



9
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) HYBRID**
11 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD MONDAY, MAY 22, 2023, AT 3:30 P.M.**
12 **THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM.**
13 **THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES, LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO**
14 **GRANDE AVENUE, SUITE 101, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

15
16 **Present:** Will McCarvill, Chair
17 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair
18 Maura Hahnenberger
19 Jan Striefel
20 Kirk Nichols
21 Amber Broadaway
22 Dave Fields
23 Patrick Shea
24 Dennis Goreham
25 Jennifer Eden
26 Del Draper
27 John Knoblock
28 Michael Marker

29
30 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy
31 Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration

32
33 **Opening**

34
35 **1. William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

36
37 The Commission discussed an email that was distributed by Amber Broadaway. Jennifer Eden
38 wondered if there was any commitment from the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) about bus service
39 moving forward. Co-Chair, Barbara Cameron did not believe so. There was a desire to restore bus
40 service to what it was before but there were a lot of difficulties with that. Patrick Shea noted that
41 there was a lot of speculation that there may be a merger of UTA and the Utah Department of
42 Transportation (“UDOT”), which would result in a single transportation decision-making process. It
43 was noted that there was no commitment from UTA to make improvements next season. Stakeholders
44 Council leadership determined that the transit conversations would continue later.

45
46 Chair William McCarvill called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
47 Meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m. He reported that it was a hybrid meeting.
48

1 **2. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council DRAFT**
2 **Minutes of Monday, April 24, 2023.**

3
4 **MOTION:** William McCarvill moved to APPROVE the April 24, 2023, CWC Stakeholders Council
5 Meeting Minutes. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
6 consent of the Council.

7
8 **3. Announcements:**

9
10 • **Leadership Timeline and Milestones (Solicitations for Nominations).**

11
12 Chair McCarvill reported that he and Co-Chair Barbara Cameron will step down as Co-Chairs of the
13 Stakeholders Council. As a result, replacements would need to be considered. From the current date
14 to June 16, 2023, it would be possible for nominations to take place. Stakeholders Council Members
15 could nominate up to three people for the positions. At the Stakeholders Council Meeting in June,
16 the Council would elect new Co-Chairs. This would be done through Ranked-Choice Voting.

17
18 • **Update on SHC Membership and Timeline.**

19
20 Co-Chair Cameron reported that some Stakeholders Council Member terms were ending. Terms were
21 expiring on June 30, 2023, and six members had decided not to request reappointment. Those six
22 members included:

- 23
24 • William McCarvill;
25 • Jan Striefel;
26 • Brian Hutchinson;
27 • Troy Morgan;
28 • Michael Maughan; and
29 • Don Despain.

30
31 Co-Chair Cameron thanked the members for their service.

32
33 To replace the six members, a request for applications was sent out in April. They were reviewed on
34 May 5, 2023. The six replacement members selected were as follows:

- 35
36 • Caitlin Curry, Wasatch Backcountry Hunters, and Anglers;
37 • Dan Zalles, The League of Women Voters;
38 • Rusty Vetter, Salt Lake City Resident;
39 • Morgan Mingle, Park City Chamber of Commerce;
40 • Ian Hartley, Mountain Trails Foundation; and
41 • Linda Johnson, Salt Lake City Resident

42
43 In addition, eight current Stakeholders Council Members have terms expiring on June 30, 2023.
44 However, those members had requested reappointment. Those members were identified as:

- 45
46 • Amber Broadaway, Solitude Mountain Resort and Deer Valley (term expiring 2023);

- 1 • Barbara Cameron, Vice-Chair of Stakeholders Council, and Big Cottonwood Community
- 2 Council Chair, Brighton Resident (term expiring 2023);
- 3 • Mike Doyle, Brighton Ski Resort (term expiring 2023);
- 4 • Del Draper, Salt Lake City Resident (term expiring 2023);
- 5 • Jennifer Eden, Salt Lake City Resident (term expiring 2023);
- 6 • Kurt Hegmann, Mill D Cabin Owners Association (term expiring 2023);
- 7 • Ed Marshall, Log Haven Restaurant (term expiring 2023); and
- 8 • Nathan Rafferty, Ski Utah (term expiring 2023).

