



**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) EXECUTIVE/
BUDGET/AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 21, 2025, AT
3:30 PM. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED WITH A VIRTUAL OPTION AT THE
CWC OFFICES, LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH
STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

Present: Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Chair
Christopher Robinson
Tom Diegel
John Knoblock

CWC Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Coordinator

Opening

**1. Chair Jeff Silvestrini will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the
Executive/Budget/Audit Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission.**

Chair Jeff Silvestrini called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and welcomed those present. He asked that someone else run the meeting, as he currently has some limitations. Commissioner Christopher Robinson offered to fulfill that role during the remainder of the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the March 17, 2025 Meeting.

MOTION: Jeff Silvestrini moved to APPROVE the March 17, 2025, Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting Minutes. Christopher Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

Executive Director Updates and Committee Discussion

1. The Executive Director will Discuss Recent Activities Regarding the CWNCR.

Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that she has been scheduling meetings with impacted member jurisdictions and the Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts to discuss the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCR”). Several meetings have taken place already and others are planned. The idea is to determine the needs and level of interest.

1
2 **2. The Executive Director will Discuss Recent Activities Regarding Potential New**
3 **Member Jurisdictions.**
4

5 Chair Silvestrini informed those present that both he and Ms. Nielsen attended a Work Session of
6 the Cottonwood Heights City Council. Cottonwood Heights considered not remaining a member
7 of the CWC. After a discussion with the Council, there was support expressed to remain for
8 another year. There have also been discussions with Holladay about joining the CWC. There is
9 some level of interest in participation. Council Member Emily Gray has expressed interest in the
10 organization and would likely represent Holladay on the CWC Board if Holladay is added. He
11 asked CWC Staff to conduct outreach since there is a desire to hear more about the CWC.
12

13 Commissioner Robinson reported that he saw Mayor Mike Weichers at a conference recently. He
14 wanted to speak to him at that time, but it did not happen, so he offered to reach out soon. Chair
15 Silvestrini explained that during the Work Session, the value added from the CWC was stressed.
16 He asked about the member contribution moving forward. Ms. Nielsen stated that she plans to
17 reach out to Council Member Suzanne Hyland and Council Member Shawn Newell for additional
18 discussion. The intention is to build on the conversation that took place during the Work Session.
19

20 Commissioner Robinson asked about the possibility of Draper joining the organization.
21 Ms. Nielsen reported that based on her outreach to Draper, there was no interest in joining at this
22 time. However, there was a willingness from High Valley Transit to participate as an Ex-Officio.
23

24 **3. The Executive Director will Discuss the Status of the Communications Director**
25 **Position and the Summer Research Intern Position.**
26

27 There were 65 applications received for the Communications Director position and the Summer
28 Research Intern position. Throughout the month of April, those applications were reviewed and
29 were weighed against a set of criteria. Interviews were scheduled for both of the positions. Offers
30 have now been made for the positions and both of the offers were accepted. The new
31 Communications Director should be at the CWC Board Meeting on May 5, 2025. Board Members
32 will be able to meet him and can then sign the employment contract. His first official day of work
33 will be on May 6, 2025. Community Engagement Coordinator, Mia McNeil, will spend the
34 majority of May training the new Communications Director. In June, she will leave the CWC. As
35 for the Research Intern, an incoming senior at the University of Utah has been chosen. The
36 Research Intern will work for the duration of the summer. At the end of the summer, there should
37 be a solid report on Conservation and Recreation Areas that can be used as a resource.
38

39 Commissioner Robinson asked for additional information about the employment contracts and
40 those selected for the positions. Ms. Nielsen reported that the Communications Director accepted
41 the initial offer and that is what will be before the CWC Board. The offer was for \$85,000. The
42 Research Intern position is for \$15 an hour and school credit. Commissioner Robinson asked if
43 CWC Legal Counsel had prepared a draft employment contract. Ms. Nielsen denied this. The
44 employment contracts have not been prepared at this time but will be ready ahead of the meeting.
45 Commissioner Robinson wanted to know what the length of the employment contract would be

1 for the Communications Director position. Ms. Nielsen explained that initially, it will be for a
2 probationary year. After that probationary year, there will be another employment contract.

