



8 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**  
9 **HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2023, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED**  
10 **BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS**  
11 **MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST.**  
12

13 **Board Members:** Chair Christopher F. Robinson  
14 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini  
15 Mayor Dan Knopp  
16 Mayor Monica Zoltanski  
17 Mayor Nann Worel  
18 Mayor Roger Bourke  
19 Annalee Munsey (Ex-Officio Member)  
20 Dave Whittekiend (Ex-Officio Member)  
21 Carlton Christensen (Ex-Officio Member)  
22

23 **Staff:** Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration  
24 Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy  
25 Shane Topham, CWC Legal Counsel  
26

27 **Others:** Dr. Jordan Smith  
28 Loretta Markham  
29 Barbara Cameron  
30 Will McCarvill  
31

32 **OPENING**  
33

34 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the CWC Board Meeting.**  
35

36 Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Once a quorum was present, the CWC  
37 Board Meeting agenda was taken out of order and the Closed Session occurred first. The Action  
38 Items were also moved forward on the agenda to ensure that enough voting members were present.  
39

40 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the CWC Board Meeting**  
41 **from Monday, December 5, 2022.**  
42

43 **MOTION:** Mayor Bourke moved to APPROVE the Minutes of the CWC Board Meeting from  
44 Monday, December 5, 2022. Mayor Worel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
45 unanimous consent of the Board.  
46

1 **VISITOR USE STUDY – TRAILS REPORT**

2  
3 **1. Dr. Jordan Smith, from Utah State University, will Present the Trails Portion of the**  
4 **Visitor Use Study.**

5  
6 Dr. Jordan Smith from Utah State University was present to share the trails portion of the Visitor Use  
7 Study with the CWC Board. The goal of the Visitor Use Study was to understand the spatial and  
8 temporal dynamics of visitor use within the canyons. The study would provide the CWC with a better  
9 understanding of where the use was happening, the amount of use that was occurring, how that use  
10 varied during different seasons, and over multiple years. It was also important to understand how use  
11 impacts various environmental conditions within the canyons. Dr. Smith reported that  
12 recommendations would be provided based on research and knowledge about recreation resource  
13 management. There could be discussion about how to move forward and manage the type of visitation  
14 that was occurring within the canyons.

15  
16 The Visitor Use Study was comprised of three different components consisting of the ecological  
17 conditions within the canyons (trail conditions, wildlife habitat, and water quality), the physical  
18 conditions (the amount of parking and restroom facilities within the canyons), and the social  
19 conditions (the amount of use happening, the economic benefits generated from recreation, and  
20 overall satisfaction).

21  
22 In early 2021, the Utah State University team began the scoping portion of the project where existing  
23 research was examined. Dr. Smith reported that the scoping component allowed the team to  
24 understand what data currently exists. At that time, a legislative and policy review was also done.  
25 He noted that a draft report of the Scoping Assessment was available to review. The Utah State  
26 University team was now at the end of the second phase. This process identified the data gaps across  
27 the Central Wasatch and collected data over a full year period. The Phase One Report had been done  
28 back in the middle of 2021. The data collection process started at the beginning of 2022.

29  
30 Dr. Smith previously presented work related to the high elevation lakes. This information was shared  
31 with the CWC Board in May 2022. It looked at the development and expansion of informal trails  
32 around the lakes. He reported that the U.S. Forest Service and the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance  
33 had been collecting use information on trails since 2017. One of the difficulties had to do with the  
34 fact that the data was sporadic. There was trail counter data only in certain locations and during  
35 certain times of the year. This made it difficult to understand how use changed throughout the year.  
36 The Visitor Use Study provided temporally and spatially consistent measures of visitor use.

