



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

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) EXECUTIVE/
BUDGET/AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ELECTRONICALLY ON MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 28, 2022, AT 3:30 P.M.**

Present: Chris Robinson, Chair
Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
Mayor Erin Mendenhall

CWC Staff: Ralph Becker, Executive Director
Blake Perez, Deputy Director
Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator

Others: Laura Briefer
Steve Van Maren
Onno Wieringa
Giles Florence
Patrick Shea

OPENING

- 1. Chair of the Board, Christopher F. Robinson, will Open the CWC Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting Plus Comment on the Electronic Meeting, No Anchor Location, as Noted.**

Chair Chris Robinson called the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Committee to read a determination, which was as follows:

‘I, as the Chair of the Board of Commissioners (the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”), hereby determine that conducting Board or Committee Meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The COVID-19 pandemic remains and the recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another surge in cases, which could again threaten to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’

1 Chair Robinson reported that an email was received from Norm Henderson, who pointed out that
2 some of the statements in the Committee determination may be out of date. Office Administrator,
3 Kaye Mickelson noted that CWC Legal Counsel, Shane Topham was responsible for updating the
4 Letter of Determination periodically. She relied on his judgment. Ms. Mickelson looked at what
5 was being done in Salt Lake City and Millcreek and both cities were doing hybrid meetings.
6 However, as the Health Officer, she recommended that the CWC continue virtual meetings in
7 March and April 2022 and look at conducting in-person meetings in May 2022. Chair Robinson
8 asked that there be discussions with Mr. Topham about the possibility of hybrid meetings. He felt
9 that should be investigated shortly to properly notice the next CWC Board Meeting.

10
11 **2. (Action) The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Will Consider Approving the**
12 **Minutes of the February 10, 2022, Meeting.**

13
14 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to approve the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting
15 Minutes from February 10, 2022. Mayor Mendenhall seconded the motion. The motion passed
16 with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

17
18 **CENTRAL WASATCH COMPACT REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

19
20 **1. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee will Review and Discuss the Central**
21 **Wasatch Compact and Make a Recommendation for the Board to Consider at the**
22 **March 7, 2022, Meeting.**

23
24 Chair Robinson reported that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee would review The Central
25 Wasatch Compact and make a recommendation to the CWC Board ahead of the March 7, 2022,
26 CWC Board Meeting. Ben McAdams and Hannah Barton from the Common Ground Institute
27 (“CGI”) were present. Mr. McAdams explained that The Central Wasatch Compact was reviewed
28 with the Committee at a previous meeting. Since then, it had been posted online and comments
29 were solicited from the Stakeholders Council and members of the public. Additionally, a Special
30 Meeting of the Stakeholders Council was held to review The Central Wasatch Compact.

31
32 Mr. McAdams suggested that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee review the broad level
33 feedback as well as some of the more specific feedback received. He reported that there was
34 general support for The Central Wasatch Compact, with some notable objections. The original
35 Request for Proposals (“RFP”) asked for a restatement and recommitment to the Mountain Accord.
36 After reviewing the Mountain Accord, Mr. McAdams found that the document could be separated
37 into two different parts. The first part related to the overall values and principles, while the second
38 part related to specific and highly negotiated action items. The Mountain Accord received
39 consensus support in 2015 and there were over 150 signers of the document.

40
41 It had been seven years since the Mountain Accord was signed and circumstances had changed.
42 For instance, some of the parcels that parties were willing to commit were no longer on the table.
43 As a result, it was not possible to recommit to the specific and highly negotiated action items from
44 2015 and readopt them in 2022. CGI felt that the values and principles could be readopted, and
45 so, The Central Wasatch Compact focused on the more timeless elements of the Mountain Accord.

1 CGI shared a document with the Stakeholders Council that compared the original Mountain
2 Accord to The Central Wasatch Compact. It focused entirely on the values and principles portion
3 of the document. Some of the Stakeholders wanted to understand why the action items had been
4 crossed out. He clarified at that time that the crossed-out sections did not indicate that the CWC
5 had abandoned the action items. Those items still existed in the Mountain Accord. However, it
6 did not make sense to recommit to them in The Central Wasatch Compact.

