



2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**  
4 **HELD MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2026, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED**  
5 **BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS**  
6 **MILLCREEK CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 1330 EAST CHAMBERS AVENUE,**  
7 **MILLCREEK, UTAH.**

8  
9 **Board Members:** Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Chair  
10 Mayor Roger Bourke  
11 Christopher Robinson  
12 Emily Gray  
13 Mayor Gay Lynn Bennion  
14 Mayor Scotty John  
15 Bev Uipi  
16 Mayor Monica Zoltanski  
17 Annalee Munsey, Ex-Officio

18  
19 **Special Advisors:** Jack Stauss

20  
21 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
22 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
23 Will McKay, Communications Director  
24 Shane Topham, CWC Legal Counsel

25  
26 **Other:** Maura Hahnenberger  
27 Phoebe McNeally  
28 Ryan Mecham  
29 Dylanger McKissen  
30 Ayja Bounous  
31 John Adams

32  
33 **OPENING**

34  
35 **1. Chair Erin Mendenhall will Call the Meeting to Order and Welcome CWC Board**  
36 **Members and the Public.**

37  
38 Chair Erin Mendenhall called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Meeting to order at  
39 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present. There was a roll call conducted of the present members.  
40

1 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the CWC Board Meeting**  
2 **on January 12, 2026.**

3  
4 **MOTION:** Christopher Robinson moved to APPROVE the Minutes of the CWC Board Meeting on  
5 January 12, 2026. Emily Gray seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent  
6 of the Board.

7  
8 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

9  
10 There were no public comments.

11  
12 **CENTRAL WASATCH DASHBOARD LANDING PAGE PRESENTATION**

13  
14 **1. Phoebe McNeally from the DIGIT Lab at the University of Utah will Present the New**  
15 **Landing Page for the Central Wasatch Dashboard.**

16  
17 Chair Mendenhall reported that there will be a presentation from Phoebe McNeally from the DIGIT  
18 Lab at the University of Utah. Ms. McNeally explained that the Central Wasatch Dashboard landing  
19 page has recently been updated. There was previously a meeting held in Cottonwood Heights with  
20 members of the public. During that meeting, members of the public expressed a desire to see a map  
21 included on the dashboard. An interactive map has since been created. The map shows the dashboard  
22 boundary, CWC study area boundary, various municipal boundaries, and the proposed boundary for  
23 the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”). It is possible  
24 to turn boundaries on and off while viewing the map. All of the different boundaries are color-coded.

25  
26 Ms. McNeally reported that the map accesses the three most popular datasets on the dashboard, which  
27 include traffic counters, webcam locations, and wildlife information. The interactive map on the  
28 landing page is intended to increase traffic to the Central Wasatch Dashboard. She next reviewed the  
29 traffic counter information that is shown on the interactive map. Ms. McNeally explained that the  
30 interactive map is optimized for desktop and laptop-sized screens and it is not as accessible on a  
31 mobile device. Work is being done to make the map more accessible on a mobile device.

32  
33 Commissioner Emily Gray asked if there is a timeline for mobile device optimization. Ms. McNeally  
34 explained that a lot depends on the software that is used, but the hope is that it will be optimized by  
35 the middle of summer. Mayor Roger Bourke expressed support for the interactive map. Maura  
36 Hahnenberger reported that the Environment System Committee has been focused on improvements  
37 to the Central Wasatch Dashboard in recent years. She believes the Stakeholders Council will be  
38 excited about these improvements, as the interactive map will make the dashboard more user-friendly.

39  
40 Chair Mendenhall reported that Commissioner Bev Uipi, Mayor Monica Zoltanski, and CWC Legal  
41 Counsel, Shane Topham, have arrived at the CWC Board Meeting since the roll call was conducted.

