



2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**
4 **HELD MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2024, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH**
5 **IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS**
6 **MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 1330 EAST CHAMBERS AVENUE, MILLCREEK, UT.**
7

8 **Board Members:** Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Chair
9 Christopher F. Robinson
10 Mayor Dan Knopp
11 Mayor Roger Bourke
12 Mayor Mike Weichers
13 Mayor Monica Zoltanski
14 Carlton Christensen, Ex Officio
15 Dave Whittekiend, Ex Officio
16

17 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
18 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
19 Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Coordinator
20

21 **Others:** Laura Briefer
22 John Knoblock (SHC)
23 Tom Diegel (SHC)
24 Danny Richardson (SHC)
25 Pat Shea (SHC)
26 Linda Johnson (SHC)
27 Dani Porier (Youth Council)
28 Faith Bitz (Youth Council)
29 Devin Weder (UDOT)
30

31 **OPENING**
32

- 33 1. **Chair Jeff Silvestrini will Call the Meeting to Order and Welcome Board Members and**
34 **the Public.**
35

36 Chair Jeff Silvestrini called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Meeting to order at
37 3:15 p.m. and welcomed those present. While waiting for a quorum, CWC Staff updates were shared.
38

- 39 2. **The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the Board Meeting on May 6, 2024.**
40

41 Once there was a quorum, Meeting Minutes from the May 6, 2024, Board Meeting were considered.
42

1 **MOTION:** Mayor Zoltanski moved to APPROVE the May 6, 2024, Meeting Minutes. Mayor
2 Bourke seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

3
4 **PUBLIC HEARING FOR FY 2024/2025 BUDGET**

5
6 1. **Christopher F. Robinson, Treasurer/Secretary of the Board, will Present the CWC’s FY**
7 **2024/2025 Budget.**

8
9 Commissioner Christopher Robinson presented the CWC Fiscal Year 2024/2025 Budget.

10
11 2. **Chair Silvestrini will Open the Public Hearing as Chair of the Board of the Central**
12 **Wasatch Commission.**

13
14 Chair Silvestrini opened the public hearing. There were no comments received.

15
16 Later in the CWC Board Meeting, Chair Silvestrini informed those present that a recording issue
17 occurred and the initial public hearing was not recorded. He invited comments on the CWC Fiscal
18 Year 2024/2024 Budget for a second time. There were no comments received at that time.

19
20 **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING FOR FY 2024/2025 BUDGET**

21
22 1. **Chair Silvestrini will Close the Public Hearing as Chair of the Board of the Central**
23 **Wasatch Commission.**

24
25 Chair Silvestrini closed the public hearing.

26
27 **STAFF UPDATES**

28
29 1. **Youth Council Updates.**

30
31 Dani Porier from the CWC Youth Council introduced herself to the CWC Board and shared updates.

32
33 2. **Youth Council/Stakeholders Council Social Event.**

34
35 Community Engagement Coordinator, Mia McNeil, discussed the Stakeholders Council and CWC
36 Youth Council social event that was held recently. She explained that it went well and was a success.

37
38 3. **Transit Map Overview.**

39
40 Ms. McNeil shared information about the CWC Study Area Transit Map. This was discussed during
41 the last CWC Board Meeting in May. The map is on the Mountain Transportation page of the CWC
42 website and now is accessible to all. She explained that the map highlights different transit
43 opportunities within the Central Wasatch. It is possible to look at different boundaries, Utah Transit
44 Authority (“UTA”), High Valley Transit, and Park City Transit stops and routes. The intention is to
45 add more as time passes. It is also possible to look at the Environmental Dashboard boundary as well
46 as the Salt Lake County/Summit County area. Ms. McNeil encouraged CWC Board Members to take
47 time to look at the Transit Map. In the future, the idea is to add routes for Transit to Trails as well as
48 the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance shuttle information. This is an ever-evolving project for the CWC.

1
2 **4. Ski Bus Priority Access Program Recap and Transit Map Announcement.**
3

4 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, shared information about the Ski Bus Priority Access Program.
5 This was the fourth consecutive year the CWC, in partnership with Sandy City, Cottonwood Heights,
6 UTA, and the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) have provided the Ski Bus Priority
7 Access Program. She reminded Board Members that this is the program where the Sandy City Police
8 Department and Cottonwood Heights Police Department work with UTA to give priority access to
9 the ski buses to SR-190 on days that SR-190 is closed for avalanche mitigation work. CWC Staff
10 shared some graphics to illustrate how the program works. The officers move commuter traffic to
11 the shoulders to allow priority access for the ski bus. This program is continuing to work well.
12

