



2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD RETREAT**
3 **HELD MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2020 AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED**
4 **ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE**
5 **GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED MARCH 18, 2020.**

6
7 **Present:** Chair Chris Robinson, Councilor Marci Houseman, Councilor Jim Bradley,
8 Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Ex Officio Member Carlton
9 Christensen, Park City Councilor Max Doilney, Mayor Dan Knopp, Mayor
10 Mike Peterson, Laura Briefer (representing Mayor Erin Mendenhall),
11 Catherine Kanter (representing Mayor Jenny Wilson)

12
13 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez,
14 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye
15 Mickelson

16
17 **Others:** Steve Van Maren, Carl Fisher, Robert Sampson, Lisa Hartman, Abi Holt
18 (Sandy City Police Department), Colby Hartman, Norm Henderson, Tom
19 Ward, **Dave’s iPhone**

20
21 **Absent:** Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Mayor Jenny Wilson

22
23 **OPENING**

- 24
25 1. **Commissioner Christopher Robinson will Call the Retreat Time to Order, and Read**
26 **Letter of Determination Regarding Electronic Meeting with No Anchor Location.**

27
28 Chair Chris Robinson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Retreat to order at
29 approximately 3:00 p.m. Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson confirmed that the Letter of
30 Determination Regarding Electronic Meetings with No Anchor Location did not need to be read
31 aloud. A roll call was conducted to determine those present.

32
33 **2021 STRATEGIC PLANNING**

- 34
35 1. **The Central Wasatch Commission Board will Discussion, Strategize, and Establish**
36 **Goals for the 2021 Year.**

37
38 Chair Robinson reported that the CWC Board Retreat would be a shortened version of the previous
39 Retreat that occurred in November 2019. He thanked Councilor Marci Houseman for volunteering
40 to lead the Board Retreat. Councilor Houseman welcomed the Board Retreat participants and
41 reported that a link to a Nearpod session was added to the Zoom chatbox. She asked participants to

1 keep Zoom open and toggle between Zoom and Nearpod as needed. Councilor Houseman outlined
2 the Board Retreat Agenda, which included:

- 3
- 4 • CWC trivia game;
- 5 • Reflecting on 2020;
- 6 • Strategic planning for 2021; and
- 7 • Discuss path forward and define action steps.
- 8

9 The Board Retreat participants took part in a CWC trivia game. First place went to Laura Briefer,
10 second place went to Robert Sampson, and third place went to Steve Van Maren.

11
12 Councilor Houseman stated that 30 minutes would be spent reflecting on the committees established
13 during the last Retreat. She asked participants to think about the work that the various committees
14 have done in the past year and identify strengths and opportunities for improvement.

15
16 Councilor Houseman asked participants to share an individual strength related to the Short-Term
17 Projects Committee. They could then ‘like’ posts from other participants or tap the heart to indicate
18 that they agreed with a specific comment. Councilor Houseman asked participants to repeat the
19 process and share an opportunity for improvement. The comments were sorted based on the highest
20 and lowest amounts of participant agreement.

21
22 Mayor Silvestrini commented that the Short-Term Projects Committee gained visibility and
23 accomplished many short-term tasks in 2020. He felt good about the work that had been done.
24 However, he noted that there may need to be a greater focus on projects that relate to the funding
25 members of the CWC. He wanted to see the CWC leverage more grant money and increase the
26 number of partners. Mayor Silvestrini commented that losing a member like Sandy City would be
27 difficult and the CWC would need to monitor the situation. What had been heard from Sandy City
28 administration was that there wasn’t enough being done to benefit Sandy residents.

29
30 Ms. Briefer commented that the Short-Term Projects Committee had done a good job. She felt that
31 the Committee would learn more as it continues. She appreciated that scoring criteria were developed
32 and felt that it would reach across the different values of the CWC and CWC Members.

33
34 Councilor Houseman introduced the next committee. She asked that Board Retreat participants share
35 an individual strength and opportunity for improvement related to the Transportation Committee.
36 They could then ‘like’ posts from other participants or tap the heart to indicate that they agreed with
37 a specific comment. Councilor Houseman sorted the comments based on the highest and lowest
38 amounts of participant agreement.

39
40 Mayor Sondak commented that Deputy Director, Blake Perez and the rest of the CWC staff had done
41 an outstanding job with the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Summit. He expressed
42 concerns that it may be difficult to reach a consensus on a transportation system and felt that the CWC
43 may have raised expectations.

