



1

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING
HELD MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2022, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED
BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS
MILLCREEK CITY HALL – 3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST.**

Board Members: Chair Christopher F. Robinson
Mayor Erin Mendenhall
Mayor Dan Knopp
Mayor Roger Bourke
Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
Mayor Michael Weichers
Mayor Monica Zoltanski

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

Others: Greg Ogden
Patrick Shea
Laura Briefer
Shane Topham
Dennis Goreham
Evelyn Everton
Jacob Minas
Joshua VanJura
Mimi Levitt
Randy Doyle
Steve VanMaren
Rusty Vetter
Tom Ward
Thomas Holst
Bob Kollar
John Knoblock
Kurt Hansen
Marian Rice
Mike Marker
William McCarvill
Jenna Malone
Megan Nelson
Mike Doyle

1 Abi Holt
2 Patrick Nelson
3

4 **OPENING**

5
6 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the CWC Board Meeting.**

7
8 Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
9

10 2. **(Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the June 6, 2022, Board Meeting.**

11
12
13 **MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to APPROVE the Minutes of the June 6, 2022, Board Meeting.
14 Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
15

16 **AUDIT PRESENTATION**

17
18 1. **Auditor Greg Ogden will Present the 2021/2022 Audit.**

19
20 CWC Treasurer, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini introduced Auditor, Greg Ogden, and thanked him for his
21 work. Mr. Ogden presented the audit and appreciated the assistance he received from staff. He was
22 surprised that they were able to complete the audit so quickly, which he attributed largely to Finance
23 Director, Dave Sanderson, being able to pull strings with Utah Retirement Systems and get their
24 Confirmation Letter completed three weeks early.
25

26 Mr. Ogden referenced page six of the audit and noted that Pension Assets were up by \$37,221. He
27 noted that many governments have recently had a net pension liability, which means that they do not
28 have enough paid into the Utah Retirement System to cover the promised benefits for retirement.
29 Unrestricted funds of \$885,791 remained for future years. On page 7, a change in net position was
30 shown with a deficit of \$44,959, which was the amount that expenses exceeded revenues during the
31 current year.
32

33 Mr. Ogden next referenced the end of the Utah Retirement Systems footnote on page 19 that showed
34 how much of a liability or asset the Central Wasatch Commission has based on its estimated rate of
35 return, which was 6.95%. If the rate of return had increased by 1% there would be an asset of
36 \$159,000. If it decreased by 1% there would be a liability of \$45,770. Footnote number 6 on page 20
37 showed the cost of the depreciated computers of \$6,700. He reported that they are fully depreciated
38 and was the reason the investment in capital assets showed a zero balance. Mr. Ogden reported that
39 there were no Management Letter findings, which was unusual but very positive. He remarked that
40 the CWC has done a very good job in the past of seldom having any findings.
41

42 In response to a question raised, Mr. Ogden stated that Utah Retirement Systems' 6.95% rate of return
43 is a very high yield.
44

45 Mayor Silvestrini thanked Mr. Ogden for his efforts and was pleased to have received a clean audit
46 letter. Mr. Ogden commented that the transition seemed to have gone very smoothly and things
47 seemed to be in order.
48

1 CWC Executive Director of Policy, Blake Perez, reported that the audit will be submitted to the State
2 with no further action required.

3
4 Chair Robinson thanked Messrs. Sanderson and Ogden, Mayor Silvestrini, and staff for completing
5 the audit in such a timely and professional manner.

6
7 **WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATE**

8
9 **1. Director of Salt Lake Public Utilities, Laura Briefer, will Provide an Update on the**
10 **Watershed Management Plan for Commissioner Discussion.**

11
12 Salt Lake Public Utilities Director, Laura Briefer, presented the Watershed Management Plan and
13 reported that the update began last fall. The update is part of Salt Lake City’s regulatory responsibility
14 under the federal and state Safe Drinking Water Acts, which are statutes that allow them to provide
15 safe drinking water to the public. It is the part of the statute that deals with source water protection.
16 It protects the water at its source prior to going into the treatment plant and distribution systems. The
17 goal of the Watershed Management Plan Update is to protect the source waters. The need for the
18 project is part of a regulatory requirement that also fits into a broader set of city policies and how they
19 manage water resources for those in their service area.