9
10 On June 5, 2023, all 14 applicants would be presented to the CWC Board for official appointment.
11 Their term of office would begin on July 1, 2023. On June 21, 2023, there would be a Special Meeting
12 of the Stakeholders Council and an election of New Co-Chairs at that time. The new Co-Chairs would
13 take over from the current Co-Chairs as of July 1, 2023. CWC Staff would present the nominees and
14 the final decision would be made by Ranked-Choice Voting.

15
16 Chair McCarvill reported that there was a three-step process. The Stakeholders Council first needed
17 to take action on the recommendations. From there, the appointments would be discussed by the
18 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting. A recommendation would then be made to the CWC
19 Board. Ultimately, the CWC Board would approve the Stakeholders Council Members. It was a
20 lengthy process. However, he stated that the Stakeholders Council schedule shifted last November
21 to ensure that the Stakeholders Council Meetings were better synchronized with the CWC Board. It
22 was noted that Rusty Vetter was listed as a Salt Lake City Resident but he is also the lead attorney
23 for Salt Lake City Public Utilities. Mr. Shea clarified that he had since retired from that position.

24
25 • **Special Meeting Notice.**

26
27 Co-Chair Cameron reported that the Special Meeting of the Stakeholders Council would take place
28 on June 21, 2023. It would include some housekeeping items as well as the Co-Chair election. Chair
29 McCarvill added that there would be a review of the rules and procedures for the new members.
30 Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez noted that the recommended Stakeholders Council
31 Members were invited to that meeting as well so there could be an introduction. Although the
32 recommended members would be present at that meeting, they would not be able to vote.

33
34 • **Upcoming Calendar.**

35
36 Chair McCarvill reported that a poll would be sent out to determine what days were best for future
37 Stakeholders Council Meetings. The intention was to maintain the 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. timeframe but
38 there was some flexibility with the specific day of the week. The poll would determine preferences.
39 He explained that the meetings would still take place on the fourth week of the month.

40
41 • **Youth Council Update.**

42
43 Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen shared information about the Youth Council. CWC
44 Staff presented the idea of a Youth Council to the CWC Board earlier in the year. She explained that
45 the Youth Council would include members between the ages of 16 and 30. The CWC Board was
46 excited about the idea. It would be beneficial to have young voices speaking out about important
47 issues as well. The Youth Council was currently in the process of being created. There would be a

1 lot of outreach conducted with high schools and colleges in the study area until August. In August, a
2 call for applicants would open and remain open for one month. A Selection Committee would select
3 the Youth Council Members. The Youth Council would largely mirror the structure of the
4 Stakeholders Council but would be slightly smaller. The intention was to have fewer than 20
5 members of the Youth Council. Ms. Nielsen reported that the first Youth Council Meeting would
6 take place in October and mirror the Stakeholders Council schedule.

7
8 • **Call for Additional ANNOUNCEMENTS from SHC Members.**

9
10 There were no additional announcements from Stakeholders Council Members.

11
12 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL COMMITTEE UPDATE**

13
14 **1. Millcreek Canyon Committee.**

15
16 **a. Millcreek Shuttle Recommendation Letter Update.**

17
18 Del Draper shared updates related to the Millcreek Canyon Committee. He noted that there were
19 discussions at the latest Transportation Committee Meeting with a representative from the U.S. Forest
20 Service. Those discussions pertained to whether the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”)
21 work should be done on a shuttle at the same time as the road improvement work. One of the things
22 the road improvement work would do was enable a shuttle. However, there were a lot of issues related
23 to shuttle stops, turnarounds, and parking areas. As a result, John Knoblock suggested that the Forest
24 Service do an environmental review of shuttle issues at the same time that the Federal Lands Access
25 Program (“FLAP”) Grant road improvement design work was underway.

