

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA**  
**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2018—9:00 A.M.**  
**SALT LAKE CITY & COUNTY BUILDING, CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84111**

- A. OPENING
  - i. Commissioner Chris McCandless will conduct the meeting as Chair of the CWC.
  - ii. The Commission will consider approving the meeting minutes of Monday, December 18, 2017.
  - iii. The Commission will consider approving the meeting minutes of Monday, February 5, 2018.
  
- B. PUBLIC COMMENT. Comments to the Commission are taken on any item not scheduled for a public hearing, as well as on any other CWC business. Comments are limited to three minutes.
  
- C. PUBLIC HEARING. The Commission will conduct a public hearing on the tentative budget for the CWC for the 2017-2018 fiscal year. Comments are limited to three minutes.
  
- D. 2017-2018 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET FOR THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION
  - i. The Commission will consider **RESOLUTION No. 2018-03** adopting the final budget of the Central Wasatch Commission for the 2017-2018 fiscal year, subject to future amendment.
  
- E. DISCUSSION OF CRITERIA AND PROCESS FOR ADDITIONAL MEMBERS AND POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTING ADDITIONAL MEMBERS POLICY—Conducted by Shane Topham
  - i. The Commission will consider **RESOLUTION No. 2018-04a**, or in the alternative **RESOLUTION No. 2018-04b**, adopting a policy for criteria and process for adding additional members to the CWC under Article V of the Central Wasatch Commission interlocal agreement.
  
- F. DISCUSSION OF LOBBYIST SCOPE OF WORK— Conducted by Laura Briefer
  
- G. NEXT MEETING
  - i. April 23—Salt Lake County
  
- H. OTHER BUSINESS
  
- I. ADJOURNMENT

## CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

On or before 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2018, the CWC does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda and agenda was 1) posted on the Utah Public Notice Website created under Utah Code Section 63F-1-701 and 2) provided to The Salt Lake Tribune and/or Deseret News and to a local media correspondent.

Final action may be taken in relation to any topic listed on the agenda, including but not limited to adoption, rejection, amendment, addition of conditions and variations of options discussed. Members of the Commission may participate electronically. Meetings may be closed for reasons allowed by statute.

The City & County Building is an accessible facility. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact Janine Calfo at [Janine.Calfo@slcgov.com](mailto:Janine.Calfo@slcgov.com), 801-483-6770, or relay service 711.

# **MEETING MINUTES**

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION  
MOTION SHEET**

**DATE:** February 28, 2018

**RE:** Motion to approve the meeting minutes of the meeting on December 18, 2017.

---

**Motion 1**

I move that the Commission approve the meeting minutes of the meeting on December 18, 2017.

**Motion 2**

I move that the Commission approve the meeting minutes of the meeting on December 18, 2017, with the following changes (provide changes).

**Motion 3**

I move that the Commission (provide alternative).

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2017- 3:14 P.M.  
COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
2277 East Bengal Boulevard, Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

**Present:** Carlos Braceras, Mayor Ben McAdams, Mayor Kelvyn Cullimore, Mayor Jackie Biskupski, Chris McCandless, Jim Bradley

**Staff:** Carly Castle, Recorder-Paula Melgar, Legal Counsel-Shane Topham, Legal Counsel-Laura Briefer

**A. OPENING**

- i. **Commissioner Biskupski conducted the meeting as Chair of the CWC.**

At approximately 3:14 p.m. Commissioner Biskupski apologized for her delay and called the meeting to order.

- ii. **The Commission considered approving the meeting minutes of Monday, July 17, 2017.**

Motion by Jim Bradley  
Second by Carlos Braceras  
Motion passed unanimously.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT**

- i. **Comments to the CWC. Comments were taken on any item not scheduled for a public hearing, as well as on any other CWC business. Comments were limited to three minutes.**

Mayor Tom Pollard from the Town of Alta reported that Item D on the agenda is to discuss whether to admit the Town of Alta as a member of the Central Wasatch Commission (CWC). The Town of Alta has participated in the process since the beginning and is one of the founding members. The Town was involved in Phases 1 and 2 and is a financial contributor. He reported that the Town of Alta is an incorporated municipality within the region described as the Central Wasatch Commission. For over 50 years, one of the guidelines of the Town of Alta has been stewardship of the environment. They also have a significant role in public safety and transportation issues that affect Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Mayor Pollard explained that Little Cottonwood Canyon Road is the only life blood to their town and it is critical to them that transportation improvements occur there. They put a large portion of their budget toward that effort. The Dispatch Center at the top of the Canyon coordinates with all of the agencies involved in public safety in the Canyon. Because of their location and the fact that they are an incorporated municipality, putting the Town of Alta in the CWC makes sense.

