

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION BOARD MEETING HELD**
2 **REMOTELY ON MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2020, AT 5:30 P.M.**

3
4 **Present:** Chair Chris Robinson, Mayor Mike Peterson, Mayor Andy Beerman,
5 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mike Reberg (representing
6 Salt Lake County Mayor Jenny Wilson), Commissioner Marci Houseman,
7 Commissioner Jim Bradley, Mayor Erin Mendenhall
8

9 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Attorney Shane Topham, Deputy
10 Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office
11 Manager Kaye Mickelson
12

13 **1. OPENING**

14
15 **A. Commissioner Christopher F. Robinson will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of**
16 **the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board.**

17
18 Chair Chris Robinson welcomed those present via UberConference and called the meeting to order
19 at approximately 5:30 p.m.
20

21 Chair Robinson reported that public comment would be accepted in a few ways. Before the
22 meeting, public comments were emailed to the Board and included in a spreadsheet that was to be
23 shared later. Public comments would also be allowed during the meeting. He asked that Board
24 Members wishing to comment send a note in the chat column to be recognized.
25

26 **B. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the March 9, 2020 Board**
27 **Meeting.**
28

29 **MOTION:** Mayor Sondak moved to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2020 meeting minutes.
30 Commissioner Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent
31 of the Board.
32

33 **2. PROPOSED AMENDMENT CWC INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT (“ILA”);**
34 **BRIGHTON APPLICATION: (Discussion and Action).**
35

36 **A. Discussion of the Proposed Amendments to Article V of the CWC ILA**
37 **(1) Omitting the “Wasatch Back”; (2) Converting the “Wasatch Back”**
38 **Appointed Commissioner Position (currently filled by Summit County) into**
39 **Membership of Summit County in the CWC (conditioned on Summit County**
40 **entering into the CWC ILA; and (3) Providing for the Appointment of *Ex***
41 ***Officio* Commissioners from Time to Time to Represent Additional**
42 **Governmental Entities with Specialized Expertise or Input, such as UTA.**
43

44 CWC Attorney, Shane Topham described the following changes made since the last meeting:
45

- 1 • The term of office of the ex officio members was changed to the lesser of one year or other
2 duration specified in the appointment.
- 3
- 4 • Section 2C was modified to permit reapplication one year after denial rather than three
5 years.
- 6
- 7 • Section E(b)(2)(a) was changed to allow for up to four ex officio Board Members at any
8 given time.
- 9

10 **B. Consideration of Resolution 2020-14 Amending Article V of the CWC ILA,**
11 **Subject to Approval of the Governing Bodies of all of the CWC's Members.**
12

13 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bradley moved to adopt Resolution 2020-14 amending Article V of
14 the CWC ILA, subject to approval of the governing bodies of all of the CWC's members. Mayor
15 Beerman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
16

17 **C. Discussion of the Status of the Town of Brighton's Application for**
18 **Membership in the CWC.**
19

20 Mr. Topham reported that the above matter prevents the governing bodies of all members being
21 asked to give consent repeatedly. He drafted a form resolution for each member entity to consider.
22 It would grant that entity's approval of the amendment to the ILA approved by the Board and the
23 admission of Brighton as a member of the CWC contingent upon Brighton's Town Council
24 approving the ILA, executing it, and delivering to the CWC. Once unanimously approved by all
25 members, the approved ILA will be sent to the Town of Brighton. He expected it to take about
26 one month to get the issue before each of the governing bodies and take action. Procedural issues
27 were discussed. Mr. Topham explained that the matter was informational only and no further
28 action was required by the Board.
29

30 **3. BUDGET/FINANCE: (Discussion)**
31

32 **A. Draft: Three Scenarios/Assumptions for 2020-2021 Budget. Commissioner**
33 **Jeff Silvestrini, Assistant Treasurer/Chair of the Budget Committee, will**
34 **update the Board on that Committee's March 31, 2020, meeting and various**
35 **other matters, including three draft scenarios for the CWC's Budget for FY**
36 **2020-2021. The Board may take action on the committee's recommendations**
37 **for Board input and approval on any of the presented matters.**
38