26
27 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) stated that they were
28 taking the shuttle into account but acknowledged that the Forest Service would need to do an
29 additional environmental review to implement a shuttle. It was possible that the results of that
30 environmental assessment may add additional items to the roadway improvement assessment. All of
31 the work is tied together. Ultimately, it was proposed that the Forest Service move ahead with the
32 NEPA process for the shuttle. The Forest Service supported a shuttle and wanted to move forward
33 but certain funding and time limitations needed to be considered.

34
35 Chair McCarvill explained that the work would now transition to the Transportation Committee. He
36 expected there to be a close working relationship between the Millcreek Canyon Committee and the
37 Transportation Committee moving forward. The Forest Service did not have the money to prepare
38 an environmental assessment so the CWC was looking at the situation to determine whether it was
39 possible to raise money and find a consultant to handle those services.

40
41 Mr. Knoblock asked CWC Staff for additional information. He noted that there was a short timeline
42 to prepare a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for a Consultant to prepare the Environmental
43 Assessment. Mr. Perez reported that the Forest Service submitted a comprehensive memo to the
44 CWC. It outlined some of their concerns with the FLAP grant work and the shuttle program. The
45 memo also outlined the criteria that needed to be addressed in the proposal. That due date was July
46 31, 2023. At that point, the Forest Service would evaluate the level of NEPA that needed to be done
47 and inform the CWC. From there, the CWC could develop a scope of work, post an RFP, and hire a

1 Consultant. Before July 31, 2023, the organization would develop the initial proposal. CWC Staff
2 would start to work on that draft based on the outline that was received from the Forest Service. There
3 was an opportunity to meet with the Forest Service at the beginning of June. Additionally, there
4 would be work with the Millcreek Canyon Committee and Transportation Committee to refine the
5 proposal.

6
7 Ms. Nielsen reiterated that CWC Staff would create the first draft of the proposal. That proposal
8 would eventually be sent to the Forest Service. She explained that several factors impacted that
9 decision. The CWC was given an incredibly tight timeframe to submit the proposal. As a result, the
10 work needed to be done in-house. There was not enough time to seek bids for a third-party Consultant.
11 In addition, having CWC Staff write the first draft of the proposal would save some money. It was
12 also within the wheelhouse of the organization, between CWC Staff and the Committee Members.
13 There was a lot of expertise that could be relied on at this phase. Mr. Perez thanked the Millcreek
14 Canyon Committee for their work and the Stakeholders Council for moving forward with a
15 recommendation. The Forest Service memo could be found on the Utah Public Notice website.

16 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL GOALS RETREAT REPORT**

17 **1. The Stakeholders Council will Review the Goals Report from Avenue Consultants.**

18
19
20
21 Chair McCarvill reported that the Stakeholders Council Retreat took place last month. He thanked
22 everyone who attended and participated. He thought Thomas McMurtry from Avenue Consultants
23 had done a good job running the Retreat. His report was included in the Meeting Materials Packet
24 for review. Chair McCarvill referenced Pages 1 and 2 of the report. It included background
25 information, goal themes, word cloud examples, and the top five goals of the Council. Chair
26 McCarvill asked that there be discussions about the first two pages of the report. He explained that
27 there would be a vote to recommend the report to the full CWC Board for approval. The goals
28 outlined in the report would guide the Council moving forward. There was some work to be done on
29 Committees as there were conversations about what exists and what should be created.

30
31 There was discussion regarding the first two pages of the report. Maura Hahnenberger liked the top
32 five goals listed in the document. The goals were specific enough that they would guide the work of
33 the Stakeholders Council but were general enough to address many different issues. The only
34 negative comment she had about the top five goals was the fact that they did not necessarily inform
35 new or different subcommittees that will assist with those goals. It was important for the Council to
36 think about which committees would most benefit the work that the Council wanted to do. Chair
37 McCarvill noted that the goals could always be adjusted. He agreed that the goals are general enough
38 but still focused, and the result of a lot of Council Member input.