42  
43 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, shared the original Central Wasatch Dashboard landing page  
44 with the Board. It had tiles that could be clicked on in order to access the data. She then shared the  
45 new landing page for comparison. It is dynamic, interactive, and draws in visitors to the dashboard.  
46 She thanked Ms. McNeally and the rest of the DIGIT Lab team for their work on the interactive map.  
47

1 **CLOSED SESSION**

- 2
- 3 1. **Chair Mendenhall will Call for a Closed Session for the Purpose of Discussing the**  
4 **Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of One or More**  
5 **Individuals, as Authorized by Utah Code Ann. 52-4-205(1)(a).**  
6

7 **MOTION:** Bev Uipi moved to go into Closed Session for the Purpose of Discussing the Character,  
8 Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of One or More Individuals, as Authorized  
9 by Utah Code Ann. 52-4-205(1)(a). Christopher Robinson seconded the motion. Vote on Motion:  
10 Roger Bourke-Yes; Monica Zoltanski-Yes; Scotty John-Yes; Gay Lynn Bennion-Yes; Emily Gray-  
11 Yes; Christopher Robinson-Yes; Bev Uipi-Yes; Erin Mendenhall-Yes. The motion passed  
12 unanimously.  
13

14 There was discussion about who will participate in the Closed Session. Ms. Nielsen explained that  
15 voting members of the CWC Board are automatically welcome, but the Chair may invite other  
16 participants. Chair Mendenhall asked that only voting members of the CWC Board attend. Mayor  
17 Zoltanski requested that Ryan Mecham join the Closed Session, as he has some information.  
18 Ms. Nielsen reported that a link to the Closed Session has been sent out to the online participants.  
19

20 The CWC Board was in Closed Session from 3:42 p.m. to 4:32 p.m.  
21

22 **CLOSED SESSION ENDS, MEETING RECONVENES.**

23

24 **MOTION:** Christopher Robinson moved to End the Closed Session and Reconvene the Meeting.  
25 Scotty John seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
26

27 After the Closed Session, the CWC Board Meeting agenda resumed.  
28

29 **FUNDING COMMITTEE UPDATES**

- 30
- 31 1. **Commissioner Monica Zoltanski will Discuss the Recent Activities of the Funding**  
32 **Committee, including Member Contribution Rates and the Associated Quantitative and**  
33 **Qualitative Criteria Matrix.**  
34

35 The Budget Discussion agenda item was heard before the Funding Committee updates. Following  
36 that discussion, Mayor Zoltanski shared information about the Funding Committee process. She  
37 explained that the Committee looked at historical contributions from members and discussed how to  
38 make funding more sustainable. Both quantitative and qualitative metrics were examined.  
39

40 Some examples of quantitative metrics include population size, tax revenue, historic contributions,  
41 and tourism revenue. Some examples of qualitative metrics include: the stake in the Legislation  
42 (benefits of permanent environmental and watershed protection, protection of recreational access),  
43 quality of life (recreation experience, mountain lifestyle, air quality), and the placemaking value of a  
44 healthy Wasatch. Mayor Zoltanski asked CWC Staff to provide additional information.  
45

46 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Funding Committee includes Mayor Zoltanski, Mayor Scotty John, and  
47 Commissioner Uipi. CWC Staff was instructed to create a funding matrix to standardize member  
48 contributions. Several quantitative components were examined, including the 2024 population, sales

1 and property tax numbers, and historic contributions. The numbers were put through a series of  
2 calculations and scores were determined. Dollar amounts were assigned to each score. As an  
3 example, Salt Lake City is the largest jurisdiction in terms of population, and it received a score of  
4 five. That population score was multiplied by \$10,000 for a population premium of \$50,000. Sales  
5 and property tax numbers for each member jurisdiction were considered as well. The sources for the  
6 jurisdictional budgets are linked within the document that is included in the Meeting Materials Packet.  
7

8 There was a tax score determined for each member jurisdiction, and the scores ranged from one to  
9 25. That score was applied to the calculation. Ms. Nielsen reported that there was a total quantitative  
10 score determined for each. The same process occurred for the qualitative components. Both the  
11 quantitative and qualitative scores were totaled to determine the contribution amount.  
12

