



2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**  
4 **HELD THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2025, AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS**  
5 **CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR**  
6 **LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 1330 EAST CHAMBERS**  
7 **AVENUE, MILLCREEK, UTAH.**

8  
9 **Board Members:** Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Chair  
10 Mayor Dan Knopp  
11 Mayor Monica Zoltanski  
12 Mayor Roger Bourke  
13 Christopher F. Robinson  
14 Ellen Birrell  
15 Emily Gray  
16 Annalee Munsey, Ex-Officio  
17 Caroline Rodriguez, Ex-Officio  
18

19 **Special Advisors:** Jack Stauss  
20

21 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
22 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
23 Ben Kilbourne, Communications Director  
24 Emory Schwieger, Research Intern  
25

26 **Others:** Ron Stewart  
27 Julia Geisler  
28 Laura Briefer  
29 Dani Poirier  
30 Mike Marker  
31 Maura Hahnenberger  
32 Representative Clinton Okerlund  
33 Representative Gay Lynn Bennion  
34 Jay Fox, Utah Transit Authority  
35

36 **OPENING**  
37

38 **1. Chair Jeff Silvestrini will Call the CWC Board Meeting to Order and Welcome Board**  
39 **Members and the Public.**

40  
41 Chair Jeff Silvestrini called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Meeting to order at  
42 2:10 p.m. and welcomed those present. He suggested the agenda be reordered to hear the 2024-2025

1 Fiscal Year Audit Report ahead of the other items, as there was not a quorum present. There was  
2 support to hear certain agenda items out of order until there was a quorum of the CWC Board.  
3

4 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the CWC Board Meeting**  
5 **Held on June 23, 2025.**

6

7 **MOTION:** Monica Zoltanski moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from June 23, 2025.  
8 Christopher Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
9 Board.

10

11 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

12

13 There was no public comment.

14

15 **ADDITIONS TO CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP**

16

17 **1. (Action) The Board will Consider Admitting the City of Holladay to the Central Wasatch**  
18 **Commission as a Regular Member and Approving Emily Gray as its Member**  
19 **Commissioner. (Resolution 2025-28).**

20

21 Chair Silvestrini reported that Resolution 2025-28 relates to the addition of the City of Holladay to  
22 the CWC. He noted that Emily Gray will serve on the CWC Board as the member Commissioner.

23

24 **MOTION:** Dan Knopp moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-28 – Admitting the City of Holladay  
25 to the CWC as a Regular Member and Approve Emily Gray as its Member Commissioner. Ellen  
26 Birrell seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

27

28 Chair Silvestrini was thrilled that the City of Holladay has officially joined the CWC. Commissioner  
29 Gray explained was excited to be at the meeting and looked forward to participating on the Board.

30

31 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Adding Save Our Canyons to the Central Wasatch**  
32 **Commission as a Special Advisor, Represented by Executive Director, Jack Stauss.**  
33 **(Resolution 2025-29).**

34

35 Chair Silvestrini reported that Resolution 2025-29 relates to the addition of Save Our Canyons to the  
36 CWC as a Special Advisor. He explained that Executive Director, Jack Stauss, will serve in that role.  
37 Mr. Stauss stated that he is excited to be attending the CWC Board Meeting. He informed those  
38 present that he has followed the Mountain Accord process and CWC work for many years.

39

40 **MOTION:** Monica Zoltanski moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-29 – Adding Save Our Canyons  
41 to the CWC as a Special Advisor, represented by Executive Director, Jack Stauss. Christopher  
42 Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

## **2024-2025 FISCAL YEAR AUDIT REPORT**

## **1. Auditor Ron Stewart will Discuss the 2024-2025 Fiscal Year Audit.**

Auditor Ron Stewart from Gilbert & Stewart reported that for an organization like the CWC, there are three things that are looked at during the financial audit process. The first is that the financial statements are materially correct, meet accounting standards, and can be relied upon. The second part of the process is an evaluation of internal controls. The third part of the process looks at State compliance. Mr. Stewart explained that a number of tests are performed to make sure everything is materially correct. Confirmations are sent out to verify that the balances shown in the books match. There are a number of invoices pulled during the audit as well.

Mr. Stewart reported that invoices are pulled at the beginning of the year and a sample is pulled after the end of the year to make sure the expenses are being posted in the right period. If an expense occurred in June but was not paid until July, the idea is to make sure that the expense was recorded in the correct fiscal year. If there were additions to fixed assets or capital assets, invoices would be pulled for those as well. Mr. Stewart explained that a lot of analytical reviews are conducted. For example, looking at the current year compared to the prior year. This is done three different times. At the beginning of the audit, there will be an account-by-account look. Individual balances are tested and this will be done a second time. At the end of the audit, when the financial statements are completed, it will be done a third time to make sure all of the balances and differences are understood.

There are a number of calculations on the financial statements. Those balances are recalculated to ensure that they meet accounting standards and are appropriate. Based on the testing conducted, a conclusion was reached that the financial statements are materially correct and meet accounting standards that can be relied upon. Mr. Stewart read from Page 1 of the Audit Report:

- In their opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the business-type activities of CWC as of June 30, 2025, and the change in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows, for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Mr. Stewart explained that this is considered an unmodified opinion, a clean opinion, or the best opinion that can be received. Something else that is looked at are the internal controls. There is no opinion provided on controls, but those are evaluated to make sure they are designed, implemented, and working effectively. This is done through interviews, questionnaires, and walkthroughs to try and understand the controls in place. If there were an area where there were no controls in place, that would be brought to the attention of the organization in writing as a material weakness. If there were portions of the CWC where controls had been working, but were not as effective as they had been previously, then that would be considered a significant deficiency, and that would be brought forward. Through the evaluation and testing, there were no issues or findings related to internal controls.

Something else that is looked at is State compliance. The State Auditor provides certain areas to look at annually on a rotating three-year basis. This year, Budgetary Compliance, Fund Balance, Fraud Risk Assessment, Open and Public Meetings, and the Public Treasurer's Bond were looked at. The State Auditor provides certain procedures to perform to determine whether there is compliance. Those procedures were performed and it was determined that the CWC is in compliance with State Law in those areas. Chair Silvestrini thanked CWC Staff for the work done throughout the year.

1

2. **Staff will present the Annual Fraud Risk Assessment.**

3

4 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, presented the Fraud Risk Assessment document and explained  
5 that it is completed on an annual basis to examine internal controls. This year, the CWC received all  
6 of the points possible. She thanked the Board Members for completing the District Board Member  
7 Training to receive points that were not received last year. Ms. Kilpack noted that the basic separation  
8 of duties for the organization are outlined in the Fraud Risk Assessment document.