37  
38 The University of Utah team worked closely with the U.S. Forest Service and shared its trails use  
39 data. Additionally, the team collaborated with the Forest Service on its process and protocols for  
40 collecting data. Data collection was being done in the same way that the Forest Service and Wasatch  
41 Backcountry Alliance had done it since 2017. However, the infrared trail counter data was not the  
42 primary type of data used to quantify visitor use in the Central Wasatch. Mobile location data was  
43 more robust and a more temporally and spatially consistent measure. Dr. Smith reported that the  
44 University of Utah team has access to mobile location data, which was the geotag coordinates of cell  
45 phone devices as they pass throughout the Central Wasatch. That data was all anonymized. Dr. Smith  
46 reported that in addition to the Forest Service trail counter data, the University of Utah team set out  
47 31 trail counters around the Central Wasatch. That data was used to calibrate the mobile location  
48 data and provide a comprehensive assessment of use.

1  
2 The primary method of collecting data was the establishment of geofences. Dr. Smith reported that  
3 52 geofences were established in the report. There was consistent data from January 1, 2019, through  
4 April 30, 2022. The most important thing was that the data was temporally consistent. He discussed  
5 the difference between calibrated and non-calibrated zones. Findings from the report were shared  
6 with CWC Board Members. Dr. Smith identified the trails and trail segments that were examined  
7 within the tri-canyon area. The average daily trip counts by season for each trail segment were  
8 calculated. Some trail segments were receiving an exceptional amount of use. This included the  
9 White Pine Trailhead and Cecret Lake. Those areas, which were shaded black on the chart shown,  
10 indicated that 2,500 to 3,000 trips were taking place on those trails each day in the summer.  
11 Alternatively, several trails received moderate to low use in the summer. There was a lot of variation  
12 in the amount of use the trails in the Central Wasatch receive. As a result, the assumption that the  
13 canyons were overrun with visitors was inaccurate since many trail segments received relatively low  
14 use. The issue had to do with the concentration of use.

15  
16 Dr. Smith reported that the study period was continuous and went from January 1, 2019, through the  
17 end of April 2022. There was consistent data for every day during that time. Mayor Silvestrini noted  
18 that cell phone data was being used in addition to the trail counters. He wondered if that method was  
19 effective in areas where there may not be good cell phone reception. Dr. Smith acknowledged that  
20 there are areas in Millcreek where cell phone reception is not consistent. Where there was satellite  
21 connectivity, the results were more accurate. Where there was just cellular network connectivity, it  
22 was slightly less accurate. However, the companies that the Utah State University team worked with  
23 to provide the data did a lot of pre-processing. There may be a geotag coordinate that was 30 meters  
24 off of a trail and that data was later corrected to the nearest trail network.

25  
26 There was discussion regarding Guardsman Pass. Based on the chart shown, it appeared that there  
27 was high traffic in the winter on Guardsman Pass and the use was higher than when the road was  
28 open during the summer. Dr. Smith clarified that the data was exclusively related to pedestrian traffic.  
29 The data did not look at vehicular counts and was filtered out by the speed at which visitors traveled  
30 through the area. Many people go snowshoeing or backcountry skiing on Guardsman Pass, so the  
31 Guardsman Pass road itself receives more use from pedestrians during the winter months. He added  
32 that bicyclists were also included in the data. It simply excluded vehicular traffic.

33  
34 Dr. Smith reported that relatively short trails that terminate at high-elevation lakes received the most  
35 use. He reviewed trails that receive moderate use, which meant there were between 150 and 300 trips  
36 per day. It was noted that many trail locations with higher use numbers were more urban approximate.  
37 Dr. Smith shared data related to summer use. Most of the trails are used more often during the summer  
38 months compared to the winter months. July was the busiest month on the trails in the canyons where  
39 there was as much as six times as much use on the trails toward the high-elevation lakes relative to  
40 their annual average. Weekend versus weekday use was also examined. Weekends were at least  
41 twice as busy compared to weekdays. Dr. Smith noted that there were graphs for all of the trails.  
42 Those were included in the report for CWC Board Member review. As for when use happened  
43 throughout the day, approximately 49% of all trips on trails in the Central Wasatch happened between  
44 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Most use occurred during peak hours.