20
21 Ms. Briefer reported that the vision for the plan is to build upon the current plan and develop sound
22 policy that they can execute that will help them meet current conditions, challenges, and opportunities.
23 Salt Lake Public Utilities is a public water provider to 360,000 people in the Salt Lake Valley. That
24 includes everyone in Salt Lake City and large portions of Millcreek, Holladay, and Cottonwood
25 Heights, and smaller portions of South Salt Lake, Murray, and Midvale. They are also considered by
26 state law to be a public water system, which triggers requirements under the Safe Drinking Water
27 Act.

28
29 Ms. Briefer reported that the Watershed Management Plan recognizes that there are a lot of
30 jurisdictional roles in the study area. Within the environment of water quality, water resources, and
31 the geographic boundaries of the source water areas, there are government entities from local to state
32 to federal entities that deal with water quality. They manage and have jurisdiction over wetlands and
33 land use, law enforcement, and wildfire response.

34
35 There are existing plans that overlap some of the same areas. The purpose of the Watershed
36 Management Plan is to protect the source water from pollution. It also takes into consideration things
37 like the Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan which was last updated in 2003 that covers the
38 management goals and implementation of lands that are owned and managed by the federal
39 government and the U.S. Forest Service. They have several plans that Salt Lake County has
40 implemented under their various jurisdictional authorities. They also have the Towns of Alta and
41 Brighton and smaller municipalities that have authorities within the watersheds. There are also plans
42 regarding infrastructure, wildlife resources, etc.

43
44 Ms. Briefer reported that the Safe Drinking Water Act requires the plan to be updated every six years,
45 which has been done since the latest comprehensive plan in 1999. While the updates have built on
46 the 1999 plan, they recognized a need for a much larger, comprehensive planning process that
47 includes significant public engagement to address changes in environmental stressors that are being
48 seen in watersheds. They also want to look at new trends, some of which involve changes in

1 regulatory requirements. They want to make sure that the management they are proposing and that
2 is reflected in the next generation of city planning for the watersheds is both adaptive and proactive.
3 They are striving to continue to provide very high-quality water at its source, ongoing stewardship of
4 the resource, and ensure that the public has access to clean water in the future.

5
6 Currently, the water quality protection strategies have been effective and no water quality concerns
7 have been identified since the early 1920s to early 1950. Since Salt Lake City began stewarding the
8 watersheds in cooperation with the Forest Service and stakeholders, they have had consistent high-
9 quality water entering into the water treatment plants and very high-quality water entering the water
10 distribution system. The treated water has exceeded all federal and state requirements under the Safe
11 Drinking Water Act. They are, however, seeing that there is a combination of potential stressors.
12 One is the increasing population. There is also additional pressure for more recreational opportunities
13 within the watersheds, continued development within and outside of the watersheds, climate change
14 vulnerability and threats, and amplified wildfire threats that are somewhat related to population
15 growth and climate change. The new plan will address the emerging issues.

16
17 Ms. Briefer presented the Plan Development Framework and stated that the foundational work will
18 involve the review of the existing watershed conditions, management strategies, and previous plan
19 recommendations, and identify changing stresses on the watershed. They are working with a
20 consulting firm from Colorado that has expertise in watershed vulnerability assessment and watershed
21 management. They are currently in the process of analyzing and integrating all of the inputs and
22 receiving public input. They are also developing draft recommendations. The intent is to present the
23 Watershed Management Plan for adoption and implementation by the Salt Lake City Council.

24
25 Ms. Briefer reported that there is a significant Engagement Framework and they have created an
26 Advisory Committee that is comprised of major jurisdictions that have a role in water quality for
27 drinking and clean water purposes. It is comprised of the State Department of Environmental Quality,
28 the State Division of Drinking Water, the State Division of Water Quality, the Forest Service, the
29 Utah Department of Natural Resources, the Division of Fire Forestry and State Lands, and Salt Lake
30 County. They also developed a Stakeholders Committee that includes a number of jurisdictions that
31 have a role in managing the Central Wasatch Mountains as well as non-governmental organizations,
32 citizen advisory groups, and community representatives. It is a large group with 60 present at
33 Stakeholders Committee Meetings.

34
35 Ms. Briefer stated that a timeline has been developed for the project. The hope was to have the final
36 Watershed Management Plan completed in December 2022 but it was expected to take until 2023.
37 They want to be sure to incorporate all of the information they receive during the public engagement
38 process. It is also fire season and some key stakeholders have been busy. They want to make sure
39 they have time to provide good input. Public comment is welcome at any time during the process.