3
4 **4. The Committee will Discuss the Use of this Fiscal Year's Budgeted Travel and**
5 **Professional Development Funds.**
6

7 During the last Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting, there was a discussion about the use
8 of unused travel and professional development funds. Collectively, that total is approximately
9 \$9,000. In the past, the professional development budget allocation has been used for mediation
10 classes and resolution classes through the University of Utah. Those classes have been beneficial
11 for CWC Staff in their roles at the CWC. This year, it is suggested that CWC Staff travel to the
12 new conservation area associated with the Emery County bill and to a National Recreation Area.
13 The details have not been finalized at this time, but she believes this could be an educational
14 experience. Commissioner Robinson and Chair Silvestrini expressed support for this proposal.
15

16 **Budget and Finance Updates**
17

18 **1. The Committee will Review and Discuss the Draft Tentative 2025-2026 Fiscal Year**
19 **Budget.**
20

21 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, presented the Draft Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year
22 2025-2026. She pointed out that the Member Contributions line item does not include anything
23 from Holladay or High Valley Transit. It assumes a \$50,000 contribution from Cottonwood
24 Heights and \$100,000 from Sandy City, even though those amounts are unconfirmed at this point.
25

26 Commissioner Robinson suggested that the reference to High Valley Transit be listed in the Ex-
27 Officio Contributions line item. He asked for a breakdown of the Member Contributions to show
28 the current assumptions. Ms. Kilpack reported that she has a spreadsheet with the breakdown.
29 Those numbers are based on the same contributions as last year. Commissioner Robinson wanted
30 to know what the amount is assumed to be from High Valley Transit. Ms. Nielsen clarified that
31 there has not been a conversation with them about the contribution amount at this time.
32

33 Discussions were had about the member contribution amounts. Commissioner Robinson asked
34 about the Sandy City contribution. Ms. Nielsen explained that last year, there was a \$60,000
35 contribution. Commissioner Robinson pointed out that there are still some uncertainties about the
36 contribution amounts and asked that those be finalized as soon as possible. Ms. Nielsen reported
37 that the intention is to have those discussions ahead of the CWC Board Meeting on May 5, 2025.
38

39 Commissioner Robinson noted that the Draft Tentative Budget shows an increase in Salaries and
40 Benefits. There is also an increase of approximately \$6,000 under the Professional Services
41 section and an increase of \$3,000 in the Budget Expenses: Operational section. He asked about
42 the amounts shown for Government Relations: State and Government Relations: Federal.
43 Ms. Nielsen reported that \$40,000 is what has standardly been contracted for the State line item.
44 There can be some discussions about that line item, especially if there will consistently be smaller
45 appropriations received. As for the \$25,000, she believes that it should remain for Federal needs.
46

1 Other items in the Draft Tentative Budget were reviewed, including Budget Expenses: Projects.
2 Commissioner Robinson asked about the reduced total project number shown. There is only
3 \$60,000 shown for Short-Term Projects. Ms. Kilpack explained that the reduction is the result of
4 the State appropriation, which was less than requested. Ms. Nielsen informed the
5 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee that the CWC requested \$185,000 from the State, but the
6 appropriation was for \$100,000. Commissioner Robinson pointed out that there were \$40,000 of
7 State costs listed. Given the appropriations reduction, this item might be worth discussing further.
8

9 **2. The Committee will Discuss Moving to a New Platform for Receiving Donations.**

10
11 Ms. Kilpack reported that the CWC has been using Clover, a third-party point-of-sale platform for
12 the last three years to receive donations for the Environmental Dashboard. A few months ago, the
13 donation account was expanded to receive donations for other items. The three-year contract with
14 Clover is coming to an end and CWC Staff would like to use a fundraising platform for non-
15 profits instead. There would be lower transaction fees and there would be more functionality.
16

17 Commissioner Robinson asked about the donation amounts received. Ms. Nielsen explained that
18 it is not a lot. Based on the information presented, there was support for the switch to a new
19 platform. Ms. Nielsen stated that there will be a Resolution presented at the CWC Board Meeting.
20