9

10 **2024-2025 SHORT-TERM PROJECTS REPORT**

11

12 **1. Staff will Review the Accomplishments of the 2024-2025 Short-Term Projects Grants.**

13

14 Ms. Kilpack reported that there is a 2024-2025 Short-Term Projects Outcomes Memo included in the  
15 Meeting Materials Packet. It includes a short summary of what each short-term project funded in  
16 2024-2025 achieved. Some images highlight the outcomes. A few Short-Term Projects Grant  
17 Program recipients have been invited to share information about their funded projects.

18

19 **2. Wendy Fisher will Discuss the Outcomes of the Utah Open Lands Bonanza Flat**  
20 **Accessible Trail Project.**

21

22 It was noted that Wendy Fisher was unable to attend the CWC Board Meeting.

23

24 **3. Julia Geisler will Discuss the Outcomes of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance Fixed Anchor**  
25 **Maintenance Project.**

26

27 Julia Geisler from the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance introduced herself to the CWC Board. She is the  
28 Executive Director of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance, which is a local non-profit rock-climbing  
29 advocacy and stewardship organization. She thanked the CWC for its support through the Short-  
30 Term Projects Grant Program. CWC support has been essential in funding trails, anchors, and historic  
31 preservation, while also allowing the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance to leverage those dollars as matches  
32 for Federal and State funding. Ms. Geisler highlighted how the grants have been used in the past.  
33 The fixed anchor maintenance program is the most recently funded project. It is one of a kind in the  
34 nation and six anchor technicians work 40-hour weeks for 10 weeks out of the year, replacing fixed  
35 anchors across the Wasatch. In 2024, over 1,000 anchors were replaced on approximately 155 routes.  
36 She explained that fixed anchor maintenance is essential for climber safety in the area.

37

38 With the assistance of the CWC, the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance has also built and maintained  
39 sustainable climbing access trails that reduce erosion while protecting fragile canyon landscapes.  
40 Continued support from the CWC also ensures that the mandatory maintenance of the world-class  
41 climbing resources in the Central Wasatch continues. In 2024, the Alpenbock Loop became the first  
42 recreational climbing area in the nation listed in the National Register of Historic Places. This  
43 recognizes both the cultural and historical significance. To celebrate this legacy, there is an original  
44 short film being produced called "Alpenbock," which is something the CWC helped to fund last year.

45

46 Ms. Geisler shared a one-minute clip from the short film with the CWC Board. There is a lot of  
47 history to celebrate. She invited the CWC Board out on Monday at 5:00 p.m. There is an Alpenbock  
48 Loop historical hike planned, which is 1½ miles. If Board Members cannot attend on Monday, there

1 are a few other historical hikes planned in the near future. Ms. Geisler thanked the CWC for all of  
2 their support. She stressed the importance of maintenance. Chair Silvestrini expressed appreciation  
3 for the work done by the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance.

4

## 5 **CWC INTERN LAND DESIGNATION RESEARCH REPORT**

6

7 **1. CWC Research Intern, Emory Schwieger, will Present Her Research Report on Federal**  
8 **Land Designations.**

9

10 Communications Director, Ben Kilbourne, reported that the CWC hired Research Intern, Emory  
11 Schwieger, to examine different land designations and how those could provide useful lessons for the  
12 Central Wasatch. Ms. Schwieger has done an excellent job researching Federal land designations.

13

14 Ms. Schwieger introduced herself and stated that she is a Senior at the University of Utah. She is  
15 pursuing a Double Major in Environmental and Sustainability Studies and Urban Ecology. She was  
16 hired as a Research Intern and was tasked with writing a report that assessed existing Federal land  
17 designations in the country. She looked at that information to see what could be applied to the Central  
18 Wasatch. Highly complicated regions like the Central Wasatch are facing pressures from climate  
19 change, growing population, transportation, development, and other issues. The concern is that  
20 existing designations do not fully meet the challenges these regions present.

21

22 The Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCR”) came out of the  
23 Mountain Accord process as a potential Legislative solution for the Central Wasatch. It would  
24 combine elements of existing frameworks into a hybrid novel designation to reflect the uniqueness of  
25 the Central Wasatch. Ms. Schwieger noted that the area is highly unique and complicated. It is a  
26 potable watershed for hundreds of thousands of people and receives over 3.2 million visitors annually.  
27 There are four world-renowned ski resorts and it is located adjacent to a growing urban metropolitan  
28 area. All of these challenges create a unique situation, which is the reason for the hybrid designation.

29

30 Ms. Schwieger explained that for her report, she began researching existing designations. She spoke  
31 to people who work in various fields within public lands. The first designation she researched related  
32 to National Conservation Areas. These are federally designated areas that are designated by  
33 Congress. There is not a set list of items that need to be met in order for it to become a National  
34 Conservation Area, but there has to be ecological, cultural, or scenic value that is considered  
35 important to the nation. National Conservation Areas can only be managed by the Bureau of Land  
36 management (“BLM”) under the Federal Land Policy Management Act. All of the 19 National  
37 Conservation Areas are managed by the BLM. There is no dedicated funding stream within them, so  
38 there is a reliance on annual Congressional appropriations that are distributed through the National  
39 Landscape Conservation System (“NLCS”). This money remains relatively stable year to year, so  
40 the problem is that when there are more designations established, each of the designations receives  
41 less money.

42

43 The second designation Ms. Schwieger researched related to National Recreation Areas. Similar to  
44 National Conservation Areas, there is not a set list that needs to be followed, but it has to provide an  
45 enhanced recreation opportunity to the country while also conserving natural and scenic resources.

46

47 Historically, National Recreation Areas were linked to dam and reservoir projects, but have also  
48 become linked to urban areas to provide close-to-home recreation for city dwellers. Due to this,

1 National Recreation Areas exist in diverse environments and also have diverse Management Plans  
2 and Legislative texts. There is work done to balance outdoor use with development, conservation,  
3 and wilderness. It is also possible to have wilderness designations within them, which many of them  
4 do. These are typically managed by the National Park Service (“NPS”) or the U.S. Forest Service.  
5

6 National Recreation Areas are funded diversely. There is annual Congressional appropriations  
7 received from their governing body, but they often receive site-specific Legislation, private  
8 concessions, and regional funding programs. National Recreation Areas also typically collect  
9 recreation fees to stabilize the funding and work with non-profits, friends groups, and volunteers.  
10

11 Ms. Schwieger explained that many National Recreation Areas are cooperatively managed. One of  
12 the National Recreation Areas she did a case study on is cooperatively managed with the park service  
13 and local agencies. Most of that comes down to the Management Plan that outlines who controls  
14 what. There are National Recreation Areas managed by a Federal group as well as local groups.  
15