40
41 The study area was described and mirrors the 1999 plan. It includes both current and future water
42 supply sources for Salt Lake City's service area. The study area includes City Creek, Parleys Creek,
43 Red Butte Creek, portions of Emigration Creek, Mill Creek, Big Cottonwood Creek, and Little
44 Cottonwood Creek. The blue-shaded areas are currently protected areas where regulations apply with
45 regard to certain types of activities in the watersheds. They coincide with everything upstream. The
46 locations of area treatment plants were identified.

1 Ms. Briefer explained that the importance is somewhat captured in the amount of water that comes
2 from these areas. The percentage of water from each watershed was identified. Having the water
3 supply so close to the place of use means that water is more affordable, there is no cost to transport it
4 over long distances, and it is gravity fed so energy use remains low. Where the watershed is situated
5 is also important. The Little Cottonwood Watershed can serve nearly the entire water service area.
6 That is because gravity flow and the distribution system are both generally to the north. The City
7 Creek Watershed, however, is limited in terms of the area it serves. It is still very important but it
8 cannot serve the area to the south. Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, and Parleys have the ability
9 to reach a very large part of the water service area.

10
11 Ms. Briefer described the following unique attributes of Salt Lake City and the Wasatch Watersheds:

- 12
- 13 • Proximity to the urban core;
- 14 • A short distance from source to tap;
- 15 • Major recreational areas concentrated in small canyons; and
- 16 • Rapid population growth.
- 17

18 The following are also in the watersheds:

- 19
- 20 • Four world-famous ski resorts less than 30 miles from downtown Salt Lake City;
- 21 • Three wilderness areas with trailheads a few miles from Salt Lake City;
- 22 • Major freeway and highways up canyons;
- 23 • Extensive trail network for hiking and biking; some walking distance from the edge of town;
24 and
- 25 • Rapidly growing mountain bike, skiing, and other recreational opportunities that are gaining
26 national attention.
- 27

28 With respect to the management of watersheds, they are open to most recreation with minimal
29 restrictions on traffic in City Creek and domestic animals in the protected watershed areas.

30
31 Unique watershed attributes include rapid population growth as follows:

- 32
- 33 • From 2010 to 2020, the State of Utah was the fastest growing in the nation;
- 34 • The Uintah-Wasatch-Cache National Forest is among the top five most visited in the nation;
35 and
- 36 • More visitors annually than Yellowstone National Park.
- 37

38 Watershed management in other communities in the west was discussed with each having its own
39 unique characteristics. A summary was provided of each watershed studied, where it exists, how
40 many it serves, the primary source of water, distance from the source, percentage of supply, and
41 characteristics of the watershed.

42
43 Ms. Briefer reported that watershed resiliency is what they are striving for. It is defined as the ability
44 of a watershed to withstand or recover quickly, from a severe event such as fires, floods, or extreme
45 weather. The characteristics of watershed resiliency include:

- 46
- 47 • Healthy riparian areas;

- 1 • Intact wetlands;
- 2 • Natural stream flows;
- 3 • Functional flood plains;
- 4 • Diverse, healthy upland vegetation;
- 5 • A mix of openings/meadows;
- 6 • Good ground cover;
- 7 • Wildfires in natural disturbance regime;
- 8 • Minimal impervious or compacted cover;
- 9 • Lower road density; and
- 10 • Well-designed stream and road crossings.

11

12 Ms. Briefer explained that they want watersheds to be able to withstand disturbances and recover
13 rapidly from any disturbance that may occur.

14

15 During stakeholder meetings and open houses, information was presented regarding potential
16 vulnerabilities and management strategies. Ms. Briefer stated that the process is based on science
17 and addresses what they are facing and how it impacts the watershed.

18

19 Three major categories of concern were identified as:

20

- 21 • Climate change;
- 22 • Wildfire; and
- 23 • Human influence.

24

25 Ms. Briefer reported that Marian Rice serves as the Deputy Director and is leading the Water Quality
26 Regulations Team. Patrick Nelson serves as the Watershed Manager and Project Manager for the
27 program.

28

29 Mayor Silvestrini commended Mses. Briefer and Rice and their staff for addressing this very complex
30 issue.

31

32 Mayor Zoltanski thanked Ms. Briefer and Salt Lake City for their leadership. She explained that
33 Sandy City shares water resources with Salt Lake City including Little Cottonwood Creek and Deer
34 Creek Reservoir. Sandy City's Public Utilities Department is mirroring many of the approaches set
35 forth in the Management Plan. She applauded them for their great work.