13 Ms. Nielsen reported that CWC Staff will share a press release later this week to recap the Ski Bus
14 Priority Access Program for the season. Additionally, there will be an alert about the Transit Map.
15 The outreach plan for the CWC is standard from release to release. It includes: sending a media
16 release to media contacts, sending out information to the newsletter list, sharing the press release on
17 the CWC website, and contacting partner jurisdictional communication managers. Social media is
18 also utilized to share the information. There is a far reach for all of the CWC press releases.
19

20 Mayor Roger Bourke stated that UTA intends to restore Route 953 and also has a plan to prioritize
21 buses for Route 942. Ex Officio Member, Carlton Christensen, confirmed this. UTA is looking at
22 potential restoration for Route 953. The organization is currently in a procurement process for some
23 supplemental services. There should be more clarity about that within the next month or so.
24

25 Mayor Monica Zoltanski believed the success of the Ski Bus Priority Access Program has to do with
26 consistency. This has trained canyon visitors to expect proper queuing in those circumstances.
27 Overall, it has been a successful program. She stressed the importance of consistency and
28 acknowledged that this would not have happened without funding from the CWC. She expressed her
29 gratitude for the coordinated effort between all involved, as the program enhances safety and the
30 overall experience. The Ski Bus Priority Access Program, in conjunction with the tire program, will
31 only make things more streamlined. As for restoring bus service levels, that is important, and she is
32 glad there are continued discussions about that. She reiterated her support for the ski bus service.
33

34 **5. Reminder that Member Contribution Invoices will Go Out in July.**
35

36 Chair Silvestrini reminded Board Members that the member contribution invoices will go out in July.
37 Ms. Nielsen clarified that the member contribution invoices are normally sent out on July 1.
38

39 **UDOT BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**
40

41 **1. A Representative from UDOT will Introduce and Discuss with the Board the Big**
42 **Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment.**
43

44 UDOT Project Manager, Devin Weder, introduced himself to the CWC Board. He explained that he
45 is the Project Manager for the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Study. Mr. Weder highlighted
46 the other members of the team: Carissa Watanabe (UDOT Environmental Program Manager), Terry
47 Warner (HDR, Consultant Project Manager), Amy Croft (HDR Environmental Lead), and Brianna
48 Binnebose (Penna Powers, Public Involvement Lead). The study overview was shared:

- 1
2 • The study will evaluate methods to reduce winter-time traffic congestion on SR-190 as
3 identified by the Utah Legislature in Senate Bill (“S.B.”) 2. As a result of numerous past
4 studies, in 2023, the Utah Legislature via S.B. 2 appropriated funds to “provide enhanced bus
5 service, tolling, a mobility hub, and resort bus stops for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.”
6

7 Mr. Weder clarified that not all of SR-190 is included in the study. It largely focuses on the canyon
8 area itself. The environmental clearance for Little Cottonwood Canyon came from the UDOT Little
9 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). A study now needs to be done to
10 environmentally clear any actions that take place in Big Cottonwood Canyon. A map was shared to
11 clarify the study location. Mr. Weder reviewed some of the timeline details with the CWC Board:
12

- 13 • Pre-Scoping Activities (Spring 2024-Fall 2024);
14 • Scoping (Fall 2024-Winter 2024);
15 • Environmental Study (Winter 2024-Fall 2025);
16 • Decision (Winter 2025).
17

18 The pre-scoping activities include conducting traffic analysis, identifying existing environmental
19 resources, developing the purpose and need of the study, and reaching out to stakeholders. Mr. Weder
20 reported that he had a meeting with Ms. Nielsen already and will meet with other stakeholders to
21 collect feedback as well. Mr. Weder reviewed the next steps in the process, which are as follows:
22

- 23 • Develop the Purpose and Need for the study as well as concept development;
24 • Stakeholder Working Group Meeting;
25 • Public scoping meeting and comment period.
26

27 Chair Silvestrini asked whether the stakeholders who will be part of the Stakeholder Working Group
28 have been identified. Mr. Weder confirmed this and explained that there will be approximately 20
29 different stakeholders. One of the main questions asked was who should be represented. He received
30 a list of names from Ms. Nielsen during their previous discussion. Mr. Weder shared information
31 about the timeline for the Environmental Assessment. If the decision is made that it should be an
32 EIS, then the timeline will be expanded accordingly. He explained that the main purpose of the
33 current process is to clear the tolling and the resort bus stops. The buses themselves do not require
34 much outside of an air quality evaluation. The mobility hub was mostly cleared by the Little
35 Cottonwood Canyon EIS, but a small analysis will be done to make sure it is correctly sized.
36

37 Commissioner Robinson asked how much was appropriated with S.B. 2. Mr. Weder reported that
38 \$150 million was appropriated. The study itself has been approved for a cost of \$2 million. Laura
39 Briefer thanked Mr. Weder for his presentation and asked whether Salt Lake City Public Utilities has
40 been identified as a stakeholder. There is a desire to be involved, particularly as it relates to the
41 construction of bus stops. She pointed out that there are water impacts with that kind of work. Mr.
42 Weder reported that he has worked with Patrick Nelson and there will be a discussion in a few weeks.
43

44 Mayor Mike Weichers asked if there is an opportunity within this study to look at the movement of
45 buses from the potential mobility hub directly to the canyon versus those on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr.
46 Weder explained that as part of another project, there has been some work done there. Heading
47 southbound, there is a bridge right before Fort Union Boulevard. They are looking into widening
48 that. Part of this could include a lane that comes out of the gravel pit development with an opposite

1 running bus lane straight into the park and ride that then goes up the canyon. That will require a
2 separate environmental clearance, but is already funded and is about to go out for the design contract.