45  
46 Dr. Smith highlighted the following three points:  
47

- 1 • There was a lot of variation in trail use across the Central Wasatch. There were opportunities  
2 to have different trail experiences, as there were busier trails and quieter trails. It was still  
3 possible to achieve a sense of solitude and enjoy the peace of the wilderness.
- 4 • The trails that terminated at high-elevation lakes tended to receive the highest levels of use.  
5 A small proportion of the trails received a vast amount of use. From a recreation resource  
6 management perspective, this was a good thing. However, the current levels of use needed to  
7 be met with adequate and appropriate levels of infrastructure.
- 8 • The general recommendation was to spatially concentrate use to the areas that already received  
9 the most use. It was important that the sites that received the most use be hardened and  
10 resilient. Additionally, it was necessary to temporally disperse use to the extent possible away  
11 from the peak summer months, peak weekdays, and peak hours.

12  
13 Mayor Silvestrini wondered if it was possible to temporally disperse use. Dr. Smith explained that  
14 identifying appropriate and adequate infrastructure that could accommodate the amount of use was a  
15 necessary first step. For areas that received the vast majority of use, it was important to provide the  
16 appropriate infrastructure to accommodate that use. That approach would limit the impacts  
17 experienced throughout the rest of the Central Wasatch.

18  
19 Dr. Smith reported that the data was available for CWC Board Member review. The graphs of use  
20 by trail would be provided to the team at the University of Utah for integration into the Environmental  
21 Dashboard.

22  
23 Mayor Silvestrini noted that Chair Robinson left the meeting at approximately 4:40 p.m. Mayor  
24 Silvestrini was asked to act as the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

25  
26 Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez asked Dr. Smith to lay out the next steps for the  
27 Visitor Use Study. Dr. Smith reported that the Utah State University team also performed visitor  
28 intercept surveys in conjunction with the National Forest Service Visitor Use Monitoring Program.  
29 Between October 1, 2021, and October 31, 2022, there were crews on site. That data was more  
30 reflective of the types of activities taking place. It would provide a specific breakdown of the activity  
31 profiles within each of the three canyons. In addition, the economic benefit could be determined as  
32 well as the total number of visitors coming to each canyon each year. All of the data was collected  
33 and sent to the Forest Service Office in Washington. That data was being processed and would be  
34 released at the end of the first quarter. A summary report of the data would be shared.

35  
36 Mayor Zoltanski asked how the numbers correlated with vehicle traffic. Pedestrian clusters were  
37 being examined but it was important to understand how pedestrians are reaching different points in  
38 the canyons as well. Dr. Smith reported that there were vehicular counts at various points around the  
39 canyons. There was a consistent trend at certain locations but it also diverged in meaningful ways at  
40 other locations. For instance, some areas had nearly all vehicular traffic and others had predominantly  
41 pedestrian traffic. The relationship between vehicular traffic and the amount of use on the roads  
42 would be explored as well as how the number of parking spots impacted trail use. Mayor Zoltanski  
43 wondered if there would be recommendations about the acceptable level of use moving forward.  
44 Dr. Smith stated that the Visitor Use Study was connected to the Visitor Use Monitoring Program  
45 framework that the Forest Service used. The first step was to look at all of the data available and  
46 determine what those acceptable thresholds were. He pointed out that what was acceptable would  
47 vary based on the infrastructure available and the desires of the Forest Service.

1 Mayor Bourke was interested in the economic benefits of the use. He hoped that the methodology  
2 allowed for that number to be negative. In Alta, there is essentially no revenue associated with all of  
3 the trail-related traffic and summer visitors but there were a lot of costs. Mayor Bourke also noted  
4 that on the seasonal use chart, several of the trails in Alta were listed as being heavily used only during  
5 the summer months. He explained that the reason for that was that the ski area closes off much of the  
6 mountain to trail use and foot traffic in the winter.

7  
8 Ex-Officio Member Munsey thanked Dr. Smith for the presentation. She was pleased that the study  
9 was well underway but wanted to understand if the exact number of visitors to the different locations  
10 would be provided in a future report. This was confirmed. Specific numbers about the total amount  
11 of use in the Central Wasatch would be provided. Ex-Officio Munsey asked if users had rated their  
12 experience in the canyon. Dr. Smith reported that visitor satisfaction would be included in the report  
13 that would be released in the second quarter of the year.

