



**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) HYBRID
STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2022, AT
3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA
ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION
OFFICES.**

Present:

Will McCarvill, Chair
Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair
John Knoblock
Alex Porpora
Amber Broadway
Brian Hutchinson
Carl Fisher
Dennis Goreham
Ed Marshall
Kelly Boardman
Kirk Nichols
Maura Hahnenberger
Mike Christensen
Mike Marker
Patrick Shea
Paul Diegel
Roger Borgenicht
Stuart Derman
Tom Diegel
Joanna Wheelton
Serena Yau
Danny Richardson

Staff:

Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy
Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration
Madeline Pettit, Community Engagement Intern

Others:

Steve Van Maren
Mike Doyle
Josh Van Jura
Brianna Binnebose
Lance Kovel

1 **Opening**

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

4
5 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He reported that this was a hybrid
6 meeting.

7
8 2. **The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders' Council DRAFT**
9 **Minutes of Wednesday, July 20, 2022.**

10
11 There were no corrections or suggestions for the July 20, 2022 Stakeholders Council Meeting
12 Minutes. As a result, Chair McCarvill stated that the minutes were approved.

13
14 3. **Announcements.**

15
16 Co-Chair Barbara Cameron shared announcements with the Stakeholders Council. She reported that
17 the Silver Lake Boardwalk is under construction on the west side. Hikers can still use the east side.
18 Next year, the east side will be renovated. That funding came from the Great American Outdoors
19 Act (“GAOA”) grant. In addition, the U.S. Forest Service and Salt Lake County were finishing the
20 Cardiff Meadow Ridge and Boardwalk. That work would be done by the end of the month. The U.S.
21 Forest Service hired a full-time Ranger to supervise activity in the Cardiff Meadow area since it is
22 one of the busiest trailheads in the Wasatch. The Town of Brighton would provide half of the funding
23 for that position. Co-Chair Cameron noted that geological signs were installed in Big Cottonwood as
24 part of the CWC Short-Term Projects program. In addition, the restroom situation had been much
25 improved due to a private company taking on the cleaning.

26
27 Co-Chair Cameron reported that the Town of Brighton raised the price of a parking ticket along the
28 highway in town. It was previously \$25 and would now be \$150. This was intended to curb illegal
29 parking in the summer and winter months. She asked that Stakeholders share that information. Co-
30 Chair Cameron informed the Council that Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen presented
31 the Environmental Dashboard to several groups recently. Additionally, the Millcreek Canyon
32 Committee held a productive meeting earlier that week. Plans were in the works to create a vision
33 statement for Millcreek related to the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. There might
34 be a field trip to the area later in the year or sometime next year.

35
36 John Knoblock shared additional information about the Silver Lake Boardwalk Project. The Forest
37 Service had enough money to get the boardwalk in but not enough to redo the loop trail around the
38 lake. As a result, Trails Utah applied for a grant and received \$425,000 to redo the trail.

39
40 **UDOT Presentation**

41
42 1. **Josh Van Jura will Present UDOT’s LCC FEIS.**

43
44 Chair McCarvill noted that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood
45 Canyon Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”) public comment period had ended. Despite
46 this, he had asked Josh Van Jura to share a brief overview and answer any outstanding questions.
47 Mr. Van Jura shared a slideshow presentation with the Stakeholders Council. He explained that the
48 purpose and need of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS was to improve roadway safety,

1 mobility, and reliability on SR-210. Travel times in 2050 were expected to be within the 80–85-
2 minute range, which would result in substantial queuing. On SR-210, Wasatch Boulevard, and North
3 Little Cottonwood, it was expected that the queuing would back up to 3500 East on 50 days of the
4 year. On 9400, it was expected to extend past Wasatch Boulevard. He noted that there are also
5 avalanche hazards in Little Cottonwood Canyon that had been considered.