3
4 Mayor Zoltanski wanted to know if what is proposed will build upon what has been done with the
5 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. She asked how the two plans interact or overlay. Mr. Weder
6 explained that the only overlap would be with the mobility hub. Outside of that, the processes are
7 completely separate. The study area, outside of the mobility hub, does not overlap at all. Mayor
8 Zoltanski believed this work is to clear tolling and create better bus access. She asked if there are
9 other transportation goals as well. Mr. Weder reported that part of this process will analyze what a
10 good bus operation looks like. For example, whether 10 or 15-minute service is ideal for users.

11
12 Mayor Dan Knopp referenced the lawsuit with Little Cottonwood Canyon. He wondered whether
13 that will impact tolling and wanted to understand if it is possible to have tolling in Big Cottonwood
14 Canyon but not Little Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Weder explained that Phase 1 for Little Cottonwood
15 Canyon is on pause due to the litigation. There is a little bit of a back and forth in terms of how the
16 lawsuit will play out and how the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) will play out as far
17 as implementation of the tolling. He stated that the plan is to implement tolling at the same time.

18 19 **FOREST SERVICE FLAP GRANT UPDATE**

20 21 **1. Dave Whittekiend will Give an Update on the Millcreek Canyon FLAP Project.**

22
23 Ex Officio Member, Dave Whittekiend, shared information about the Millcreek Canyon Federal
24 Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant project. He explained that he is the Forest Supervisor of the
25 Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. FLAP was established to improve transportation facilities
26 that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within Federal lands. It is administered by the
27 Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”). He stated that FHWA has extensive experience
28 implementing the FLAP work in national forests, national parks, and other Federal public lands.

29
30 The FLAP has improved a lot of roads within the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. FLAP
31 leverages local funds with a minimum of 6.7% partner cost match. The Millcreek Canyon FLAP
32 work is estimated to cost \$19.6 million, and partner contributions, including an overmatch for
33 trailheads, are approximately \$7.3 million. There is a good match for that particular project. Some
34 of the partners on the Millcreek Canyon FLAP work include FHWA, Salt Lake County, the U.S.
35 Forest Service, and the City of Millcreek. For the trailheads and other trail improvements, the partners
36 are the CWC, Trails Utah, and the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. There is also funding assistance
37 through the Utah Outdoor Recreation grants. A lot of partners were brought together for this work.

38
39 Ex Officio Whittekiend reported that FHWA has issued a final finding of no significant impact. That
40 was done on May 15, 2024. The Forest Service has issued an independent draft decision notice and
41 finding of no significant impact on May 22, 2024. He explained that the Forest Service has a different
42 NEPA process than FHWA. The Forest Service draft decision is based on analysis from FHWA and
43 their Environmental Assessment. The decision space is limited to very specific project elements.

44
45 One of the elements is to terminate the existing 1991 Forest Road and Trail Act (“FRTA”) Salt Lake
46 County easement from Millcreek Canyon Road and authorize a new FRTA easement, including the
47 realigned road and frequent maintenance areas. Another decision is to authorize construction
48 activities within the project area outside of the existing easement. Those are primarily necessary for

1 slope stabilization adjacent to the roadway. Another decision that will be made by the Forest Service
2 is to relocate and improve trailheads, parking, and picnic areas within Upper Millcreek Canyon. This
3 includes the relocation of informal roadside parking in order to improve trailheads and picnic areas.
4 Ex Officio Whittekiend reported that this includes: Maple Grove Picnic Area, White Bridge Picnic
5 Area, Elbow Fork Trailhead, Alexander Basin Trailhead, and Upper Big Water Trailhead. The
6 intention is to remove parking from the roads and move it out of the impact zone of the stream.

7
8 The Forest Service draft decision is subject to a Forest Service objection process. Ex Officio
9 Whittekiend explained that before a decision is made, the public has the opportunity to object to the
10 draft decision. The 45-day objection period ends on July 7, 2024, and a legal notice was published
11 in The Salt Lake Tribune on May 22, 2024, with instructions outlining how to object. He clarified
12 that there are specific requirements about who may object to the Forest Service draft decision.