16 Commissioner Ellen Birrell asked about the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area and  
17 the local entities involved in the management. Ms. Schwieger reported that there are over 70 different  
18 stakeholder groups involved. She explained that when researching National Conservation Areas and  
19 National Recreation Areas, she was expecting to write a report where she did a case study on each  
20 designation type and then determined that a novel designation would be the best path forward for the  
21 Central Wasatch. However, that is not what the research indicated. She did case studies on National  
22 Recreation Areas, because a National Conservation Area would not work in the Central Wasatch.  
23

24 Ms. Schwieger explained that the first case study she did was on the Sawtooth National Recreation  
25 Area. This was established by Congress in 1972 and it protects over 750,000 acres of land in central  
26 Idaho. It is a popular area that receives over 1.2 million annual visitors and is managed by the Forest  
27 Service. It is also heavily supported by friends groups, such as the Sawtooth Society. It is also a  
28 watershed for over 30,000 people, has a diverse funding model, and more than half the area is  
29 designated as wilderness. The Sawtooth National Recreation Area was originally considered for  
30 National Park status, but there was a lot of local opposition because there were concerns that it would  
31 be too restrictive. The National Recreation Area was selected as a compromise. The Management  
32 Plan balances the uses in the area. She reported that there is timber harvesting in the Sawtooth  
33 National Recreation Area, which is mostly done by the Forest Service for fire management. There is  
34 grazing and non-metallic mineral extraction as well, but those are only allowed as long as the scenic,  
35 ecological, or recreational values are not impaired. The Sawtooth National Recreation Area has a  
36 heavy emphasis on conservation, which serves as a strong precedent for the Central Wasatch.  
37

38 The Sawtooth National Recreation Area is funded in diverse ways. Ms. Schwieger reported that they  
39 receive their Congressional appropriation through the Forest Service each year, but there is also a  
40 license plate that generates approximately \$50,000 per year for them. It has generated over \$1 million  
41 since its creation and it was created by the Sawtooth Society. In addition, there is money received  
42 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and from local and private grant funding. Something  
43 that is unique about the Sawtooth National Recreation Area is that it was the first forest unit to use  
44 scenic easements as part of its central plan. This allowed the government to acquire land and mineral  
45 rights through donation, purchase, or exchange, and also helped to protect private lands without fully  
46 acquiring them. Within their Management Plan, they also have specific zoning regulations.  
47

1 The second case study that Ms. Schwieger conducted was on the Santa Monica Mountains National  
2 Recreation Area. It was designated in 1978 and it protects over 150,000 acres in Southern California.  
3 The area is special because it is considered to be a Mediterranean biome. This only exists in four  
4 other places in the world, so there are a lot of endemic species that live there that need to be protected.  
5 It is also culturally relevant and protects over 1,000 archeological sites of the Chumas and Tongva  
6 peoples. It is widely considered to be the largest urban National Park in the world, as it serves more  
7 than 18 million people within a one-hour drive. In 2013, it generated over \$26 million for the area  
8 and it created over 300 jobs in local sectors. It is also easily accessible by public transit.  
9

10 One of the main goals of the creation of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area was  
11 to piece together a mosaic of fragmented habitat and management. There were chunks of land that  
12 were managed by different groups and the idea was to consolidate them under one Management Plan.  
13 This means that it is considered one of the most complicated units in the park system, with over 20  
14 different landowner types and 70 stakeholder groups who work within it. It is also considered to be  
15 a cooperatively managed National Recreation Area. Similar to the Sawtooth National Recreation  
16 Area, the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area receives funding in diverse ways. This  
17 includes annual appropriations through the NPS and funding from the Land and Water Conservation  
18 Fund. There is direct work with partners and there are also volunteers. User fees and private  
19 donations are collected as well. Something unique about this area is that when the Wallis Annenberg  
20 Wildlife Crossing is done, there will be the largest wildlife crossing in the world.  
21

22 After the case studies, Ms. Schwieger reviewed the Mountain Accord documents and meeting notes  
23 to determine the rationale for the hybrid designation. She wanted to better understand the main goals  
24 of the Legislation. In 2015, it was noted that a National Recreation Area provides watershed and  
25 ecological protection, but the concern was that it would not provide enough protection. Based on the  
26 notes and planning documents, the main goals that shaped the CWNCRA include:  
27

- 28 • Protecting ecological and scenic values;
- 29 • Restoring degraded resources;
- 30 • Safeguarding watersheds and wildlife;
- 31 • Limiting ski area expansion;
- 32 • Applying adaptive management to fire and vegetation; and
- 33 • Enabling land exchanges and acquisitions to consolidate management.

34  
35 Ms. Schwieger shared a table to illustrate the similarities between the case studies conducted and the  
36 CWNCRA. It shows the similarities between the goals of the designation and the unique  
37 characteristics that exist on the land. All have or would need diverse funding models. In addition,  
38 these were a result of development pressures in the area. She reported that the Sawtooth National  
39 Recreation Area was created to stop an open-pit mine that was going to be built in the mountains.  
40 The Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area was created because there was a lot of  
41 concern about suburban sprawl going into the mountains and then the public losing access. While  
42 the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area does not need to protect the watershed,  
43 because it is not applicable to them, there is an emphasis on protecting other ecosystem services.  
44

45 Both of the case studies demonstrated that National Recreation Areas are highly flexible and can  
46 integrate conservation and recreation values and goals into a Federal designation. Existing  
47 designations are likely to have higher political feasibility, as novel designations require more  
48 education for the public and Representatives. National Recreation Area funding is also highly

1 diverse. Ms. Schwieger shared a quote from Ben Katz of the Conservation Lands Foundation:  
2 “...where the rubber meets the road is with the Management Plans... the title is less important than  
3 what is going to happen on the ground.” This quote summarizes what she found in her research.  
4

5 Commissioner Birrell noted that a lot of the case study information is applicable to the Central  
6 Wasatch area. It is exciting to think about what might be possible here. Laura Briefer explained that  
7 she was involved in the Mountain Accord process. She recalls the negotiations related to the title of  
8 the Legislation. The research conducted by Ms. Schwieger is important because it shows that the title  
9 might not matter as much. That being said, the title has a lot of meaning to those who participated in  
10 the Mountain Accord discussions. She expressed appreciation for the case study information.  
11

12 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, stated that Ms. Schwieger has done a wonderful job on the  
13 research. The main takeaway for CWC Staff was that whatever the designation, this land needs to be  
14 designated in some way based on what was shown in the case studies. Chair Silvestrini appreciated  
15 hearing about the flexibility. If there are opportunities to have more involvement on a local and State  
16 level, this might be more attractive to Legislators. He stressed the importance of reaching a  
17 consensus.  
18