6
7 Mr. Van Jura shared information about the public comments on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon
8 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”). 14,000 comments were received. There was a lot
9 of support for tolling and a phased implementation. He believed UDOT had decided to proceed with
10 a phased approach due to the comments received. On August 31, 2022, UDOT selected the
11 Gondola B Alternative as the preferred alternative with a proposed phased implementation plan. That
12 alternative had a capital cost of \$550 million. This was a reduction of \$42 million as a result of
13 consolidating the parking at the La Caille Base Station. There would be 2,500 stalls there. The
14 reduction of the bus service would also reduce the cost by \$3.6 million. The total travel time was
15 expected to be 55 minutes. This was one minute longer than the Enhanced Bus with No Roadway
16 Widening Alternative. He explained that the travel time included driving to the base station, parking,
17 waiting for a gondola, and the gondola ride itself.

18
19 Over 20 different environmental impacts had been explored. This included air quality, water quality,
20 noise, environmental justice, and impacts during construction. There was a lot of that included in the
21 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. Mr. Van Jura shared information related to air quality. All
22 of the alternatives would significantly improve the air quality because the intention was to shift 30%
23 of people in private vehicles to transit. Almost 4,000 tons of greenhouse gases would be saved. The
24 gondola had slightly higher emissions than the bus alternative, which he felt was important to
25 recognize. UDOT took a close look at water quality concerns. Nearly half a million people received
26 some or all of their drinking water from Little Cottonwood. As a result, UDOT focused on worst-
27 case scenario modeling assumptions. Even using the worst-case conditions, safe drinking water
28 thresholds for contaminants of concern were not approached.

29
30 Mr. Van Jura described the main reasons UDOT had selected the Gondola B Alternative as the
31 preferred alternative. The first reason had to do with the purpose and need. The Gondola B
32 Alternative had the highest travel time reliability because it operated in a separate alignment. It would
33 not be prone to slide-offs, crashes, slow-moving vehicles, or avalanche debris on roads.
34 Environmental impacts were considered in the preferred alternative selection process. Additionally,
35 the gondola had the lowest overall lifecycle cost, which was another consideration.

36
37 UDOT recognized that the gondola would have high visual impacts. That was a concern to many
38 canyon users. Since so many comments were received about the visual impacts, UDOT had done
39 several artistic renderings. Those could be found in Chapters 17 and 32 of the UDOT Little
40 Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. Mr. Van Jura shared some of those renderings with the Council.

41
42 The phased approach was discussed. Currently, UDOT did not have the \$550 million needed to
43 implement the entire transportation project. The gondola made up \$335 million of the estimated
44 \$550. There was \$159 million in commonalities as well, which included snowsheds, trailhead
45 improvements, parking restrictions, and tolling equipment. Some funds were allocated, with \$13
46 million allocated for the purchase of right-of-way at the mouth of Big Cottonwood. UDOT
47 recognized that the money was not all in hand and did not know how long it would take to secure
48 the total amount of necessary funds. However, it was important to address existing issues.

1
2 Some of the proposed improvements included improving and increasing bus service, adding more
3 parking, and tolling. The implementation would be phased and dependent on when funding becomes
4 available. The sub-alternatives included tolling, transit, parking, widening of Wasatch Boulevard,
5 snowsheds, trailhead improvements, and the no winter parking alternative. Mr. Van Jura reported
6 that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS public comment period ended on October 17, 2022,
7 at 11:59 p.m. He did not have an exact comment count at the current time, because some duplicate
8 comments needed to be removed. However, he estimated that approximately 13,000 comments were
9 received. He thanked everyone who submitted a comment. Moving forward, UDOT would read all
10 of the comments and evaluate whether any additional engineering or environmental assessment was
11 required. The intention was to have a Record of Decision (“ROD”) ready in the winter. Based on
12 the number of comments received, it would likely be later in the winter.