21 **Millcreek Canyon Shuttle**

22 23 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Update to the 2012 Fehr and Peers Millcreek Canyon** 24 **Shuttle Feasibility Study.**

25
26 Ms. Nielsen reported that the next item on the agenda relates to the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle. In
27 the Meeting Materials Packet, there is an updated memo and a scope of work from Fehr & Peers.
28 This can be a sole source procurement since it is an update to the original Millcreek Canyon Shuttle
29 Feasibility Study that Fehr & Peers conducted in 2012. The cost of the update is \$34,000 and it
30 should take approximately four months. The scope of work includes the following tasks:
31

- 32 • Task 1: Kick-Off Meeting and Goal Setting;
- 33 • Task 2: Existing Conditions;
- 34 • Task 3: Parking Demand and Location;
- 35 • Task 4: Toll Revenue Impacts;
- 36 • Task 5: Shuttle Service Plan;
- 37 • Task 6: Documentation.
- 38

39 Ms. Nielsen explained that the study update will be considered during the CWC Board Meeting.
40 Once it is approved, the work can start immediately. The \$34,000 is proposed to come out of the
41 unallocated line item in the current fiscal year budget. Commissioner Robinson asked what will
42 happen after the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study has been updated. Ms. Nielsen
43 reported that the motivation behind the update is to answer the questions that the Forest Service
44 posed that the CWC was unable to answer. Some of the questions from the Forest Service include:
45

- 46 • What are the impacts on the land?

- What will the service look like?
- Who will run the shuttle service?
- How will the fee booth tolls be recompensed to the Forest Service?
- What are the details of the parking and staging area? How much will that cost?

If all of those questions are answered in a way that is satisfactory to the Forest Service and other interested parties, the next step could involve the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process. Based on conversations with the Forest Service, the NEPA analysis is expected to be a Categorical Exclusion. In NEPA, there are certain levels, and Categorical Exclusion is the lowest level. It essentially states that there is negligible impact associated with the proposed project. The next level is an Environmental Analysis and the most involved level is an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). This is expected to be a Categorical Exclusion based on the impact level.

Commissioner Robinson asked if there are parties interested in assisting with the funding of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle and if those parties have reviewed the scope of work. Chair Silvestrini does not believe there has been a review conducted by potential interested parties. He has reservations about spending money on a study prematurely when Millcreek Canyon will be under construction and partially closed. There have been some arguments made that a shuttle service might work for the lower portion of the canyon while the upper portion of the canyon is under construction, but there is some uncertainty about that. He does not want to spend \$34,000 now and find out later that more study needs to be done because the action taken was premature.

Commissioner Robinson noted that it does not appear there is anyone wanting this information who would then fund the shuttle implementation after the NEPA process takes place. He fears that the organization could spend \$34,000 on the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study update, but there is no one willing to fund the actual shuttle. Ms. Nielsen reported that she has spoken to Helen Peters at Salt Lake County. She has indicated some level of interest and support in the next step, which is the NEPA process. According to previous Forest Service conversations, a Categorical Exclusion was estimated to cost approximately \$100,000. Millcreek City has previously indicated interest in a shuttle program. She feels there is some level of urgency in the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study update because it is right before the upper portion of the canyon will be closed for construction. In order to obtain data that is not impacted by the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) construction, the study work needs to start shortly. Additionally, it is important to have solid answers to the questions posed by the Forest Service.

Tom Diegel acknowledged the concerns expressed by Commissioner Robinson and Chair Silvestrini. He reminded those present that there were previous discussions about a shuttle in anticipation of the FLAP grant work. The original idea was for the shuttle to run concurrently. Mr. Diegel pointed out that some entities look to the CWC for leadership. If the organization shows some vision and pushes forward, others will be more likely to follow. He stressed the importance of taking action. There have been some questions about who will fund a shuttle, but there are many possibilities that can be explored. Commissioner Robinson wondered whether different parties might be interested in assisting with the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study update. He wants to see some level of support from others before the study is updated.