39
40 Michael Marker was surprised that there was no reference to the reason the CWC was formed. The
41 organization was created to implement the Mountain Accord. He stressed the importance of relating
42 all of the work done in the CWC to the Mountain Accord. There were initial meetings before the
43 CWC was established and there were discussions at the County level about the function of the
44 organization. It was determined that the CWC would be directly tied to the Mountain Accord but as
45 time passed, it seemed that there had been some change in focus. He did not think that shift had been
46 addressed directly within the CWC Board or the Stakeholders Council. If the Stakeholders Council
47 wanted to redefine its purpose there should be an agreement that the organization is no longer tied to
48 the Mountain Accord. He expressed frustration about the process.

1
2 Chair McCarvill pointed out that the Consultant used the Mountain Accord and foundational
3 documents from the CWC early on in the session to orient the discussions. He agreed that the Council
4 always needs to consider the Mountain Accord and those foundational documents but he felt that the
5 Stakeholders Council Retreat allowed there to be a rededication to the Mountain Accord. Having
6 goals that specifically relate to the operation and function of the Stakeholders Council was critical.
7

8 Mr. Marker stated that the purpose of the Stakeholders Council was to support the work of the CWC
9 Board. The Council was meant to assist the CWC Board, which meant it made sense for the CWC
10 Board to determine the work done within the Council. It would not be appropriate for the
11 Stakeholders Council to decide what they want to work on. He reiterated that the Stakeholders
12 Council was intended to assist the CWC Board with its mission and goals. Mr. Knoblock understood
13 the comments shared by Mr. Marker. Supporting and implementing the Mountain Accord was the
14 priority of the organization. He believed that was occurring. For instance, the Millcreek Canyon
15 shuttle was a specific item mentioned in the Mountain Accord. The trails plan was another specific
16 item in the Mountain Accord as was improving transportation in the canyons. He did not believe the
17 organization was straying from that foundational document.
18

19 Mr. Knoblock noted that at one point, CWC Staff suggested that there be a Mountain Accord
20 scorecard. Something like that would make it easier to track what was being done that was in
21 alignment with the Mountain Accord. Ms. Nielsen explained that a scorecard existed. She did not
22 believe it was shared publicly, but CWC Staff worked from it. She offered to share it with the Council.
23

24 Ms. Nielsen asked for additional comments from Mr. Marker. She noted that the work of the
25 Stakeholders Council was in support of what was laid out in the Mountain Accord. This included the
26 feasibility and implementation of the Millcreek Canyon shuttle, the Central Wasatch National
27 Conservation and Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”), and so on. Everything that the CWC did was
28 dictated by what was set out in the Mountain Accord. Mr. Marker did not see the work relating to
29 the published documents from the Mountain Accord. He felt the organization was making its own
30 way. Mr. Knoblock wondered whether a particular item was concerning to him. Mr. Marker denied
31 this. He explained that he had noticed a general drift in direction as time passed. Sometimes, he
32 sensed that the Stakeholders Council was taking on activities that were not sustainable. For instance,
33 doing the work of institutions and municipalities that had jurisdiction over the area. He wondered
34 what the future vision for the CWC, specifically the Stakeholders Council, would be. Mr. Marker
35 referenced the restroom maintenance contract that the organization was taking on. He did not believe
36 that was a sustainable activity and he felt there needed to be more discussion about that.
37

38 Mr. Marker explained that the Mountain Accord was effective because of the four-systems approach.
39 There was a desire to balance those four systems. He felt that had been lost over time. He expected
40 that those kinds of issues would have been addressed during the Stakeholders Council Retreat.
41 However, that had not happened. He reiterated that some of the activities the organization had taken
42 on were not sustainable long-term. Mr. Knoblock asked again for a specific example. Mr. Marker
43 referenced what was happening in Little Cottonwood Canyon. There was a transportation system that
44 the organization was not really involved in. That system would drive the future of the canyon.
45 Everything else would need to fit into whatever UDOT decided should be done. He felt the
46 Stakeholders Council was involved in activities, but he did not believe they were advising the Board.
47

1 Co-Chair Cameron asked if there was some kind of subcommittee that Mr. Marker was interested in
2 creating to address this issue and create his vision. Mr. Marker did not know whether he was the only
3 Council Member who felt this way. He wondered whether others on the Council felt similarly. Mr.
4 Shea noted that the Mountain Accord was limited to the Central Wasatch, but the principles,
5 articulations, and aspirations, were a touchstone that needed to be maintained as something there was
6 dedication to. He pointed out that when organizations became more structured, it became easy to
7 forget about the founding principles. It seemed that the Mountain Accord provided a clear sense of
8 what the organization was trying to do. The organizational questions were important, but sometimes,
9 those organizational questions overtook the founding principles.

