

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION SHORT-TERM PROJECTS**  
2 **COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2020 AT 2:30 P.M. IN THE**  
3 **SALT LAKE CITY AND COUNTY BUILDING, CANNON ROOM LOCATED AT**  
4 **451 SOUTH STATE STREET, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH**

5  
6 **Present:** Committee Members:

7  
8 Chair Jim Bradley, Salt Lake County  
9 Erin Mendenhall, Salt Lake City Mayor  
10 Marci Houseman, Sandy City Council (via telephone)

11  
12 Others:

13  
14 Carl Fisher, Save Our Canyons  
15 Patrick Morrison, CCF  
16 Martin Jensen, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation  
17 Patrick Nelson, Salt Lake City  
18 Beckee Hotze, U.S. Forest Service  
19 Mary Young, Wasatch Graffiti Busters  
20 Catherine Kanter, Salt Lake County Regional Development  
21 Ashley Burr, Sky Ridge  
22 Allison Alfredt, Sky Ridge  
23 Kathryn Davies, Greater Salt Lake County Municipalities District  
24 Michael Galieti, Despain Ditch Company  
25 Ralph Becker, Central Wasatch Commission Executive Director  
26 Lindsey Nielsen, Central Wasatch Commission Communications Director  
27 Carly Lansche, Central Wasatch Commission Staff  
28

29 **1. MEETING MEMO**

30  
31 Chair Jim Bradley called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

32  
33 **a. Chair Jim Bradley will Review the Memo Prepared to Give Context to Each**  
34 **Agenda Item.**

35  
36 Chair Bradley reported on a short-term project explanatory memo that identified two associated  
37 projects. The desire was to give staff direction on both.

38  
39 **2. THE UTAH OUTDOOR RECREATION GRANT**

40  
41 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen reported that CWC staff is pursuing the Utah  
42 Outdoor Recreation Grant. Staff was seeking input from the Committee on which grants to apply for.  
43 In preparation for drafting Tier 2 grant proposals consisting of \$150,000 from the State, they identified  
44 two different projects in discussions with various partners with interest, background, and knowledge  
45 of the projects. The projects were identified as the Silver Lake Boardwalk Reconstruction Project,  
46 with an anticipated cost of \$2 million to \$3 million, and the White Pine Bridge Reconstruction Project,  
47 which involves the Boardwalk in Big Cottonwood Canyon.  
48

1           **a.     The Silver Lake Boardwalk Project Draft Grant Proposal.**

2  
3           **i.     Committee Members will be asked to Discuss the Draft Grant Proposal,**  
4           **Provide Guidance, and Determine a Plan of Action for Submission.**  
5

6 In various meetings with jurisdictional partners and staff, there was discussion about which level of  
7 the grant proposal to submit. The proposal is significant and in order to be eligible, a project must  
8 exceed \$2 million. The grant disbursement would be \$500,000. Direction was sought on whether to  
9 proceed with the lower level grant application request of \$150,000, which requires a 50/50 match in  
10 the form of cash or in-kind donations. Ms. Nielsen stated that this option is more tenable as there are  
11 community funds already allocated to the Silver Lake Boardwalk Project that exceed the 50% match.  
12

13 If a decision is made to pursue the full Silver Lake Boardwalk reconstruction, they would have to do  
14 significantly more work to obtain the needed additional funds. Ms. Nielsen clarified that Tier 1 is for  
15 new infrastructure in the canyons while Tier 2 is for existing infrastructure that requires maintenance.  
16 Tier 3 is for outdoor recreational projects. The highest tier is the Regional Asset tier that is \$500,000  
17 or greater. Ms. Nielsen asked for direction on whether to submit an application for a lower-level tier  
18 or pursue the larger Regional Asset Tier.  
19

20 Martin Jensen from Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation stated that they are planning to submit a  
21 proposal for the Jordan River Water Trail. They have matching funds already in place for the project,  
22 which is underway. Chair Bradley commented that there is a differentiation between the urban and  
23 rural projects with the Jordan River Water Trail Project qualifying as an urban project. The boardwalk  
24 would be considered rural. Mr. Jensen stated that it was unclear how they are differentiated, however,  
25 even though it is in rural Salt Lake County they will likely consider it an urban project.  
26

27 Ms. Nielsen reported that she spoke with one of the Project Managers from the State who manages  
28 the grant who indicated that the Silver Lake Boardwalk Grant Application would qualify as an urban  
29 project. She also stated that one urban and one rural grant will be awarded.  
30

31 Mayor Mendenhall asked if there is funding available from the Forest Service or Save Our Canyons.  
32 Beckee Hotze from the U.S. Forest Service stated that for the last five years they have sought funding  
33 but have fallen short. She hoped they could work together on fundraising efforts over the next year.  
34