7
8 One concern expressed during the Stakeholders Council Meeting was the title of The Central
9 Wasatch Compact. Some Stakeholders Council Members believed that additional engagement
10 was needed to adopt a document of such significance. Mr. McAdams felt that the current name
11 may convey more weight than intended. The intention was to state that the organization was still
12 committed to the values that were outlined in the Mountain Accord. He wondered whether it
13 would be best to retitle the document. Rather than The Central Wasatch Compact, it could be titled
14 Restatement and Recommitment to the Principles of the Mountain Accord. That would make it
15 clear that it is linked to the original document and had a few minor adjustments.

16
17 Mr. McAdams reported that some Stakeholders felt there was value in a future process that would
18 create The Central Wasatch Compact. For instance, taking the values and principles document
19 and distilling it down to a simplified one or two-page document. It could be similar to The Utah
20 Compact. Mr. McAdams believed that could be a unifying process for the CWC over time. The
21 current document could be the Restatement and Recommitment to the Principles of the Mountain
22 Accord, but in the future, The Central Wasatch Compact could be developed through a lengthier
23 process that included more public engagement.

24
25 It was noted that there was clear opposition to The Central Wasatch Compact from the ski resorts.
26 Mr. McAdams did not understand what was objectionable about the current document. While he
27 understood that some of the resorts were not willing to put their private lands on the table for a
28 land exchange, the principles seemed timeless and unifying. He wanted to better understand from
29 the ski resorts where there were concerns. CGI recommended that the organization move forward
30 and adopt a document that recommitted to the values and principles of the Mountain Accord.

31
32 Mayor Silvestrini wondered if anyone other than the ski resorts had voice opposition to the
33 document. Mr. McAdams reported that there was some opposition and concern. Additionally,
34 there were online comments and emails that expressed concerns. However, there was general
35 support for the document. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker noted that the comments that
36 were specifically against The Central Wasatch Compact were from Alta, Solitude, and Snowbird.
37 There was opposition to some of the language that was included in the document.

38
39 Mr. McAdams overviewed the specifically requested changes. He reported that a request was
40 made to reinsert language related to restrooms into The Central Wasatch Compact. With the
41 consent of the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee, he believed it was possible to work the
42 language back into the document. It was originally removed from the Alta land exchange section.
43 The reason that it was removed was because it was located in the specific and highly-negotiated
44 action item section of the Mountain Accord. However, that language could be reinserted back into
45 The Central Wasatch Compact where the amenities were discussed.

1 Chair Robinson asked about the suggestion to delete Paragraph 3 and Paragraph 4. He noted that
2 those paragraphs were included in the version of The Central Wasatch Compact that had been
3 released for public comment. Mr. McAdams explained that CGI wanted to elevate judgment calls
4 to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee, but he did not support the deletion of those paragraphs.
5 He felt it was important to acknowledge that actions were often interrelated. While not every
6 action was interrelated, many actions were. For example, transportation decisions would impact
7 the quality of natural open spaces and vice versa. His recommendation was not to delete those
8 paragraphs recognizing that that would be for the Committee to decide.
9

10 Mr. McAdams pointed out that much of the language was lifted directly from the Mountain
11 Accord. He was reluctant to make a lot of changes to the wording that was related to land
12 exchanges and conservation actions because that was the result of a two-year public process. Some
13 Stakeholders Council Members wanted to delete that language and some wanted to keep that
14 language in. Mayor Mendenhall explained that the agreements in the Mountain Accord were the
15 reason that Salt Lake City was invested in the CWC. The removal of the land exchanges would
16 cause Salt Lake City to readdress the extent of its participation in the organization. Mr. McAdams
17 noted that while some of the land exchanges were not currently viable, that did not mean that all
18 of the land exchanges were not viable. Chair Robinson was comfortable leaving the language in
19 The Central Wasatch Compact.
20

21 Mayor Silvestrini suggested that the language related to land exchanges remain in The Central
22 Wasatch Compact. It could be discussed further with the CWC Board. The ski resorts could
23 address their concerns more directly and explain their position at the next CWC Board Meeting.
24 Mr. McAdams clarified that the requested deletion of the land exchange language did not come
25 directly from the ski resorts. The ski resorts expressed general opposition to the document. He
26 reported that there was a suggestion made to reference “voluntary land exchanges,” which would
27 be consistent with the intent and may show greater respect for private property owners.
28