14  
15 Mayor Knopp asked about the Visitor Use Study information and what would be incorporated into  
16 the Environmental Dashboard. Dr. Smith reported that the graphs and charts shared during the CWC  
17 Board Meeting would be shared with the University of Utah team. Mayor Silvestrini noted that some  
18 questions were left in the Zoom chat box. However, he asked that those questions be held until the  
19 public comment portion of the CWC Board Meeting. Alternatively, it would be possible for Dr. Smith  
20 to respond to the individuals with questions following the meeting.

## 21 **BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON MOBILITY ACTION PLAN UPDATE**

### 22 **1. Angie Bauer-Fellows, Project Manager from AECOM, will Present the Current Status** 23 **of the BCCMAP, including Values, Goals, Network Gaps Analysis, Public Engagement,** 24 **and Upcoming Timelines and Milestones.**

25  
26  
27  
28 In the absence of Angie Bauer-Fellows, Loretta Markham from AECOM was present to share  
29 information with the CWC Board. She discussed the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan  
30 (“BCCMAP”). That work began in October 2022 with network assessment and data collection. Many  
31 of the existing plans had been reviewed since that time. It was anticipated that the results of the  
32 BCCMAP would be ready in May 2023. The timeline was shared with the CWC Board. She noted  
33 that a public survey would start on January 10, 2023, and would last for one month.

34  
35 Ms. Markham reported that during the last presentation about the BCCMAP, information about the  
36 vision, goals, and guiding values was shared. None of that information had changed, but she pointed  
37 out that funding opportunities were added to the Vision Statement. She reminded the CWC Board  
38 Members that the intention of the BCCMAP was to create an implementation plan that synthesized  
39 the work done to date and focus on mobility and transit.

40  
41 Some of the plans that were reviewed were shared. Ms. Markham clarified that the list was not  
42 complete but highlighted some of the categories and issues that were explored. The intent was to use  
43 the information that was already available. The BCCMAP would pull together all of that information  
44 and create a roadmap that would move the work forward. Ms. Markham stated that there were  
45 important ongoing plans to consider as well. For instance, there was the Utah Department of  
46 Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). That  
47 work was ongoing and AECOM was working closely with UDOT as well as the Utah Transit

1 Authority (“UTA”). Understanding how that work would impact Big Cottonwood Canyon was  
2 important. There may also be opportunities for cross-information sharing.

3  
4 Key takeaways were reviewed. Ms. Markham reported that the Implementation Plan was not a single  
5 solution but would focus on the necessary next steps. She pointed out that there was a bulleted list of  
6 needs in the presentation slides. Ideally, the recommendations that would be put forward would  
7 address those needs. Ms. Markham reported that AECOM’s focus was on mobility solutions. It was  
8 important to utilize all information to address parking needs, look at transit use, improve connections  
9 to the regional transit system, and improve overall mobility in the area.

10  
11 Ms. Markham discussed outcomes. The BCCMAP would look at multi-modal mobility and share  
12 recommendations. That would be compiled in a report that would address next steps, funding,  
13 timeline, and the process for implementation. She reiterated that there would be a public survey that  
14 would start on December 10, 2023. It would be open for one month and be hosted through the CWC  
15 website. It touched on the topics of improved transit service year-round, parking, tolling, and mobility  
16 hubs. Ms. Markham reported that AECOM would meet with the Transportation Committee in  
17 February 2023. At that time, there would be more information about the concepts and  
18 recommendations. There would also be a meeting with the Stakeholders Council. The final results  
19 of the Big Cottonwood Canyon MAP would be presented to the CWC Board in May 2023.

20  
21 There was discussion about the survey. Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen reiterated that  
22 it would be hosted on the CWC website. It would be sent out via all of the CWC communication  
23 channels, including the newsletter and social media accounts. E-kits would be sent out to the  
24 jurisdictional communications teams as well. There would also be a media release. CWC Board  
25 Members discussed Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) service during the winter months. Ex-Officio  
26 Member Christensen reported that service had been cut in both canyons. In Little Cottonwood  
27 Canyon, the 953 bus was eliminated due to labor shortages. That was probably the biggest change  
28 that occurred.