44
45 Mayor Knopp noted that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) revisited the train mode
46 and added it back into their work. He felt that was a huge achievement. Ex Officio Member, Carlton
47 Christensen was pleased with the Stakeholders that participated in transportation discussions. Mayor
48 Peterson thanked Mr. Perez for his work. He believed that in order to have a good outcome, there

1 needed to be a good process. Mayor Peterson commented that the process had been outstanding thus
2 far. He was impressed with the number of Summit participants and how the transportation discussions
3 had progressed. There was now a wealth of information that could be used in the next quarter to
4 reach a consensus.

5
6 Councilor Houseman introduced the next committee. She asked that Board Retreat participants share
7 an individual strength and opportunity for improvement related to the Legislative/Land Tenure
8 Committee. They could then ‘like’ posts from other participants or tap the heart to indicate that they
9 agreed with a specific comment. Councilor Houseman sorted the comments based on the highest and
10 lowest amounts of participant agreement.

11
12 It was noted that the highest liked comment stated that the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee had
13 recognized that they needed to step back, reevaluate goals, and build consensus. Mayor Silvestrini
14 noted that this was discussed at the last Board Retreat. There had not been a consensus from the ski
15 resorts about their participation in the land exchanges. The Commissioners felt it was important to
16 continue to make progress in other areas. Mayor Silvestrini believed the CWC deserved credit for
17 recognizing that the timing wasn’t right to reach a consensus around land exchanges. Councilor
18 Houseman agreed. She noted that it is often difficult to reassess and felt it took courage and leadership
19 to step back and reflect on a situation. Carlson Christensen commented that any resolution would
20 require multiple parties coming to the table and reaching shared goals. Each side needs one another
21 to move forward.

22
23 Councilor Houseman opened up the strategic planning portion of the Board Retreat. She asked that
24 the conversations now be limited to the Commission Members. Councilor Houseman noted that
25 comments, findings, and potential recommendations related to the Short-Term Projects Committee,
26 Transportation Committee, and Legislative/Land Tenure Committee would be discussed and charted
27 using a matrix mapping system. Councilor Houseman asked that the Commissioners consider the
28 following questions:

- 29
30
- If we were to act on a recommendation, what kind of impact would it have?
 - Is the recommendation feasible?
 - Could it be implemented quickly or would it take more time?
- 31
32
33

34 For the Short-Term Projects Committee, one highly-rated recommendation was to invite other
35 funding sources to be part of the process. Councilor Houseman asked the Commissioners if they felt
36 that ranked as high impact, low impact, high feasibility, or low feasibility.

37
38 Carlton Christensen discussed the Transportation and Land Use Connection (“TLC”) program. He
39 felt that the program made it easier for applicants and was more straightforward. He noted that there
40 were a lot of entities out there that could do something similar.

41
42 Mayor Peterson noticed that another highly-ranked recommendation was similar to the suggestion to
43 invite other funding sources. There was discussion regarding merging the two recommendations.
44 Chair Robinson suggested that the recommendation now specify increase funding, including seeking
45 new sources. The Commissioners agreed.

46
47 Carlton Christensen noted that if other parties contributed money, they would likely expect a certain
48 level of participation. Chair Robinson clarified that the CWC may seek grants to leverage CWC

1 money with others. Max Doilney commented that the feasibility of obtaining grants would be lower.
2 He noted that there may be difficulties related to timing and seeking grants. Additionally, many
3 grants have specific parameters about how they can be used. Chair Robinson noted that the Land and
4 Water Conservation Fund that was part of the Great American Outdoors Act could be a good source
5 but he agreed that grants could be difficult to obtain and took time.
6

7 Another highly-rated recommendation related to the Short-Term Projects Committee was to focus on
8 a few primary areas. Chair Robinson commented that the issue will only be focusing on a few areas
9 and the CWC had a lot of priorities. He felt it was important to consider the point made by Mayor
10 Silvestrini about projects that would benefit member jurisdictions.
11

12 The Commissioners discussed where to place the recommendations on the matrix map. Ms. Briefer
13 felt these recommendations needed to come with an asterisk. A lot would depend on administrative
14 capacity and consensus. She felt that grant funding could be highly feasible and impactful but there
15 were a lot of additional factors to consider. Councilor Houseman suggested moving the
16 recommendations to sections that indicated high impact and low feasibility. The placement would
17 recognize the importance of the items but also acknowledge that some aspects would be more feasible
18 than others.
19