39 Chair Robinson reported that three draft scenarios were proposed for the 2020-2021 budget.
40 Mayor Silvestrini, Assistant Treasurer/Chair of the Budget Committee, updated the Board on the
41 matter. He met with staff on March 31 to discuss the three scenarios and staff met with other
42 members of the Board to update them on what was being considered. They discussed how best to
43 budget for the organization. Initially, they were only concerned about which entities were going
44 to contribute and in what amounts. They may, however, now be faced with an entirely different
45 budget position for each jurisdiction based on the COVID-19 situation and changes to revenues.
46

1 The following three scenarios were described:
2

- 3 1. There are no changes and the CWC collects from the participating members as has
4 been done in the past.
- 5
- 6 2. Assumes that some jurisdictions may not participate or not to the same level.
7
- 8 3. No member entities contribute and reserves are utilized.
9

10 No pay increases were envisioned for staff until there is a better understanding of revenues going
11 forward. Mayor Silvestrini suggested they begin soliciting commitments from jurisdictions in
12 terms of whether they are willing to contribute at the same level they have in the past.
13

14 The intent was to continue work on the Environmental Dashboard but very little in terms of
15 projects. It was noted that currently, many cities have a lot of unknowns. The goal was to present
16 recommendations to the Board after the next Budget Finance Committee Meeting scheduled for
17 April 16. A Tentative Budget will be adopted after which a public hearing will be held. Final
18 approval of the budget was anticipated at the June meeting.
19

20 Mayor Sondak referenced the spreadsheet and stated that Scenario #1 assumes all of the revenue
21 from memberships but includes an expenditure of \$910,000. Scenario #2 ultimately spends more
22 with less generated from membership fees. All three scenarios include office rent. Executive
23 Director, Ralph Becker explained that they entered into a 10-year lease with a five-year obligation.
24 He pointed out that staff has not been in the office since March 16. As the lease is written, they
25 are obligated. They shared in the tenant improvement costs and they are tied to the first five years
26 as a firm commitment. Staff planned to review the lease with Mr. Topham to see if there was a
27 clause that allows for vacation of the lease due to extraordinary emergencies.
28

29 Mr. Becker reported that they tried to provide three different scenarios to provide a discussion
30 starting point for the board to move forward with in determining a final budget. The first scenario
31 assumed that all of the entities contributed their full amounts. The \$909,000 reflects that pooled
32 amount. Scenario #2, which is \$897,000, shows partial contributions and how it could be
33 apportioned between compensation, projects, and professional services. Scenario #2 assumes that
34 some reserves will be utilized. Scenario #3 is \$825,000 and represents no contributions from
35 members. This alternative would involve heavy use of reserves.
36

37 Chair Robinson commented that approximately \$351,000 is in projects with main operations being
38 approximately \$600,000. There had been discussion of taking one year's worth of operating
39 expenses and separating it from the existing cash in the PTIF fund of about \$1.1 million. That
40 leaves \$500,000 that is not reserved for operations. Possible options were discussed.
41

42 Mayor Mendenhall observed that the member dues in the first two budget scenarios represent a
43 23% decrease with a decrease to zero in Scenario #3. She stated that they have never collected
44 \$855,000 from members but realized that under ideal circumstances they could. She leaned toward
45 a hybrid approach and felt that the number in Scenario #2 seemed more like a beginning point than
46 a true hybrid. She suggested they come up with a much more accurate hybrid.

1
2 Mayor Mendenhall inquired about this year's Retreat and if there was a commitment to the
3 Homestead for the event. She suggested that these types of expenses be eliminated where possible.
4 At the next meeting she also asked for information about software and grant distributions. She
5 suggested that the upcoming Transportation Summit be canceled, if possible, along with the 2020
6 Transportation Panel. She wanted to see a budget scenario that shows what was generated this
7 year. From that, she asked to see a budget scenario that reflects actual revenue and a 50% decrease
8 revenue scenario.