13
14 Only persons or organizations who submitted formal comments during the combined scoping and
15 comment period on the FHWA Environmental Assessment (between March 6 and April 7) that
16 specifically pertained to the Forest Service decision space may submit an objection to the Forest
17 Service draft decision. Ex Officio Whittekiend clarified that objections only apply to the Forest
18 Service draft decision. Objections to the FHWA decision will not be considered by the Forest Service.
19 All valid objections will be evaluated. It is anticipated that there will be a final decision by early
20 August. While working through that process, the Forest Service is also trying to analyze future visitor
21 management. Road improvements are necessary to sustain the roadway and allow safe access for all.

22
23 Ex Officio Whittekiend reported that the CWC submitted a proposal to the Forest Service for a shuttle
24 service in Millcreek Canyon. That proposal was evaluated but has not been advanced, because the
25 proposal did not meet all of the necessary Forest Service screening criteria. The District Ranger sent
26 a letter on September 5, 2023, detailing the issues. The proposal did not identify a feasible
27 procurement of the necessary parking needed at the mouth of the canyon. It also did not demonstrate
28 how the cost of the necessary land for parking (between \$8 million and \$10 million) would be funded
29 while maintaining economically feasible passenger fares. It did not address how canyon user fees
30 would be recompensed to the County and Forest Service for shuttle users. He explained that those
31 fees are used for projects in the canyon to mitigate resource damage and to accommodate visitor use.

32
33 Ex Officio Whittekiend reported that based on the preliminary conversations with the CWC on a
34 potential Millcreek Canyon shuttle, there was not enough clarity about whether the identified parking
35 has the necessary capacity, land owner approval, or public support. There was roadside parking
36 identified along the frontage road near Skyline High School. That was supported by UDOT, but they
37 recognized that it has limited capacity. The other potential site is also owned by UDOT but is
38 managed by Salt Lake County. It is currently a park and has significant public interest. Salt Lake
39 County would likely have concerns about removing a park and paving that area for shuttle parking.

40
41 The Forest Service continues to work with Salt Lake County to identify feasible measures to manage
42 visitation in Millcreek Canyon. Ex Officio Whittekiend stated that the Forest Service and Salt Lake
43 County are considering the National Park Service and Forest Service lessons learned from existing
44 shuttle and visitor management systems at 13 different national parks. Although the Forest Service
45 recognizes the benefits of shuttles, one common challenge is the expensive start-up and operational
46 costs compared to other visitation management systems. Other challenges are that the land for shuttle
47 parking is typically far from the shuttle destination and that the visitation levels tend to increase.

1 Based on the lessons learned elsewhere and the current challenges associated with shuttle services,
2 work is being done with the County to consider alternative management systems. Shuttles are still
3 on the table, but there are a lot of difficulties in implementing that kind of service in this particular
4 area. There have also been discussions about implementing a timed entry system. Ex Officio
5 Whittekiend discussed what is next for Millcreek Canyon. May 23 through July 7 is the objection
6 period and review of the Forest Service decision. Pending the final Forest Service decision,
7 construction of the upper Millcreek Canyon Road improvement project could occur from Spring 2025
8 through Fall 2026. There are ongoing discussions with Salt Lake County about the implementation
9 of a visitor management system when the upper portion of the canyon will be closed to vehicle traffic.
10 In the fall, the Forest Service and Salt Lake County intend to submit a new FLAP grant application
11 to improve the lower canyon portion. If that is selected, construction would be anticipated in 2030.
12

13 Chair Silvestrini reported that he has had a number of discussions about a shuttle with the District
14 Ranger. The canyon improvements need to be done before a shuttle would be workable, as there
15 needs to be locations where the shuttles can pull off and there also needs to be restroom capacity.
16 There are a lot of steps that must be taken before a shuttle program can be successful. This does not
17 mean that anyone is giving up on the concept of a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon, but whatever is
18 proposed has to align with the Forest Service's experience and knowledge. He explained that
19 Millcreek City is willing to work on the parking issues and he is committed to moving this forward.
20

21 Commissioner Robinson wondered whether the Forest Service anticipates a lot of opposition to the
22 road improvements funded by the FLAP grant in the upper portion of the canyon. Ex Officio
23 Whittekiend is not certain whether there will be objections or not. Chair Silvestrini pointed out that
24 a number of modifications have been made to accommodate some of the public comments received.
25 Ex Officio Whittekiend reported that FHWA has worked hard to design something that meets the
26 desires of the public, but still fits within the environmental constraints of the canyon. Commissioner
27 Robinson believed some were trying to couple the road improvements with a shuttle because there
28 were concerns about road improvements leading to increased visitation. Ex Officio Whittekiend
29 clarified that shuttles were not analyzed as part of the NEPA for the Millcreek Canyon FLAP work,
30 but those are not precluded. In the future, it is still possible to implement a shuttle system there.
31