10
11 Dennis Goreham reminded those present that one of the primary goals of the Mountain Accord was
12 the Legislation. The CWC had a committee that focused on that work but the Stakeholders Council
13 had never done anything related to the Legislation. Chair McCarvill pointed out one of the goals
14 from the Stakeholders Council Retreat, which was to “Establish clarity on the Legislation and
15 prioritize passing Legislation.” Mr. Goreham stressed the importance of contributing to that work.
16 Jan Striefel pointed out that during the Stakeholders Council Retreat, there were times when groups
17 mentioned the importance of the Mountain Accord. She wondered if that was included in the report.

18
19 **2. The Stakeholders Council May Recommend the Report to the CWC Board for Review**
20 **and Approval.**

21
22 **MOTION:** Chair McCarvill moved to forward with a recommendation of approval. Co-Chair
23 Cameron seconded the motion.

24
25 There was discussion on the motion. Mr. Knoblock wondered if it was possible to make changes to
26 the draft. He suggested changing the first goal to state, "Work together as a diverse group to protect
27 the canyons for everyone, in accordance with the goals established in the Mountain Accord." That
28 would ensure the language is more specifically tied back to the Mountain Accord. Chair McCarvill
29 was supportive of the suggestion. The original motion made by Chair McCarvill and seconded by
30 Co-Chair Cameron was not voted on as Mr. Knoblock shared an amended motion, which would
31 include reference to Mountain Accord in Goal #1.

32
33 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to Forward a Recommendation of APPROVAL to the
34 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and CWC Board for the Stakeholders Council Retreat Report, as
35 amended. Jan Striefel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
36 Council.

37
38 **FINAL BCC MAP REVIEW**

39
40 **1. CWC Staff will Brief the Stakeholders Council on the Final Big Cottonwood Canyon**
41 **Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) and Receive Any Feedback.**

42
43 Mr. Perez shared information about the Final Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC
44 MAP”). He explained that he would review the presentation that was given during the CWC Board
45 Meeting in May. There would then be discussions about the Final BCC MAP document. The BCC
46 Map development timeline was shared. The process began in October. Since then, there had been
47 data collection, analysis, and a public survey. Additionally, 45 comments were received on the draft

1 version of the document. Those comments were incorporated into the final version. The CWC Board
2 reviewed the Final BCC MAP during the last CWC Board Meeting, where it was adopted.

3
4 The general themes from the public comments were as follows:

- 5
- 6 • Support for the BCC MAP effort;
- 7 • A desire for active transportation improvements and consideration;
- 8 • A desire for electric bus considerations; and
- 9 • A desire to acknowledge the carrying capacity of the canyon.

10
11 Mr. Perez reported that revisions were made to the document based on the comments received.
12 Additionally, the Watershed, Water Rights, and Water Quality memo from the Salt Lake City
13 Department of Public Utilities was added. Mr. Perez explained that the Final BCC MAP included
14 near-term, mid-term, and long-term recommendations. The first few shown were easier and more
15 affordable, such as restriping the Big Cottonwood Canyon Park and Ride lot. That would add some
16 more parking to the mouth of the canyon for a lower cost. Expanding on the supplementary shuttle
17 program was another possibility.

18
19 The next round of recommendations was mid-term to long-term. Mr. Perez explained that those were
20 larger projects that could improve mobility and implement a lot of the goals from the BCC MAP. For
21 instance, roadway improvements would enhance the ability of transit to deliver service. He noted
22 that those ideas were pulled from the UDOT Big Cottonwood Canyon Corridor Plan. There was also
23 enhanced bus, an exclusive transit lane, and resort mobility hubs listed. That was a package of items
24 that could move forward. The enhanced bus would improve bus service along key corridors.
25 Restriping the highway between Solitude and Brighton to give buses priority was suggested as well
26 as mobility hub concepts at both of the ski resorts. The Final BCC MAP also included some tolling
27 recommendations, a suggestion to restrict on-street parking, bus incentives, improved valley transit
28 service, year-round bus service, and trailhead improvements.