## **PRESENTATION OF THE CWC 2024-2025 ANNUAL REPORT**

### **1. Staff will Present the 2024-2025 CWC Annual Report.**

23 Chair Silvestrini reported that CWC Staff has created the 2024-2025 CWC Annual Report document,  
24 which is included in the Meeting Materials Packet. He noted that the document is educational and  
25 thanked CWC Staff for their efforts. Ms. Nielsen stated that CWC Board Members also received  
26 hard copies of the 2024-2025 CWC Annual Report in the mail. The document starts with a quote  
27 from Terry Tempest Williams, who provided the keynote address at the Central Wasatch Symposium.  
28 There is a Director’s Message as well as information about CWC Staff and Commissioners. In  
29 addition, there is the organizational chart, jurisdictional boundaries, and information about the  
30 Stakeholders Council and CWC Youth Council. The document also highlights the Central Wasatch  
31 Symposium and looks at the Mountain Accord deliverables. There is information about the Short-  
32 Term Projects Grant Program, CWNCR, transportation, and the Central Wasatch Dashboard.  
33 Community engagement is highlighted as well as the In The Wasatch podcast. Ms. Nielsen added  
34 that there is a financial overview included and a thank you to those who have participated.  
35

36 Chair Silvestrini noted that there are several Representatives present, and their attendance is  
37 appreciated. He also expressed appreciation for the appropriation the Legislature made so the CWC  
38 was able to do some of the work that has been highlighted in the 2024-2025 CWC Annual Report.  
39 He believes the Legislators are present to listen to the Transportation Work Session. As a result, he  
40 requested that the Transportation Work Session item be heard before the next agenda item.  
41

## **MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE FEASIBILITY STUDY**

### **1. Staff will Present the Results of the Public Comment Period for the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study Update.**

47 Ms. Nielsen reported that in June, the CWC Board approved an update to the 2012 Millcreek Canyon  
48 Shuttle Feasibility Study from Fehr & Peers. The update will ensure that the plan is reflective of

1 current conditions and needs. It will also look at the feasibility of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle service  
2 now. The CWC opened a 30-day public comment period starting in July and nearly 400 comments  
3 were collected. Mr. Kilborne stated that there were 375 respondents and those came through the  
4 comment form. There were also some phone calls and emails received about the study.

5  
6 The information that came through the comment form was useful because it communicated what  
7 people are most interested in with a shuttle. Based on the comments, there is a desire for a shuttle to  
8 allow bicycles, for it to be convenient, for riders to be able to bring their animals, for hassle-free  
9 parking, and for skis to be allowed. In addition, there were comments about having picnic items  
10 accommodated. Picnicking is popular in Millcreek Canyon, which is important to keep in mind.  
11 When it comes to convenience, this seems to mean different things to different people. Convenience  
12 is not only the amount of time that someone waits for a shuttle, but also the overall ease of use.  
13

14 The schedule was also important to a lot of respondents. Most of the comments expressed a desire  
15 for the shuttle to run every 15 minutes, but listed 30 minutes as the highest amount of time they would  
16 be willing to wait. There was not a seasonal preference expressed, as most of the respondents wanted  
17 year-round shuttle service in Millcreek Canyon. A question was asked to determine whether people  
18 were willing to pay the same amount that is currently paid at the fee booth. Most were willing to pay  
19 the same amount but would be incentivized if the shuttle amount was less than what those in personal  
20 vehicles have to pay. Respondents did not have a desire to purchase two different passes, because  
21 users would likely sometimes drive and take the shuttle.  
22

23 Commissioner Gray asked how it would work if the respondents wanted one pass but also wanted  
24 personal vehicles to be charged a bit more. Mr. Kilbourne was not sure how to solve that problem.  
25 Chair Silvestrini pointed out that there are also complications from working with the Forest Service  
26 and Salt Lake County. The fee collected at the booth is used for canyon improvements, so there is no  
27 desire to jeopardize that revenue stream. It might be possible to increase the fee to incentivize a  
28 shuttle. One of the goals of the shuttle is to reduce the number of personal vehicles in the canyon.  
29

30 Mr. Kilbourne reported that there was excitement about the possibility of loop hikes. This would  
31 involve the shuttle dropping someone off at one location and then being picked up at a different  
32 location. This would make it possible to connect trails not previously connected. Ms. Nielsen  
33 summarized the comments received and noted that there is strong support for a Millcreek Canyon  
34 shuttle. The CWC will be receiving the draft update to the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility  
35 Study from Fehr & Peers by the end of the week. It will be shared with the CWC Board and will then  
36 be released to the public for review and comment. There will be a second round of public comments.  
37 CWC Board Members will have the final document ahead of the CWC Board Meeting in November.  
38

## 39 **TRANSPORTATION WORK SESSION**

40  
41 1. **The Transportation Committee will Lead a Work Session to Determine Transportation**  
42 **and Transit Priorities and Projects for the Central Wasatch Commission.**  
43

44 a. **The Commission will Discuss how they might Encourage Expanded Bus Service**  
45 **for the 2025-2026 Season.**  
46

47 Mayor Monica Zoltanski welcomed those present to the Transportation Work Session. She noted that  
48 there is litigation that is in conflict with the advancement of the Utah Department of Transportation

1 (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). The question is  
2 where that leaves canyon advocates, user groups, and stakeholders. At the last Transportation  
3 Committee Meeting, it was determined that there should be a broader discussion to see if it is possible  
4 to create short-term solutions that ease the current pressures. UDOT and the participants in the  
5 litigation seem to be at an impasse about whether Phase I of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon  
6 EIS can proceed. However, it is possible to discuss possible solutions outside of the EIS.  
7

8 Mayor Zoltanski thanked Representative Clinton Okerlund, Representative Gay Lynn Bennion, and  
9 Jay Fox from the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) for attending the Transportation Work Session.  
10 She noted that the Representatives have posed questions about who could run extra transit, what extra  
11 transit could look like (buses, shuttles, private transportation vendors), the recommended service  
12 levels to meet demand, and what opportunities and obstacles there might be. Ex Officio Carlton  
13 Christensen previously stated that planning for the bus service this year is already complete. It is still  
14 possible for the CWC Board to examine what else can be done and what opportunities exist. Mayor  
15 Zoltanski reported that the bus solution offers immediate, flexible, and responsive infrastructure  
16 without having to wait for tolling, road widening, and other technical EIS recommendations.  
17