29 Laura Briefer felt that the organization should be careful not to delete things that were heavily
30 negotiated in a public process. The Central Wasatch Compact had not had the same level of public
31 process. A lot of the specific action items in the Mountain Accord were negotiated as part of an
32 interconnected package. Removing one item started to unravel a lot of the agreements. The
33 information that was being discovered during the Situational Assessment was worthwhile but it
34 was not intended to substantively change negotiated agreements. Mr. McAdams agreed and
35 clarified that the default was not to make changes to the specific action items unless they were
36 highly negotiated in the future or were consistent with the intent. He believed adding the word
37 “voluntary” to the land exchanges was entirely consistent with the intent of the Mountain Accord.
38

39 Chair Robinson asked about the suggestion to delete Paragraph 2 under the Stated Principles
40 paragraph. Mr. McAdams explained that the comment was received but he recommended that the
41 deletion not be made. However, he did support the addition of “we live, we work,” in the
42 introductory paragraph on page 1 of The Central Wasatch Compact. That addition was consistent
43 with the intent of the Mountain Accord. Another suggestion made was to delete the words, “in
44 conjunction,” which he did not recommend, because the intent of the Mountain Accord was that
45 actions would be developed in conjunction. Chair Robinson overviewed recommended changes:
46

- 1 • Change the title of the document, and all references to the title, from The Central Wasatch
2 Compact to Restatement and Recommitment to the Principles of the Mountain Accord;
- 3 • Add the words, “We live, we work,” to the introductory paragraph.
- 4 • Add in references to “voluntary land exchanges” within the document; and
- 5 • Add the word “restroom” in a logical place.

6
7 Chair Robinson reported that Mr. McAdams would create a clean copy of the Restatement and
8 Recommitment to the Principles of the Mountain Accord and create a redline version to compare
9 it to The Central Wasatch Compact that was distributed for public comment. The clean copy
10 would be the result of recommendations gathered by CGI and submitted to the
11 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. Mr. McAdams believed that the CWC should continue to
12 negotiate, consensus build and move forward with the action items. However, he did not feel that
13 the action items from the Mountain Accord should be in the restatement document. Mayor
14 Silvestrini clarified that the CWC was not abandoning or replacing the Mountain Accord. The
15 restatement document would simply reaffirm the shared principles.

16
17 Mr. McAdams noted that Carl Fisher left a comment in the Zoom chat box. He believed that the
18 redline comparison document between the Mountain Accord and The Central Wasatch Compact
19 had caused confusion. Chair Robinson agreed that the direct comparison may have led people to
20 believe that the Mountain Accord itself was being changed. It made more sense to present the
21 clean copy and The Central Wasatch Compact comparison to the CWC Board rather than a
22 comparison to the original Mountain Accord.

23
24 Mr. Becker believed the reaffirmation of the values and principles was a first step. At a later date,
25 the organization could create a compact where the information was further refined to a one-page
26 document. Chair Robinson asked Mr. McAdams to refine the document, share a redline
27 comparison between The Central Wasatch Compact and the Restatement and Recommitment to
28 the Principles of the Mountain Accord, and present the information at the CWC Board Meeting.

29
30 **2. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee will Consider Other Tasks Outlined in the**
31 **Situational Assessment Request for Proposal, Including Board Structure and**
32 **Management Structure.**

33
34 Mr. McAdams reported that CGI had been working on a recommendations document in addition
35 to The Central Wasatch Compact. The recommendations document summarized the survey and
36 interview results. It also included specific recommendations from CGI. The 20-page document
37 would be presented to the CWC Board at the next meeting. Chair Robinson asked that the
38 document be included in the Meeting Materials Packet for review ahead of the March 7, 2022,
39 CWC Board Meeting. It could be discussed at a high level and there could be another meeting to
40 determine whether there was anything in the recommendations document that should be adopted.

1 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD UPDATE**

2
3 1. **Staff will Provide the Committee with an Update on Timeline and Upcoming**
4 **Commissioner Engagement with the Environmental Dashboard.**

5
6 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen shared updates related to the Environmental
7 Dashboard. She reported that the team at the University of Utah had nearly completed the beta
8 version of the Environmental Dashboard. Each CWC Board Member would have an opportunity
9 to participate in a one-on-one walkthrough of the beta version with the University of Utah team.
10 The walkthroughs would take place between March 14, 2022, and March 31, 2022. The goal of
11 the walkthroughs was to familiarize the CWC Board with the beta version and to share feedback.