## 29 30 **COMMITTEE UPDATES AND REPORTS**

### 31 32 **1. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee (“EBAC”) Met on December 19, 2022. Meeting** 33 **Minutes Included in Meeting Materials Packet.**

- 34 • **Reminder that Annual Housekeeping Items Need to be Completed.**
- 35 • **Six Month Evaluation for Executive Directors Scheduled for Friday, January 13.**
- 36 • **Mayor Silvestrini will Update Board on the Implementation of the 6<sup>th</sup> Human**  
37 **Element to the Environmental Dashboard.**

38  
39 Mayor Silvestrini reported that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee (“EBAC”) met on  
40 December 19, 2022. The meeting minutes were available for review.

### 41 42 **2. Transportation Committee Updates.**

- 43 • **Mayor Knopp will Briefly Outline Upcoming Transportation Committee actions.**

44  
45 Mayor Knopp reported that a Transportation Committee Meeting was scheduled for January 11, 2023,  
46 at 3:00 p.m. He hoped to discuss the survey and share it with as many people as possible.

1 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE AND REPORT**

2  
3 1. **William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Provide an Update on the Activities of**  
4 **the Stakeholders Council.**

5  
6 Stakeholders Council leadership, William McCarvill, and Barbara Cameron were present to share  
7 information with the CWC Board. Ms. Cameron congratulated Alta Ski Area for being voted the  
8 most sustainable winter resort in the world. There was information about that on the Alta Ski Area  
9 website. It also included information on the Ske-Cology program, which was intended to teach young  
10 skiers about ecology and local wildlife. Stewardship and educational outreach were important.  
11 Mayor Silvestrini added that District Ranger, Bekee Hotze was awarded District Ranger of the Year.  
12

13 Mr. McCarvill reported that Stakeholders Council Members identified goal setting as something they  
14 wanted to work on in the upcoming year. Stakeholders Council leadership was currently looking for  
15 someone to provide that training. Mr. McCarvill informed those present that 14 Stakeholders Council  
16 terms will expire in June 2023. The process of determining who wanted to stay, and potentially  
17 looking for new Stakeholders Council Members, would need to start shortly.  
18

19 **CLOSED SESSION**

20  
21 1. **Chair Robinson will Invite the Board to Commence a Closed Session to Discuss the**  
22 **Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of an Individual,**  
23 **as Authorized by UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-205(1)(a).**

24  
25 There was discussion about how virtual attendees would participate in the Closed Session.  
26

27 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved that the CWC Board go into Closed Session to discuss the  
28 character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, as authorized by  
29 Utah Code Ann. 52-4-205(1)(a). Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Chair  
30 Robinson-Aye; Mayor Knopp-Aye; Mayor Bourke-Aye; Mayor Worel-Aye; Mayor Silvestrini-Aye;  
31 Mayor Zoltanski-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.  
32

33 **CLOSED SESSION ENDS**

34  
35 The CWC Board was in Closed Session from 3:38 p.m. to 3:48 p.m.  
36

37 **CWC BOARD MEETING RECONVENES**

38  
39 The CWC Board Meeting reconvened.  
40

41 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

42  
43 Ms. Nielsen noted that there were several questions in the Zoom chat box. Anyone wanting to ask  
44 questions during the official public comment period was invited to raise their hands. No hands were  
45 raised. Mayor Silvestrini reported that any questions left for Dr. Smith could be captured. It may be  
46 possible for Dr. Smith to respond to those questions after the meeting.  
47

1 **ACTION ITEMS**  
2

3 1. **Consideration of Resolution 2023-01 – Approving Entry into the Third Amendment to**  
4 **an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Utah State University for a Visitor Use Study**  
5 **for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.**  
6

7 Mr. Perez reported that Resolutions 2023-01 and 2023-02 were related to the incorporation of the  
8 Visitor Use Study into the Environmental Dashboard. This had to do with the sixth element, which  
9 was also referred to as the human element. The implementation pricing and feasibility were discussed  
10 in April 2022. The CWC Board tabled the decision at that time to look at it again in January 2023.  
11 CWC Staff presented a recommendation to Mayor Silvestrini in the fall. Mayor Silvestrini brought  
12 the recommendation and funding strategy to the EBAC and CWC Board for consideration. The  
13 recommendation was to move forward with the contract amendments and straddle two fiscal years.  
14 That meant half of the amount would be paid in the current fiscal year and the remaining half would  
15 be paid the next fiscal year.  
16