13 Ms. Gray asked about the qualitative analysis. She noted that the stake in the Legislation seems to be  
14 the only variable and asked for additional information about how the numbers were determined.  
15 Ms. Nielsen explained that the stake in Legislation came down to water protection. Mayor Zoltanski  
16 asked for CWC Board Member feedback on what has been proposed by the Funding Committee.  
17

18 Mayor Gay Lynn Bennion commented that there was a thorough analysis conducted. It was helpful  
19 to see both the quantitative and qualitative information. Mayor Zoltanski noted that the matrix can  
20 be amended if there are other items Board Members think should be included. Chair Mendenhall  
21 thanked Mayor Zoltanski and the Committee for their efforts, as this establishes a formula to assess  
22 contributions. She acknowledged the work that has been done. It would be meaningful to couple this  
23 with information about the CWC and the increased costs to provide additional context.  
24

25 Ms. Gray pointed out that different amounts will be approved by individual municipalities. She asked  
26 what would happen if an entity came back and stated that only a certain amount can be contributed.  
27 Mayor Zoltanski stated that there is value in member jurisdictions meeting the contribution amounts.  
28 It strengthens the organization and makes it possible to accomplish more than what can be done  
29 individually. The CWC is the only regional multi-jurisdictional organization that is focused on the  
30 environmental and economic viability of the canyons. She asked that member jurisdictions do their  
31 best to meet the member contribution amounts that have been determined. There is now data that can  
32 be taken back to member jurisdictions when funding for the CWC is discussed.  
33

34 Commissioner Christopher Robinson stated that it has been challenging keeping Summit County at  
35 the table, because the perception is that most of the CWC work is focused on the western side of the  
36 County line. The percentage change shown in the total calculation chart shows Summit County at a  
37 200% change. He pointed out that it is actually a 300% change. He is not sure that the quantitative  
38 or qualitative components work as well in the Wasatch Back. Commissioner Robinson is finishing  
39 18 years on the County Council this year, and he will not run again. Some of the highlights of his  
40 experience have included the Mountain Accord and CWC. However, he is not sure there will be  
41 equal interest from his successor or others on the County Council. He has had trouble with the  
42 \$25,000 member contribution in the past, so he has concerns about a number that is triple that amount.  
43

44 Mayor Zoltanski thanked CWC Staff for the time and effort that went into the calculations. Ms.  
45 Nielsen reported that ahead of the Budget Hearing to approve the Draft Tentative Budget, she will  
46 reach out to each CWC Board Member to confirm what there is comfort including in the Draft  
47 Tentative Budget. She knows the numbers for some of the member jurisdictions, but not all of them.  
48

1 Ms. Gray asked how close the known numbers are to the amounts listed in the funding document.  
2 Ms. Nielsen explained that it varies. Some member jurisdictions immediately expressed support for  
3 what was presented in the spreadsheet, while others came back with a number in the middle. She  
4 noted that this exercise was conducted to ensure the long-term sustainability of the organization.

5  
6 Commissioner Robinson noted that the Draft Tentative Budget has a placeholder amount of \$583,600.  
7 He asked what would happen if more than that was received from member contributions. Ms. Nielsen  
8 explained that there is not a lot of project work included in the Draft Tentative Budget, so if there was  
9 additional money received, it would likely be used to do more project work. For instance, the Central  
10 Wasatch Dashboard could be further built out, or there could be a capacity study of some sort  
11 conducted. The project work in the current draft is reflective of the funding available to work with.

## 12 **BUDGET DISCUSSION**

### 13 **1. The Board will Discuss the Draft Tentative Budget for 2026-2027.**

14  
15  
16  
17 The CWC Board discussed the budget. It was noted that a copy of the Draft Tentative Budget for  
18 2026-2027 is included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Chair Mendenhall asked about the Fund  
19 Balance and what that has looked like in the past. Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, reported that  
20 it is normally between \$1 million and \$1.3 million. The bylaws dictate that there needs to be at least  
21 one year of operational budget in reserves at all times. During the last budget year, the CWC was  
22 close to dipping below that one-year amount, which is the reason member contributions have been  
23 discussed. While member contributions have remained relatively steady since the creation of the  
24 CWC, the overall costs have increased. She noted that one year is between \$800,000 and \$900,000.