32 Discussions were had about visitor management. Ex Officio Whittekiend explained that it is not
33 possible to allow expanded use indefinitely without some level of use management. Mayor Zoltanski
34 noted that some of the most beautiful trails for equestrian use are at the top of Millcreek Canyon. She
35 wondered whether any equestrian interests are participating in this process. Ex Officio Whittekiend
36 stated that the intention of the road improvements is to make it wide enough to allow vehicles side-
37 by-side up and down the canyon. Currently, it is largely a single lane in the upper portion. The other
38 intention is to move parking off the road and into actual trailhead facilities.
39

40 Chair Silvestrini believed there is a balancing act and the idea is to balance the character of the canyon
41 road and the necessary improvements. Many public comments indicate that the character of the
42 roadway is vital to preserve. He reported that the road will not be wide enough to accommodate
43 bicycle lanes on the side of the road in the highest portion of the canyon because it would change the
44 character of the road there completely. Discussions were had about road widths and the FLAP work.
45

1 **EXECUTIVE/BUDGET/AUDIT COMMITTEE UPDATES AND DISCUSSION**

2
3 **1. Chair Silvestrini will Open a Discussion about the CWC’s Ex-Officio Membership.**

4
5 Chair Silvestrini shared information about the recent Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting.
6 There was a discussion about the CWC Ex-Officio Membership. If there is interest in having a more
7 robust discussion about this matter, he asked that it be added to the next CWC Board Meeting agenda.
8 Mayor Zoltanski wondered whether it was possible to look at categories or classifications of
9 stakeholders and community partners. The goal is to make the CWC as relevant as possible across a
10 broad area. She likes the idea of having a broader voice but wants to know what voices the
11 Stakeholders Council might be lacking. It is important to have a balanced amount of representation.
12

13 Chair Silvestrini suggested that there be a CWC Board discussion at the next meeting. Time can be
14 made available for those conversations. He asked that Board Members give thought to this matter
15 before then. The numbers need to be manageable, but even during Stakeholders Council discussions,
16 it is clear that there are some Council Members who have not been as engaged. For instance, some
17 of the ski resort representatives. Mayor Zoltanski thought it would be useful to establish some criteria
18 to differentiate between a Stakeholder and an Ex-Officio Member. Mayor Bourke believed it would
19 be worthwhile to understand why some ski resort representatives withdrew from the Council.
20

21 **2. Chair Silvestrini will Discuss the Central Wasatch Symposium and Proposed Resolution**
22 **2024-13 Approving an Independent Contractor Agreement with Pathway Associates,**
23 **LLC for Event Management Services.**

24
25 Chair Silvestrini reminded Board Members that there have been some discussions about holding a
26 Central Wasatch Symposium early next year. CWC Staff has now brought forward an Independent
27 Contractor Agreement with Pathway Associates. Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC is looking to
28 host a conference-style event in early 2025 called the Central Wasatch Symposium. It will be a two-
29 day event with various workshops and educational presentations from experts in the study area. The
30 goal is to gather around these issues in a commonplace and have meaningful discussions. In an effort
31 to ensure that the event goes well, CWC Staff reached out to a few event planning companies.
32 Pathway Associates ultimately stood out with what they are able to provide at a fair cost level.
33

34 Before the CWC Board is an Independent Contractor Agreement for \$4,900. Pathway Associates
35 will provide a day of support over the two-day Central Wasatch Symposium. Pathway Associates
36 will take care of volunteer management and coordination as well as any troubleshooting. It will be
37 beneficial to CWC Staff to have that additional support. The agreement includes support during the
38 event, planning and programming support, and registration support. Chair Silvestrini noted that the
39 Meeting Materials Packet includes a copy of the Central Wasatch Symposium summary information
40 as well as the proposal from Pathway Associates. He explained that Pathway Associates presented
41 two options: 25 hours (would not include additional training for volunteers at the event) for \$3,700
42 or 33.5 hours (would include training for volunteers at the event) for \$4,900. For the additional \$1,200
43 it makes sense to have training for the volunteers to ensure the event runs smoothly throughout.
44

1 **3. Chair Silvestrini will Discuss the Renewal of Our Contract with Casey Hill and Proposed**
2 **Resolution 2024-11 Approving It.**
3

4 Chair Silvestrini reported that one of the Action Items on the agenda is for a contract renewal with
5 Casey Hill. Mr. Hill has done a good job lobbying the State Legislature with respect to appropriations
6 for the CWC. He believes this is something that the CWC Board should approve during the meeting.
7

8 **4. Chair Silvestrini will Discuss a Proposed Contract with Gilbert & Stewart, CPAs for**
9 **Auditing Services, and Proposed Resolution 2024-17 Approving It.**
10