36

37 Mayor Knopp serves on the Advisory Council and commented that their watersheds are all open to
38 the public. Many watersheds in other cities are not. He appreciated that they remained open.

39

40 Ms. Briefer recognized Mayor Mendenhall for her support of the process. She stated that they will
41 also be making updated presentations in other public venues and ensuring that members of the CWC
42 are made aware of those.

43

44 Chair Robinson introduced CWC Intern, Madeline Pettit who is the subject of a Resolution provided
45 in the packet. The intent was for her to work 20 hours per week. Ms. Pettit reported that she is
46 originally from Southern California and is a marketing student at the University of Utah. She is in
47 her senior year and was happy to be working with the Central Wasatch Commission.

1
2 **COMMITTEE UPDATES AND REPORTS**
3

4 **1. The EBAC Met on July 18, Meeting Minutes Included in the Meeting Materials.**
5

- 6 • **The 2022 Board Retreat will take place in the first half of November for a half day. Date and time to be determined.**
7
8

9 Chair Robinson reported that a one-half day Retreat was to be scheduled for the second week in
10 November. Mayor Silvestrini stated that it is easier for many participants to commit to one-half day
11 rather than a full day. He thought it was important to get solid participation from the entire CWC
12 Board. Important issues need to be discussed including ways to financially support the organization.
13 He encouraged all Board Members to make a good faith effort to attend.
14

15 Chair Robinson indicated that Mayor Knopp kindly offered to hold the Retreat at the Lodge in Big
16 Cottonwood Canyon.
17

- 18 • **There is a willingness from the Forest Service to join the Central Wasatch Commission
19 as an ex officio member. Leading into the October Board meeting, staff and
20 Commissioners will determine parameters for the addition of the Forest Service and
21 draft a resolution formally adding the USFS to the Board.**
22

23 Chair Robison recalled that the Interlocal Agreement creating the CWC allowed for up to four
24 ex officio members. There are currently two consisting of Carlton Christensen from the Utah Transit
25 Authority (“UTA”) and Annalee Munsey from the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and
26 Sandy. The decision was made as part of the Strategic Assessment to reach out to other jurisdictions.
27 It was noted that the U.S. Forest Service is one of the largest landowners in the area. The desire was
28 to extend an offer to the Uintah-Wasatch-Cache Ranger District to appoint someone to serve as an ex
29 officio CWC Board Member. The reappointment of Mr. Christensen would also be sought.
30

31 Mayor Silvestrini commented that Carlton Christensen was unable to be present at this meeting due
32 to a conflict. He stated that UTA has been a valuable ex officio member and he felt it was important
33 to keep them engaged. He was pleased that the U.S. Forest Service expressed a willingness to
34 participate as well. They will have limitations on being able to vote but because they are a major
35 landowner, they must be involved and participate.
36

37 Mayor Bourke agreed and suspected that they are the largest single landholder in the area. Chair
38 Robinson did not yet know who would be appointed. Mayor Silvestrini commented that they will be
39 a valuable addition without making a financial contribution. Mayor Knopp agreed and did not think
40 they should try to get a financial contribution from the U.S. Forest Service but simply have them at
41 the table.
42

43 Mayor Zoltanski commented that it makes sense to have the U.S. Forest Service involved to share
44 resources, ideas, and establish points of contact.
45

- 46 • **Staff presented a fundraising and outreach plan (attached) to the EBAC for discussion,
47 which details a capital campaign to raise \$25,000 for the ongoing maintenance of the
48 Environmental Dashboard.**

- 1
2 • **A resolution to approve the donation platform and checking account for the**
3 **Environmental Dashboard will be considered for approval.**
4

5 CWC Executive Director of Administration, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the Board received a
6 spreadsheet detailing outreach and a connected fundraising plan that is a living document for the
7 Environmental Dashboard. The timeline is now to the end of the year. They will be embarking on a
8 roadshow to present the Environmental Dashboard in the manner it has been presented to the Board,
9 other organizations, and community groups. The intent is to consider approval to enter into a contract
10 with the fundraising platform account for the Environmental Dashboard.
11

12 **2. The Transportation Committee Met on June 30th, Meeting Minutes included in Meeting**
13 **Materials.**
14

- 15 • **Commissioner Knopp will present the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan**
16 **and Professional Services Agreement for discussion.**
17
18 ○ **Staff will release the RFP and materials following Board approval.**
19