25  
26 Chair Mendenhall noted that Salt Lake County previously stopped participating in the CWC.  
27 Additionally, there have been other members who have decreased their contributions. She  
28 acknowledged that there has been some volatility in the revenue. Chair Mendenhall pointed out that  
29 it is not known whether all member jurisdictions will contribute the increased amounts that have been  
30 discussed. Mayor Bourke does not believe it is wise to count on all of the proposed member  
31 contributions in the draft budget, as some might come in under what has been contemplated.

32  
33 Commissioner Robinson asked for additional information about the surplus. Ms. Nielsen clarified  
34 that the budget surplus in the current fiscal year is approximately \$140,000. Ms. Kilpack did not have  
35 information about the end-of-year fund balance, but noted that there are still expenditures that have  
36 not been paid out at this time. She offered to share that number with the CWC Board in the future.

37  
38 Commissioner Robinson recalled that there was some money in the Public Treasurer's Investment  
39 Fund ("PTIF") that was left alone. There has been budgeting done to break even, and the PTIF has  
40 been set aside. He believes it makes sense to focus on balancing the budget. If there is an additional  
41 \$140,000 that would otherwise be added to reserves, it makes sense to discuss the options.

42  
43 Chair Mendenhall does not know what the bank account looks like, but sees the expenses and  
44 revenues listed in the budget document. Commissioner Robinson noted that it is possible to review  
45 the balance sheet with the CWC Board Members. Mayor Zoltanski reported that there is a 12%  
46 contingency fund in Sandy City. She asked if there should be an amount that is closer to 10% or 12%  
47 for the CWC. It might be worthwhile for an outside analyst to review the CWC budget and set some  
48 benchmarks. There could be a request for proposal ("RFP"), and the CWC budget could be compared

1 to non-profit organizations or similarly sized organizations. Mayor Zoltanski would like to know that  
2 the CWC is aligned with the Utah market for an organization of this scale.

3  
4 Commissioner Robinson noted that there is an operating and capital budget of approximately  
5 \$972,000. If no more revenue was received, it would be possible to continue the entity for just over  
6 one year, living off the reserves. The one-year amount is a benchmark already in place. Chair  
7 Mendenhall addressed the suggestion from Mayor Zoltanski. She pointed out that the CWNCRA is  
8 one of the main objectives of the organization. It is because of the CWNCRA that she does not feel  
9 there is a comparable non-profit or similarly sized organization as far as operational objectives.

10  
11 Mayor Zoltanski noted that during the recent Legislative Session, there was pushback against cities  
12 that had high contingency funds. Since the CWC receives State appropriations, it would be wise to  
13 look at the budget. She believes a one-year operating budget is a lot to have in reserves. Chair  
14 Mendenhall pointed out that the bylaws state the organization must have that amount in reserves.

15  
16 Commissioner Robinson explained that the CWC Board has been asked to share comments on the  
17 Draft Tentative Budget for 2026-2027. He noted that there are several options that can be considered,  
18 including what is in the Meeting Materials Packet. He feels it makes sense that there be some money  
19 in reserves in the event there is no support from member jurisdictions or the State Legislature. His  
20 proposal is that the CWC focus on the \$972,000 budget in the Meeting Materials Packet, and the  
21 reserves be left as they are. There was discussion about the Fund Balance Appropriation line item.

22  
23 Ms. Kilpack explained that the Member Contributions line is not filled in on the Draft Tentative  
24 Budget for 2026-2027. The Fund Balance Appropriation line item that is shown will be offset by  
25 whatever the member contributions are. Ms. Kilpack reported that the \$583,000 listed is more than  
26 the member contributions last year, as the contributions last year were \$482,000. However, it is less  
27 than the total amount requested for member contributions. The assumption is that more than last year  
28 will be received, but the full amount will not be received. Mayor John asked if inflation is the reason  
29 for the proposed member contribution increase. Ms. Nielsen informed those present that the member  
30 fees have not increased since the CWC was created. Mayor John wanted to know what benefits there  
31 are to the member jurisdictions. Ms. Nielsen mentioned the CWNCRA, the Short-Term Projects  
32 Grant program, and other work done by the CWC. She noted that while member contributions have  
33 not increased, inflation and the cost of services have both increased by approximately 30%.