9
10 Mayor Peterson commented that Cottonwood Heights is in the middle of their budget process and
11 currently they are committed to making their contribution. They would, however, like to see
12 streamlining of expenditures where appropriate and potentially come up with a new formula for
13 contributions so that everyone still contributes. He recognized that the formula may vary and
14 differ from what it has been in the past. He stated that it will be difficult for him to champion
15 continued funding if every member entity is not contributing.

16
17 Mayor Beerman appreciated the effort that had gone into formulating the scenarios and noticed
18 that the revenue scenarios range greatly. As circumstances have changed, they also need to see
19 modifications based on expense changes. This year the expenses were expected to be \$825,000 to
20 \$850,000. With virtually no cuts, they are seeing an increase in expenses and differences in
21 revenue. Initial estimates in Park City are in excess of 30% drops. Mayor Beerman suggested that
22 a scenario be prepared that considers much larger cuts and a budget that is low in revenues.

23
24 **B. Phase 2 – Environmental Dashboard. Discussion and possible action (via voice**
25 **vote) on a proposal to provide up to \$176,308 to fund the completion of Phase**
26 **2 of the CWC's Environmental Dashboard Project. Staff recommends that**
27 **funding for Phase 2 be included in the CWC's FY 2020-2021 Budget.**
28

29 Chair Robinson commented that approximately \$600,000 of their expenses are payroll, benefits,
30 occupancy, and legal fees. Concerning the Environmental Dashboard contract, Mr. Becker
31 explained that the Interlocal Agreement was approved and since then they have reached out to the
32 University of Utah to see how things might unfold. Mr. Topham stated that the Board has the
33 option to terminate for any or no cause. He asked that the Budget and Finance Committee provide
34 more austere budgets on both the revenue and expenses and determine what to do with the
35 \$176,000 contract for Phase 2 of the Environmental Dashboard.

36
37 Mayor Silvestrini stated that the intent was to get people thinking. He noted that it is a difficult
38 task without an approximation of what revenues might be. He remarked that there has never been
39 a definitive formula for contributions.

40
41 Mr. Becker reported that staff and the Finance/Budget Committee will look at ways to reduce
42 expenditures and present something that is in the middle range for the May meeting. They will
43 also reach out to members of the Board to get an approximation of what the contributions might
44 be from each jurisdiction.

1 **4. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (Discussion)**

2
3 **A. Commissioner Mike Peterson, Chair of the Transportation Committee, and**
4 **Executive Director, Ralph Becker will update the Board on the Committee’s**
5 **March 30, 2020, Meeting and various other matters, including the Mountain**
6 **Transit System scope and planning document. The Board may take action on**
7 **the committee’s recommendations for Board input and approval on any of the**
8 **presented matters.**
9

10 Mayor Peterson reported that they are nearing the end of the initial scoping phase to define the
11 Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”). The goal was to have the CWC Board approve the
12 scoping, attributes, objectives, and overall initiative. Earlier in the year, they released an initial
13 draft Mountain Transportation System scoping document for public comment.
14

15 Deputy Director, Blake Perez presented the findings from the public comments received. The
16 purpose of the report was to provide a summary of written comments, identify the public’s
17 preference for scope, attributes, and objectives for a Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”)
18 within the Central Wasatch and make staff recommended edits, changes, or additions to the
19 scoping document. The comment period took place from February 7 to March 1. Over 1,200
20 comments were received with 366 individuals commenting. There were four major comment
21 themes consisting of scope, attributes, objectives, and transportation mode/management. 43% of
22 the comments pertained to transportation mode and management, 29% to objectives, 12% to scope,
23 and 16% to attributes.
24

25 The definitions of the four major topics were described and pertain to the geographic footprint of
26 the MTS system consisting of (1) the current regional transportation system, (2) economic and
27 recreation nodes, (3) attributes that an MTS should exhibit, and (4) objectives and preferred
28 outcomes. Transportation modes and management are defined as specific types of modes and
29 transportation demand management strategies such as parking and tolling.
30