35 Catherine Kanter from Salt Lake County Regional Development stated that she and Mr. Jensen have  
36 addressed the issue and her inclination was to pursue Tier 2 due to the size of the match in the Regional  
37 Asset Tier. While they do not have the matching funds now, she was confident that they can find  
38 them. Mr. Jensen concurred and stated that the County has pledged \$100,000 for the boardwalk. He  
39 pointed out that those funds have an expiration date and need to be spent by 2021. The County wants  
40 to work on Silver Lake but they are short on funding for the entire project. They recommended  
41 utilizing the \$100,000 and continue working on other projects.  
42

43 Mayor Mendenhall suggested that staff be directed to proceed with the Tier 2 level. Ms. Nielsen  
44 stated that the request will be for \$300,000 in the grant application with \$100,000 coming from Salt  
45 Lake County and other community partners. \$150,000 is already dedicated to the project, which is  
46 adequate and in excess of the 50% needed to support the application.  
47

48 Marci Houseman joined the meeting via telephone.

1  
2 **b. The White Pine Bridge Project Draft Grant Proposal.**  
3

4 Ms. Nielsen reported that they can submit more than one grant application for the same tier. White  
5 Pine Bridge was a project that the Forest Service identified as being needed. It would involve  
6 reconstruction of the current bridge and replace the existing culvert systems. The cost estimate was  
7 \$110,000 to \$150,000. It was noted that the project would benefit the watershed. Ms. Nielsen stated  
8 that they will consider utilizing CWC funding and jurisdictional partners for contributions.  
9

10 In response to a question raised, Ms. Nielsen explained that Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects are seeking  
11 \$100,000. The Regional Asset Tier is separate and is for projects in excess of \$2 million with a grant  
12 award of \$500,000. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker explained that they are applying for a  
13 Tier 2 project. Collectively, the total amount is \$1 million.  
14

15 Ms. Kanter suggested they address the four areas in the Mountain Accord. Mr. Fisher commented  
16 that there is a strong watershed component associated with the culvert. He asked if it was possible to  
17 package the grant proposal for trails and watersheds and keep it within Tier 2. There was discussion  
18 about the short-term projects being visible. There was some question as to whether the State would  
19 accept a joint application. Ms. Nielsen responded that if that were pursued the result would be mean  
20 that less work could be done on both sites. She pointed out that they would not want to compete with  
21 the County.  
22

23 Mayor Mendenhall was of the opinion that the optics would be that they are uncertain. She stressed  
24 the need for fluidity. Mr. Becker reported that the CWC has budgeted \$60,000 this fiscal year.  
25 Possible other ways to spend those funds were identified. In addition, the CWC has a substantial  
26 amount in reserves so that if something comes up, they could consider it. He stressed the importance  
27 of timing and the need to meet the timelines required for submitting grant applications. Various  
28 projects were discussed as well as possible funding options.  
29

30 Ms. Nielsen explained that the objective of today's meeting was to give staff direction on the grant  
31 proposals. Mr. Fisher commented that if they are combined, there would be \$150,000 for White Pine  
32 Bridge and \$100,000 for Silver Lake from the County that could potentially be doubled. Mayor  
33 Mendenhall was concerned that combining the projects could sacrifice the application. She suggested  
34 they work collectively toward getting funding through matching funds. She was concerned about the  
35 unknowns associated with the Silver Lake funding. It was noted that the worst-case scenario would  
36 be that they have to give the money back. Ms. Nielsen stated that there is a substantial amount of  
37 dedicated community funds for the Silver Lake Project. White Pine would be a more expensive  
38 proposal.  
39

40 Mr. Becker pointed out that the Silver Lake project would be one the CWC could sponsor utilizing  
41 funds from multiple sources. There is also money for White Pine. He was confident that they have  
42 the needed resources to pursue both opportunities. Ms. Nielsen clarified that currently, they do not  
43 need to use the funds for Silver Lake. They would not be asking for the full \$3 million. She clarified  
44 that the grant is \$150,000 with in-kind contributions being sought as well.  
45

46 Patrick Nelson from Salt Lake City commented that in terms of water quality, getting users to use the  
47 restroom is the top priority. Whether it is done this year or next, it is a great start. Moving forward  
48 there are several projects that can be completed. Cleaning restrooms was also a major priority for the

1 Town of Brighton. He noted that the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation (“CCF”) hired another trail  
2 crew this year.