17 Mr. Perez reported that there had been discussions with CWC Legal Counsel, Shane Topham, about  
18 amending the contracts. Mr. Topham gave the CWC Board the go-ahead. Pending the review of the  
19 second quarter financials, it may be possible for the CWC to fund the current year portion without a  
20 budget amendment. Mr. Perez reiterated that Resolution 2023-01 and Resolution 2023-02 were  
21 related to contract amendments with Utah State University and the University of Utah.  
22

23 Chair Robinson believed that Resolution 2023-01 had a fiscal impact of \$27,862.57. If the agreement  
24 was signed, half would likely be paid in the current fiscal year without a budget amendment. The  
25 other half would be incorporated into the budget next year. This was confirmed. Mr. Perez clarified  
26 that there were two payments. One would be to Utah State University and the other would be to the  
27 University of Utah. Between the two, the cost would be approximately \$32,000. The CWC would  
28 pay approximately \$16,000 in the current fiscal year and approximately \$16,000 next fiscal year.  
29

30 Chair Robinson wondered if there was an issue with the organization entering into the agreement if  
31 the funds had not been budgeted in the current or future year. Mr. Topham noted that the funds had  
32 been discussed in the current year. The CWC could exit a contract if the amount was not budgeted  
33 for. This was non-binding. However, he believed there was a chance that a budget amendment would  
34 not be needed for the current year and a plan was in place for next year.  
35

36 **MOTION:** Mayor Zoltanski moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-01 – Approving Entry into the  
37 Third Amendment to an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Utah State University for a Visitor  
38 Use Study for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Mayor Worel seconded the motion. The motion  
39 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
40

41 2. **Consideration of Resolution 2023-02 – Approving Entry into the Fifth Amendment with**  
42 **the University of Utah for the Environmental Dashboard.**  
43

44 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-02 – Approving Entry into the  
45 Fifth Amendment with the University of Utah for the Environmental Dashboard. Mayor Knopp  
46 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
47



1 **3. Consideration of Resolution 2023-03 – Concerning Access in Cardiff Fork.**

2  
3 Chair Robinson reported that the Stakeholders Council forwarded the Cardiff Fork issue to the CWC  
4 Board. Mr. Perez explained that a recommendation was discussed at the last CWC Board Meeting.  
5 At that time, the CWC Board asked Mr. Topham to draft the recommendation into a formal resolution.  
6 That had since been done. Mr. McCarvill thanked Mr. Topham for drafting the language. That area  
7 in Cardiff Fork had been an issue in the past and an agreement was crafted to allow both public and  
8 private uses to take place. However, the agreement had not been renewed. He noted that access to  
9 public lands in Cardiff Fork was important to a wide range of recreationalists. It was necessary to  
10 have a resolution that suited all interested parties.

11  
12 The CWC Board reviewed the resolution language. Chair Robinson read the following aloud:

- 13
- 14 • WHEREAS, consequently, CWC's Board of Commissioners (the "Board") met in regular  
15 session on 9 January 2023 to consider, among other things, encouraging all stakeholders—  
16 including USFS, the Owners Association, Salt Lake County (as the local governmental  
17 authority with jurisdiction over Cardiff Fork) and Salt Lake City (by right of the perennial  
18 flow of Cardiff Fork water into the Big Cottonwood watershed and its ownership of adjacent  
19 parcels)—to promptly engage in diligent, good-faith efforts to resolve the current impasse to  
20 restore public access as under the Special Use Permit.
  - 21 • NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of the Central  
22 Wasatch Commission that the CWC encourages all the aforementioned stakeholders to  
23 promptly engage in diligent, good-faith efforts to resolve the current impasse to restore public  
24 access within Cardiff Fork as under the Special Use Permit.
- 25