34  
35 Commissioner Robinson noted that the proposed increase in member contribution is not based on  
36 inflation, but on a matrix that was created. There were both quantitative and qualitative criteria  
37 considered. The Draft Tentative Budget acknowledges that there has not been a decision made on  
38 the member contributions at this point. It also lists the known revenues and expenditures.

39  
40 Commissioner Robinson suggested that the CWC Board discuss the expenses shown in the Draft  
41 Tentative Budget document. Chair Mendenhall noted that a lot of the expenses are ongoing, such as  
42 attorney and accountant services, but there are some one-time expenses as well, such as the website  
43 redesign. There are ongoing and one-time expenses in the same column. She would like to see the  
44 ongoing expenses and one-time expenses separated out. CWC Staff confirmed that this can be done.

45  
46 Discussions were had about the Short-Term Projects Grant Program line item and the CWNCRA.  
47 Chair Mendenhall stated that Laura Briefer previously mentioned a potential capacity study. She  
48 asked where that would fit into the budget. Ms. Nielsen explained that a capacity study is not

1 accounted for within the Draft Tentative Budget. If there is a CWC Board Member consensus to  
2 contract for an additional study or some kind of addition to the Central Wasatch Dashboard, there  
3 could be a budget amendment made. Mayor Bourke asked what a canyon capacity study would cost,  
4 but this was not known. The Unallocated Project Funds line item was discussed. Ms. Kilpack  
5 reported that right now, there is around \$5,000 unspent. There was \$40,000 budgeted, and  
6 approximately \$34,000 was spent on the Millcreek Canyon shuttle, leaving some in the current fiscal  
7 year that could be applied to the next budget year. It was clarified that the information on the right  
8 side of the budget document is from the 2025-2026 budget. This was included for comparison.

9  
10 Commissioner Robinson pointed out that the ability to fund the expenses is somewhat dependent on  
11 the member contributions that are received. He suggested that the CWC Board discuss the matrix  
12 that was created by the Funding Committee, as it is important to provide feedback on that proposal.

13  
14 **2. The Board will Discuss the Budget Surplus for 2025-2026 and where to Allocate It.**

15  
16 **a. Short-Term Projects**

17 **b. Website Redesign (Memo Included in Meeting Materials Packet).**

18  
19 Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a budget surplus. She asked the CWC Board to discuss what should  
20 be done with that surplus. It is possible to allocate more money to the Short-Term Projects Grant  
21 Program in the current fiscal year or start the website redesign work. She reported that the surplus  
22 amount is approximately \$140,000. Chair Mendenhall mentioned the Utah Department of  
23 Transportation (“UDOT”) decision to move ahead with increased bus service in Little Cottonwood  
24 Canyon and tolling. With UDOT moving forward with portions of the UDOT Little Cottonwood  
25 Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”), she would like to discuss how to make the most  
26 out of that for the CWCNCRA. Commissioner Robinson believed the question is whether the CWC  
27 Board would like the surplus to be spent in the current fiscal year or if it should be carried forward.

28  
29 Several members of the CWC Board were in favor of carrying the surplus forward to the next fiscal  
30 year. Ms. Gray stated that she is interested in looking at canyon capacity, as that is part of the  
31 Mountain Accord charter. There is uncertainty about the cost of that kind of work, but it might be  
32 possible to start looking into this. Ms. Nielsen believed the CWC Board would like to replenish the  
33 savings account with the surplus. She reminded those present that the funding for Short-Term  
34 Projects was reduced in the current fiscal year due to budget constraints. Ms. Kilpack reported that  
35 in the current fiscal year, \$50,000 was budgeted for the Short-Term Projects Grant Program. This is  
36 down from the \$100,000 that is normally allocated for the Short-Term Projects Grant Program. Last  
37 year, the Legislative appropriation was less than requested, so budget reductions were made. The  
38 question is whether the CWC Board would like to restore that amount to \$100,000 with the surplus.

