

Executive Board Meeting Notes

Date: October 26, 2015; 3:30-5:00 PM
Location: Salt Lake County, 2001 S State Street, Room N4-600
Attendees: Mayor McAdams, Chris Robinson, Andy Beerman, Mayor Cullimore, Mayor Dolan, Mayor Pollard, Nathan Rafferty, Joan Degiorgio, Mike Wilson, Carl Fisher, Cathy Kahlow (for Dave Whittekiend), Andrew Gruber, Laura Briefer (for Mayor Becker), Dave Kallas (for Mike Allegra), representative from FHWA, additional attendees in audience

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS:

1. Decision: Andy Beerman moved to approve the release of the funds for the Environmental Dashboard, seconded by Mayor Dolan. Motion passed with unanimous approval.
2. Action Item: Ann Ober will make changes to disclosure form and distribute it for signing at the next Executive Board meeting.
3. Action Item, Mike Grass: Public kick-off in early November 2015 to re-engage the public and reach out to media, let them know what Phase II looks like. System group meeting planned for early November also.
4. Action Item, Mike Grass: the team is working on a number of one-sheets that are easy to understand the key actions in the next phase.
5. Action Items, Brad Barber: Federal Lands Task force will consider Special Management Area, and the issue will be addressed again at the next Executive Board meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Welcome and introduction
 - a. Chris Robinson welcomed everyone and conducted introductions
2. Updates
 - a. University of Utah would like to partner, is submitting a proposal for our consideration (Joanna Ganning in Metropolitan Research Center is leading the effort).
 - i. Part of discussion is whether to break up economic studies by projects, or have the economic group look at all economic components of Mountain Accord.
 - ii. Selection of who will perform the economic study services should go through some sort of standardized RFP process.
 - iii. Executive Board to select proposal after Program Manager is chosen.
 - b. Utah AGRC (Bert Granberg) has offered to house Mountain Accord's GIS data for Phase II.
 - i. A database in a centralized location provides many benefits. The state would house it at no cost; it would be part of what they provide as an ILA partner.
 - ii. UTA will pass on all the GIS and mapping data to the State when it's received from Parametrix.
 - iii. Andrew Gruber commented that AGRC does great work, and the Mountain Accord technical team should have a dialogue with AGRC to see what they could do to serve our needs, but err on the side of the state's offer.
3. Parametrix Contract—Mary DeLoretto

- a. Contract is in the process of being closed out. They did some work September, and the contract was extended for a couple months in case we wanted maps. One big effort is transferring the GIS data. Anticipate approximately \$20K for the September work, leaving approximately \$80K unexpended.
4. Budget Update—Mary DeLoretto
 - a. Approximately \$2.1M currently in the holding account, with expected contributions from ILA partners to add another \$1.1M for this year. Three entities have signed the latest ILA.
 - i. The October 1, 2015 version of the ILA should be the one to be signed.
 - b. Outstanding commitments—Grit Mill, Dashboard, Parametrix, Program Manager Phase I contract.
5. Program Manager Selection
 - a. Program Manager should be selected by the end of November at the latest.
 - b. Dave Kallas: UTA is managing holding account because Mountain Accord doesn't have one. The Phase II Program Manager contract will be done through WFRC, so they will hold that contract. UTA will assign the amount of the Program Manager contract from the holding account to WFRC for program management. UTA will likely do something similar with Salt Lake County for the Environmental Dashboard contract.
 - i. The hope is to make Mountain Accord an entity capable of managing a holding account, so UTA may release responsibility for holding the funds. UTA's internal auditing requirements make it difficult for UTA to hold funds but not manage the contracts.
 - c. Andrew Gruber: We're not contemplating that WFRC be responsible for maintaining the Mountain Accord holding account, or managing all the other contracts and work efforts, for example the NEPA work. Want to avoid scope creep for what WFRC has the capacity to do.
 - i. First task of the Program Manager's scope of work is to come up with an organizational structure going forward, like the creation of a new legal entity.
6. Environmental Dashboard
 - a. Request approval for the release of \$250K in funds so that the Environmental Dashboard contract selection may proceed.
 - b. Anne Ober: Salt Lake County will be releasing an RFP soon, but can't release until we have money in hand. The \$250K is a not to exceed amount to develop the Dashboard. The Dashboard will be updated on an annual basis, and the amount required for those updates has not yet determined.
 - c. Joan Degiorgio: The idea for the Dashboard came out of the Environmental System Group because we need a single set of metrics as we measure environmental conditions going forward
 - d. It's recommended that Mountain Accord have 2-3 members of the Executive Board to be involved with the Dashboard and be champions for it.
 - e. **Decision: Andy Beerman moved to approve the release of the funds for the Environmental Dashboard, seconded by Mayor Dolan. Motion passed with unanimous approval.**
7. Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form—Ann Ober
 - a. Ann Ober: It's impossible to draft a disclosure form that exactly mirrors every entities' own disclosure forms, so the hope is that this disclosure form captures all of them substantially enough.