13
14 Brian Hutchinson believed that UDOT had a narrow purpose and need statement. He also pointed
15 out that the purpose and need did not focus on equity. It seemed that reliability was the most important
16 factor. He wondered whether it would be possible to have a study that would address air quality
17 impacts on a more regional level. Mr. Van Jura explained that UDOT felt the correct impact areas
18 had been addressed. Some people felt that the purpose and need statement was too narrow, but he
19 respectfully disagreed. He added that the air quality model was part of the Wasatch Front Regional
20 Council (“WFRC”) air quality model. Lance Kovel and Brianna Binnebose were in attendance.
21 Mr. Van Jura noted that they would answer certain Council questions.

22
23 Patrick Shea wondered what the cost of the EIS was to date. Ms. Binnebose offered to find that
24 information and share it in the Zoom chat box. The amount was on the UDOT website. It was noted
25 that the number was approximately \$11.5 million. Mr. Knoblock wanted to know if there was a way
26 to implement the single-occupant vehicle toll sooner. For instance, single-occupant vehicles could
27 travel through a separate lane where there was a toll booth. Mr. Van Jura reported that UDOT had
28 been analyzing tolling, but that sounded like more of an operational change than what was being
29 considered part of the long-term EIS. Any additional construction in the canyon would require
30 environmental clearances. He offered to find out more information after the meeting.

31
32 Carl Fisher noted that UDOT had evaluated a lot of different gondola configurations. The selection
33 UDOT made was the gondola alternative with no buses. Mr. Van Jura confirmed this. There was no
34 anticipated bus service from the mobility hubs to the base station. Mr. Fisher pointed out that in the
35 initial screening reports, UDOT found that the gondola without buses alternative failed to meet the
36 screening criteria because it would create congestion rather than alleviate congestion. He wondered
37 what had changed. Mr. Van Jura clarified that the base station location had changed.

38
39 Mr. Fisher asked for additional information about the process for disposing of Forest Service lands in
40 roadless areas to construct gondola towers. Mr. Kovel wanted clarification about the roadless areas
41 because there was only one modification to where the gondola route was. He referenced 3.1W in the
42 Forest Plan, a watershed emphasis that had a prohibition on road construction.

43
44 Mr. Fisher believed that 3.1W was important but some lands were protected under the roadless rule
45 that the gondola towers would be impacting. He was also curious about the general Forest Service
46 process. For instance, there would be an additional National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).
47 Mr. Kovel explained that the Forest Service had been a cooperating agency since the inception of the
48 EIS. The Forest Service had incorporated its requirements, reviewed the analysis, and provided input

1 to UDOT throughout the entire EIS process. He discussed the Federal Highway Administration
2 (“FHWA”). Under Title 23 Section 317, FHWA had the authority to appropriate Forest Service land
3 for highway purposes. It was not a complete transfer of Forest Service land but a non-exclusive
4 easement over Forest Service land. The Forest Service would retain the rights to that FHWA
5 easement. FHWA and UDOT, by deed, would have the authorization to use that for highway
6 purposes. The Forest Service did not have to make a decision for those easements under that scenario.
7

8 In a case where FHWA could not obtain an easement, the other option was that UDOT could come
9 directly to the Forest Service and ask for a Special Use Permit. At the current time, the Forest Service
10 was waiting for FHWA to weigh in. Mr. Kovel noted that within the EIS, there were a lot of “if/then”
11 statements. FHWA had not formally weighed in yet and UDOT still needed to release the ROD.
12 Mr. Fisher wondered if the ROD needed to be published before the FHWA process could move
13 forward. Mr. Kovel explained that it was up to the FHWA to make that determination. Following
14 the ROD and FHWA determination, the Forest Service would need to make a decision about any of
15 the lands that the FHWA could not obtain an easement for.
16

17 Following the ROD and FHWA determination, the Forest Service would have to make a decision for
18 any lands that the FHWA could not obtain an easement for. The Forest Service would issue a Draft
19 ROD and then there would be a 45-day objection period, a 45-day objection resolution period, and
20 then there would be a final Forest Service ROD. For some of the alternatives in the EIS, a Forest
21 Plan amendment would be required. The only amendments that the Forest Service was considering
22 for the Forest Plan were project-specific amendments. Those would not be forest wide and would
23 not set precedent for future projects in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest.
24