20 Councilor Houseman shared the main recommendations for the Transportation Committee. They
21 were to converge on a recommendation, try to engage again with UDOT leadership, and formulate a
22 consensus to the extent that there could be one. Councilor Houseman asked the Commission
23 Members if they felt each recommendation would rank as high impact, low impact, high feasibility,
24 or low feasibility.
25

26 Mayor Sondak pointed out that the first and third recommendations were very similar. He felt they
27 both indicated that a transportation system needs to move forward. Mayor Knopp noted that the hope
28 was to have a consensus be highly feasible. That was what the Transportation Committee and CWC
29 had been working toward. Chair Robinson was optimistic that a consensus would be reached but
30 acknowledged the challenges involved. Catherine Kanter liked the word “aspirational”. She felt that
31 the Committee should aspire to reach a consensus but continue to be realistic about the associated
32 challenges. Mayors Silvestrini and Sondak also liked the word “aspirational”. Chair Robinson
33 suggested that the recommendation be changed to “Aspire for consensus and converge in a
34 recommendation”. Chair Robinson noted that it was feasible to aspire for a consensus.
35

36 For the recommendation related to UDOT leadership, Mayor Knopp noted that the impact was high
37 but feasibility could be an issue. Chair Robinson added that the desire should be to engage with more
38 than just UDOT leadership. He mentioned State and Federal leadership as well. Chair Robinson
39 suggested language that stated, “To obtain or promote support from local State and Federal
40 leadership.” The Commission Members liked the recommendation.
41

42 Ms. Briefer noted that there was a difference between low feasibility and something that is complex
43 or difficult. She commented that the nature of the CWC was to tackle difficult or challenging issues.
44 There was discussion regarding how to appropriately word and organize the categories. Councilor
45 Doilney believed it would be important to have a unified voice in order to engage with State and
46 Federal officials in the future.
47

1 Ms. Kanter reported that at the last CWC Board Meeting, there was discussion regarding values that
2 would drive the decision-making process moving forward. She wondered if those values should be
3 added to the conversation. Chair Robinson believed that the Commission Members were approaching
4 the recommendations with those values in mind. However, language could be added to describe the
5 shared values of the CWC Members.

6
7 Councilor Houseman shared the main recommendations for the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee.
8 They were “To work with new State and Federal leadership, find opportunities for collaboration
9 between private and public goals, couple land preserving legislation with the MTS and public
10 engagement about why this is so important in the context of transportation, recreation, and economic
11 considerations.” Councilor Houseman asked the Commission Members where they felt each
12 recommendation would rank on the matrix map.

13
14 Chair Robinson believed the legislation and transportation needed to be joined together to reach a
15 consensus. Land preservation needed to take place at the same time as transportation. Mayor Knopp
16 noted that legislation and transportation have two different paths. They were both important but the
17 CWC could not let one hold the other back. Chair Robinson discussed the importance of State
18 leadership support for a transportation system that was a consensus product as well as for land
19 preservation. He felt that the CWC needed to link the two together and show consensus. Chair
20 Robinson noted that things were now moving forward with transportation and they needed to take the
21 position that transportation and land preservation were linked. Mayor Knopp expressed concerns and
22 felt that linking the two together could prevent either one from moving forward. Mayor Peterson
23 suggested that the two concepts could run parallel to one another without being formally joined. He
24 felt that a lot would depend on the transportation alternative that was selected.

25
26 Jim Bradley wondered what type of land protection would exist without the land exchanges. He also
27 asked about transportation system options that may encourage or discourage different levels of
28 development. Chair Robinson noted that some of those questions would be answered in the next part
29 of the Board Retreat. He felt it was important to focus on the recommendations and matrix mapping
30 at the current time.

31
32 Councilor Houseman asked about the recommendation to work with new State and Federal
33 leadership. Commissioners felt it was a low challenge with a high impact. For the recommendation
34 to find opportunities for collaboration between private and public goals, Mayor Sondak believed it
35 would have a high impact but would present challenges. The recommendation related to public
36 engagement was discussed. Ms. Briefer felt that it had a low degree of challenge with a high impact.
37 Chair Robinson suggested altering the language to state, “Public engagement about why this is so
38 important in the context of transportation, recreation, economic, and preservation considerations.”