- i. Disclose if you own property in the Mountain Accord project area or make a living within the Mountain Accord project boundary.
 - ii. If not a voting member, don't need a disclosure. State legislators haven't voted, so it doesn't apply to them.
 - b. Mayor McAdams: It's more appropriate to make this a personal statement, not an affidavit.
 - c. Chris Robinson: "Appearance of a conflict of interest" seems vague and broad. Could that be better defined? Something like "personal pecuniary interest"?
 - d. Mayor McAdams: Recommend that it read something like "I have the following investments and pecuniary interests in the project area."
 - e. Gift ban/limit not addressed because there's too much variation amongst the Executive Board entities. Public officials are already subject to rigorous gift bans according to the rules of their various jurisdictions.
 - f. **Action Item: Ann will make these changes and distribute it for signing at the next Executive Board meeting.**
8. Public Launch for Phase II—Mike Grass
 - a. The public engagement team has been updating the Facebook page and webpage, but hasn't kept up media outreach.
 - b. **Action Item, Mike Grass: Recommend that we hold a kick-off in early November 2015 to re-engage the public and reach out to media, let them know what Phase II looks like.**
 - c. Another important component is to re-engage the System Groups. We have sent out three emails since Phase I wrapped up and had pretty good engagement from those who have received them.
 - i. Goal is to have System Group meeting in early November.
 - ii. Laynee has had some ideas about re-tooling the System Groups for Phase II. This will probably be presented at next Executive Board meeting.
 - d. Nathan Rafferty: Where are we on having a one-sheeter for the public about what the next steps are?
 - i. **Action Item, Mike Grass: the team is working on a number of one-sheets that are easy to understand. The one-sheets will cover five points—Dashboard, land exchange, federal designation, trails, NEPA/transportation**
 - e. Mayor Pollard: Transportation initiative needs to be in the forefront.
 - f. Cathy Kahlow: It's looking like NEPA will have two parts—first, the Forest Service looking at land use for recreation, transportation, and environmental protection. Related to congressional bills. When those decisions are made, we can begin next phase of NEPA, with transit questions being continued by the FTA and focusing on corridors identified by the Forest Service.
9. Park City to Big Cottonwood Canyon Study Update
 - a. Ann Ober: The study has been delayed because components of the traffic demand study need to be extrapolated and interpreted. The data requires modeling that WFRC doesn't have the staffing to evaluate. We also need an economic model before being able to proceed.
 - i. We can't get answers to questions like carrying capacity because no one is in agreement about the WFRC model. The same is true with the economic component.
 - ii. Requesting a 1-year delay to continue with that study. The recommendation is that we move forward when the information becomes available.

- b. The delay may mean that the study will be too late to be part of the first NEPA process, but this is a risk the Executive Board is willing to take.
- c. Meetings with the Big Cottonwood Canyon Community Council revealed that they want this information before proceeding, too. It is foundational to how they will grow over the coming years.
- d. We will have a scope proposal for the 1-80 study in December.

10. Federal Designation

- a. Brad Barber: There is still not a consensus on the name. The task force recommended Conservation Management Area as a compromise between National Monument and National Recreation Area. This recommendation was not unanimous, however.
 - i. The majority of the task force can accept recreation in the name, but there's not a consensus. But a majority also believed that including "recreation" weakens the designation.
 - ii. Recreation is there and is obvious; we don't have to say it in the name. Conservation Management Area represents a compromise, it's not something new or unknown, and it's politically feasible.
 - iii. Aside from the name, the details of legislation are close to being finalized.
- b. Carl Fisher: Recreation on our public lands is an inherent characteristic. Environmental characteristics are typically downplayed, so people want to see them elevated. The conservation community has made a lot of compromises on the Wilderness front. All the conservation groups think that recreation shouldn't be something that's promoted. We don't need to advertise that it's the playground.
 - i. There are various naming conventions. There are a lot of benefits to name it something that exists already. An important part of protection is being part of a bigger system that offers the protection.
- c. Nathan Rafferty: A lot of recreating happens in the area. It feels like a short sale if recreation isn't named in designation. If we want to get this passed through Congress, we need package that includes recreation to make it more sellable. A great compromise is to list both activities.
- d. Mayor McAdams: Can we diffuse this conflict and call it something else, like a Special Management Area?
- e. Chris Robinson: Both sides are robbed of promotional rights if there's a sterilized name like Special Management Area. The bigger question is whether the essence of the designation in the name or the legislation.
- f. Carl Fisher: Both Nathan and I agree that the name is really important. And we would have to distinguish this Special Management Area from the ones proposed in the Wilderness Bill that's been to Congress three times.
- g. Mayor McAdams: The preference is to get a name that has a consensus.
- h. **Action Item: Task force will consider Special Management Area, and the issue will be addressed again at the next Executive Board meeting.**

Meeting notes were prepared by Carly Castle of Salt Lake City. If you have comments or questions, please contact laynee@mountainaccord.com.