39  
40 The CWC Board expressed support for restoring the Short-Term Projects Grant Program funding to  
41 \$100,000 in the current fiscal year. This would require \$50,000 from the surplus to be used for this  
42 purpose. The remainder could be moved forward to the next fiscal year budget. Chair Mendenhall  
43 noted that no vote is being taken on the surplus at this time. Mayor Bourke is in favor of a well-done  
44 capacity study, because he sees the rise in canyon users each year. However, there is uncertainty  
45 about what that kind of study would cost and who could conduct a study effectively.

46  
47 Chair Mendenhall noted that there could be a request for information (“RFI”) to better understand  
48 what the study would entail and what it would cost. There was Board Member support for that

1 approach. Mayor Zoltanski suggested that UDOT or the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”)  
2 be asked to match the funds so the CWC is not covering the study costs on its own. It will likely be  
3 expensive to do a comprehensive study. Chair Mendenhall stated that an RFI could be drafted to  
4 better understand what the project could look like. At the same time, there could be work done with  
5 UDOT and WFRC. The information received could shape the request for qualifications (“RFQ”).  
6

## 7 **CWNCRA OVERVIEW AND UPDATES**

### 8 9 **1. Staff will Discuss Recent CWNCRA Activities.**

#### 10 11 **a. The Legislative and Land Tenure Committee Can Convene as Needed.**

12  
13 Ms. Nielsen reported that there has been re-engagement with the CWNCRA with jurisdictional  
14 partners, ski resorts, and water stakeholders to see if there is a desire to engage in a re-draft that would  
15 modernize the CWNCRA. The last time the Legislation was drafted was in 2020, so it is an  
16 appropriate time to re-draft. Negotiations have been going well so far, but there is still a lot that needs  
17 to be done.  
18

## 19 **CAPACITY STUDY DISCUSSION**

### 20 21 **1. The Board will Continue Conversations from the January 2026 Meeting about Further** 22 **Study into the Capacity in the Central Wasatch Canyons.**

23  
24 Ms. Nielsen stated that based on CWC Board discussions, there is a desire to pursue a capacity study.  
25

## 26 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

### 27 28 **1. The Stakeholders Council Chair and Co-Chair will Present the Recent Activities of the** 29 **Stakeholders Council and Engage with the Commission for Guidance and Feedback.**

30  
31 Ms. Hahnenberger shared updates about the Stakeholders Council. The focus has been on identifying  
32 projects and ideas that are appropriate for the Stakeholders Council to pursue. She noted that there is  
33 a desire to increase collaboration between the Stakeholders Council subcommittees and between the  
34 Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. During a meeting, the Council had a brainstorming  
35 session to identify possible projects that either the full Stakeholders Council or subcommittees could  
36 take on. At the most recent Stakeholders Council Meeting, those ideas were reviewed, and Council  
37 Members determined priority items. Some of the identified themes were land conservation, land  
38 stewardship, and communication and education. The Stakeholders Council was supportive of  
39 increasing the Short-Term Projects Grant Program funding to \$100,000 and partnering with other  
40 organizations.  
41

42 To encourage increased collaboration, there have been semi-regular meetings held with the  
43 subcommittee Chairs. Additionally, as part of the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda, there is a  
44 review of the CWC Board Meeting agenda. This ensures that Council Members know what the CWC  
45 Board will be discussing. Council Members are encouraged to attend CWC Board Meetings or  
46 subcommittee meetings so there is more awareness of the issues being discussed.  
47

1 Chair Mendenhall mentioned property acquisition for conservation. She asked if specific properties  
2 have been brought to Salt Lake City Public Utilities for consideration. Ms. Hahnenberger did not  
3 believe so, but there have been specific properties discussed at various subcommittee meetings.  
4 Council Members have noted that certain properties were for sale and expressed concerns about  
5 potential development. Chair Mendenhall noted that there is not always awareness of what properties  
6 are for sale. She offered to speak to Ms. Hahnenberger about this further after the meeting.