11 Chair Silvestrini reported that the auditor for the CWC suffered a health issue and has retired. As a
12 result, he is unable to complete the audit the CWC hoped he would conduct at the end of the Fiscal
13 Year. However, he has arranged with another firm to take over his practice, Gilbert & Stewart. They
14 have committed to doing the audit that Greg Ogden would have done for the same amount of money.
15 The request is now to approve a contract with Gilbert & Stewart for the auditing services.
16

17 Commissioner Robinson noted that the memo implies that Gilbert & Stewart have committed to the
18 pricing for FY 2024/2025 and FY 2025/2026. He stated that this is helpful for the organization
19 moving forward. Chair Silvestrini agreed that it makes sense to move forward with them at this time.
20

21 **5. Chair Silvestrini will Discuss the Renewal of the CWC's Tri-Canyons Restroom**
22 **Maintenance Contracts with:**
23

- 24 a. **EcoBrite Services and Proposed Resolution 2024-12 Approving it.**
- 25 b. **Town of Brighton and Proposed Resolution 2024-16 Approving it.**
- 26 c. **Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest and Proposed Resolution 2024-15**
27 **Approving it.**
- 28 d. **Salt Lake City Public Utilities will be Ready for Signature at the August Board**
29 **Meeting.**
30

31 Chair Silvestrini reported that the CWC has been managing contracts to maintain restrooms in the tri-
32 canyon area. There are Resolutions on the meeting agenda to approve with EcoBrite, the Town of
33 Brighton, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, and Salt Lake City Public Utilities. He clarified
34 that the Salt Lake City Public Utilities contract will be ready for the August CWC Board Meeting.
35

36 **6. Chair Silvestrini will Discuss a Proposed Change to the CWC Employee Manual and**
37 **Proposed Resolution 2024-18 Approving It.**
38

39 Chair Silvestrini reported that CWC Staff has brought forward a proposed amendment to the CWC
40 Employee Manual. This will strengthen a few of the policies. One of them is related to internet
41 security. It will caution CWC Staff to respect the fact that some communications are confidential and
42 to be mindful before sending out certain emails. Additionally, it is important that CWC Staff feels
43 comfortable reporting fraud, so language has been created to address that appropriately.
44

45 **7. Staff will Present the CWC's Annual Fraud Risk Assessment.**
46

47 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, shared information about the CWC Fraud Risk
48 Assessment. She explained that this is completed on an annual basis and demonstrates the separation

1 of duties and responsibilities around the handling of cash. The assessment was filled out and most
2 points were received. The only item that the CWC missed out on was having all Commissioners
3 complete entity-specific training within four years of their term appointment dates. Everything else
4 received points and the organization is classified in the very low risk category, which is a good score.

5
6 Commissioner Robinson asked whether there is clarity about who has and has not completed the
7 entity-specific training. Ms. Kilpack confirmed this and offered to reach out to the Commissioners
8 who have not completed the training. Chair Silvestrini noted that this is an easy thing to correct for
9 next year. Ms. Nielsen reported that the changes to the CWC Employee Manual are what bumped
10 the organization from the low category to the very low category. That is the reason for the changes.

11 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

12 **1. Stakeholders Council Chair and Co-Chair John Knoblock and Tom Diegel will Discuss** 13 **with the Board the Recent Activities of the Stakeholders Council.**

14 **a. The Stakeholders Council Retreat was Held on May 16, 2024.**

15
16
17 Chair of the Stakeholders Council, John Knoblock, reported that the Stakeholders Council Retreat
18 took place on May 16, 2024. It went well and most of the Council Members attended. Based on the
19 discussions, it is difficult for a lot of the volunteers to keep track of everything that is happening with
20 all of the subcommittees. The intention is to find a way to make sure all Council Members are
21 informed. Only one representative from the ski resorts was able to attend. That representative stated
22 that there is a desire to have a bigger voice and potentially be an ex-officio member of the CWC.
23 There were then discussions about the need for balance and the potential for an environmental group,
24 such as Save Our Canyons, to have an Ex Officio Member role as well. Co-Chair of the Stakeholders
25 Council, Tom Diegel, thought the retreat went well and encouraged engagement with other members.

26
27
28
29 Chair Silvestrini had the opportunity to attend the Stakeholders Council Retreat. During the retreat,
30 there was a cross-committee breakout session to try to break down some of the existing barriers. Mr.
31 Knoblock reported that there was a social event with the Stakeholders Council and CWC Youth
32 Council. That event allowed for relationship building and increased communication.