They have a lot of experience in the Canyon and can provide a local perspective. It will also give residents some comfort in the fact that they have input on issues that significantly impact their town.

Steve Maren, a citizen, thanked the Commission and staff for providing such a detailed packet of information. He was concerned about governance and stated that the roll call reflected in the minutes indicates the position of members prior to their election and includes additional Commissioners who arrived later in the meeting. That did not seem right to him. Later in the meeting, one of the appointed members was recorded as voting multiple times prior to notification by the legislative body that he was approved to be a Commissioner. The member was invited to sit with the group and his vote was recorded before he was ratified by the member cities. Further, today Mr. McCandless is being appointed by Mayor Dolan to represent Sandy City. He noted that the letter submitted was effectively Mayor Dolan's resignation from the Commission.

Mr. Chris McCandless had a similar question about whether he should be seated at the Dias or wait until his membership is ratified. Legal counsel advised him to sit with the group and that the appointment was made upon Mayor Dolan's resignation.

Jen Clancy identified herself as the Executive Director of Friends of Alta and was representing their small interest at the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon. They expressed support for the Alta area being included in the Central Wasatch Commission Study Area and for the Town of Alta to have representation on the Executive Board.

Chris Robinson identified himself as the Chair of the Summit County Council who has been involved with the Mountain Accord since its inception. He felt that Summit County had a lot to add to the CWC. Much of their geography was included in the project area, which included the area south of I-80 and west of US-40. Much of their critical water shed comes from the Wasatch Mountains and they serve as the back door to the Central Wasatch. Some of the Forest Service land in the proposed National Conservation and Recreation Area Act is being considered for the federal designation. If that were to occur, the Council asked that Mr. Robinson be the appointee.

**C. NOTICE OF A PPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER REPRESENTING SANDY CITY - Chris McCandless.**

Commissioner Biskupski reported that Mayor Tom Dolan stepped down from his position on the Commission in November. He notified all parties that he was appointing Sandy City Council Member, Chris McCandless, to serve as Sandy's representative.

**Jim Bradley moved that the Commission accept the appointment of Chris McCandless to represent Sandy City on the Central Wasatch Commission. The motion was seconded by Kelvyn Cullimore. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**D. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS**

**i. Town of Alta.**

- a. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2017-01 appointing an Additional Member Representing the Town of Alta.**

**ii. Summit County.**

- a. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2017-02 appointing an Additional Member Representing Summit County.**

The above two matters were discussed together. Mayor Cullimore felt it was wise to include Alta. He did, however, have reservations about the group getting overly large. He questioned whether studies should be conducted on the implications of admitting the two entities that have applied and determine if there are others interested in applying. It was his opinion that Alta has a stronger position than Summit County, but he was not sure that was a distinction they were ready to make.

Mr. McCandless' preference was to wait until the February meeting so that he can understand the issue better. Mayor McAdams was in favor of proceeding to accept the two additional stakeholders. Commissioner Cullimore questioned whether the desire of the Commission is to have broader discussion about future applicants. He wanted to make sure that the criteria upon which they are basing the acceptance of additional members is founded in policy and determine what they are trying to accomplish.

Laura Briefer commented on the sub-committee, the work they will do, and their role in the process. She explained that the Commission's Interlocal Agreement established an Advisory Committee. The desire was to attract a broad group of stakeholders and utilize their knowledge of the areas that could potentially be impacted by future actions. The intent is to provide an opportunity for the committee members to participate in a meaningful manner.

**Mayor Cullimore moved that the Commission take under advisement the applications of Alta and Summit County and use it as a launching point to better define the criteria for accepting additional board members and take action in February. Chris McCandless seconded the motion.**

**Carlos Braceras made a friendly amendment to include language encouraging others to put forward a name to serve on the Commission by February and define a period during which entities may apply. Mayor Cullimore accepted the friendly amendment. Vote on motion: Carlos Braceras-Aye, Mayor Ben McAdams-Aye, Mayor Kelvyn Cullimore-Aye, Mayor Jackie Biskupski-Aye, Chris McCandless-Aye, Jim Bradley-Nay. The motion passed 5-to-1.**

**E. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2017-03 ADOPTING AMENDED BYLAWS AND PROCUREMENT POLICY.**

Legal Counsel, Laura Briefer, gave a summary of the two new sections and reviewed Chapter 7-Procurement Policy. At their July 2017 meeting the Commission adopted bylaws and the State Procurement Policy. They also authorized the creation of the sub-committee comprised of staff from the various organizations that study procurement policies. The proposed additions were reviewed. The Commission's team of attorneys drafted the new procurement policy.