20 Mayor Knopp reported that the plan was moving forward more quickly than the Utah Department of
21 Transportation (“UDOT”) was anticipating. They were in the process of interviewing consultants. A
22 letter was received from UDOT indicating that they were worried that the Request for Proposals
23 (“RFP”) will conflict with the announcement of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”)
24 decision. Mayor Knopp stressed that the intent is simply to start the process.
25

26 Mr. Perez reported that the RFP has gone through the Transportation and Executive Committees and
27 both the Forest Service and UDOT have reviewed it and given feedback. Adjustments were made
28 over the past month regarding the timeframe, the amount of the contract, how long the RFP will be
29 open, the timeline for the actual contract, and the CWC doing a budget amendment at the October
30 meeting to receive the funds from the funding partners and allow for the budget to spend out the RFP.
31 Formal action was not being sought tonight but simply approval to move forward with the RFP. A
32 Resolution and final action would be forthcoming at the October meeting.
33

34 Chair Robinson reviewed an email from UDOT’s Region II Project Manager, Grant Farnsworth who
35 indicated that there are additional comments after further review of the Big Cottonwood Canyon
36 Mobility Action Plan with the UDOT Environmental Group. The timing of the study is problematic
37 as it will be during the scheduled release of the LCC final EIS. They were trying to limit other projects
38 being considered during this time to maximize the clarity of the LCC EIS effort. Chair Robinson
39 assumed that they should continue the timing of the study without delay. The timeline would be
40 condensed and be difficult to coordinate with stakeholders. It was recommended that the deliverables
41 needed for January be identified to determine what portions of the study can be continued past the
42 January deadline. It was noted that public outreach during this time will be affected by the release of
43 the EIS. It was recommended that the public outreach be specific and include constructive feedback
44 regarding improvements that are set up to avoid spillover sound. The BCC map should focus on
45 projects that can be built to solve problems being observed now while including assumptions that the
46 LCC EIS preferred alternative will be built.
47

1 Chair Robinson asked if there was anything in the email that would cause them to want to alter the
2 RFP or the timing. Mr. Perez reported that a meeting was held with UDOT but no guidance was
3 given with respect to timing.
4

5 Mayor Zoltanski asked if any indication was given of when their decision was coming. Mayor Bourke
6 stated that they have not been given any information. Mayor Silvestrini commented that there are
7 Consultants that will take the work. He thought that the risk was two separate canyons. He did not
8 consider confusing the two to be a legitimate concern. He stressed the importance of getting the work
9 done for Big Cottonwood Canyon.
10

11 Mayor Zoltanski asked if there had been any consultation between UDOT and CWC staff. Mr. Perez
12 responded that Mayor Knopp has been involved throughout the process. They have been working
13 with Mr. Farnsworth and sent the RFP over. They have reviewed it twice. The latest comments were
14 as described. Mayor Knopp stated that what they are trying to do is much simpler than Little
15 Cottonwood. They are already getting letters of support and people like the concept they are trying
16 to put forward. Mayor Bourke suggested they keep the momentum going.
17

18 Chair Robinson stated that the next step will be to release the RFP. He assumed that will happen once
19 they discuss their Mobility Action Plan as an action item. Mr. Perez stated that no formal resolution
20 is required to move forward. The resolution and formal agreement will come at the October meeting.
21 One slight adjustment was made as there was a preference to have the CWC be not only the main
22 project manager but to pay for all of the monthly invoices with the Consultant. The Professional
23 Services Agreement in the draft form that was distributed was one that the Consultant would bill all
24 of the funding partners appropriate for. The preference was for the CWC to be the main agency. It
25 was recommended that the CWC move forward with a budget amendment to be presented at the
26 October meeting. They would then be able to accept and spend the funds appropriately for the project.
27

28 Mayor Silvestrini stated that as Treasurer because it is new money and a project, it requires a budget
29 amendment in order to execute it. Chair Robinson liked the idea of the CWC serving as the clearing
30 house rather than separate invoices being sent to multiple agencies. The \$10,000 contribution the
31 CWC was making was already in the budget for the Transportation Committee and will not require a
32 budget amendment. The budget amendment is required to increase the budget to take into account
33 the funds to be received from those who have agreed to pay and disburse those proceeds to the selected
34 contractors. Chair Robinson clarified that the \$10,000 line item is directed toward the BCC Map,
35 which would require the support of the Board.
36

37 **MOTION:** Mayor Bourke moved to APPROVE the RFP and the Mobility Action Plan in order for
38 it to be released to solicit Contractors on the schedule outlined. Mayor Mendenhall seconded the
39 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
40

41 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE AND REPORT**

42

43 **1. William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Provide an Update on the Activities of**

44 **the Stakeholders Council.**

45

46 Will McCarvill reported that at their July Board Meeting they were updated on the new staffing
47 structure and provided with a new responsibility chart. They also received an update on the Strategic
48 Plan that was worked on earlier in the year. They were informed of the Uintah-Wasatch-Cache

1 National Forest Fee Proposal. The decision was made to let each organization deal with it on its own
2 due to a diversity of opinions.