3  
4 Mayor Mendenhall agreed that there are strong partnerships involved and the CWC also has reserves  
5 that can be allocated. Mr. Becker stated that in-kind contributions can also be provided. Mayor  
6 Mendenhall suggested that staff be directed to pursue \$350,000 for Silver Lake and \$150,000 for  
7 White Pine with the CWC seeking a match. Ms. Nielsen stated that on the high end the total project  
8 for White Pine would be \$150,000 with a required match of \$39,000. Ms. Hotze stated that there is  
9 an opportunity to utilize volunteers and contribute toward the in-kind contribution. Mayor  
10 Mendenhall felt a sense of uncertainty with the White Pine project. She preferred to have more surety.  
11 Ms. Hotze provided assurance that the projects can be scaled back, if necessary.

12  
13 Mr. Fisher commented that they are skirting the issues and stressed that this has been a generational  
14 issue. He explained that every time they come up with a project or proposal, it is not pursued because  
15 there is never committed funding. He suggested they pursue something and demonstrate that they  
16 can get something done. He was confident that fundraising efforts will be successful. He suggested  
17 that they show that the area is a priority.

18  
19 Chair Bradley stressed that the purpose of the subcommittee is to identify needed projects and give  
20 the CWC exposure. Both projects are opportunities to do that. Whatever they decide to pursue must  
21 be done correctly. Mr. Becker stated that between now and the end of the fiscal year, the Central  
22 Wasatch Commission will go through a budget adjustment. He stated that there is a substantial  
23 amount in reserves to cover any gap.

24  
25 **i. Committee Members will be asked to Discuss the Draft Grant Proposal,**  
26 **Provide Guidance, and Determine a Plan for Action for Submission.**

27  
28 **MOTION:** Mayor Mendenhall moved that the Short-Term Project Committee direct staff to proceed  
29 with two grant applications; one for the Silver Lake Project with a total project cost of \$300,000 and  
30 a \$150,000 request for the White Pine Bridge Project. The cost of the project is \$150,000 with a  
31 \$60,000 cash match from the Central Wasatch Commission. Chair Bradley seconded the motion.

32  
33 Ms. Nielsen stated that staff would present prepared grant applications at the next meeting scheduled  
34 for March 9.

35  
36 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

37  
38 **3. IDENTIFIED PROJECTS MATRIX**

39  
40 **a. Committee Members will Discuss a Matrix of Already-Identified “Shovel-Ready”**  
41 **Projects.**

42  
43 **4. CALL FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS**

44  
45 **a. Chair Jim Bradley will Summarize the Requested Edits Made to the Call for**  
46 **Project Proposals Document Initially Presented to the Committee During its**  
47 **January Meeting.**

1           **Chair Jim Bradley will Ask Committee Members to Discuss the Proposed**  
2           **Timeline for Opening the Call for Proposals, Review of Proposals Received by**  
3           **CWC Staff, Committee Members, and the Full Commission.**  
4

5 Ms. Nielsen reported that the next step will be to obtain a Letter of Support from the Land Manager.  
6 If the Committee is comfortable, it would be delivered to the full Commission at the March 9 meeting.  
7 They would want to submit the project proposal shortly thereafter. The public would be given four  
8 weeks to respond to the call for proposals.  
9

10 Mayor Mendenhall was concerned that the costs will change over time. She pointed out that  
11 organizations often pursue multiple lines of funding and they could be potentially unclear about how  
12 much of the \$60,000 will be allocated. Ms. Nielsen stated that the call for proposals could be pushed  
13 out further if desired by the Committee. She pointed out that the State will make the determination  
14 mid-May.  
15

16 Chair Bradley would not want to be in the position of not being able to deliver because all of the  
17 money has been spent. He pointed out that sending out a call for projects that also sends a message  
18 of expectation. Additional clarity was sought on the cost of projects. Mr. Becker explained that when  
19 they began the process, they did not know exactly what they would be pursuing. Based on the work  
20 of the Budget Finance Committee and the CWC, they knew there would be a pool of money available,  
21 however, the amount had not yet been determined. The intent was to use it to pursue special projects.  
22 He stated that it will likely be in excess of \$100,000. Possible options were discussed.  
23

24 Ms. Kanter stated that they addressed putting out RFIs. Before the State grant opportunity was  
25 presented, they explored the idea of putting out RFIs to solicit ideas. The State grant forced them to  
26 focus on one particular area and distracted them from the original opportunity. Mayor Mendenhall  
27 suggested they be clear in the characterization of the RFI and specify in the description that the grant  
28 application is a preliminary step.  
29

30 It was reported that the Save Our Canyons Fundraiser was scheduled for March 7.  
31

32           **5. ADJOURNMENT**  
33

34 The Central Wasatch Commission Short-Term Projects Committee Meeting adjourned at  
35 approximately 3:45 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Short-Term Projects Committee Meeting held Monday, February 24, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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

10