25 Mr. Van Jura reported that there was no permanent roading anticipated for the construction of the
26 gondola towers. The list of how each tower was anticipated to be constructed was included in Chapter
27 2. Mr. Kovel asked that any specific lands that Mr. Fisher had questions about be submitted via email.
28 He offered to look into the details and share additional information following the meeting. Mr. Fisher
29 explained that the specific lands were mentioned in the comment submitted by Save Our Canyons.
30

31 Mr. Shea noted that there was a regulation passed in November 2000 related to the roadless policy.
32 That was still in effect. He did not agree that there would be no roads because roads would be needed
33 for maintenance of the gondola towers. Mr. Shea asked whether a transfer would be possible, where
34 an entity other than UDOT could own the gondola outright. Mr. Van Jura offered to look into that.
35 It was noted that the underlying land could not be transferred to a different entity, because the Forest
36 Service retained all rights to that land.
37

38 Kirk Nichols believed that the worst queuing was on I-215. UDOT had stated that the study area was
39 large enough, but he did not find it to be so, since it did not account for that traffic queuing. He
40 believed the gondola would only increase the queues in that area. He asked for further justification
41 about the small UDOT study area. Mr. Van Jura did not disagree that the queuing that was
42 experienced a few times a year was an issue. It was not very often that it queued back onto I-215, but
43 it was a dangerous situation when it did happen. The majority of that queuing was related to the left
44 turn delays associated with Big Cottonwood Canyon rather than Little Cottonwood Canyon. UDOT
45 was studying the 30th busiest hour. Mr. Nichols pointed out that people would park by the gondola.
46 Everything was connected and it was necessary to study those connected effects.
47

1 Paul Diegel left a comment in the Zoom chat box. It had been reported that the gondola would need
2 an inspection after every artillery avalanche mitigation mission. He asked about the time it would
3 take to reopen the gondola after those missions. Mr. Van Jura explained that there had been
4 discussions with the gondola manufacturers about this. There were three ropes, two of which were
5 track ropes and one of which was a haul rope. The haul rope had continuous non-destructive testing.
6 This meant it was always operational. As for the track ropes, since they did not move, they would be
7 inspected through cameras at the tower locations. It would be under five minutes from the last shot
8 to the time that the inspection was complete. That would likely be less than the time required for the
9 maintenance and avalanche inspectors to drive the slide paths to verify there was no road debris.

10
11 Kelly Boardman asked Mr. Van Jura to explain why UDOT was looking at Little Cottonwood Canyon
12 in a vacuum. Traffic was just as bad in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Van Jura explained that a lot
13 of traffic had been seen in Big Cottonwood Canyon as well. If tolling or occupancy restrictions were
14 put in place within Little Cottonwood Canyon, it was likely that those would be implemented in Big
15 Cottonwood Canyon at the same time. This would require a separate environmental document. That
16 was all stated in Chapter 2 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. Chair McCarvill thanked
17 Mr. Van Jura for his presentation and for answering Stakeholders Council questions.

18 19 **Stakeholders Council Committee Update**

20 21 **1. SHC Committee Annual Reports will be Presented at the November CWC Retreat.**

22
23 Chair McCarvill reported that the CWC Board Retreat was to take place on November 10, 2022. He
24 and Co-Chair Cameron would attend that retreat. The Stakeholders Council Annual Reports 2022
25 would be shared at that time. It was reviewed with the Council Members. Co-Chair Cameron
26 explained that it was also included in the packet. She asked that those present review the list of sub-
27 committee members to determine that the names were accurate. It was noted that Joanna Wheelton
28 needed to be added to the Trails Committee list. Co-Chair Cameron stated that the report would be
29 presented to the full CWC Board at the CWC Board Retreat along with the survey results.