39
40 The final portion of the Board Retreat was focused on establishing the path forward. Executive
41 Director, Ralph Becker presented a staff report that outlined the main goals and projects for the CWC
42 through December 2021. He reported that the budget would need to be handled during the first half
43 of the year. The Budget/Finance Committee was functioning well under the leadership of Mayor
44 Silvestrini. Mr. Becker noted that the CWC was in good financial shape and the member
45 contributions had come in either at or exceeding what was projected for the year. He expressed
46 appreciation for the jurisdictions and their continued commitment.

1 The Environmental Dashboard project was included in the plans for 2021. Communications Director,
2 Lindsey Nielsen noted that the original timeline went into the first half of 2022. With the additional
3 funding from reserves, the timeline had shifted to the end of December 2021. Mr. Becker believed
4 many people were looking forward to the completion of the Environmental Dashboard project. He
5 felt it would be an accomplishment for the Commission.
6

7 Mr. Becker reported that Councilor Bradley served as Chair of the Short-Term Projects Committee.
8 In 2021, there would be a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) and a selection of projects using established
9 criteria. The goal was to have the selection process occur during the first half of the year so that
10 projects could be implemented during the construction season. Mr. Becker added that in the past
11 year, staff had leveraged money through public and private partners. He felt that would continue to
12 be a priority for the CWC as well as the additional focus on potential grant opportunities. Mr. Becker
13 stated that in 2020, the Short-Term Projects Committee had done work to establish criteria, had
14 created a process related to the selection of projects, and had prioritized those projects to ensure that
15 they were funded and implemented. Most of the projects had been completed with the exception of
16 one that had been pushed to 2021 due to timing issues.
17

18 The Visitor Management Study RFP would take place in 2021 and a Selection Committee had already
19 been created. Mr. Becker reported that the Stakeholders Council had been heavily involved in the
20 project. The first few months of the year would see the selection of a consultant to handle the work.
21 The study would move forward throughout the remainder of 2021. Mr. Becker was confident that
22 there would be many solid proposals.
23

24 Mr. Becker discussed the MTS. It had been a priority for the CWC in 2020 and there was still more
25 to be done. Mr. Becker believed the hardest work for the Commission would take place in the next
26 quarter as they aspired to reach a consensus. He reported that it was important to reach a consensus
27 during that timeframe due to UDOT decisions that were scheduled to take place by the end of the
28 year. The decision would impact a lot of CWC jurisdictions directly. In order for the CWC to be
29 able to influence the UDOT decision, it was important to reach a consensus beforehand.
30

31 The legislation was also discussed. Mr. Becker stated that staff was still reviewing and responding
32 to comments from the comment period that had recently ended. The goal was to get the draft
33 legislation into a form where there was renewed consensus and support. Mr. Becker reported that the
34 Legislative/Land Tenure Committee was chaired by Mayor Jenny Wilson and she was fully
35 committed to that work. He felt it was important to reach out to Congressman John Curtis as the
36 Committee moved closer to reaching a consensus.
37

38 Mr. Becker discussed the land exchanges and changes made to the draft legislation. The land
39 exchanges had been one important piece. They were intended to realign properties more closely to
40 where the public uses and private uses were. For instance, often private lands were treated as public
41 lands and vice versa. There was value in attempting to realign the land ownership through land
42 exchanges to reflect where public and private uses were dominant. However, as the U.S. Forest
43 Service went through its review process, it became clear that the land exchanges were not feasible.
44 The ski resorts wanted to consider other ways to accomplish the objectives. As a result, the land
45 exchanges were removed from draft legislation.
46

47 Mr. Becker believed the most important part of the draft legislation related to the creation of new
48 designations that would clearly delineate where development could occur outside of the ski areas.

1 New designations would provide security for those interested in preservation and the long-term
2 protection of the mountains. He noted that private lands were excluded from the legislation.

3
4 The finalization of the MTS was discussed. The CWC Board understood the importance of reaching
5 a consensus for either a proposal or recommendation related to transportation in the mountains.
6 Mr. Becker noted that a lot of work had been done so far, but 2021 was the time to make decisions.
7 Councilor Bradley noted that land designation would impact the type of transportation system needed.
8 Mr. Becker believed that transportation and land preservation needed to run parallel to one another.
9 He noted that they would not be able to operate completely in synch because one was a State decision
10 and the other was a Federal decision. However, both sets of goals could be accomplished in parallel.

11
12 Mayor Peterson discussed the timeline for reaching a consensus. Mr. Becker reported that UDOT
13 would release their Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) by
14 mid-year 2021. That EIS would include their preferred alternative. In order for the CWC to be able
15 to weigh in or have some level of influence, it was essential to reach a consensus within the first
16 quarter.