31 Mr. Perez reviewed the key findings and stated that most comments on scope pertained to
32 connections to the regional transit system. There were explicit comments indicating that they
33 support the current scope. They also had comments both for and against connections between the
34 Cottonwood Canyons and Park City, Summit County, and Wasatch County. The key attributes
35 identified were environmentally friendly, equitable access, efficient, and year-round access. The
36 key findings for objectives included improved transit, disincentivize vehicles, carrying capacity-
37 visitor management, reduction in the number of vehicles, and incentivize vehicles. Key findings
38 in the mode and management included parking in the valleys, support for particular modes, support
39 for particular management strategies. This feedback would be used as part of the next phase.
40

41 Mr. Perez presented the staff recommendations and reviewed the scope, attributes, and objectives.
42 CWC staff recommended an MTS that serves the Central Wasatch Mountains including the
43 Wasatch Front, which includes Millcreek Canyon, Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, and the
44 Wasatch Back. Staff recommended a system that connects the Cottonwood Canyons and further
45 investigation into connections between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City, Summit County,

1 and Wasatch County. Chair Robinson pointed out that such connections would only be done
2 taking into account local preferences.

3
4 Mr. Perez next displayed the proposed map highlighting the recommendations. Millcreek Canyon
5 was highlighted in green with a potential FLAP grant, Wasatch Boulevard and Little Cottonwood
6 Canyon were highlighted in yellow to represent the UDOT EIS, which is scheduled to be
7 completed in 2022. The regional transportation system was included and potential transit
8 connections to Park City and Summit County including the Mayflower development in Wasatch
9 County.

10
11 Mr. Perez reported that the recommended Mountain Transportation System at its core would be
12 effective economically and efficient in moving people to desired destinations throughout the year.
13 The attributes were that it would be affordable, accessible and safe for users while minimizing
14 negative environmental impacts on the watershed, ridgelines, air quality, and visual quality while
15 enhancing the experience of visiting the Central Wasatch Mountains. It was recommended that
16 the MTS accommodate current and increasing recreation demand by prioritizing efficient transit
17 that serves all recreation nodes and uses. It was recommended that the MTS provide emergency
18 egress and conduits and ensure access for private property owners. The intended outcomes
19 included reducing traffic congestion, limiting parking in the canyons, concentrating development
20 around transit nodes, improving skier amenities, and improving communication with the public
21 about roadway conditions and parking availability through various technologies.

22
23 Other recommendations included prioritizing both short and long-term transportation solutions,
24 considering visitor management strategies, and evaluating a mix of private and public funding
25 mechanisms for the Mountain Transportation System. Next steps included seeking approval for
26 recommended scope attributes and objectives, review conclusions of scope with the Stakeholders
27 Council, member jurisdictions, the legislative body, State Legislature, etc. CWC staff will develop
28 an evaluation matrix and use it to evaluate modes of management against the attributes and
29 objectives.

30
31 Mayor Peterson stated that the Board should decide whether to accept the report and move forward.
32 If so, with what stipulations. Chair Robinson described the protocol to be implemented at the
33 meeting. The intent was to take action at the end of the meeting. Approximately one dozen
34 comments were sent via email and should be reviewed in addition to public input taken tonight
35 before taking action.

36
37 Mayor Mendenhall thanked staff for preparing the report. She pointed out that there are several
38 items in the latter part of the summary section and categorizing the attributes might help make
39 more strategic decisions going forward. What she considered to be missing was the inclusion of
40 values about what an MST should prioritize. Salt Lake City's top priority is watershed protection
41 including the quality of the watershed and their ability and right to protect it. Additional values to
42 Salt Lake City would be that there is equity, who pays for it, environmental quality, and assurances
43 which should be part of the decision-making process and not just an outcome.

44
45 Mr. Becker suggested they spend time over the next month prioritizing and weighing certain
46 values, objectives, and attributes. Items of most importance could be given priority among the

1 various factors to be considered. Mayor Peterson agreed with Mayor Mendenhall’s comment on
2 prioritization. In his conversations with staff, they felt that prioritization should be a component.
3 He agreed that it needs to be part of the strategy moving forward. Mayor Mendenhall suggested
4 that the Board prepare to have a conversation about values at the next meeting.