18 Mr. Fox introduced himself to the CWC Board. He shared an overview of the UTA service. There  
19 is a 12-month service, with the exception of the ski service. There are 36 operators moved to ski  
20 service each season, which means the rest are focused on providing the remaining service. That has  
21 impacts on the organization, but there are mitigation efforts made. Mr. Fox reported that following  
22 the COVID-19 pandemic, there were labor issues throughout the transit industry. He pointed out that  
23 it takes very experienced operators to handle ski service. The younger operators tend to want  
24 predictable schedules and focus on work that will not result in overtime. Since a shift was made to a  
25 model that accommodates that, the turnover has been reduced. The 12-month service has been  
26 provided effectively throughout the year. Mr. Fox shared information about the ski service last year,  
27 highlighting Route 994 and Route 972. There was also a supplemental service added. He explained  
28 that a contractor was brought in to hire non-union labor on a seasonal basis to supplement the service.  
29 The intention was to replace some of the service previously provided by the suspended Route 953.  
30

31 Mr. Fox explained that resort employees were pulled off the buses, because close to half of the  
32 ridership at the previous service level was from employees. Pulling them off the routes increased the  
33 capacity for other visitors. There is now a robust vanpool program to accommodate employees. In  
34 addition, Brighton and Solitude created their own charter bus service to pull employees off the buses  
35 and increase the capacity of the system. Mr. Fox shared information about the services provided as  
36 well as the ridership numbers. When comparing 2024-2025 to 2023-2024, the numbers increased  
37 4.86% for the UTA routes. Adding in supplementary service resulted in an increase of almost 10%.  
38

39 Mayor Dan Knopp asked for a comparison of the current ridership numbers versus the pre-pandemic  
40 levels. Mr. Fox offered to check and report back with that information, but he estimates that the  
41 ridership has trended upward. He explained that capacity has always been the issue. Pulling most of  
42 the vehicular traffic out of the canyon during peak times means enhanced service can work well.  
43

44 Mayor Roger Bourke pointed out that the numbers provided are essentially how many people are on  
45 the bus, but he wondered how many people would have taken the bus if there had been one available.  
46 He explained that his question relates to unfilled demand. He appreciates the difficulty in trying to  
47 measure that, but it might be interesting to look into. Mr. Fox does not have that data, but based on  
48 his experience, most people are patient waiting for a bus. To determine unfilled demand, a survey

1 might need to be conducted. Commissioner Gray asked if UTA has noticed a change in ridership  
2 with the different resorts implementing a parking reservation system, which was confirmed.  
3

4 Commissioner Birrell reported that students at the University of Utah presented last night. She  
5 thanked Professor Steven Floyd Bartlett for organizing and moderating that. Something that stood  
6 out to her about the presentation was the idea of an Intelligent Transportation System (“ITS”).  
7 Commissioner Birrell applauds the ski resorts and all of the agencies that have worked to better inform  
8 motorists, but she hopes the Transportation Committee will look further into ITS. While the UTA  
9 schedule is already set for the upcoming ski season, it is still possible to look into resources that will  
10 better manage the flow. Commissioner Birrell pointed out that what has been done in Sandy is an  
11 example of what can be accomplished when there is collaborative will.  
12

13 Mr. Fox shared information about the situation in 2022, when it was not possible to provide the same  
14 service that had been provided in the past due to labor issues. Working with the ski resorts,  
15 communities, UDOT, and others was beneficial. He thought it made sense to bring UDOT into the  
16 current conversations, because ultimately it is their environmental document that is looking to resolve  
17 a lot of the transportation issues in the canyons. The more parties that are at the table, the better,  
18 because different points of view usually lead to productive solutions. Chair Silvestrini reported that  
19 the CWC has funded a Ski Bus Priority Access Program, which is a bypass service where there is a  
20 police escort for buses. He asked for feedback about the effectiveness of that program and how it can  
21 be improved. He explained that the CWC is intending to fund the program again this year. Mr. Fox  
22 stated that it is viewed positively, but he would like to bring the operating team in to provide feedback  
23 about how it is working and potentially provide suggestions to improve effectiveness. He offered to  
24 reach out to the team so there can be further discussion about the Ski Bus Priority Access Program.  
25

26 Representative Okerlund introduced himself to the CWC Board. He is not committed to a particular  
27 methodology of solving the problem, but it is clear that there is a problem that needs to be addressed.  
28 UTA has been collaborative and whenever there have been questions, UTA has been willing to answer  
29 them. Representative Okerlund believed it was too late to do anything with the UTA bus plan for the  
30 season, but asked if it was too late to add supplemental service from private operators. Chair  
31 Silvestrini pointed out that the issue will likely come down to whether there is funding. Mr. Fox  
32 stated that the Planning and Engagement Office would need to be engaged to determine what would  
33 be possible. Mayor Zoltanski asked what the ideal schedule is when it comes to seasonal planning.  
34 Mr. Fox stated that discussions normally happen at the beginning of the year, but offered to obtain  
35 more information.  
36

37 Chair Knopp has seen a lot of improvement with UTA in the last few years. He pointed out that the  
38 current conditions are likely short-term, because the situation will improve after the implementation  
39 of the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”). Once there are transit hubs and  
40 bus lanes in place, the situation overall will be much better. Chair Knopp discussed the capacity of  
41 the road and stressed the importance of reducing the number of personal vehicles in the area.  
42

43 Representative Bennion expressed appreciation to the CWC for the work that has been done. She  
44 wondered whether there was State funding that was not tied to the UDOT Little Cottonwood EIS for  
45 the canyons and offered to look into that further. It might be possible to use some for private  
46 contractors. As for the University of Utah presentation that took place last night, there were exciting  
47 potential solutions mentioned. She thanked everyone for continuing to have these discussions.  
48

1 Commissioner Birrell shared information about Cottonwood Heights. Through support and funding  
2 from the Utah Legislature via UDOT, it was possible to hire three additional traffic officers. This  
3 was in conjunction with traction control. She explained that traction control is key when it comes to  
4 reducing the number of crashes in the canyon. Her initial hope was that the three additional officers  
5 would be able to spend time assisting with the gridlock on SR-210 through Cottonwood Heights as  
6 well. However, that has not happened in the last two years. A new development is that UDOT has  
7 announced that it plans to widen a portion of SR-210. The idea is that the Cottonwood Heights Police  
8 Department would be able to direct motorists on their way to Little Cottonwood Canyon on those  
9 gridlock mornings to the shoulders. She feels this will be an improvement, but when it comes to  
10 funding, municipalities do not necessarily have the resources to hire more traffic officers.

11  
12 Special Advisor Stauss asked if there has been engagement with the ski areas to see if there is interest  
13 in private bus shuttles to their resorts this winter. He noted that Snowbird had this in place for  
14 Oktoberfest. Mayor Zoltanski asked those present to submit questions to CWC Staff. Those  
15 questions can be consolidated and forwarded to Mr. Fox and the Representatives. This will be an  
16 ongoing discussion at the CWC level. She thanked those who participated in the Work Session.