26 Chair Robinson pointed out that one of the referenced stakeholders was the Forest Service. He  
27 wondered if Ex-Officio Member Dave Whittekiend from the Forest Service had an issue with the  
28 resolution language. It mainly encouraged action. Ex-Officio Whittekiend explained that the Cardiff  
29 Canyon Owners Association needed to apply for a Special Use Permit. Until that happened, a Special  
30 Use Permit would not be pursued. Additionally, there were unresolved issues related to the previous  
31 Special Use Permit and notices of non-compliance. Those notices of non-compliance need to be  
32 resolved before the process was able to move forward. There was mediation scheduled with the  
33 Cardiff Canyon Owners Association, but a Special Use Permit could not be issued until an entity  
34 applied for one. Chair Robinson clarified that the CWC was not asking anyone to apply for a Special  
35 Use Permit. The language was mainly an encouragement for all parties to reach a resolution.

36  
37 Mayor Knopp reported that he received concerning reports that the Cardiff Canyon Owners  
38 Association stationed a private security person in the area who was telling visitors that the entire  
39 canyon was closed and they were not allowed to pass. He wondered if the Forest Service was  
40 addressing that issue. Ex-Officio Whittekiend reported that law enforcement has been in the area and  
41 some investigation had been done. Nothing actionable had been discovered. He reported that private  
42 land is private and public land is public. If an individual wants to prevent someone from crossing  
43 over private land, there was nothing illegal about that. Mayor Knopp wanted to know if there was a  
44 way to mark public access. Ex-Officio Whittekiend explained that based on current access, there are  
45 areas where it is not possible to move up the canyon without crossing a private lane. Attempts were  
46 made to mark the boundary lines.

1 The CWC Board inquired about the level of tension associated with the issue. Ex-Officio Whittekiend  
2 reiterated that mediation had been scheduled. He described the current sentiments as simmering. He  
3 hoped it would be possible to work through some of the existing issues with mediation. It may be  
4 helpful for the parties involved to know that the CWC Board encouraged a resolution. Ms. Cameron  
5 had heard reports that people were scared of the private security person in the area. It was a tense  
6 situation currently. A private person keeping people out of the canyon was of concern.  
7

8 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-03 – Concerning Access in  
9 Cardiff Fork. Mayor Zoltanski seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent  
10 of the Board.  
11

12 **4. Consideration of Resolution 2023-04 – Supporting County-wide Funding for Emergency**  
13 **Services in all Canyons.**  
14

15 Chair Robinson reported that four issues were raised by the Stakeholders Council. Two had since  
16 been presented to the CWC Board in the form of a resolution. Resolution 2023-04 related to County-  
17 wide funding for emergency services in the canyons. It encouraged the County to increase its  
18 contribution to address the current shortfall in EMS services for all of the canyons. This included the  
19 amendment of the County’s 2023 budget. Ms. Cameron reported that the County Council wanted to  
20 have a solution in place by March. She appreciated the work that Mr. Topham had done on the  
21 resolution. It was concerning that Salt Lake County would pull out EMS funds.  
22

23 Mayor Silvestrini believed the resolution language would be clearer if it encouraged Salt Lake County  
24 to cover the current shortfall in providing emergency services. Adding the word “emergency” might  
25 be worthwhile. Chair Robinson believed that “services” was defined elsewhere in the document.  
26

27 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-04 – Supporting County-wide  
28 Funding for Emergency Services in all Canyons. Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion  
29 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
30

31 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**  
32

33 Mayor Zoltanski reported that Sandy City, in cooperation with the Sandy Police Department, was  
34 providing the escort service for UTA buses and would also guide residents who live in the mouth of  
35 the canyon to their homes. Her residents were very grateful for that service. Mayor Zoltanski also  
36 noted that on December 10, 2023, the Salt Lake County Council would discuss potential funding for  
37 private bus services to augment the ski bus services. Sandy City was supportive of that.  
38

39 **ADJOURN BOARD MEETING**  
40

41 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC Board Meeting.**  
42

43 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to ADJOURN the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Zoltanski  
44 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
45

46 The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Monday, January 9, 2023.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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