Carlos Braceras noted that the document does not mention Part 24 of the Utah Procurement Code, which addresses conduct and ethics. It was suggested that the policy recognize Part 24. It should also require that all CWC employees act as procurement professionals and be trained on the requirements of Part 24.

**Carlos Braceras moved to approve the Bylaws and Procurement Policy, as amended, with the addition of Part 24 of the Procurement Code, which includes ethics, so that any CWC employee may act as a procurement professional, subject to Part 24. Chris McCandless seconded the motion with a correction to page 12 of the word "quiet". The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**F. REPORT ON ONGOING PROGRAMS.**

**i. Environmental Dashboard-Joan Degiorgio and Marian Rice.**

A copy of the presentation is attached and incorporated to these minutes by this reference. Marian Rice presented the Dashboard Report and reported that it is a tool for decision makers and those interested in data in the Central Wasatch. This is the first step in the process, which is to develop a framework, create a data base, and prepare a written report. Ms. Rice introduced their team and reported that the 12-member Steering Committee is guiding the process.

Joan Degiorgio explained that the task of the Environmental Sub-Committee is to determine the condition of the environment with the focus being on five specific items. Water indicators were developed to measure water supply, water quality, and stream health. Data was made available for each indicator. The location of data gaps was also identified in terms of wildlife species and riparian areas. Ms. Rice described their next steps, one of which will be to move forward with the online dashboard.

Mayor McAdams thanked the team for their efforts and for developing the dashboard as a starting point to collect information.

Mayor Cullimore clarified that support for the dashboard will fall under the purview of the Commission going forward.

Ms. Rice explained that the Steering Committee has identified their preference for an online dashboard. It is updated and visible and will get much more traffic. They also received an offer

for donated time and resources, which would allow the online dashboard to be developed at a much lower cost.

Mr. McCandless asked why both the final report and the online dashboard could not be done at the same time. Ms. Degiorgio stated that both could be done but were not for budgetary reasons. The written report could be completed with the existing contract. There would, however, be an additional cost for the online dashboard.

Ms. Briefer explained that costs were provided by the Environmental Dashboard Team and included in the budget proposal. She noted that the cost of the online dashboard is \$60,000 above the current contract. There would also be ongoing costs to keep it updated.

**ii. Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Study-Laynee Jones.**

The above item was tabled to the February Meeting as Ms. Jones was not present.

**iii. Valley to Mountain Transit Alternatives Analysis Study-Caroline Rodriguez and Heidi Spoor.**

A copy of the presentation is attached and incorporated to these minutes by this reference. Heidi Spoor from HDR Engineering introduced herself and presented the details of the study. She stated that HDR is Summit County's consultant on the Valley to Mountain Alternatives Analysis. Today's presentation was funded from the original Mountain Accord. Ms. Spoor explained that Summit County, Park City, UDOT, UTA, Salt Lake City, and the Wasatch Front Regional Council teamed up to complete the project. The first phase focused on SR-224. The project intends to identify and compare the costs, benefits, and impacts of a range of transit alternatives. Ms. Spoor stressed that Summit County specifically indicated that they do not want to pursue roadway improvement alternatives. The goal was a transit project on SR-224, which was part of an effort to reduce the number of cars on SR-224 and lower the carbon footprint while maintaining the small-town feel.

Ms. Spoor reported that an Operations Study will be done on the existing Park City-Salt Lake Connect to determine how to align the existing bus service with the transit alternative on SR-224. In July 2017, Park City and Summit County introduced electric express bus service on SR-224, which has been very successful. The study builds on that momentum. Ms. Spoor described the FTA/AA process and stated that is no longer a requirement for communities to undergo an AA if they want to pursue FTA funds. It is a locally led flexible planning process and is the first step in determining the best transit improvements for a corridor. They will evaluate the benefits and costs of several alternative transit approaches and ultimately, Park City and Summit County will recommend a locally preferred alternative based on the study results.