17  
18 **b. The Commission will Discuss Existing and Potential Future Connections Between**  
19 **Salt Lake City and Park City along Parley's Corridor.**

20  
21 Ex Officio Member Caroline Rodriguez shared information about High Valley Transit. She reported  
22 that currently, High Valley Transit operates a fare-free bus every hour or so with all-day service  
23 between Salt Lake Central Station into Kimball Junction. There are no plans to remove service and  
24 she reiterated that it is currently fare-free. There are limited stops in the valley and anyone can  
25 connect from the UTA system to the High Valley Transit system. Chair Silvestrini asked about the  
26 ridership numbers. Ex Officio Rodriguez offered to provide exact ridership numbers. During the  
27 summer and fall, it is almost full with seated passengers, and in the winter, it is standing room only.  
28 There is enough demand where it would be possible to expand the service, but there are funding  
29 limitations.

30  
31 **BREAK**

32  
33 The CWC Board took a short break before continuing to discuss the agenda items.

34  
35 **BOARD BUSINESS**

36  
37 **1. (Action) The Board will Consider a Passthrough Funding Contract with Salt Lake**  
38 **County to Continue Tri-Canyon Restroom Maintenance in Partnership with the Forest**  
39 **Service. (Resolution 2025-30).**

40  
41 Chair Silvestrini reported that Resolution 2025-30 relates to restroom maintenance in the tri-canyon  
42 area. This has been done for a number of years and he feels it is a worthwhile endeavor. Ms. Nielsen  
43 explained that this is a funding agreement with Salt Lake County for essential work to keep trailhead  
44 restrooms clean. Mayor Knopp stated that the Town of Brighton will continue their contribution.

45  
46 **MOTION:** Emily Gray moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-30 – A Passthrough Funding Contract  
47 with Salt Lake County to Continue Tri-Canyon Restroom Maintenance in Partnership with the Forest

1 Service. Dan Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
2 Board.

3

4 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Extending the Project Deadline for Certain 2024-2025**  
5 **Short-Term Project Grant Recipients. (Resolution 2025-31).**

6

7 Chair Silvestrini reported that Resolution 2025-31 relates to project deadlines for certain 2024-2025  
8 Short-Term Projects Grant Program recipients. There were a few short-term projects funded that did  
9 not complete their projects on time. After discussion at the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee level,  
10 there was support to adopt a Resolution that extends the grants. Ms. Nielsen explained that there  
11 were some Short-Term Project Grant Program recipients unable to complete the work in the allotted  
12 time due to circumstances outside of their control. The two projects from Trails Utah have been  
13 unable to start for those reasons. The third project, which was from Utah Open Lands, received the  
14 funding back. There is a desire to focus on that project in the future when it makes more sense for  
15 them. As a result, the Resolution before the CWC Board will only impact the Trails Utah projects.

16

17 **MOTION:** Emily Gray moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-31 – Extending the Project Deadline  
18 for Certain 2024-2025 Short-Term Project Grant Recipients. Dan Knopp seconded the motion. The  
19 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

20

21 **3. The Board will Discuss Issuing a CWC License Plate.**

22

23 Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a memo in the Meeting Materials Packet about a CWC License  
24 Plate. The report from Ms. Schwieger identified a potential funding stream that the CWC has not  
25 considered previously, which is a CWC-themed license plate. Mr. Kilbourne reported that if there  
26 were 500 license plates, the minimum amount of money the CWC would receive would be \$12,500  
27 per year. It could be a lot more than that, but there are some variables to consider. He has started to  
28 work through the first steps, which have involved reaching out to the new License Plate Committee.

29

30 Chair Silvestrini noted that the memo outlines what needs to be done, including the plate design,  
31 generating interest and gathering applications, and submitting the plate application. He believes this  
32 is something CWC Staff should pursue. There was support from the CWC Board to move forward.

33

34 **4. The Board will Discuss the Potential Creation of a Member Contribution Committee.**

35

36 Chair Silvestrini reported that in the past, there have been discussions about forming a Member  
37 Contribution Committee. He understands there are budgetary considerations that need to be taken  
38 into account, but there is stress put on the organization when a budget is adopted and then the full  
39 member contributions are not received. It makes sense to form a Committee to discuss this further.  
40 Mayor Zoltanski reported that full funding for the CWC was in her proposed budget, but it did not  
41 pass the Council. It was determined that after the elections, there can be discussions about the  
42 Committee.

43

44 **5. The Board will Discuss the Potential Hire of a Community Engagement Intern.**

45

46 Ms. Nielsen reported that Mr. Kilbourne was recently hired as the full-time Communications Director.  
47 His position replaced the half-time position that was previously filled by Mia McNeil, who served as  
48 a Community Engagement Coordinator. Mr. Kilbourne has been serving in his role for the last four

1 months and it has become clear that there is too much work to do, even moving the role from 20 hours  
2 to 40 hours. For those reasons, CWC Staff is asking the CWC Board to consider a call for applications  
3 for a nine-hour per week Community Engagement Internship. This intern would assist Mr. Kilbourne  
4 with social media outreach, in-person outreach, and could potentially increase the outreach that is  
5 done for the Central Wasatch Dashboard. That would allow Mr. Kilbourne to focus more on brand  
6 development for the CWC. The internship would be nine hours per week at \$15 per hour. That would  
7 total \$3,500 over six months. The budget this year is tight, but some spots in the budget could be  
8 drawn from. For example, there are \$6,000 unallocated dollars in the budget. It is also possible to  
9 draw from the line item, allocating \$25,000 for Federal Lobbying Representation.