30 31 **2. Results of Survey.**

32
33 Co-Chair Cameron reported that a Stakeholders Council Survey 2022 was conducted. She thanked
34 those who responded to the survey questions. Several common themes had been incorporated into
35 the document. The following questions and answers were reviewed:

- 36
37 • Why did you join the Stakeholders Council?
 - 38 ○ To advocate for watershed and environmental protection, better transit, and high-
 - 39 quality visitor experience;
 - 40 ○ To promote equity in canyon transportation and recreation;
 - 41 ○ To have a voice in what happens in the canyons;
 - 42 ○ To stay informed;
 - 43 ○ To help set goals, strategies, and solutions to ensure conservation and preservation;
 - 44 and
 - 45 ○ CWC is the last, best opportunity to collaborate for sustainable canyon management
 - 46 and preservation.

- In 2023, the Stakeholders Council should:
 - Increase Committee and Stakeholder contributions;
 - Focus on sustainability of natural resources;
 - Offer ideas to the CWC Board, not the other way around;
 - Present more concrete actions for the CWC Board to consider;
 - Increase communication with the public and decision-makers;
 - Allow more voices to be heard, not dominated by a few; more surveys;
 - Be proactive, not reactive;
 - Provide clear communication and discussion;
 - Focus on substance and action, not procedure and administration;
 - Provide clear mission, vision, and meeting cadence; and
 - Provide support for public transit planning.
- As for meeting frequency, the majority of Stakeholders Council Members voted for bi-monthly meetings to sync with CWC Board Meetings.

3. SHC Committee Members will be Voted on at the January 2023 SHC Meeting.

Chair McCarvill explained that on a yearly basis, sub-committee leadership and committee members need to be proposed and voted on. He reviewed the Millcreek Canyon Committee Members list shown on the Annual Report, which included Tom Diegel as Chair. Alex Porpora asked to be removed from the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

MOTION: Chair McCarvill moved to APPROVE the amended list for the Millcreek Canyon Committee Membership Composition for 2023. Kirk Nichols seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Chair McCarvill reviewed the Trails Committee Members list shown on the Annual Report, which included John Knoblock as Chair. Ms. Wheelton was added to the list and Stuart Derman also asked to be added as a member of the Trails Committee.

MOTION: Chair McCarvill moved to APPROVE the amended list for the Trails Committee Membership Composition for 2023. Co-Chair Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Chair McCarvill discussed the Preservation Committee. According to the bylaws, a committee needs to meet at least once annually. The Preservation Committee had not met in over a year. He understood that the Preservation Committee was under review and reorganization but it had not met the bylaw requirements. He believed this vote should be delayed until the January 2023 meeting while those issues are resolved and a plan to move forward is created.

Cardiff Fork Proposal

1. Tom Diegel will Lead Discussion on Proposed Cardiff Fork Memo.

Mr. Tom Diegel shared a memo related to the current conflict in Upper Cardiff Fork. He reported that there was an article in *The Salt Lake Tribune* one month ago related to the area. There hadn't been any developments since the Special Use Permit expired in May 2022. For the last decade or so,

1 there was a Special Use Permit in place between the Forest Service and the Cardiff Canyon Owner's
2 Association. The Special Use Permit allowed landowners to travel across public land on motorized
3 vehicles, only on the rough historic mining road, in exchange for allowing the public to cross the
4 private lands to access the adjacent public lands. That Special Use Permit alleviated a lot of the
5 historical conflict in the area. However, the Special Use Permit expired in May 2022 and there was
6 no application to renew the permit. Currently, landowners were no longer able to legally access their
7 private inholdings. Additionally, the public no longer had the right to cross those private lands.