5
6 Commissioner Houseman commented on next steps and felt that the pie charts reflect many of the
7 priorities of those who responded.

8
9 **5. OTHER CWC ADVISORY COMMITTEES: (Discussion).**

10
11 **A. Executive Committee. Chair Chris Robinson will update the Board on the**
12 **March 16, 2020, Executive Committee Meeting.**

13
14 Chair Robinson stated that much of the last Executive Committee Meeting was devoted to the
15 budget. There was nothing more to report.

16
17 **B. Short-Term Projects Committee. Commissioner Jim Bradley, Chair of the**
18 **Short-Term Projects Committee, will update the Board on that committee’s**
19 **meeting and various other matters, including grant disbursements. The Board**
20 **may take action on the committee’s recommendations for Board input and**
21 **approval on any of the presented matters.**

22
23 Commissioner Bradley stated that no action was required of the Board at this meeting. On
24 March 13, a call was put out for short-term projects with a maximum amount of \$20,000
25 anticipated from the CWC that will have a positive impact on the target area. Thirty applications
26 were received with the vast majority being projects that could be completed in a productive and
27 timely fashion. Over the next several days staff would review the applications to be presented on
28 April 29. The applicants will have been informed that their projects are being considered and will
29 be asked to provide details. At the next meeting, they will choose the projects to be presented to
30 the Board at the May 5 meeting.

31
32 Mayor Peterson asked if the budget discussion will impact how they evaluate and proceed with
33 the short-term projects. Commissioner Bradley reviewed the projects over the past several days
34 and stated that they will exceed the \$60,000 budget. Prior to recent events, he hoped to obtain
35 more funding from the CWC but he realized now that that is unlikely. More information will be
36 sought on what is available for the effort and pursue in-kind contributions.

37
38 **C. Legislative/Land Tenure Committee: Commissioner Jenny Wilson, Chair of**
39 **the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee, will update the Board on that**
40 **Committee’s March 20, 2020, meeting and various other matters, including**
41 **Bonneville Shoreline Trail issues. The Board may take action on the**
42 **committee’s recommendations for Board input and approval on any of the**
43 **presented matters.**

44
45 Mike Reberg reported that the Legislation/Land Tenure Committee met two weeks earlier. The
46 primary discussion pertained to challenges to the land exchanges proposed in the legislation

1 derived from Mountain Accord and the associated problems. The question posed was whether
2 land exchanges matter. The consensus was to try to resolve issues that were unresolved by the
3 traditional land exchanges. There was a significant amount of discussion regarding exploring a
4 directed exchange concept in the legislation as opposed to the traditional land exchange value for
5 value model. The consensus was that that is a direction they ought to explore further and identify
6 the challenges associated with a directed exchange. He sensed that a directed land exchange
7 concept was worth putting more energy into, which was the next step for the committee.
8

9 Chair Robinson mentioned that Representative John Curtis has been trying to put forward a one-
10 off bill that would amend wilderness and allow the Bonneville Shoreline Trail to be extended in
11 areas where the wilderness currently prevents that from occurring. There had been discussion that
12 the CWC had tried to facilitate between various parties both pro and con. The CWC wished to
13 build a consensus and if they cannot, they will not take a position. Mr. Becker reported that early
14 on the determination was made to not put the matter on the Board's agenda because there was
15 fierce conflict about whether running an independent Bonneville Shoreline Trail bill was
16 advisable.
17