Ms. Spoor indicated that the study team first defined the purpose of the Valley to Mountain Project. It was determined to be to enhance multi-modal transportation choices in the corridor, promote sustainability in the corridor and Park City as a whole, and promote system efficiencies within the SR-224 corridor and Park City. A workshop was held in the Summer of 2016 where the project partners brainstormed the goals of the project and established goals that could be tied

back to the project purpose. The goals can be measured as they embark on the alternatives analysis. Nine project goals were identified with one of the most important being to increase capacity on SR-224 during peak periods while avoiding excessing road widening.

Ms. Spoor commented that there is a parking problem in Park City. Summit County and Park City are looking at remote Park and Ride lots with the hope being to look at potential connections to the transit alternative on SR-224 and reduce the number of cars going into Old Town and address the parking needs there. The intent was also to provide a transit investment that meets the current needs and has the ability to expand for future growth. In the end, the hope was to preserve the right-of-way and create a transit way that can potentially expand. Ms. Spoor stated that the study is meant to further support local and regional transportation plans for the long-term express transit service strategy in the corridor. Park City completed a short-range transit development plan last summer that stressed a robust transit alternative on SR-224. Other plans also exist, and the project is building on that momentum. Ms. Spoor explained that the project partners also want to provide a safe and competitive transit alternative to automobiles on SR-224.

Ms. Spoor commented that the project is needed because there are existing system deficiencies. The project partners desire the project area comprise more livable communities that are supported by a multi-modal transportation system. In the summer of 2016, the project purpose and goals were developed, and the alternatives screened. During the first level of screening, Summit County and Park City were clear that they wanted to consider all of the alternatives. Ultimately, they came up with eight primary groups of technologies, which were described. The top two were identified as Electric Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit/Rapid Street Car. Aerial Transit screened well but the project partners determined that it probably wasn't the best fit to move people from Kimball Junction to Old Town Park City. They did, however, request that remain an option.

The three alignment options were identified as:

1. A center running transit alternative.
2. A side running transit alternative with directional lanes on each side of SR-224.
3. A side running alternative where both transit lanes would be on the west side of SR-224.

Each would assume the six-mile long route that begins at the Kimball Junction Transit Center, which is located behind the Summit County Library. It would end at a New Transit Center at the intersection of Bonanza Drive and Munchkin Road off of SR-248 in Park City. Between the two end points will be four additional stops. They number of stops was limited since the intent was for it to be an express service that competes with automobiles.

Ms. Spoor indicated that the center running option would likely be separated from the general-purpose lanes. In their discussions with UDOT, snow plowing concerns were identified. The shoulders would remain in place. The side running option was the compromise alternative and legitimizes what exists by giving it its own dedicated bus way while keeping the shoulder and

center median in place. The third alignment consists of the transit only facility on the west side of SR-224. It would be separated by a median and a shoulder.

An Online Open House was held between October 31 and December 12. An Open House was held in Park City on December 5 where a presentation was given to the public where they were asked for input. So far it had been determined that Alternative #2 costs the least and has the fewest right-of-way and environmental impacts. Alternative #3 was the most expensive and will likely have the most impacts. The intent was to continue screening the alternatives. The Level 2 screening will then be prepared after which a meeting will be held in January with the project partners who will recommend a preferred alternative.

**iv. Federal designation-Bill Simmons.**

Bill Simmons updated the Commission on the briefing of Congressman Curtis that took place a few weeks earlier. Mayor Dolan reached out to Congresswoman Love and asked her to reintroduce the same legislation that Congressman Chaffetz introduced. She agreed to do that. Last year, Congressman Bishop expressed a desire to seek changes, which had not yet been publicly articulated. Congresswoman Love still intends to introduce it. In addition, Congressman Curtis is a very strong supporter of the Mountain Accord and the legislation. He anticipated that Congressman Stewart would also become a co-sponsor as he was last year. It was expected that the process will move forward early next year. The next step will be for a markup in the Federal Lands Sub-Committee of the Natural Resources Committee and then the full committee of which Congressman Bishop is the Chair.