10  
11 Commissioner Robinson expressed support for a Community Engagement Intern. Ms. Nielsen  
12 informed those present that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee advised CWC Staff to halt  
13 forward motion on an existing contract that was entered into with the DIGIT Lab out of the University  
14 of Utah. That contract halt was done to cover the recent deficit. That decision is separate from the  
15 decision to fund a six-month internship for approximately \$3,500. The internship can be funded by  
16 pulling from unallocated budgeted funding or from the line item for Federal Lobbying Representation.  
17 The third option is to dissolve the Millcreek Canyon Committee at the Stakeholders Council level  
18 and absorb that work into the other existing subcommittees: Recreation System Committee,  
19 Transportation System Committee, Environment System Committee, and Economy System  
20 Committee. She noted that the Millcreek Canyon Committee has dedicated Council Members serving  
21 on that Committee, and it was the first subcommittee of the Stakeholders Council created.  
22

23 Chair Silvestrini pointed out that the idea of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle is still being pursued. He  
24 believes a specialized subcommittee that is dedicated to the issues in Millcreek Canyon makes sense.  
25 He would rather the money come from the unallocated budgeted funding or the Federal Lobbying  
26 Representation line item. Commissioner Robinson agreed with Chair Silvestrini and noted that it  
27 might make more sense to take the \$3,500 out of the Federal Lobbying Representation line item.  
28

29 **6. Land Acquisition Discussion:**

30

- 31 a. **The Board will Discuss the Role the CWC Should Play in the Mountain Accord**  
**Objective of Developing a Land Acquisition Program for Conservation.**
- 32
- 33 b. **The Board will Discuss the Role, if any, that the Stakeholders Council Should**  
**Play.**
- 34
- 35 c. **The Board will Discuss the Formation of a Working Group to Develop a Strategy**  
**Around Land Conservation.**
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39

40 Ms. Nielsen explained that the land acquisition item on the CWC Board Meeting agenda is a  
41 continuation of a discussion from previous CWC Board Meetings. Land conservation was a directive  
42 laid out in the Mountain Accord charter, but it is something that the CWC has not focused on much.  
43 The idea was to identify private lands from willing sellers that could be transferred or sold into public  
44 ownership for land conservation purposes. The question is whether there is a desire to create a  
45 Working Group or Committee that is specifically focused on land conservation. This group could  
46 determine what the role of the CWC should be when thinking about regional land conservation. In  
47 addition, the group could define what the strategy of the CWC should be moving forward. For  
48 instance, the CWC could act as a convener, or there might be other ways the CWC could assist.

1  
2 Ms. Briefer believes there should be a broader discussion about land preservation, but noted that land  
3 acquisition could be a part of that discussion. The CWC would be a good convener. She wondered  
4 whether a Working Group could fit into the Legislative and Land Tenure Committee work. Chair  
5 Silvestrini acknowledged what was mentioned in the Mountain Accord, but pointed out that there is  
6 no money available to consider land acquisition. Ms. Briefer noted that there is a lot that can be talked  
7 about and she reiterated that the CWC can be a convener. Additional discussions were had about the  
8 possibilities. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that there is a Legislative and Land Tenure Committee that  
9 exists. Land acquisition is something that would fit within those Committee discussions.

10  
11 **7. Commissioners from Park City, Summit County, and High Valley Transit will Discuss**  
12 **Current Topics of Importance, if any, to the Wasatch Back and Pertinent to the Work**  
13 **of the CWC.**

14  
15 Due to audio issues experienced by Commissioner Robinson, it was determined that the item about  
16 the Wasatch Back would be discussed at the next CWC Board Meeting.

17  
18 **8. The Board will Discuss How a Potential New Iteration of the CWNCR Could Address**  
19 **the Four Central Wasatch Systems.**

20  
21 Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a memo in the Meeting Materials Packet. She reported that the  
22 most current version of the CWNCR was drafted back in 2020. As demonstrated during the  
23 presentation from Ms. Schwieger, there is a need and the time is now to redraft and refocus. The  
24 memo is meant to start a conversation about how to rebalance the four systems: recreation,  
25 environment, transportation, and economy. The careful balance that made the bill work in its early  
26 iterations has been lost to time and redrafts. The bill has been through multiple redrafts, so she asked  
27 the CWC Board to consider whether rebalancing efforts should take place with the CWNCR.  
28

29 Mayor Knopp explained that he would need to see a map that clearly shows the boundaries.  
30 Ms. Nielsen believed that if there was a new draft of the Legislation considered, then there would  
31 need to be a discussion about rebalancing the four systems within the draft. In early iterations of the  
32 CWNCR, each of the four systems was involved in a careful negotiation process. During the various  
33 redrafts, items have been pulled out due to different circumstances and changing conditions.  
34

35 Chair Silvestrini believes the CWNCR draft needs to be reworked slightly. He referenced the earlier  
36 presentation about National Recreation Areas. There needs to be something that accomplishes the  
37 conservation and watershed goals, but also interests the State government. He stressed the importance  
38 of working in collaboration. Commissioner Birrell agreed that there needs to be collaboration, so this  
39 will be palatable to the State Legislature. Special Advisor Stauss stated that it is important for CWC  
40 Board Members, Stakeholders, and others to be involved in the conversations. Ms. Briefer  
41 commented that this is the right time to rebalance the CWNCR, because many changes have  
42 occurred. She noted that it might be beneficial to have an objective third-party facilitator. Mayor  
43 Knopp pointed out that the ski areas need to be involved in this process as well.  
44

45 Dani Poirier explained that she is with the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance. She has been following  
46 the process over the years and wondered whether there would be public comment periods related to  
47 the CWNCR. Given the current climate, there is a lot of public appetite for something like this.  
48 Chair Silvestrini confirmed this. Mayor Zoltanski acknowledged that there is complexity involved in

1 this process due to the competing interests. It was noted that the CWC could lay out the framework.  
2 There might be funding sources, grants, foundations, or programs that could assist with funding needs.  
3

4 Ms. Nielsen explained that the Bonneville Shoreline Trail continuation and the associated wilderness  
5 offsets would be removed from a future iteration of the CWNCRA because that has already been  
6 taken care of in the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Advancement Act that was passed a few years ago.  
7 As mentioned earlier, the land exchanges in the CWNCRA were removed in earlier iterations. She  
8 agrees that these need to be included in future versions of the CWNCRA. Different options can be  
9 explored when it comes to the land exchanges. Other components of the bill are still applicable.  
10 Chair Silvestrini asked about the next steps. Mayor Zoltanski believed there is agreement that an  
11 update is needed and a course of action must be determined. Ms. Briefer suggested working on a  
12 draft scope or framework. It can then be reviewed by the Legislative and Land Tenure Committee.  
13 It was confirmed that the Committee will discuss this matter further in the future.  
14

15 **9. (Action) The Board will Consider Resolution 2025-32 – Opposing Rescission of the 2001**  
16 **Roadless Rule.**

18 Chair Silvestrini reported that the Central Wasatch would be impacted by a rescission of the 2001  
19 Roadless Rule. Resolution 2025-32 indicates that the CWC Board is in opposition to this.  
20 Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a map that outlines the lands that are currently inventoried as  
21 roadless areas. This is overlaid with the proposed boundaries of the CWNCRA. Ms. Briefer reported  
22 that Salt Lake City submitted some comments before the comment deadline. Those comments can  
23 be shared. There has been a lot of feedback from Utah residents in opposition to the rescission.  
24