18 **6. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

19
20 Chair Robinson shared the following written comments:
21

22 *Dina Hall* commented on the Transportation Committee and asked that a live camera be placed at
23 the top of Big Cottonwood Canyon. Currently, the highest camera is below Solitude Resort. This
24 has frequently stopped traffic right below the Brighton Loop when the resort is busy. She also
25 asked if it is feasible to have a thru-traffic lane around the Brighton Loop since on busy days it
26 takes 20 to 30 minutes to get around because of the time it takes to park cars at the Brighton Resort.
27 She lives very near the Brighton Loop and frequently gets stuck in traffic. She stated that the road
28 is wide enough for two lanes, which would give snow plows a wider area. Parked cars would have
29 to be kept out of the lanes.
30

31 *Leann Walker* asked that any available money for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in Little
32 Cottonwood Canyon and the road be combined to purchase property at the intersection to enhance
33 open spaces. She commented that it would be a shame to let the opportunity to purchase the land
34 slip away. This is an area where hikers and bikers can enter the canyon, cross the road, access the
35 trail, or catch a bus. She visualized the potential for picnic tables, wildlife proof dumpsters, bike
36 racks, restrooms, WIFI, and electricity. A vehicle pull-in and a circle back out from the road and
37 beside the trail could facilitate emptying the dumpster. There could also be charging stations for
38 electric cars and an area for cars to wait for heavy traffic to dissipate or to learn about the unique
39 geology, watershed, and wildlife habitat in the area. Signage on the outer walls of the restroom
40 structure could include a map of the trails, cautions about the need to dispose of waste and food
41 wrappers to avoid attracting wildlife, rules about dogs, and reasons to protect the watershed.
42 Ms. Walker did not feel now was the time to commit to gondolas.
43

44 *Dustin Townsend* commented on transportation and stressed the need for a tram going up the ski
45 hill. Long term, he believed this will be safer, cleaner, and more efficient.
46

1 *Mark Levine* commented on the proposed amendment to the ILA Brighton Application. He owns
2 a home in Brighton and supported the Town of Brighton being admitted as a member of the CWC.
3 He stated that Brighton is very well positioned geographically for consideration as the main
4 transportation hub to connect all of the ski areas and provide a transportation link to the metro area
5 and Park City with gondolas or a similar transit system.
6

7 *Norm Henderson* commented on transportation and indicated that a critical attribute of any MTS
8 alternative being considered is that it provides secondary emergency egress for Big and Little
9 Cottonwood Canyons, which includes the Towns of Brighton and Alta, the Granite area, four ski
10 resorts, and year-round guests and visitors. The need was specified by the State in SR-10 that was
11 passed in 2012 and incorporated into the Salt Lake County Mountain Transportation Study
12 conducted in November 2012. Concerning the Budget/Finance Committee, his understanding was
13 that to be a member entity and participate in the CWC, a member must contribute. Both Summit
14 County and Park City have not contributed for 2020 and are likely not to contribute this year. He
15 asked how the current CWC Chair can conduct CWC business if he is not representing a valid
16 member entity. It was noted that the CWC Chair pushed forward without a vote of the CWC for
17 the Mountain Transportation Study being reported on.
18

19 *Burt Holland* commented on transportation and stated that as an avid downhill and backcountry
20 skier he often travels by car up and down the canyons. A recent trip to Brighton took 2 ½ hours
21 from the canyon entrance. He was ultimately forced to walk the last two miles as the traffic came
22 to a standstill around noon. There were no signs at the canyon entrance indicating that there were
23 issues or delays. A UFA officer began sending cars back down the canyon at about 12:10 p.m.
24 just above Solitude. By 12:30 p.m. it was discovered that the Brighton parking lot had plenty of
25 room and cars were allowed to proceed slowly. Mr. Holland suggested that signs be posted
26 indicating how many spaces are available, the expected transit time up the canyon, parking fees,
27 and other limitations.
28

29 Mr. Holland addressed the Transportation Committee and avalanche danger. He stressed the
30 seriousness of avalanches and stated that because there is only one road that provides access, in
31 the event of an avalanche 5,000 to 30,000 people could be trapped at the resorts. Elsewhere
32 avalanche sheds have been built to protect roads. Mr. Holland suggested that any transit solution
33 include avalanche sheds as well as a second high-volume egress.
34