**G. DISCUSSION OF OFFICE SPACE NEEDS-Conducted by Laura Briefer.**

**i. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2017-04 Approving Assignment of Lease and Assumption Agreement for Office Space.**

Laura Briefer reported that the Commission was provided with a possible resolution to approve entry into an Assignment of a Lease Agreement for office space that was previously held by Lane Jones Consulting or an alternative. She explained that the Lease Agreement was entered into in June 2016 and expires May 31, 2019. The office space is located on Racquet Club Drive near the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. The rent is \$2,060 per month and multiple tenant improvements were made while the Mountain Accord occupied the space. There is a conference room, office space for an Executive Director, and staff work areas. There are also areas for work groups to gather to discuss projects. The lease anticipates a future assignment to the Central Wasatch Commission. The sub-committee met and recommended they keep the space as it is ready for occupancy once an Executive Director is hired. During the Mountain Accord process, they struggled to find a suitable location to meet and discuss projects. It was suggested that they retain the space for the time being and assign the Lease Agreement to the Central Wasatch Commission.

**Mayor Cullimore moved that the Commission adopt Resolution 2017-04 approving entry into an Assignment of Lease and Assumption Agreement. Chris McCandless seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

## **H. STAFFING DISCUSSION - Conducted by Laura Briefer.**

### **i. Executive Director.**

Ms. Briefer was present representing the sub-committee and stated that they were tasked with preparing a staffing and budget proposal. She referred to her transmittal to the Commission dated December 11, 2017. Staffing issues were discussed. Ms. Briefer explained that the CWC is a new organization formed under the Interlocal Act. As such, one of the primary staffing goals is for an Executive Director who would handle general administration and management of the organization and follow all appropriate statutory requirements and best practices for government entities. The second goal would be to conduct the substantive mission initiatives of the Central Wasatch Commission. The goal of the Executive Director would be to administer and manage the organization, move the CWC initiatives forward under the direction of the Commission, and have other potential staff report to the Executive Director. Ms. Briefer recommended that this be an employee of the Central Wasatch Commission and likely a full-time employee who is supported by an administrative support person to perform clerical tasks.

### **ii. Accounting/Finance Support.**

Ms. Briefer stated that another function would involve Accounting and Financial Services. This position would also be accountable to the Board and the Executive Director. There should be a separation of duties and organizational structure. The function of the Accounting and Financial Services role would be to prepare a budget in coordination with the CWC and the Director and involve general accounting, payroll, arranging for audits, establishing internal controls, and other issues that are important to an entity.

### **iii. Recommendation on Legal Representation for CWC (written briefing).**

In addition to the Executive Director, it was recommended that outside legal counsel be retained to work under the direction of the Commission. It was suggested that this be a contracted position with a firm that employs individuals with governmental expertise to ensure compliance with the Open and Public Meetings Act, GRAMA, and other rules and regulations that apply to governmental entities. Legal counsel may also be needed to evaluate project specific initiatives.

The final staffing function involved Technical Consulting. It was recognized that the Commission may want to contract with individuals or firms who offer specialized services and expertise relative to specific projects or programs. These may include intergovernmental relations, services related to federal legislation, transportation, or environmental issues, recreation, or economic issues. Technical consulting work will be overseen and managed by the Executive Director and the Central Wasatch Commission Board. With regard to the budget, the staffing recommendations were incorporated into various budget line items.

Mayor Cullimore's understanding was that the Executive Director will be the one employee of the CWC with the potential for an administrative employee to be hired at some point to provide

assistance. All other positions would be contracted. Ms. Briefer confirmed that that was the case.

**Jim Bradley moved to proceed and initiate the hiring process for an Executive Director to be guided by the criteria set forth in writing in the motion sheet in the packet by reference, which addresses various processes and considerations that the committee should employ. Chris McCandless seconded the motion.**

Ms. Briefer stated that the sub-committee is prepared to begin the hiring process. Mayor Cullimore expressed appreciation to the sub-committee for their work. The sub-committee members were identified as:

- Shane Topham, Legal Counsel for Cottonwood Heights;
- Carly Castle, Special Project Manager for Salt Lake City Public Utilities;
- Matt Dias, Park City Assistant City Manager;
- Rusty Vetter, Salt Lake City Attorney's Office;
- Jana Young, Summit County Director of Administration and Intergovernmental;
- Mary DeLoretto, Environmental Studies Manager with UTA;
- Kimberly Barnett, Salt Lake County Associate Deputy Mayor;
- Robert Sampson, Salt Lake County Sheriff's Lieutenant; and
- Ned Hacker from the Wasatch Front Regional Council.