12
13 Expert agencies like the U.S. Forest Service and the Utah Division of Water Quality would also
14 participate in a one-on-one walkthrough of the beta version before it went live to the public. From
15 there, public engagement would begin for the beta version of the Environmental Dashboard,
16 starting at the Stakeholders Council Meeting on April 20, 2022. That would start a two-week
17 public comment campaign. After the implementation of the feedback received from the CWC
18 Board, expert agencies, and the public, the finalized Environmental Dashboard would be released
19 in the middle of June 2022. Chair Robinson wondered when the one-on-one walkthroughs would
20 be coordinated. Ms. Nielsen explained that she would start that outreach shortly.

21
22 Mr. Becker reported that CWC Staff had seen a preview of the beta version and he felt that the
23 Environmental Dashboard would be an incredible tool for the area. Ms. Nielsen did not believe
24 there was a similar dashboard in existence. There was a report card for areas with environmental
25 indicators within areas in Colorado, but what was being done with the Environmental Dashboard
26 was one-of-a-kind. She was excited about the completion of the project.

27
28 **SHORT-TERM PROJECTS COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

29
30 1. **The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee will Appoint Commissioners to the Short-**
31 **Term Projects Committee.**

32
33 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Short-Term Projects Committee had lost two Committee Members.
34 Currently, Max Doilney from Park City was on the Committee and would remain until Mayor
35 Nann Worel assumes her role as a commissioner. She had spoken to Mayor Mike Weichers, the
36 new Commissioner from Cottonwood Heights, and he agreed to join the Short-Term Projects
37 Committee, pending approval from the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. Mayor Roger Bourke
38 from Alta had also expressed interest. Ms. Nielsen noted that the Short-Term Projects call for
39 ideas would open on March 7, 2022, and would remain open for 30 days. On April 5, 2022, the
40 work of CWC Staff and the Short-Term Projects Committee would begin.

1 **PARLEY CANYON MINE PROJECT**

2
3 **1. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee will Consider CWC Involvement in the**
4 **Parleys Canyon Mine Project.**

5
6 Chair Robinson reported that the Parleys Canyon Mine Project would involve opening a 634-acre
7 gravel pit in Parleys Canyon. This location was included in the CWC area and some of the
8 representatives involved with the CWC had concerns related to the project. He wanted to hear
9 from the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and determine if it should be discussed with the full
10 CWC Board. There could also be a Resolution from the CWC Board about the item.

11
12 Mayor Silvestrini explained that Millcreek was interested in the project because the city was
13 immediately down the canyon from the potential mine. Millcreek residents, particularly along the
14 south rim of the canyon, had already been the victims of dust emissions from the existing quarry
15 on the other side of the canyon. The new quarry would be much larger than the existing quarry.
16 There would be issues with fugitive dust, but according to State regulations, mitigation of fugitive
17 dust is not required when prevailing winds exceeded 25 miles per hour. Millcreek filed an
18 intervention with the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining and so had Salt Lake City. Both cities also
19 submitted statements to the Salt Lake County Council with respect to the Ordinance amendments
20 the Council was considering, which would remove mining as a conditional use in the Foothills and
21 Canyons Overlay Zone. Mayor Silvestrini felt it made sense for the CWC to take a position.

22
23 Save Our Canyons and the Mount Aire community had spoken out against the project and in
24 support of the Salt Lake County Council Ordinance amendments. Mayor Silvestrini reported that
25 the Parleys Canyon Mine project applicant had filed both a small mine application and a large
26 mine application at the same time. Salt Lake City had concerns about water quality. Millcreek
27 shared those concerns because Salt Lake City was the water provider for the City. Mayor
28 Silvestrini noted that his main concern related to fugitive dust. Ms. Briefer added that the applicant
29 had also filed a stream alteration permit and she believed the applicant would file an air quality
30 permit as well. There were a lot of concurrent processes taking place. She believed it would be
31 appropriate for the CWC to support the Salt Lake County Council Ordinance amendments.