17
18 Chair Robinson believed that the Central Wasatch National Conservation Recreation Area Act
19 (“CWNCRA”) was 90% to 95% finalized but was not quite ready. He believed that April 5, 2021,
20 was an appropriate timeline for both the MTS and legislation. Chair Robinson pointed out that there
21 was additional work to be done on the land tenure side. Discussions were had related to the first
22 quarter schedule. Chair Robinson suggested meeting twice a month in the first quarter. The meetings
23 would take a closer look at the amended UDOT Alternatives Report. There could also be a separate
24 meeting to discuss each of the proposed alternatives.

25
26 Mayor Knopp suggested inviting mode experts or UDOT representatives to the meetings early on in
27 the year. There could be brief presentations as well as question and answer sessions. Chair Robinson
28 liked the suggestion but felt there should be a full meeting devoted to each alternative. The
29 Commissioners discussed the potential meeting schedule for the first quarter of 2021.

30
31 Councilor Bradley commented that transportation itself wasn’t an objective. Rather, it was a means
32 to an objective. He felt it was important to further discuss the objectives. Chair Robinson noted that
33 at the last CWC Board Meeting, they had discussed values that would help evaluate a transportation
34 system. The next step was not to evaluate the transportation alternatives but better understand them.

35
36 Mr. Becker believed it was important to review the values and objectives of the CWC. He suggested
37 discussing transportation items with a lot of consensus first. Those discussions would prepare the
38 Commission for the more thorough work that would follow. Chair Robinson wondered whether there
39 should be a meeting to examine the UDOT Alternatives Report. He felt it was important to fully
40 understand the report before evaluating specific alternatives. Mayor Peterson agreed. From there,
41 the Board could determine how to combine the information from UDOT with the information
42 gathered through the CWC. Mayor Peterson reiterated the importance of examining the UDOT
43 Alternatives Report now that it had been amended.

44
45 Councilor Houseman captured some of the points made during the conversation. She added them to
46 a Google Slides document. The transportation-related action items were listed under the
47 Transportation Committee. Chair Robinson suggested altering the wording to state that the CWC
48 Board would review the UDOT Alternatives Report.

1
2 Ms. Kanter felt it was important to merge the original values outlined for the MTS system with the
3 additional values that had been discussed during the December 7, 2020 Board Meeting. Chair
4 Robinson commented that the next step would be to further understand the UDOT Alternatives
5 Report. This would allow Staff the time to put the values onto a matrix map. Once the Board was
6 ready to judge the specific alternatives, the map could be used for direction. Chair Robinson added
7 that UDOT would be one of the decision-makers and it was important to fully understand the
8 alternatives they had proposed.

9
10 Mr. Perez wondered whether Chair Robinson wanted to request that a UDOT representative be
11 present during a CWC Board Meeting in January. Chair Robinson believed that would be beneficial.
12 Discussions were had about when it would be appropriate to invite UDOT. It was determined that
13 they should be invited to the meeting devoted to the UDOT Alternatives Report. The representative
14 could also be invited to a later meeting as needed.

15
16 The Commissioners discussed a meeting strategy. Ms. Kanter suggested discussing the alternatives
17 at the first meeting in January and focusing on the values and attributes at the second meeting in
18 January. Chair Robinson wondered whether there were other meetings that should be scheduled
19 beforehand. He suggested that the first meeting explore the UDOT Alternative Report from June 8,
20 2020, and November 20, 2020. The next meeting would invite alternative mode experts to participate
21 in a discussion. The third meeting would relate to the values. After that, the Board could begin to
22 rank and evaluate transportation modes.

23
24 Mayor Knopp preferred to focus on each alternative separately. Chair Robinson suggested spending
25 30 minutes on each alternative. Mayor Knopp wondered whether 30 minutes would provide enough
26 time for a mode expert to share a brief presentation and answer questions. He believed 1 hour would
27 be more appropriate. Chair Robinson asked whether the Board liked the idea of there being two
28 presentations per meeting. Mayor Peterson believed it would be beneficial to have a written report
29 beforehand. That would shorten the presentation time for the alternatives. Mr. Becker commented
30 that Staff could work with the mode experts to provide condensed information.

31
32 Chair Robinson reported that the purpose of the meetings in January was to understand what was
33 being proposed and to further discuss the various alternatives. After that, the alternatives could be
34 examined to see if there was a transportation option that aligned with CWC values. Mr. Becker
35 commented that the Commission would need to review CWC objectives, attributes, and values as
36 well as those from UDOT. That process would act as a reminder that there were different objectives
37 on both sides. Chair Robinson noted that UDOT had a fairly narrow purpose. The CWC wanted to
38 make sure the alternatives were examined through a broader lens.