1 Ms. Nielsen reported that there are grant programs that a Millcreek Canyon shuttle would fit in
2 well with. There are several possibilities and work has been done to determine some of them.
3 That being said, there have not been direct requests made for financial contributions to the study
4 update. Commissioner Robinson reiterated that he would like to have a better idea of what the
5 level of support might be and what parties might be interested. Chair Silvestrini believes it might
6 make sense to look into the level of support that exists currently. Based on his conversations with
7 the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), he is not certain UTA has an interest in a canyon shuttle.
8 There will likely be a private contractor needed for the service. There are unknowns about whether
9 Salt Lake County or Millcreek City will choose to assist with funding a Millcreek Canyon shuttle.

10
11 Mr. Diegel reminded those present that Ms. Nielsen previously spoke to the Wasatch Front
12 Regional Council (“WFRC”), but the deadline was missed for a grant proposal. Ms. Nielsen
13 reported that at the CWC Board Meeting in January, there was a comment made by Mayor Erin
14 Mendenhall about a WFRC grant that was applicable. However, the application deadline was
15 missed by a matter of weeks, so the timing did not work out for that potential funding source.

16
17 John Knoblock noted that a Millcreek Canyon shuttle was mentioned in the Mountain Accord. As
18 a result, it makes sense that the CWC is the main driver of this work. He mentioned the potential
19 \$100,000 for a Categorical Exclusion. Based on his experience, there is usually a nominal amount
20 of money needed for a Categorical Exclusion and it only costs a few thousand dollars. His
21 suggestion is to broaden the scope of work so it includes the information needed to fulfill the
22 Categorical Exclusion. Ms. Nielsen clarified that the \$100,000 estimate was a number based on
23 discussions with the former Salt Lake Ranger a few years back, so it might not be accurate.

24
25 Commissioner Robinson believes it would be ideal for interested parties to be involved in the
26 Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study update process. There could be some comments
27 received about the scope of work. In addition, there could be some level of commitment provided.
28 Ms. Nielsen explained that a public engagement coalition-related task can be added to the scope
29 of work or she can work on that individually. Chair Silvestrini believes CWC Staff should handle
30 that. There is some groundwork that the CWC will need to do to achieve some level of buy-in.

31
32 Ms. Nielsen asked if the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee would like this item to be removed
33 from the next CWC Board Meeting agenda. Commissioner Robinson explained that it depends on
34 whether or not CWC Staff would be ready to present at that time. It is possible there might be
35 different feedback received from the CWC Board than the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee.

36
37 Mr. Diegel reported that he spoke to Salt Lake Ranger, Adam Shaw, about a Millcreek Canyon
38 shuttle. Mr. Shaw has expressed support for the shuttle and sees it as a priority. Mr. Diegel noted
39 that he was reading about the Little Cottonwood Canyon gondola that has been proposed. He
40 asked if there were full funding mechanisms in place ahead of that EIS process. Mr. Diegel also
41 pointed out that if there is a need to raise the \$34,000 for the study update, that could likely be
42 done. He believes there would be some level of enthusiasm for the shuttle-related work.
43 Commissioner Robinson noted that while the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) did
44 not have the funding prepared, UDOT has more access. The CWC is not in a position to operate
45 a shuttle independently. He feels there needs to be more collaboration at this point in the process.

1 Ms. Kilpack asked if there is a desire to include funding in the next fiscal year's budget for this
2 work if the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study update does not move forward at this time.
3 Commissioner Robinson is not certain, as his concerns would be the same. He wants to know who
4 else is interested in a Millcreek Canyon shuttle that might be willing to contribute future funding.
5 Ms. Nielsen thanked Committee Members for their feedback and offered to look into this.

6 7 **Strategic Plan Follow-Up** 8

9 **1. The Committee will Revisit the Topics Discussed for Next Fiscal Year's Strategic** 10 **Plan, as Needed/Desired:** 11

12 **a. Land Acquisition Program.**

13 **b. Environmental Monitoring and Restoration Program.** 14

15 Ms. Nielsen recommended that the Committee discuss this item at the next meeting.
16

17 **Short-Term Projects Committee Meeting** 18

19 **1. Staff will Discuss the Recent Short-Term Projects Committee Meeting and Funding** 20 **Recommendations.** 21