33 **b. The Stakeholders Council Chair and Co-Chair will Discuss Recent Leadership** 34 **and Membership Changes, Including Proposed Resolution 2024-14 Approving** 35 **the Membership Changes.**

36
37
38 Mr. Knoblock noted that there have been some recent membership changes on the Council. He shared
39 information about the different subcommittees. The Millcreek Canyon Committee is continuing to
40 discuss the FLAP grant. The Recreation Systems Committee has discussed the Tri-Canyon Trails
41 Master Plan. The Environment Systems Committee is discussing the Human Element of the
42 Environmental Dashboard. That tied into the ski resort attendance numbers for the Visitor Use Study.
43 The Economy Systems Committee has been slow to find its footing. The Chair of that subcommittee,
44 Dave Fields, has limited time and is considering passing the role onto someone else. As for the
45 Transportation Systems Committee, there are a lot of transportation-related matters.

1 c. **The Chair and Co-Chair will Discuss a Recommendation Advanced from the**
2 **Stakeholders Council to the Board Concerning Phase 1 Implementation of the**
3 **Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.**
4

5 Ms. Nielsen shared information about a recommendation that was advanced from the Stakeholders
6 Council to the CWC Board. She explained that it originated from the Transportation Systems
7 Committee. Patrick Shea brought up this matter during that Committee Meeting and asked that it
8 ultimately be moved forward to the CWC Board for consideration. The request was for the CWC
9 Board to pose questions to UDOT. The questions have to do with who has the authority to purchase
10 additional buses for the tri-canyon area and the timeframe for ordering those additional buses.
11

12 Chair Silvestrini reported that this matter is now before the CWC Board as a discussion item. He was
13 asked to share a comment about this at the Stakeholders Council Retreat but declined to do so at the
14 time. The question is something that should likely be posed to both UDOT and UTA. He believed
15 there would be some level of coordination between the two agencies as far as who will purchase the
16 buses and when that will happen. It is important to ask questions to the appropriate parties. Ex
17 Officio Christensen does not believe UTA would be the purchaser of the buses. There is a
18 presumption that UTA will be the operator, but that has not been determined. He pointed out that
19 there are only two bus providers that meet the Build America standard that the Federal Government
20 requires and one of those is in some financial challenges. The company that UTA primarily uses is
21 not, as it is privately owned and fairly well financed. Every transit agency in America essentially has
22 two options to choose from, so that can create some issues with obtaining additional buses. He noted
23 that the likelihood of having electric buses for this purpose will not be high at least initially.
24

25 Mayor Weichers reminded CWC Board Members that the Phase 1 implementation is currently on
26 hold due to the lawsuit. As a result, there is no timeframe for ordering additional buses. It was noted
27 that Mr. Shea posed a number of questions in the Zoom chat box. The questions were as follows:
28

- 29 • Will the internal UTA process to select the new bus acquisition be open to the public?
 - 30 • Are any of the stakeholders proposed by UDOT who are plaintiffs in the current litigation?
 - 31 • Please explain how the lawsuits are stopping any work on Phase 1 and Phase 2.
- 32

33 Ex Officio Christensen stated that there will be a normal procurement process and a Selection
34 Committee will recommend a provider. That provider will be awarded during their Board Meeting.
35 He clarified that this will be supplemental in nature and will not replace the existing service.
36

37 Chair Silvestrini asked how the CWC Board feels about advancing the questions from the
38 Stakeholders Council to UDOT. Mayor Weichers stated that he has been told that UDOT is not
39 moving forward with the phases until the lawsuits are settled, so he is not sure that the second question
40 needs to be asked. Mr. Shea shared comments with the CWC Board. He believed that the
41 jurisdictional boundary dispute between UTA and UDOT is holding up progress to alleviate the traffic
42 congestion in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Someone needs to decide
43 who will make the decisions and who will finance the buses. It was noted that the funding was
44 appropriated to UDOT and not UTA. Mr. Shea stated that the reason UDOT is claiming they are
45 unable to move forward because of the lawsuit is in order to blame those upset about the gondola.
46

47 Commissioner Robinson was not opposed to forwarding the questions to UDOT. He does not believe
48 there was a downside to asking. Chair Silvestrini pointed out that some of the answers are already

1 known, as previously indicated by Mayor Weichers. However, he is not opposed to asking UDOT.
2 Mayor Bourke thought it was worthwhile to have the answers to the questions on the public record.

3
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved for CWC Staff to inquire about UDOT the two questions
5 included in the May 16, 2024, memo. Mayor Bourke seconded the motion. The motion passed with
6 the unanimous consent of the Board.

7
8 It was determined that CWC Staff will draft a letter to UDOT that will be signed by the Chair.

9
10 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

11
12 Chair Silvestrini opened the public comment period.

13
14 *Linda Johnson* explained that she has been focused on issues in the area for approximately two
15 decades. She has a concern about the canyons that needs to be addressed now that there is so much
16 climate change. Her concern relates to the equitable use of the canyons. This is not an environmental
17 issue or an economic issue, but it is an issue that relates to people. Ms. Johnson believes the counties
18 need to fix the zoning to address the changes happening. This is something that could potentially be
19 discussed during the Central Wasatch Symposium. Chair Silvestrini agrees that this is an important
20 issue to discuss. There are many different types of divides and equity should always be considered.
21 He supported the idea of discussing the matter further to determine how to share the resource.