8
9 Mr. Diegel reminded those present that he represents the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance on the
10 Stakeholders Council. The Wasatch Backcountry Alliance is concerned that there will be issues
11 similar to what was seen prior to the issuance of the Special Use Permit. This means that the
12 landowners will need to access their property illegally and there could be conflicts related to public
13 access. There had been a lot of historical conflicts. As a result, there was a lot of concern about the
14 future of the area. The Special Use Permit expired on May 31, 2022, and the Cardiff Canyon Owner's
15 Association decided not to apply for a reissue of the permit. Mr. Diegel reported that in 2020, a yurt
16 was built on a private parcel high above the bottom of the drainage and at the top of the permitted
17 road without permission. From the perspective of Salt Lake County, it was an illegal yurt.

18
19 It was important to avoid conflict in the area. Mr. Diegel believed that the regulatory agencies would
20 need a lot of support to curtail the activities that would lead to conflict. The idea of the memo was to
21 ensure that everyone within the CWC knows what is happening. He felt that a formal Resolution
22 would inform others that the organization supported the respective agencies, including the Forest
23 Service, Salt Lake City, and Salt Lake County. Mr. Diegel requested that the Stakeholders Council
24 consider a formal Resolution and move it forward to the CWC Board.

25
26 Mr. Hutchinson was in support of a proposal to the CWC but felt there was language in the proposed
27 Resolution that should be adjusted. He noted that there are property owners at the base of the canyon
28 that is impacted by snowmobiles and ATVs. Those vehicles were also damaging the road and causing
29 high levels of road maintenance. He asked that the Resolution language not be related to a quick
30 solution. There should be a solution where snowmobiles and ATVs were not permitted.

31
32 Mr. Fisher explained that this was a complicated legal issue. When he had spoken to Dave
33 Whittekiend from the Forest Service at the last CWC meeting, he mentioned that people in the area
34 want a right to access. That was not something that was within his job description to give. It was
35 important for the Stakeholders Council to understand that this was a complex issue.

36
37 Ed Marshall agreed with the objectives outlined by Mr. Diegel. He also agreed with the comments
38 from Mr. Hutchinson and Mr. Fisher. Mr. Marshall explained that he would have to oppose the issue
39 based on the current Resolution language. This was not because there was support for the Cardiff
40 Canyon Owner's Association necessarily, but because he was in support of private property rights in
41 the canyon. The first sentence called on the government to exercise its power without there being a
42 mention of the interests of the private property owners. The language needed to be balanced.
43 Mr. Marshall pointed out that the second sentence suggested procuring funding to purchase the
44 needed properties outright. This would violate the Interlocal Agreement of the CWC, which called
45 for purchases from willing sellers only. The word "needed" had troubling overtones. He could not
46 support the current Resolution but could support a variation of it with different language.

1 Mr. Diegel pointed out that there are private property owners in the area who had claims. However,
2 they had historically not been very respectful of the adjacent public lands, in his opinion.
3 Mr. Marshall clarified that his comments were not based on the specifics of the situation. He wanted
4 to ensure that a precedent was not established where private property rights were not treated even-
5 handedly and government power was called upon without limits. He did not oppose the objective of
6 the Resolution but wanted to make sure the language respected private property rights.

7
8 Mr. Paul Diegel was not sure that the Stakeholders Council or CWC involvement would make a
9 difference but he felt this was an important issue. Some of the property owners believed that the
10 property boundaries were incorrect and there was no public land there. It seemed that some were
11 trying to take the law into their own hands, which was a concern. If there was no resolution, he was
12 concerned that there could be violent interactions during the winter season. This needed to be taken
13 seriously, but he did not know whether any of the government entities were taking it all that seriously.

14
15 Mr. Knoblock wanted to address the language related to purchasing needed properties. He believed
16 that meant needed for access and by no means implied that there would be an eminent domain put
17 forth. Chair McCarvill believed those present had brought a lot of different perspectives to the table.
18 He wanted to see interested Stakeholders Council Members rewrite the language. He agreed that this
19 was an important issue and that there needed to be more visibility. A motion needed to be presented
20 to the full CWC Board. He wanted the CWC Board to consider the issue and recommendation. This
21 would likely need to wait until the January 2023 Stakeholders Council Meeting so a vote could be
22 taken and the revised language written. Mr. Shea wanted to make a motion at the current meeting.
23 He was concerned that the winter months would be extremely dangerous if nothing was done.
24 Discussions were had about possible motion language.