35 Mr. Holland next addressed fire danger in the Cottonwood Canyons and stated that regulations
36 preventing home and property owners from eliminating brush increases the potential for fire. He
37 did not understand how so much building activity and investment had been made without regard
38 for proper fire protection. He stressed the need for a second egress.
39

40 Mr. Holland commented on the environmental consequences of increased canyon access. He did
41 not understand how the CWC and its predecessor have operated for so long with no progress.
42 Millions of tax dollars have been spent with no benefit and no study results. Time has been wasted
43 exploring tunnels through the mountains, a train system for one canyon only, widening the road to
44 three lanes, and various other misguided, impractical, and expensive solutions that damage the
45 environment. He suggested that the transportation plan consider relevant and reasonable plans that
46 take the environmental impact into account while supporting tourism and convenience for the

1 public to access the canyons. Aerial transportation, such as gondolas, has been successful in other
2 resort areas and allows tourists to park in one resort and travel by gondola to another. Mr. Holland
3 did not support the idea of overcrowded buses when pandemics will continue to present a threat.
4

5 There were no further written comments. Chair Robinson opened the meeting to live public
6 comments. There were no live comments. The public comment period was closed.
7

8 **7. COMMISSIONER ACTIONS**
9

10 **A. Budget/Finance.**
11

12 **B. Mountain Transportation System Parameters.**
13

14 Chair Robinson responded to Norm Henderson’s comments regarding his audacity to chair
15 meetings when Summit County is not paying its way. He explained that Park City and Summit
16 County are evaluating their level of participation and he apologized that they have not yet come to
17 a conclusion. Earlier discussions about budgets going forward will inform and influence those
18 decisions. Members of his Council are preoccupied with other matters and question the degree to
19 which Summit County should be involved. Notwithstanding that, Chair Robinson stated that he
20 has done his best to fulfill his appointment to serve as Chair.
21

22 Mayor Beerman recalled that about six months ago when the request came out, he lodged a concern
23 with the committee that there was no formula and Park City’s portion was disproportionately high.
24 He was told to pursue it anyway, which has not gone well for him. His Council has pushed back
25 and he has no rationalization because the number was arbitrary. He was confident that he can get
26 funding from his Council but not \$100,000 without justification. He planned to get the matter
27 back on their agenda in about one more month. He expected to be able to secure about one-half
28 of the requested contribution.
29

30 Mayor Peterson stressed the importance of recognizing that Mayor Beerman and Chair Robinson
31 were heavily involved with Mountain Accord and bring institutional knowledge and value. He
32 expressed his appreciation to both for their participation. He hoped the financial issues can be
33 worked through very soon.
34

35 **MOTION:** Mayor Peterson moved to proceed with the Mountain Transportation System
36 parameters, which pertain to the scope, attributes, and objectives and approve staff’s report and
37 recommendations. Staff should go back to the Stakeholders Council and prepare a matrix that
38 identifies both values and prioritization. Mayor Mendenhall seconded the motion. The motion
39 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
40

41 Commissioner Houseman identified the following three action items as a result of tonight’s
42 meeting:
43

- 44 1. Estimated contribution level.
- 45 2. Values relative to helping staff prioritize the Master Transportation Plan.
46

1
2 3. Draft language to be presented to their respective councils regarding the Town of
3 Brighton.
4

5 Mr. Topham reported that the Board Members would receive the proposed resolution approving
6 the amendment to the ILA and the admission of Brighton the following morning.
7

8 Prior to adjournment, Carl Fisher expressed his love for the mountains on behalf of himself and
9 his children.
10

11 Mr. Becker recognized that the Board Members are all thoroughly engaged in much more
12 important issues at the moment. He thanked them for taking the time during this crisis to keep the
13 CWC's efforts moving forward. He welcomed suggestions on ways to use their time most
14 efficiently.
15

16 **8. ADJOURNMENT**
17

18 **MOTION:** Mayor Peterson moved to adjourn. Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The
19 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
20

21 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:15 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Meeting held Monday, April 6, 2020.*

3

4 *Teri Forbes*

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____