29
30 The next steps were reviewed. Mr. Perez reported that moving forward, the BCC MAP would be
31 shared with all relevant agencies and departments. The intention was to share the document with
32 others. He explained that it had already been sent to the County and UDOT. There had been a bit of
33 correspondence with UDOT about key items that could be implemented. The document would
34 continue to be shared over the next few weeks. There was a desire to share it with State
35 Representatives and State Leaders as well. Mr. Perez informed those present that the State Legislature
36 approved \$150 million for bus service, bus stops, tolling, and mobility hubs in both Little Cottonwood
37 Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. The BCC MAP would time well with that funding.

38
39 Mr. Perez noted that some pieces of the BCC MAP were outside of the scope of funding from the
40 appropriations. The CWC could fill that void, particularly with long-term funding from the Wasatch
41 Front Regional Council ("WFRC"). It would be possible to be a local jurisdiction in partnership with
42 others to implement any of the BCC MAP recommendations that fell outside of the appropriations.
43 There had been a lot of support from the CWC Board on that. He acknowledged the discussions that
44 had taken place at the start of the meeting. Mr. Perez explained that Kirk Nichols had sent out some
45 comments, which were distributed to the Council over the weekend. Ms. Broadway followed up
46 with a response to those comments. Those had also been shared.

1 Ms. Eden stated that a lot of the plans were unable to be implemented without public transportation
2 commitments. That had been an issue in both of the canyons. UTA could change plans and no one
3 could do anything about that. She wanted to know how decreased traffic and improved conditions
4 could be ensured without some sort of authority. For the plan to become more than just a plan, there
5 needed to be guarantees about public transportation. Mr. Perez noted that the \$150 million would
6 address that, as the intention was to improve bus service, bus stops, mobility hubs, and tolling. UTA
7 might not be able to restore their service next season, but the season after that, it might be possible.
8 There was funding to enhance certain elements, but it would take a bit of time to implement. Mr.
9 Perez pointed out that there were also options outside of UTA. For example, a shuttle program had
10 been implemented. There were examples of third-party providers working to address the needs. He
11 noted that the BCC MAP referenced the possibility of creating a special transportation or transit
12 district for the tri-canyon area. There were several different ways that the work could move forward.
13

14 Mr. Shea explained that he had spoken to several individuals at UDOT. Based on those conversations,
15 it seemed possible that some of the \$150 million could be used for gondola infrastructure. He thought
16 it would be worthwhile to have the Stakeholders Council ask the CWC Board to seek confirmation
17 that the \$150 million appropriated during the 2023 Legislature would be used exclusively for the
18 items listed and not have any connection, directly or indirectly, to the gondola.
19

20 Mr. Knoblock referenced a comment made in the email from Mr. Nichols, which related to a number
21 four bus. If UTA could do that, it would spread out parking more so the parking would not be forced
22 into two or three Park and Ride lots. Getting UTA into an agreement on that would be a wonderful
23 step forward. He liked the idea mentioned by Mr. Perez about a special transit district for the tri-
24 canyon area, as UTA had a much larger responsibility Statewide and had priorities outside of the
25 canyons. He wondered who could implement a third-party shuttle bus system. Mr. Knoblock
26 discussed summer transit. That would be a substantial change and the Forest Service believed it
27 would require an environmental assessment before buses would be able to drop people off at
28 trailheads. Perhaps during the environmental assessment for the Millcreek Canyon shuttle, it would
29 be possible to think about the environmental assessment for summer transit to trailheads.
30