22 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Short-Term Projects Committee met on April 9, 2025, to review
23 Short-Term Projects Grant Program proposals. 12 of the short-term proposals are recommended
24 to be at least partially funded. There is a good blend of previous projects, such as anchor
25 maintenance and graffiti abatement, and new projects. The details are included in the memo.
26 There was a matrix used for the Committee evaluations and there was agreement on the funding.
27

28 **Stakeholders Council Discussion** 29

30 **1. The Chair and Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council will Discuss with the Committee** 31 **the Recent Activities of the Stakeholders Council, including the Open Call for** 32 **Applications.** 33

34 Stakeholders Council leadership shared information about the recent Stakeholders Council
35 activities. Mr. Knoblock reported that there was a Stakeholders Council Meeting held last week
36 where there was a discussion about a land acquisition program. There were presentations from
37 Salt Lake City Public Utilities, Utah Open Lands, and Summit Land Conservancy. Council
38 Members discussed the value of creating a list of potential properties for protection. There was
39 general support, but there were also concerns about increasing land values with that kind of list.
40 The Stakeholders Council also talked about the Forest Service and the needs there as well as how
41 Save Our Canyons and the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation plan to provide assistance.
42

43 The Transportation System Committee discussed the traction control enforcement that occurred
44 this winter. There is a desire to have dialogue with some of the rental car companies to ensure
45 there is compliance. Additionally, there were discussions about the lawsuits and available funds.
46

1 **Staff Announcements**

2
3 **1. Youth Council Updates.**

4
5 Ms. McNeil shared information about the CWC Youth Council. There are some Committee and
6 Co-Chair check-ins scheduled so action items can be established ahead of the summer months.
7 The Outdoor Access Committee assisted with the Gear Shed launch party at the beginning of April.
8 That event was a success and one of the CWC Youth Council Members, Crystal Chen, worked
9 with the Gear Fund Collective and Mobile Moon Co-Op on that. She reiterated that the launch
10 party was well run and there was an announcement made about the purpose of the Gear Shed. The
11 next CWC Youth Council Meeting will take place in May. That will be her last CWC Youth
12 Council Meeting, as she will then pass the torch to the new Communications Director. Chair
13 Silvestrini asked that Gear Shed data be shared with the CWC Board at some point in the future.
14

15 **2. The Next EBAC Meeting is Scheduled for Monday, May 19, 2025, at 3:30 P.M.**

16
17 The next Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting will take place on May 19, 2025.

18
19 Commissioner Robinson asked that a reminder be sent out for CWC Board Member training for
20 those who have not completed that. Ms. Kilpack reported that there are two members that have
21 not completed the training and she is working on some additional communication with them.
22

23 **3. The Next CWC Board Meeting and Tentative Budget Hearing, are on May 5, 2025,**
24 **at 3:30 P.M.**

25
26 The next CWC Board Meeting and Tentative Budget Hearing will be on May 5, 2025.
27 Commissioner Robinson reported that he will attempt to participate in the meeting via Zoom, but
28 his participation might be intermittent. As for the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting on
29 May 19, 2025, he will be attending the NACo Western Interstate Region Conference in South
30 Dakota that week. However, he will do his best to attend that meeting via Zoom as well.
31

32 Chair Silvestrini discussed the time of the CWC Board Meeting on May 5, 2025. It was suggested
33 that the meeting start at 4:00 p.m. instead. The meeting agenda was reviewed. There is the
34 Tentative Budget to approve, the Short-Term Projects Grant Program recommendations, the Fraud
35 Risk Assessment, and the employment contracts. All of the items discussed during the
36 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting will be on the agenda for the CWC Board Meeting.
37 Commissioner Robinson and Chair Silvestrini believe the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee
38 Meetings should be used to prepare for the CWC Board Meetings and to review necessary items.
39

40 **Other Business**

41
42 There was no additional business discussed.
43

1 **Closing**

2
3 1. **Chair Silvestrini will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Executive/Budget/Audit**
4 **Committee Meeting.**

5
6 **MOTION:** Jeff Silvestrini moved to ADJOURN the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee
7 Meeting. Christopher Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
8 consent of the Committee.

9
10 The Central Wasatch Commission Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting adjourned at
11 approximately 4:41 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, April 21, 2025.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8
9 Minutes Approved: _____