3
4 Ms. Nielsen provided information on the fundraising outreach plan for the Environmental Dashboard.
5 There was also discussion on whether to have another committee that would promote the dashboard.
6 The intent was for the Preservation Committee to work on it with those interested in the
7 Environmental Dashboard. Mr. McCarvill reported that they were updated on the Big Cottonwood
8 Canyon Mobility Action Plan. The next meeting was scheduled for October.

- 9
10 • **The Stakeholders Council met on Wednesday, July 20.**

11
12 The above matter was not discussed.

13 **ACTION ITEMS**

- 14
15
16 1. **Consideration of Resolution 2022-38 A Resolution Approving and Ratifying Entry Into**
17 **an Employment Agreement with Madeline Pettit.**

18
19 Chair Robinson reported that Ms. Pettit has been on the job since June 21 and the Resolution would
20 be retroactive.

21
22 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-38, a Resolution approving and
23 ratifying entry into an Employment Agreement with Madeline Pettit. Mayor Weichers seconded the
24 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

25
26 Mayor Zoltanski thanked Ms. Pettit for her willingness to serve.

- 27
28 2. **Consideration of Resolution 2022-34, A Resolution Approving a Donation Platform for**
29 **the Environmental Dashboard.**

30
31 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-34, a Resolution approving a
32 Donation Platform for the Environmental Dashboard. Mayor Zoltanski seconded the motion. The
33 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

- 34
35 3. **Consideration of Resolution 2022-37, A Resolution Reappointing an Ex-Officio**
36 **Commissioner to Represent the Utah Transit Authority.**

37
38 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-37, a Resolution reappointing
39 an Ex-Officio Commissioner to represent the Utah Transit Authority. Mayor Bourke seconded the
40 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

41 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

42
43
44 *Patrick Shea* commented that it seems in many ways that with the gondola, UDOT continues to delay
45 making a decision. He suggested that the CWC invite the Director of UDOT to attend a meeting and
46 explain the reason for the delay. Chair Robinson did not believe that inviting them to a meeting would
47 result in any additional information. His advice was to wait for UDOT to deliver the final EIS when
48 they are ready.

1
2 There were no further public comments. The public comment period was closed.
3

4 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**
5

6 *Mayor Zoltanski* stated that in response to Mr. Shea’s comment that no one on the Board presses for
7 dates, certainties, dates, or insight at every opportunity. She stated that the decision-makers continue
8 to process the immense volume of public comment and should make an announcement this summer.
9 She had pressed in every way she knew of. She stressed that a lot is riding on this decision and she
10 was watching it very closely.
11

12 *Mayor Silvestrini* advised the Board that earlier in the day she approved a new agreement with Zions
13 First National Bank with respect to credit cards for CWC staff. Previously they had individual credit
14 cards in their names and have since changed to a “P” card system where one card can be used for all
15 CWC expenses. There is no need going forward for staff to have separate credit cards. This will be
16 a more efficient way to keep track of charges on one statement. It is set up with Mr. Perez as the
17 administrator and Mayor Silvestrini having the ability to review the activity on Zions secure system.
18 The intent was to streamline the administration of the credit card system.
19

20 Mayor Silvestrini suggested that for the next meeting all Board Members meet at the true anchor
21 location.
22

23 **CLOSED SESSION**
24

- 25 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will end the closed session for the purposes**
26 **for to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an**
27 **individual as authorized by UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-205(1)(a) and re-open the Central**
28 **Wasatch Commission Board meeting.**
29

30 **BOARD MEETING REOPENS**
31

- 32 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Reopen the CWC Board Meeting**
33 **Following the Closed Session.**
34

35 There was no closed session.
36

37 **ADJOURN BOARD MEETING**
38

- 39 1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC Board Meeting.**
40

41 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to adjourn. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion
42 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
43

44 The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:56 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, August 1, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____