32
33 Chair Robinson asked about the status of the small mine application. Mayor Silvestrini reported
34 that the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining denied the small mine application administratively, on
35 the basis that a large mine application was filed at the same time. The applicant filed a request for
36 agency action, which was an appeal to the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining. The Division of Oil,
37 Gas, and Mining received public comment and granted the petitions to intervene for Salt Lake
38 City, Millcreek, and Save Our Canyons. That hearing was held last week, but the matter was
39 continued to the next month. Chair Robinson suggested that Mayor Silvestrini, Mayor
40 Mendenhall, and Ms. Briefer draft a Resolution and a Letter of Encouragement to the Salt Lake
41 County Council from the CWC. Mayor Mendenhall felt it was important that the CWC connection
42 to the project area be highlighted in the language. Chair Robinson asked that the Resolution and
43 Letter of Encouragement be drafted and added as an action item at the next CWC Board Meeting.

1 **BUDGET AND AUDIT ITEMS**

2
3 **1. Fraud Risk Assessment.**

- 4
5 • **The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee will Receive the Fraud Risk Assessment.**

6
7 Chair Robinson noted that the Fraud Risk Assessment had been filled out and signed by Mr. Becker
8 and CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez. Mr. Perez explained that the Fraud Risk Assessment was
9 something that needed to be completed on an annual basis. It was done internally and had been
10 completed by CWC Staff. CWC Accountant and auditor had taken a look at the assessment.
11 Mayor Silvestrini pointed out that the organization could score an additional 20 points if CWC
12 Board Members submitted their ethical behavior, conflict of interest statement, and evidence of
13 special district training. Chair Robinson believed all CWC Board Members should do so. He
14 asked that it be added as an agenda item at the next CWC Board Meeting to act as a reminder.

15
16 **2. State Appropriation Update.**

- 17
18 • **Staff will Provide the Committee an Update on the Status of the State**
19 **Appropriation.**

20
21 Mr. Becker reported that the CWC was included in the State budget and there would be
22 appropriations of \$200,000. It had been identified for the Environmental Dashboard, Visitor Use
23 Study, some special projects, and the bus bypass service.

24
25 **3. 2022-2023 Budget Building Timeframe.**

26
27 Mayor Silvestrini explained that the CWC needs to adopt a budget at the CWC Board Meeting in
28 June 2022. The plan was to hold a public hearing on the proposed budget and adopt it at that
29 meeting. To do so, a tentative budget needed to be adopted at the CWC Board Meeting in May.
30 The start time and tentative budget would be put forth in April 2022.

31
32 Mayor Silvestrini discussed the social component of the Visitor Use Study. It had been determined
33 that additional funding would be needed for that part of the project. There had been \$6,000 worth
34 of donations so far and State appropriations could also be of assistance. He did not know when
35 the State appropriations would be received. However, the CWC could budget in the next fiscal
36 year for the social component of the Visitor Use Study. If the organization did not have the State
37 money immediately, reserves could be used, and then the reserves could be repaid once the State
38 money is received. Mr. Perez noted that a contract amendment with Utah State University would
39 be needed to handle the social aspect of the Visitor Use Study.

40
41 Chair Robinson reported that CGI would present during the next CWC Board Meeting and share
42 recommendations about the CWC organizational structure moving forward. He hoped that the
43 CWC would be able to build a budget based on what was adopted as a result of the Situational
44 Assessment. Mayor Silvestrini wondered if it would be possible to receive the recommendations
45 document that weekend. Mr. McAdams confirmed that he could share that information. Chair
46 Robinson believed it was important to include that in the packet ahead of the CWC Board Meeting.

1 Mr. McAdams stated that it would be ready and could be discussed at the meeting. Additionally,
2 a high-level Executive Summary could be included.

3
4 **4. USU Social Aspects.**

5
6 Chair Robinson reported that a Budget Memo overviewed the contributions and funds needed for
7 the social aspect of the Visitor Use Study. He wondered whether that needed to be discussed
8 further. Mr. Becker explained that with the State appropriations, it was assumed there would be
9 some funding available for that portion of the Visitor Use Study. That funding, in addition to other
10 contributions, and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy membership
11 contribution would assist in the budget building process.

12
13 **ADJOURN COMMITTEE MEETING**

14
15 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC**
16 **Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting.**

17
18 **MOTION:** Mayor Mendenhall moved to adjourn. Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The
19 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

20
21 The Central Wasatch Commission Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting adjourned at
22 approximately 4:48 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting held Monday, February 28, 2022.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____