**The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**I. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2017-05 APPOINTING A BUDGET OFFICER.**

**Mayor McAdams moved that the Commission adopt Resolution 2017-05 appointing Jim Bradley to serve as the Budget Officer. Mayor Cullimore seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**J. PRESENTATION OF THE 2017-2018 TENTATIVE BUDGET-Conducted by the Budget Officer.**

**i. Update on Payment of Invoices.**

Mr. Bradley reported that \$104,860 worth of invoices had not been paid since the cessation of the Mountain Accord and before the formal birth of the CWC. Those doing work for the cause were in limbo in terms of specific authorization to move forward. He analyzed the work done and the requests for payment and it was his opinion that they should be paid for various reasons set forth in his letters provided to the Commission. On June 9, 2017, the State Auditor recognized the CWC as a legitimate organization, which was the date selected as the demarcation between who pays the invoices. Invoices dated prior to June 9, 2017, would be paid by the Mountain Accord with funds held by UTA. Invoices submitted after that date would be the responsibility of the CWC and totaled about \$22,000. It was stressed that invoices cannot be paid until a budget is adopted.

**ii. Report on Monies Received.**

Mr. Bradley reported that \$290,000 was received with \$100,000 coming from the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy. Salt Lake County submitted \$190,000 of which \$10,000 was reserved to be used to resolve the lawsuit being waged against the Mountain Accord. Invoices were sent to those that owe them money. Mr. Bradley reported that the Tentative Budget shows a projected income of \$1,860,000 for the fiscal year 2017-2018. The expenses were itemized and very broad.

Ms. Briefer reported that the \$1.8 million income is from the Interlocal Agreement among various entities including Cottonwood Heights, Draper, the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake Sandy, Park City, Sandy City, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Summit County, the Town of Alta, UDOT, and UTA. UTA's contribution was replaced by an in-kind contribution of increased bus service over the three-year life of the Interlocal Agreement. She explained that those monies were the remaining allocation for 2016 and 2017.

Ms. Briefer stated that the sub-committee had a great deal of discussion about the general philosophy of the budget. They wanted to be conservative but also allow for flexibility. The expenses were divided into broad categories. One was personnel costs, which reflect the Executive Director and any staff that work directly for the CWC. There are also operations and maintenance costs related to running the organization as well as charges and services that include legal, finance, and accounting services. The majority of the budget would involve carrying forward projects identified in the Mountain Accord. Ms. Briefer reported that currently the Central Wasatch Commission is not involved in building or maintaining capital projects, but it is fulfilling many of the programs and projects that were present in the Accord.

Mayor Cullimore noted that the budget was circulated to members of the Commission for review prior to this meeting. The proposed document reflects input from all Commission Members.

**iii. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2017-06 Adopting Tentative Budget for the 2017-18 Fiscal Year, Scheduling a Public Hearing and Providing for Public Notice.**

**Jim Bradley moved to approve the Tentative Budget for the period July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018 and made available for public inspection. Notice will be published reporting**

**the time and place of the public hearing. The public hearing was to at the next meeting scheduled for February 5, 2018 at the Salt Lake City Public Safety Building located at 475 South 300 East. The motion was seconded by Carlos Braceras. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

Legal Counsel, Shane Topham, recommended that Mr. Bradley restate his motion to specify the resolution number.

**Mr. Bradley asked to readdress Resolution #2017-06 to reflect the resolution number. The resolution adopts the Tentative Budget for the period July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. The motion was seconded by Mr. McCandless. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**K. DISCUSSION OF STAKEHOLDER COUNCIL APPLICATION PROCESS -  
Conducted by Kimi Barnett.**

Kimi Barnett from Salt Lake County reported on the creation of the Stakeholder Council. She reported that the inclusion community members and organizations involved in the work of the CWC felt strongly that it be included in the Interlocal Agreement that created the CWC. She stated that they would soon request formal approval of an application for a new process. She asked that the Commission consider specific criteria for the application process. The goal was to create a clear and transparent method for the selection of members to the Council. The proposed application form was presented. Ms. Barnett recommended that criteria be set on which to base a decision about who is chosen to serve. The hope was to get the Stakeholder Council established in the near future. In response to a question raised about the number of positions, Ms. Barnett explained that the Interlocal Agreement specifies 28 to 35 stakeholders.

Mr. Braceras asked if the Executive Director will support the Council. Ms. Barnett confirmed that that was the case and stated that the sub-committee feels strongly that the Executive Director be the point person for the Stakeholder Council.

Mayor Biskupski asked about timing. Ms. Barnett explained that it could be included as part of the action items presented at the next meeting for approval. She asked that feedback be provided to her within the next month.

