arbitrarily. She wanted to dispel that  
11 narrative. That was not what was happening. Ms. Kanter clarified that Salt Lake County is a regional  
12 government that represents 23 municipalities. As a regional government, it is not possible to focus  
13 on one area and not think about the others. Salt Lake County needs to think about everyone. As a  
14 result, additional deliberations were needed. She reiterated that the motion was premature and  
15 suggested that it be paused. Ms. Kanter offered to come back to the Council and share progress  
16 reports with the Stakeholders Council Members in the future.

17  
18 Mr. Fisher was excited to see \$5 million allocated for land acquisition and open space protections  
19 within the Mayor's Proposed Budget. He wondered where that money would come from. Ms. Kanter  
20 explained that the County Council will determine those details. Presumably, there will be a decision  
21 that something in the budget will be reduced to make the numbers work. Alternatively, an increased  
22 budget could be proposed, but that was unlikely.

23  
24 Chair McCarvill proposed an alternate motion. He suggested that action on the item be delayed until  
25 there is additional information about the schedule of decisions. Co-Chair Cameron believed the facts  
26 were available and had been presented by Chief Burchett from UFA. She explained that this was an  
27 imminent problem and felt it was important to support UFA in the canyons. There was discussion  
28 regarding the timeline. Some Council Members felt there was urgency and it did not make sense to  
29 wait. Ms. Kanter clarified that it was not certain whether the \$3.175 million contribution would be  
30 reduced by \$647,000. It was possible that in June 2023, a different decision could be made by the  
31 Council during the annual budget adjustment. Members of the Stakeholders Council further discussed  
32 the timeline and the Salt Lake County Council process.

33  
34 Chair McCarvill reiterated his motion to delay the item. Dennis Goreham seconded the motion. The  
35 Council discussed the motion. Several Council Members were opposed to the alternate motion and  
36 were in support of the original motion suggested by Co-Chair Cameron. It was noted that the Salt  
37 Lake County Council vote would take place in a few weeks and it was necessary to address the issue.

38  
39 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to TABLE the motion that the Stakeholders Council ask the CWC  
40 Board to urge the Salt Lake County Council to provide funding that would cover the shortfall and  
41 restore the \$647,000 for emergency services in the canyons. Dennis Goreham seconded the motion.  
42 Vote on motion: Barbara Cameron-Nay; Kirk Nichols-Nay; John Knoblock-Nay; Dennis Goreham-  
43 Aye; Will McCarvill-Abstain; Mike Christensen-Aye; Dave Fields-Nay; Ed Marshall-Nay; Mike  
44 Marker-Aye; Carl Fisher-Aye; Paul Diegel-Aye; Del Draper-Nay; Stuart Derman-Nay, Nate  
45 Rafferty-Nay; Troy Morgan-Nay; Amber Broadaway-Nay; Maura Hahnenberger-Nay; Roger  
46 Borgenicht-Nay; Jan Striefel-Abstain; Sarah Bennett-Nay; Serena Yau-Abstain; Mike Doyle-Nay;  
47 Brian Hutchinson-Aye; Danny Richardson-Nay; Pat Shea-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-Nay. The motion  
48 failed 7-to-16 with 3 abstentions.

1  
2 The Council voted on the original motion proposed by Co-Chair Cameron.  
3

4 **MOTION:** Co-Chair Cameron moved to APPROVE a recommendation that the CWC Board urge  
5 the Salt Lake County Council to provide funding that would cover the shortfall and restore the  
6 \$647,000 for emergency services in the canyons. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. Vote on motion:  
7 Barbara Cameron-Aye; Kirk Nichols-Aye; John Knoblock-Aye; Dennis Goreham-Abstain; Will  
8 McCarvill-Abstain; Dave Fields-Aye; Ed Marshall-Aye; Mike Marker-Nay; Carl Fisher-Nay; Paul  
9 Diegel-Nay; Del Draper-Aye; Stuart Derman-Aye, Nate Rafferty-Aye; Troy Morgan-Abstain; Amber  
10 Broadaway-Aye; Maura Hahnenberger-Aye; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Jan Striefel-Abstain; Sarah  
11 Bennett-Abstain; Serena Yau-Abstain; Mike Doyle-Aye; Brian Hutchinson-Nay; Danny Richardson-  
12 Aye; Pat Shea-Nay; Kurt Hegmann-Aye. The motion passed 14-to-5 with 6 abstentions.  
13

14 **CENTRAL WASATCH NATIONAL CONSERVATION AND RECREATION AREA ACT**  
15 **("CWNCRA") Overview.**  
16

17 1. **Staff will Provide Stakeholders an Overview of the 10.27.20 CWNCRA and Answer**  
18 **Stakeholder Questions.**  
19

20 The above item was not discussed.  
21

22 **OPEN COMMENTS**  
23

24 There were no further comments.  
25

26 **ADJOURN MEETING**  
27

28 1. **William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**  
29

30 **MOTION:** Patrick Shea moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Kurt Hegmann  
31 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.  
32

33 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Special Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, November 16, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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