7  
8 **2. (Action) Resolution 2026-10 – Releasing and Appointing Stakeholders Council**  
9 **Members.**

10  
11 **MOTION:** Christopher Robinson moved APPROVE Resolution 2026-10 – Releasing and  
12 Appointing Stakeholders Council Members. Scotty John seconded the motion. The motion passed  
13 with the unanimous consent of the Board.

14  
15 **ACTION ITEMS**

16  
17 **1. (Action) Consideration of Resolution 2026-11 – Approving Zions Bank Account Signers.**

18  
19 **MOTION:** Christopher Robinson moved APPROVE Resolution 2026-11 – Approving Zions Bank  
20 Account Signers. Scotty John seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent  
21 of the Board.

22  
23 **LEGISLATIVE SESSION UPDATE**

24  
25 **1. Staff will Discuss the Outcomes of the CWC’s Legislative Session Activities.**

26  
27 Ms. Nielsen reported that there was a \$2.5 million appropriation request submitted, but there was a  
28 \$250,000 appropriation received. This is the largest State appropriation that the CWC has ever  
29 received. She explained that the bulk of the appropriation request was for a three-year Millcreek  
30 Canyon shuttle pilot program. That funding was not received because Salt Lake County expressed  
31 some concerns at the last minute about the appropriation moving forward. There is work being done  
32 with Salt Lake County currently to see if those concerns can be addressed. She is confident that all  
33 concerns can be addressed, but she will continue to share status updates with the CWC Board.

34  
35 **YOUTH COUNCIL UPDATES**

36  
37 **1. CWC Youth Council Chair Dylanger McKissen will Discuss a Short-Term Projects**  
38 **Grant Proposal from the Youth Council.**

39  
40 **2. Staff will Discuss the Activities of the Youth Council.**

41  
42 Chair of the CWC Youth Council, Dylanger McKissen, introduced himself to the CWC Board. He  
43 has served on the CWC Youth Council for approximately two years and has been the Chair since last  
44 summer. For the last year or so, the Council has been reorganizing. There used to be different  
45 subcommittees, but it was somewhat disorganized as far as a central goal. As a result, there was a  
46 switch from subcommittees to Officer roles. While discussing the main goal of the CWC Youth  
47 Council, it was determined that there is a desire to hold a CWC Youth Council Symposium. There  
48 would be networking opportunities, speakers, and lunch provided. Chair Mendenhall asked if the ski

1 resorts would be invited to attend. Mr. McKissen stated that anyone interested in attending would be  
2 welcome. The CWC Youth Council Symposium is the main project that Council Members are  
3 focused on right now, but another goal is to have a trail clean-up project or something similar.

4  
5 Chair Mendenhall suggested that the CWC Youth Council create a list of needs for the event. That  
6 could include a location for the event or organization contacts. Mr. McKissen confirmed that at the  
7 next CWC Youth Council Meeting, there can be work done on a list of needs for a symposium. Mayor  
8 John asked about the timeline for a CWC Youth Council Symposium. Mr. McKissen explained that  
9 the hope is that it would happen in the middle of the fall semester, but it depends on funding and  
10 planning. Communications Director, Will McKay, clarified that this is attached to a Short-Term  
11 Projects Grant Program proposal. It will be considered by the Short-Term Projects Committee.

## 12 **STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### 13 **1. The Short-Term Projects Committee will Meet to Make Funding Recommendations on** 14 **April 27, 2026. The CWC Board will Consider Approving Funding Decisions at the June** 15 **22, 2026, CWC Board Meeting.**

16  
17  
18  
19 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Short-Term Projects Committee will meet on April 27, 2026, to review  
20 the project proposals and make funding recommendations. The Committee recommendations will be  
21 reviewed and finalized during the CWC Board Meeting scheduled for June 22, 2026.