25 26 **2. Stakeholders Council will Consider Voting on Memo.**

27
28 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved that the Stakeholders Council forward the proposal to the CWC
29 Board, allowing for minor language changes ahead of the next CWC Board Meeting. Co-Chair
30 Cameron seconded the motion.

31
32 There was discussion regarding the motion language. Mr. Tom Diegel explained that he would be
33 happy to work with Mr. Marshall and the Stakeholders Council leadership to adjust the language. A
34 substitute motion was proposed in the Zoom chat box to simplify the process. Mr. Knoblock accepted
35 the substitute motion language. He believed it made sense to keep the motion simple.

36
37 **MOTION:** Carl Fisher moved that the Stakeholders Council forward the following language to the
38 CWC Board: Out of concern for the canyon, public safety, public lands, watershed, and private
39 property rights, just to name a few, we urge the CWC to try and find a resolution to the issues in
40 Cardiff Fork, understanding that there are complicated legal issues at play. Brian Hutchinson
41 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

42 43 **Transportation Memo/Resolution**

44 45 **1. Pat Shea will Lead Discussion on Proposed Transportation Memo.**

46
47 Mr. Shea commented that he had been frustrated with the roundabout way that areas of the Central
48 Wasatch were being handled. For instance, Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon,

1 and Millcreek Canyon. He believed that the transportation choices from UDOT were being driven
2 by private economic interests. That was the reason he had asked Mr. Kovel earlier in the meeting
3 whether there was an opportunity for the Special Use Permit to be transferred to a public-private
4 entity instead. Mr. Shea felt it was time to make a clear recommendation.

5
6 Co-Chair Cameron believed the Resolution, titled, “Resolution of Common Sense and Fiscal
7 Responsibility Concerning Little Cottonwood Canyon,” was a well-written document with supported
8 material and direct, pointed questions for UDOT. However, she was concerned with the fourth point,
9 which stated: “The Stakeholders Council requests immediate action on Federal Legislation to protect
10 against the damage the State seeks to initiate with its FEIS.” She asked that a substitution be made
11 and it instead read: “The Stakeholders Council requests that action on the Federal Legislation be
12 considered at a time when we can offer a reasonably safe and high-quality visitor experience.” The
13 infrastructure in the canyon was not able to support more visitation. There was limited public transit
14 and none in the summer as well as disorganized parking and increasing crime. The Cardiff Mill D
15 area was consistently on the Unified Police Department ("UPD") heat map for the most police activity
16 in the entire Wasatch. There were many high-crime areas. Though progress had been made with
17 graffiti and restrooms, there was a lot more to be done. It was important that there be a safe and high-
18 quality visitor experience before Federal Designation was considered.

19
20 Mr. Shea was supportive of the amendment suggested by Co-Chair Cameron. Chair McCarvill
21 offered an additional amendment for consideration. He wanted the items listed to be added to the
22 comments that were recently put together by the CWC Board on the FEIS. Mr. Knoblock explained
23 that he would have a difficult time supporting the Resolution, because of the following:

- 24
25 • The Stakeholders Council supports the common-sense approach for alleviating traffic
26 conditions in Little Cottonwood Canyon, particularly during the Winter ski season, provided
27 that specific traffic flow goals are stated in 2022/23 and when the desired traffic flow numbers
28 have been achieved the proposed Gondola construction would be eliminated.