22
23 There were no further comments. The public comment period was closed.

24
25 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

26
27 There were no Commissioner comments.

28
29 **ACTION ITEMS**

30
31 **1. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-10 - Adopting a Final Budget for Fiscal Year**
32 **2024/2025.**

33
34 Chair Silvestrini thanked CWC Staff and Commissioner Robinson for their preparation of the budget.
35 There were some variables during the budget process, but everyone involved did an excellent job.

36
37 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-10 – Adopting a Final
38 Budget for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Chair
39 Silvestrini-Aye; Commissioner Robinson-Aye; Mayor Bourke-Aye; Mayor Knopp-Aye; Mayor
40 Weichers-Aye; Mayor Zoltanski-Aye. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

41
42 **2. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-11 - Approving and Ratifying Entry into the**
43 **Fifth Amendment to an Independent Contractor Agreement with Casey Hill.**

44
45 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-11 – Approving and
46 Ratifying Entry into the Fifth Amendment to an Independent Contractor Agreement with Casey Hill.
47 Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1 **3. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-12 - Approving and Ratifying Entry into an**
2 **Amendment to an Independent Contractor Agreement with EcoBrite Services.**
3

4 Ms. Nielsen reported that these agreements are largely continuations of existing contracts. The
5 amounts are slightly lower because the expenses for the upcoming Fiscal Year for restroom
6 management are lower. That is the reason that the numbers listed are slightly reduced from before.
7

8 **MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-12 – Approving and Ratifying
9 Entry into an Amendment to an Independent Contractor Agreement with EcoBrite Services.
10 Commissioner Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of
11 the Board.
12

13 **4. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-13 - Approving an Independent Contractor**
14 **Agreement with Pathway Associates, LLC, for Event Management Services.**
15

16 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-13 – Approving an
17 Independent Contractor Agreement with Pathway Associates, LLC, for Event Management Services.
18 Mayor Bourke seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
19

20 **5. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-14 - Releasing and Appointing Stakeholders**
21 **Council Members.**
22

23 Ms. Nielsen explained that before the CWC Board is the formal release of Grace Tyler, who was
24 serving as the formal stakeholder for Save Our Canyons after Carl Fisher left the organization. The
25 new Executive Director, Spencer Shaver, will be added to serve as the stakeholder for Save Our
26 Canyons. Additionally, Resolution 2024-14 will officially release Kirk Nichols from the Council.
27 Chair Silvestrini expressed appreciation for those who served and welcomed the new member.
28

29 **MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-14 – Releasing and Appointing
30 Stakeholders Council Members. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
31 unanimous consent of the Board.
32

33 **6. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-15 - Approving an Agreement with United**
34 **States Forest Service for Joint Funding of Tri-Canyons Restroom Maintenance.**
35

36 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-15 – Approving an
37 Agreement with the United States Forest Service for Joint Funding of Tri-Canyons Restroom
38 Maintenance. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent
39 of the Board.
40

41 **7. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-16 - Approving an Amendment to an**
42 **Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with the Town of Brighton Concerning Tri-Canyon**
43 **Restroom Maintenance.**
44

45 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-16 – Approving an
46 Amendment to an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with the Town of Brighton Concerning Tri-
47 Canyon Restroom Maintenance. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
48 unanimous consent of the Board.

1
2 **8. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-17 - Approving and Ratifying Entry into an**
3 **Independent Contractor Agreement with Gilbert & Stewart, CPAs, for Auditor**
4 **Services.**
5

6 Commissioner Robinson asked whether this is for the Fiscal Year audit that Mr. Ogden was working
7 on or if it includes additional years. Ms. Nielsen explained that it is an absorption of the previous
8 contract but with Gilbert & Stewart. It is for the three years that the CWC contracted with Mr. Ogden.
9

10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-17 – Approving and
11 Ratifying Entry into an Independent Contractor Agreement with Gilbert & Stewart, CPAs, for Auditor
12 Services. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of
13 the Board.
14

15 **9. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2024-18 - Approving Amendments to the CWC**
16 **Employee Manual.**
17

18 Commissioner Robinson asked to review the redline version of the CWC Employee Manual.
19

20 **MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to APPROVE Resolution 2024-18 – Approving Amendments
21 to the CWC Employee Manual. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
22 unanimous consent of the Board.
23

24 **OTHER BUSINESS**
25

26 **CLOSING**
27

28 **1. Chair Silvestrini will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Board Meeting.**
29

30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to ADJOURN the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Bourke
31 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
32

33 The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:15 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Monday, June 3, 2024.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____