39
40 It was suggested that Councilor Houseman change the language on the Google Slides document from,
41 “work with UDOT experts to prepare presentation summary to each mode,” to “work with mode
42 experts to prepare presentation summary to each mode.”

43
44 Chair Robinson clarified that the meetings in January would include the full CWC Board. Mr. Becker
45 discussed potential adjustments that may need to be made to the CWC Board Meetings in January in
46 order to accommodate the transportation discussions. Further conversations were had about how to
47 structure the January meetings. Chair Robinson determined that there would be a 2-hour meeting to
48 discuss two alternatives and a two-hour meeting to discuss a third alternative with an hour of general

1 discussion by the Commission. The alternatives discussed would include aerial, cog rail, and
2 enhanced bus service.

3
4 Councilor Houseman stated that the Transportation Committee could formulate the first draft of an
5 action plan with Staff. Chair Robinson asked that the Executive Committee handle the task.
6 Mr. Perez reported that a drafted action plan could be ready for the Executive Committee to discuss
7 and review on December 21, 2020.

8
9 Planning for the Short-Term Projects Committee was discussed. Chair Robinson noted that the Short-
10 Term Projects Committee members would be taking part in two CWC Board Meetings per month in
11 January and February to work on the MTS. He wondered whether the Committee should begin work
12 on short-term projects beginning on March 1, 2021. That would prevent the Short-Term Projects
13 Committee from handling both the MTS work and short-term projects. Councilor Houseman
14 wondered how that would impact the RFP process. She asked if Staff would be able to juggle the
15 MTS work and the RFP for short-term projects. Ms. Mickelson reported that there was \$30,000 for
16 short-term projects that was intended to be spent by June 30, 2021. There were also projects that had
17 been submitted previously to consider.

18
19 Ms. Nielsen noted that last year for short-term projects, the RFP hadn't been opened until March,
20 with review by the Committee in May and funding for projects in June. However, she informed the
21 Board that she had the capacity to open the RFP process. It would depend on what the CWC Board
22 decided to do. Chair Robinson asked Ms. Nielsen to handle the RFP process so that responses would
23 be ready for review on March 1, 2021.

24
25 Chair Robinson discussed the idea of member jurisdictions receiving some benefit. He wondered
26 whether each member jurisdiction should be asked to propose a potential project to the short-term
27 projects RFP. Councilor Bradley believed that was a positive suggestion but noted that it was
28 important to inform the member jurisdictions that their proposals may or may not be selected. Board
29 Members discussed the appropriate timelines for the RFP process.

30
31 The Legislative/Land Tenure Committee was discussed. Chair Robinson stated that there were three
32 key pieces to the work, which included the following:

- 33
- 34 • Work with the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee and lobbyist, Casey Hill to come up with
 - 35 a proper resolution that will keep the legislature interested in the CWC work;
 - 36 • Figure out land protections; and
 - 37 • Continue to refine the bill.
- 38

39 Mr. Becker noted that the land protections piece was a longer-term item and didn't feel that it would
40 be concluded in the first quarter of the year. It would be worked on throughout 2021. Ms. Briefer
41 added that it would make sense to include something related to public engagement and how legislation
42 fits in with transportation. The Commissioners agreed.

43
44 Mayor Peterson believed that clear expectations needed to be shared with the mode experts about
45 their future presentations. He felt they should be brief in order to maximize the amount of time the
46 Commissioners had to ask questions. Chair Robinson agreed. The pre-read materials would be a
47 useful way to cut down on presentation time. Mayor Sondak suggested that there be a page limit or
48 a series of questions for the mode experts to answer for the pre-read material. Chair Robinson

1 believed it was important to give thought to the format. Councilor Doilney noted that the
2 Commissioners could submit questions to Staff or the mode experts ahead of the meetings in order to
3 avoid repeat or low-level questions.

4

5 Chair Robinson thanked Councilor Houseman for her work structuring the CWC Board Retreat. He
6 also thanked the participants for their input and suggestions.

7

8 **ADJOURNMENT**

9

10 **MOTION:** Councilor Bradley moved to adjourn the CWC Board Retreat. Mayor Knopp seconded
11 the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

12

13 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:13 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Retreat held Monday, December 14, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____