Mayor Cullimore suggested that applicants be asked to attach a formal resume or curriculum vitae to better identify their skillsets and interests.

In response to a question raised by Mayor Biskupski, Ms. Barnett stated that 30 days would be enough time for her review prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Bradley referenced the Budget Report and stated that UTA has been holding funds from which invoices were paid prior to June 29. Mary DeLoretto asked that the funds be transferred to the CWC and that funds be reserved for rent payments until they have a functioning checking account. Mayor Biskupski asked that that decision be postponed since there is a budget issue that needs to be resolved first.

**Mayor McAdams moved to propose a Resolution of Appreciation be adopted to acknowledge the service of Mayors Dolan and Cullimore. Mayor Biskupski seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

Mr. Braceras introduced Project Manager, John Thomas, who is conducting the NEFA work for the Little Cottonwood Canyon Project. Mr. Thomas reported that on October 13, 2017 the Utah Transportation Commission approved funds for UDOT to initiate the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Little Cottonwood Canyon. Since then, they have hired a consulting team to begin the process of developing a scope of work. Input was received from various community and environmental groups and businesses who are aware of the direction of the Mountain Accord and issues in the Canyon. They plan to continue to build on those collaborations. UTA, the Forest Service, and Salt Lake City Public Utilities will be cooperating agencies that will have a great deal of involvement in the day-to-day direction of the EIS. They were happy to see the environmental dashboard come to fruition and plan to continue to build on it. Over the next few months, updates will be provided to the CWC and by October they will be considering alternatives. In February, they will go into more detail about an approved scope of work.

Mr. Braceras asked that this be included as a standing agenda item for the CWC going forward.

**L. NEXT MEETING**

**i. February 5, 2017-Salt Lake City (Meeting to Include Budget Hearing).**

The next Central Wasatch Commission Meeting was scheduled for Monday, February 5, 2018, at 3:00 p.m., at the Salt Lake City Public Safety Building, located at 475 South 300 East, in Salt Lake City, Utah.

**M. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no Other Business.

**N. ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Braceras moved to adjourn. Mayor McAdams seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION  
MOTION SHEET**

**DATE:** February 28, 2018

**RE:** Motion to approve the meeting minutes of the meeting on February 5, 2018.

---

**Motion 1**

I move that the Commission approve the meeting minutes of the meeting on February 5, 2018.

**Motion 2**

I move that the Commission approve the meeting minutes of the meeting on February 5, 2018, with the following changes (provide changes).

**Motion 3**

I move that the Commission (provide alternative)

1 **Central Wasatch Commission Meeting Minutes**  
2 **Salt Lake City and County Building**  
3 **451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84111**  
4 **February 5, 2018**  
5

6 The Central Wasatch Commission Board members met in open meeting on February 5,  
7 2018, at 3:00 p.m. in the Salt Lake City Council Chambers.  
8

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>
Andy Beerman	Commissioner	Present
Jackie Biskupski	Vice Chair	Present
Carlos Braceras	Commissioner	Excused
Jim Bradley	Commissioner	Present
Ben McAdams	Commissioner	Excused
Chris McCandless	Chair	Present
Mike Peterson	Commissioner	Present
Laura Briefer	SLC Public Utilities Director	Present
Carly Castle	SLC Special Projects Manager	Present
Michelle Kellogg	Park City Recorder	Present

9  
10 **A. Opening and Approval of December 18, 2017 Minutes:**

11 Acting Chair Biskupski called the meeting to order. She noted some edits to the  
12 December 18<sup>th</sup> minutes, including that Commissioner Beerman was absent and Laura  
13 Briefer was staff, not legal counsel as indicated. Also, the name Maren on Page Two  
14 should be Van Maren.  
15

16 Commissioner McCandless moved to approve the December 18, 2017 minutes as  
17 amended. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion.

18 **RESULT: APPROVED**

19 **AYES:** Commissioners Biskupski, McCandless and Peterson

20 **ABSTAINED:** Commissioner Beerman

21 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras, Bradley and McAdams  
22

23 **B. Public Comment:**

24 Steve Van Maren commented on the proposed changes to the bylaws and noted when  
25 other officers were elected, they should be at the same time, and also there was no  
26 term of office indicated. He commented that it was a long time between meetings and  
27 asked for more frequent meetings to get work done.  
28

1 Harris Sondak, Alta Mayor, requested that the Town of Alta become a member of the  
2 Commission. He suggested criteria to be considered a member, and stated Alta was a  
3 municipality which was a government entity, the borders adjoined and were part of the  
4 study area, the town had its own zoning, was a proponent of preservation, vehicles  
5 accessed the town by SR 210, and the town was focused on recreation.