29
30 He explained that the “common-sense approach” was not a clearly defined term. Mr. Shea reported
31 that this was a term that Mayor Jenny Wilson and Mayor Erin Mendenhall had used previously. Mr.
32 Fisher suggested that language be added to state, “as Salt Lake County has referred to, a common-
33 sense approach.” That could create additional clarity. He expressed concerns about the amendment
34 proposed by Co-Chair Cameron. He believed that Federal Legislation would help address the issues
35 rather than create a barrier. The Forest Plan did not currently support having transit access to
36 trailheads. That was something that needed to be cleared up, which could be done through Federal
37 Legislation. He did not want to see that removed from the proposed language.

38
39 Mr. Shea believed there were ways to reach a consensus. He asked that Stakeholders Council
40 leadership read the recommendation that was currently under consideration at the CWC Board Retreat
41 for feedback. It could be added to the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda in January 2023 for
42 further discussion. Chair McCarvill thanked Mr. Shea. He felt there had been a good discussion on
43 the matter. Mr. Shea asked that Mr. Knoblock, Mr. Fisher, and Co-Chair Cameron submit the
44 amendments that they wanted to see and distribute those to the Stakeholders Council for
45 consideration. He could then create an edited version of the document and redistribute it.

1
2 **2. Stakeholders Council May Vote on Proposed Memo.**
3

4 The vote was delayed until the January 2023 Stakeholders Council Meeting.
5

6 Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez noted that there could be discussions about
7 whether or not the item was appropriate to discuss at the CWC Board Retreat. He believed it would
8 be possible to present the item to the Executive Committee in mid-November. Mr. Shea suggested
9 that the Stakeholders Council leadership present a report at the CWC Board Retreat. Something more
10 definitive could move forward from the Stakeholders Council in January 2023. Mr. McCarvill
11 believed the first step was determining whether there was Council agreement on the language.
12

13 **CWC Retreat**
14

15 **1. Blake Perez will Provide an Overview of the Goals and Objectives of the Annual CWC**
16 **Retreat. Q&A from SHC Members will Follow.**
17

18 Mr. Perez reported that the CWC Board Retreat would take place on November 10, 2022, from
19 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The retreat would take place at Silver Fork Lodge. There would be a virtual
20 option as well. The retreat had three main components: Strategic Plan evaluation, goal and value
21 prioritization, and Stakeholders Council direction. There was an optional hike and a social dinner
22 event following the CWC Board Retreat. The meeting agenda was on the Utah Public Notice website.
23

24 **Open Comments**
25

26 Ms. Wheelton reported that the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation season just wrapped. Since the
27 foundation had collaborations and partnerships with many Stakeholders Council Members, she
28 wanted to highlight some of the accomplishments made that year. The Cottonwood Canyons
29 Foundation worked on eight major projects. 65 miles of trail received to repair and maintenance, 25
30 miles received heavy maintenance and construction, 55 new drainages were built, 286 drainages were
31 repaired and maintained, 4,800 feet of trail was naturalized, and a lot of work was done on campsite
32 naturalization. In addition to the eight major projects, the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation had also
33 worked on 28 trails for annual maintenance. As for weeds, 11,000 pounds of weeds were removed
34 from the canyons. The Cottonwood Canyons Foundation had collaborations with residential groups
35 as well. 1,500 native plants were planted, 164 acres were surveyed, and 71 acres were treated.
36

37 Over 6,500 hours of volunteer time was dedicated to the canyons and there were approximately 600
38 volunteers. Additionally, 226 guided walks were offered. Each one of those walks had important
39 watershed education components. Those were good outreach opportunities within the community.
40 Ms. Wheelton reported that there had been over 10,000 in-person and virtual students who
41 participated in their water education program. Co-Chair Cameron thanked the Cottonwood Canyons
42 Foundation. Mr. Knoblock believed the Forest Service had given the Cottonwood Canyons
43 Foundation the go-ahead to expand the Adopt-a-Trail Program to all trails in the canyons.
44

1 **Adjourn Meeting.**

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

4
5 **MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. The motion
6 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

7
8 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:56 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, October 19, 2022.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____