31 Co-Chair Cameron referenced the Transportation Committee. It might be worth sharing some
32 Stakeholders Council concerns and priorities with that Committee. For example, enhanced buses and
33 a possible special district. That Committee might have more power than the Stakeholders Council to
34 move that kind of work forward. Mr. Knoblock noted that the Chair of the Transportation Committee,
35 Mayor Dan Knopp, stated that there could be participation on the Transportation Committee. Anyone
36 interested in joining the meetings could do so. He suggested that Council Members participate. Ms.
37 Nielsen explained that even though there was a Transportation Committee at the Board level, it would
38 still be possible for the Stakeholders Council to create something similar. She noted that the
39 Preservation Committee was created at the Stakeholders Council level and it had a goal to focus on
40 the Legislation, even though there was already a Legislative and Land Tenure Committee at the Board
41 level. All Stakeholders Council Members were welcome to attend by CWC meeting as members of
42 the public. That being said, a committee that was focused on transportation at a Council level would
43 create a platform for Stakeholders Council Members to gather and share ideas.
44

1 **BUDGET REVIEW FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023/2024**

2
3 **1. CWC Staff will Brief the Stakeholders Council on the CWC’s Approved Tentative**
4 **Budget for Fiscal Year 2023/2024 and Receive Any Feedback.**
5

6 Mr. Perez reported that there were two attached documents in the Meeting Materials Packet related
7 to the approved Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2023/2024. That included a memo with more
8 detailed information about each line item. The spreadsheet was also there for review. He explained
9 that the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2023/2024 was approved during the CWC Board Meeting
10 in May 2023. The budget-building process started around the time of the CWC Board Retreat in
11 November 2022. Some goals and strategic plans were discussed at that time. For instance, solidifying
12 some mid-term funding commitments from member jurisdictions.
13

14 At the beginning of the year, meetings were set up with individual jurisdiction members to discuss
15 contributions. An agreement had been reached with each of the member jurisdictions so there was
16 clarity about what each member would contribute. It did not differ much from what the previous
17 contributions were in past years. Looking back at the Strategic Plan, the important pieces were
18 determined and the budget was built accordingly. The Tentative Budget had been worked on at the
19 executive level for the last several months. Mr. Perez reported that before the Board Meeting, there
20 would be a public hearing, where members of the public could comment. After that, the CWC Board
21 would approve the budget. By law, the budget needed to be passed by the end of June.
22

23 Mr. Perez reviewed the revenue portion of the Tentative Budget. He reported that the majority of the
24 CWC funding came in from member jurisdictions. That funding stayed in the Public Treasury
25 Investment Fund (“PTIF”), which was where the interest line item came in. The Other Government
26 line included contributions from Ex Officio Members. The State appropriations for 2022/2023 were
27 shown. He explained that the appropriations were a carryover from the Visitor Use Study. That
28 number was slightly lower now, as updated numbers had come in over the weekend. It was now
29 \$66,000.
30

31 The Tri-Canyons Restroom contract was listed in the budget. Mr. Perez reported that the organization
32 was partnering with the Forest Service, Salt Lake City Public Utilities, and others to maintain the
33 restrooms in the tri-canyons. The Tentative Budget also listed administration fees from the State
34 appropriations, donations for the Environmental Dashboard, and the State appropriations that were
35 awarded for the next fiscal year. The expenses were reviewed. This included salaries and benefits
36 for CWC Staff. The CWC Board went with a 6% cost of living adjustment (“COLA”) from the
37 previous year. There was also an intern line item. Mr. Perez was excited about the addition of a
38 second intern in the next fiscal year. That intern would focus on transportation. It would be beneficial
39 to have additional support with the transportation work. This decision was based on the Strategic
40 Plan and the goals that the CWC Board set back in November. There was a desire to focus on
41 transportation in the tri-canyons. The additional intern would assist with that work.
42

43 Mr. Perez highlighted the Professional Services listed in the budget. A lot of that carried over from
44 previous years. Certain contracts had been outlined. The Operations section was reviewed, which
45 included public notices, travel, office supplies, rent, insurance, bank charges, and software. Mr. Perez
46 reported that the lease would end at the end of April 2024, which was noted. The project-related
47 expenses were reviewed. This had to do with the deliverables for the next fiscal year. The first line
48 item there was for the Stakeholders Council and the Youth Council. Each of those groups had \$3,000