### 22 **2. The Next Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting will be on June 1, 2026.**

23  
24  
25 The next Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting will be held on June 1, 2026.

### 26 **3. The Next CWC Board Meetings will be on May 4, 2026 (Special Budget Meeting) and** 27 **June 22, 2026 (Regular CWC Board Meeting).**

28  
29  
30 The next CWC Board Meeting will be on May 4, 2026, which is a Special Budget Meeting.  
31 Ms. Kilpack explained that the Draft Tentative Budget needs to be approved during the month of  
32 May. The next CWC Board Meeting will be held on June 22, 2026, which is a regularly scheduled  
33 meeting. The Budget Hearing and approval of the Final Budget will occur during the June meeting.

34  
35 Ms. Kilpack reported that there is a new Stakeholders Council Member attending the CWC Board  
36 Meeting. Ayja Bounous was appointed in Resolution 2026-10 and was asked to introduce herself.  
37 Ms. Bounous explained that she grew up at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon and has spent her  
38 life playing, living, and working in the canyon. She is a writer and has two published books. In  
39 addition, she has been asked to contribute chapters to other books. All of those books are either about  
40 snow, climate change, the Wasatch community, Little Cottonwood Canyon, or ski history. She comes  
41 from a ski-oriented family. Both of her grandfathers helped with the Snowbird resort development.

## 42 **OTHER BUSINESS**

43  
44  
45 Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a member of the public who arrived at the meeting after the public  
46 comment period. If there is a willingness to hear public comment, there is someone who would like  
47 to speak. Chair Mendenhall and other CWC Board Members expressed support for hearing the  
48 comment.

1  
2 John Adams is on the Stakeholders Council, but he is not at the meeting representing the Stakeholders  
3 Council. When he saw that capacity was on the agenda, he wanted to hear the CWC Board Member  
4 discussion. He believed there should be clarity about why a capacity study is needed. In his opinion,  
5 a lot of time is spent focused on the symptoms of the canyons, such as traffic, water, wilderness, and  
6 experience, but there is not as much time spent talking about the system-level patterns that produce  
7 these symptoms. Sometimes, there is work done to address the symptoms, but there is still  
8 reinforcement of the dynamics that produced those problems in the first place. Mr. Adams explained  
9 that the symptoms are a result of humans in the canyons and humans traveling to the canyons.

10  
11 The Cottonwood Canyons have for-profit businesses that are driven by business models that require  
12 growth. Mr. Adams added that there is State dependency on increasing revenue through tourism  
13 growth. If there is agreement that endless growth is not sustainable in the canyons, then there is  
14 agreement that there is some capacity or limit for humans in the canyons. Mr. Adams explained that  
15 when he has spoken about this in other meetings, there are usually comments about solving the  
16 transportation problems. Right now, the road is both a problem and the solution. It is a problem  
17 because there is traffic, and visitors do not want to wait in the traffic. It is the solution because the  
18 canyons are somewhat protected from additional visitation. Any attempt to solve traffic or parking  
19 issues without understanding or agreeing on a capacity limit is short-sighted. Mr. Adams likes the  
20 idea of asking other organizations to assist with a capacity study, but noted that it is important for  
21 there to be a clear idea of what will be defined. Capacity was contemplated during the Mountain  
22 Accord process.

23  
24 Chair Mendenhall asked if there are members of the Stakeholders Council who would be interested  
25 in discussing an RFI scope. There could be a document created that outlines the reason there is a  
26 desire to study capacity in the canyons. That could be shared with the CWC Board for consideration.  
27 Ms. Hahnenberger confirmed that there are Council Members who would be interested in this work.

## 28 29 **CLOSING**

### 30 31 **1. Chair Mendenhall will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Board Meeting.**

32  
33 **MOTION:** Bev Uipi moved to ADJOURN the CWC Board Meeting. Emily Gray seconded the  
34 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

35  
36 The CWC Board Meeting adjourned at 6:03 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, April 13, 2026.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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