25 **MOTION:** Monica Zoltanski moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-32 – Opposing Recission of  
26 the 2001 Roadless Rule. Ellen Birrell seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous  
27 consent of the Board.  
28

29 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

31 **1. The Stakeholders Council Chair and Co-Chair will Present the Recent Activities of the**  
32 **Stakeholders Council and Engage with the Commission for Guidance and Feedback.**

34 Chair of the Stakeholders Council, Maura Hahnenberger, introduced herself to the CWC Board. She  
35 shared information about the Stakeholders Council activities. In recent months, the Council has been  
36 focused on two primary goals: gathering more information about the Central Wasatch (recreation  
37 activities and who is visiting the Central Wasatch) and thinking about what actions the Council can  
38 take or support to move forward with the goals of the Mountain Accord. For the information  
39 gathering goal, the Environment System Committee has been identifying important updates for the  
40 Central Wasatch Dashboard. There have already been some improvements made, so they are more  
41 usable and accessible. One of the Council Members, John Knoblock, has been focused on collecting  
42 additional data that is specifically related to the use of the Central Wasatch from different user groups.  
43

44 In addition, at the August 20, 2025, Stakeholders Council Meeting, there was a presentation from  
45 Dr. CJ Blye, who is a Recreation and Tourism Researcher at the University of Utah. She provided a  
46 framework on the concept of carrying capacities, including the different types of carrying capacities.  
47 She also discussed some of the management strategies available to manage capacity. As for what  
48 actions the Stakeholders Council can take, several subcommittees are considering what types of

1 management strategies could be implemented in small-scale projects. For example, there could be  
2 education provided about how to reduce the visitor impact. The Council is interested in receiving  
3 feedback about actions that can be taken and what can be done to support the CWC Board.

4  
5 Ms. Hahnenberger reported that the Stakeholders Council has also been considering the idea of land  
6 conservation. There are no current actions being taken by the Council, but it is something that is of  
7 interest. Several Council Members would like to be involved in the continued discussions. The  
8 Stakeholders Council is continuing to follow national and local actions that are occurring and might  
9 impact the Central Wasatch, such as the rescission of the Roadless Rule. Council Members have also  
10 been encouraged to submit public comments as individuals. The Stakeholders Council is active and  
11 engaged in the work that is being done and is also open to receiving additional feedback.

12  
13 **a. (Action) Addition of New Members. (Resolution 2025-33).**

14  
15 **MOTION:** Ellen Birrell moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-33 – Addition of New Members.  
16 Dan Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

17  
18 **b. (Action) Appointment of Interim and Permanent Co-Chairs. (Resolution 2025-34).**

19  
20  
21 **MOTION:** Monica Zoltanski moved to APPROVE Resolution 2025-34 – Appointment of Interim  
22 and Permanent Co-Chairs. Christopher Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
23 unanimous consent of the Board.

24  
25 **STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS**

26  
27 **1. Youth Council Updates.**

28  
29 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Central Wasatch Symposium will take place in a few months on January  
30 8 and 9, 2026. The announcement of the date will be sent out tomorrow. Ticket sales will open  
31 tomorrow at a 30% reduced early bird rate, so those sure that they will be attending can purchase a  
32 discounted ticket. Chair Silvestrini expressed appreciation for the Central Wasatch Symposium last  
33 year. He looks forward to the second year of the Central Wasatch Symposium.

34  
35 Mayor Zoltanski mentioned the University of Utah presentation that took place last night and  
36 suggested that it be a part of the Central Wasatch Symposium in some manner. It might be possible  
37 to include the students. Ms. Nielsen offered to follow up with Mayor Zoltanski about this suggestion.  
38 She noted that other suggestions related to program creation can be submitted to CWC Staff.

39  
40 Mr. Kilbourne shared a CWC Youth Council update. There are new Officer roles that have been  
41 created within the CWC Youth Council. At the next CWC Board Meeting, there will be a liaison  
42 listening in. There will also be a Stakeholders Council liaison from the CWC Youth Council.  
43 Mr. Kilbourne reported that the CWC Youth Council is starting to work on projects that can be  
44 submitted for the Short-Term Projects Grant Program. Their ideas are impressive and there has been  
45 mention of a potential Youth Symposium that would be somewhat similar to the Central Wasatch  
46 Symposium. There have also been discussions about a west side shuttle to bring people from  
47 elementary schools on the west side into the Central Wasatch. Chair Silvestrini mentioned the  
48 Millcreek Promise Program and suggested that there be some outreach or collaboration there.

1  
2 Mayor Zoltanski mentioned the Sandy Youth Council. Ms. Nielsen explained that CWC Staff can  
3 present to the Sandy Youth Council. It was noted that there was a presentation made to the  
4 Cottonwood Heights Youth Council already, which resulted in some submitted applications.  
5

6 **2. The Next Board Meeting will be on November 3, 2025, Unless There is a Desire to**  
7 **Reschedule in Light of the November 4, 2025, Election.**

8  
9 Chair Silvestrini reported that the next CWC Board Meeting is scheduled to take place on November  
10 3, 2025. However, that is the Monday before the election. It was suggested that the date be  
11 rescheduled. Ms. Nielsen reported that a scheduling poll will be released to determine a date.  
12

13 **OTHER BUSINESS**

14  
15 Chair Silvestrini reported that he will serve as Mayor of Millcreek until November 10, 2025, and then  
16 he will pass the torch to someone new. He has enjoyed his work with the CWC. He has mixed  
17 feelings about departing, but he knows it is the right decision based on the current circumstances.  
18

19 Mayor Knopp stated that it has been a pleasure to work with Chair Silvestrini here and elsewhere. He  
20 expressed appreciation for his leadership. Mayor Zoltanski thanked Chair Silvestrini for his service  
21 and commitment to the mission of the CWC. Commissioner Birrell stated that she has learned a lot  
22 from him and appreciates his work. Mayor Bourke noted that Chair Silvestrini does his job extremely  
23 well. Ms. Briefer thanked him for his years of partnership and for leadership on the CWC.  
24 Commissioner Robinson commented that it has been a pleasure working with him and wished him  
25 the best in the future. Ms. Nielsen stated that Chair Silvestrini has been a wonderful leader at the  
26 CWC and a champion for the work of the organization. He has been a role model for CWC Staff.  
27

28 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

29  
30 There were no additional comments.  
31

32 **CLOSING**

33  
34 **1. Chair Silvestrini will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Board Meeting.**

35  
36 **MOTION:** Monica Zoltanski moved to ADJOURN. There was no second. The motion passed with  
37 the unanimous consent of the Board.  
38

39 The meeting adjourned at 5:02 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 on Thursday, September 25, 2025.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes  
6 T Forbes Group  
7 Minutes Secretary

8  
9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

10