1 to do professional development or goal setting. There was also funding listed for a CWC Board
2 Retreat. There was money for the implementation of the sixth element of the Environmental
3 Dashboard as well, which was State appropriation funds dedicated towards that implementation.
4

5 Also listed in the project expenses was Grants Disbursement as well as an item for the bus bypass
6 service. Mr. Perez explained that the latter was a State appropriations fund. For the last two years,
7 the CWC, UDOT, Sandy City Police Department, and UTA, had partnered for the bus bypass service.
8 The service improved headways by 46% on canyon closure days. Restroom cleaning, graffiti busters,
9 and the Visitor Use Study were all listed. He noted that the Visitor Use line item was carryover. It
10 was anticipated that the final Visitor Use Study report would be ready in August. There was \$95,000
11 listed in short-term projects, which was State appropriation dollars. In addition, there were expenses
12 for the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) and the Central Wasatch Symposium. The
13 symposium would be a one-day event dedicated to issues in the Central Wasatch. The total expenses
14 were listed as \$874,850 and revenue was \$875,000. Mr. Perez reiterated that Stakeholders Council
15 Members could share comments during the public hearing on the budget.
16

17 Mr. Shea asked about the Central Wasatch Symposium. He wondered who would plan that and
18 whether it would include members of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez explained that no decisions
19 had been made, but the expertise of the Stakeholders Council would be included. Mr. Knoblock
20 referenced the bus bypass item. He wanted to know whether that was just for the buses that came
21 from the south in Sandy or if there was enough to establish the service for buses coming from the
22 6200 South Park and Ride. Mr. Perez believed summer would be the ideal time to discuss the
23 evolution of that program. At the moment, the focus was on buses coming from 9400 South. That
24 did not mean there could not be improvements made. Mr. Knoblock noted that there was a lot of
25 clustering there. He stressed the importance of prioritizing that area.
26

27 **OPEN COMMENTS**

28
29 Chair McCarvill opened the comment period.
30

31 Mr. Shea thanked CWC Staff for their hard work on the budget. Discussions were had about whether
32 committees at a Stakeholders Council level would create more work for CWC Staff. Ms. Nielsen
33 noted that there would be more work, but that work could benefit the organization. If any
34 Stakeholders Council Members had an idea for a subcommittee and had support from other Council
35 Members, that committee could be created as long as it was within the scope identified under the
36 Mountain Accord: transportation, economy, environment, and recreation. Additional information
37 was shared about the bus bypass service and the Cottonwood Connect system. It was reported that
38 9,000 rides were given on the Cottonwood Connect system, which generated \$63,000 in revenue.
39 That revenue went into the operating expenses for the Cottonwood Connect system program.
40

41 Ms. Hahnenberger asked about nominations for the Co-Chair positions. She wanted to know how
42 those should be submitted. Mr. Perez reported that CWC Staff would send out a list of the current
43 members. That list would not include the new members. However, it would include everyone still
44 on the Council and those who had chosen to obtain new terms starting July 1, 2023. That list would
45 be sent out the following morning to all Stakeholders Council Members. Additional information was
46 included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Mr. Perez clarified that CWC Staff would reach out to all
47 nominees to make sure that those nominated wanted to continue with the process.
48

1 Mr. Knoblock asked about the status of Salt Lake County and their participation in the CWC. Mr.
2 Perez explained that some work had been done with staff from Salt Lake County. The CWC also
3 sent email updates to Mayor Jenny Wilson and there were discussions with Jim Bradley. Mr. Perez
4 had also put in a request to meet with their County Council in the future to discuss the matter.
5

6 Ms. Nielsen noted that Dan Zalles and Ian Hartley had both listened to the Stakeholders Council
7 Meeting. Chair McCarvill welcomed them both and thanked them for their interest in the Council.
8

9 There were no additional comments.

10

11 **ADJOURN MEETING**

12

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

14

15 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Patrick Shea
16 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
17

17

18 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council 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 Hybrid Stakeholders Council Meeting held Monday, May 22, 2023.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____

10