6  
7 Carl Fisher, Executive Director of Save Our Canyons, indicated people were anxious  
8 about the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS process. The main concern was that the  
9 conservation pieces of CWC were not a priority. He asked to prioritize the Conservation  
10 Act in Washington. He also expressed concern about modifications made to land  
11 exchanges, and thought CWC needed to look at the land exchanges. He heard that  
12 mining claims were being exchanged for service rights, which was concerning to the  
13 conservation and recreation community. He also indicated House Bill 136 would prohibit  
14 entities from engaging in issues of importance on our public lands, and noted this bill  
15 would be discussed at the House Natural Resources Committee tomorrow morning.

16  
17 Doug Fry stated he represented the Big Cottonwood Community Council. A three piece  
18 study was commissioned and it was now complete. It highlighted the concerns of  
19 transportation, toilets and trails for this area. He indicated the study could be found on  
20 [www.bigcottonwoodcommunity.org](http://www.bigcottonwoodcommunity.org) and he had hard copies with him for those in  
21 attendance.

22  
23 John Knelblock represented the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Committee and Trails Utah.  
24 He indicated that during the Mountain Accord, there was consensus on an  
25 environmental dashboard and a trails plan. He wanted to make sure the CWC was  
26 familiar with the draft trails plan because he wanted a plan and process put into place  
27 for moving forward with that plan. He also requested that CWC revisit the Bonneville  
28 Shoreline Trail and the alignment of wilderness with respect to the Central Wasatch  
29 Natural Conservation and Recreation Area legislation.

30  
31 Kevin Dwyer, Salt Lake Valley Trails Society, stated this mountain bike group was  
32 growing and there was a lack of trail resources. He thought there should be more  
33 transparency and communication with various governmental entities and the user  
34 groups. He asked that his group be involved as a stakeholder. With respect to the  
35 Transit agenda item, he met with Laura Hanson, UTA, and talked about the mountain  
36 bike shuttle operations for Big Cottonwood Canyon. He felt a formalized system should  
37 be created for minimizing the loads going up the canyon and also with parking and  
38 sanitation at the top of the canyon.

39  
40 Commissioner Bradley arrived at 3:20 p.m.

1 **C. Appointment of Commissioner Representing Cottonwood Heights:**

2 Commissioner McCandless moved to appoint Cottonwood Heights Mayor Michael J.  
3 Peterson to the Central Wasatch Commission. Commissioner Beerman seconded the  
4 motion.

5 **RESULT: APPROVED**

6 **AYES:** Commissioners Beerman, Biskupski, Bradley, McCandless and Peterson

7 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras and McAdams

8 Commissioner Peterson stated he served two terms on the Cottonwood Heights City  
9 Council before becoming Mayor. He indicated he worked for 35 years as a Parks and  
10 Recreation practitioner, and stated he was qualified and excited to serve on this  
11 commission.

12  
13 **D. Recognition of Past Members:**

14 Acting Chair Biskupski expressed appreciation to outgoing Commissioners Dolan and  
15 Cullimore. Commissioner Peterson requested the resolution be read at the respective  
16 city council meetings of Former Sandy Mayor Tom Dolan and Former Cottonwood  
17 Heights Mayor Kelvin Cullimore. Acting Chair Biskupski read the resolution into the  
18 record. Commissioner Beerman stated he worked with these men for the past five  
19 years and had witnessed their vision, hard work and ability to build consensus, which  
20 got this group to where it was today.

21  
22 Commissioner Beerman moved to approve Resolution 2018-01, a resolution expressing  
23 gratitude to Former Mayors Dolan and Cullimore for their work and service to the  
24 Central Wasatch Commission. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion.

25 **RESULT: APPROVED**

26 **AYES:** Commissioners Beerman, Biskupski, Bradley, McCandless and Peterson

27 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras and McAdams

28  
29 **E. Election of Chair:**

30 Acting Chair Biskupski nominated Chris McCandless as chair. Commissioner  
31 McCandless accepted the nomination. Commissioner Peterson seconded the  
32 nomination.

33 **RESULT: APPROVED**

34 **AYES:** Commissioners Beerman, Biskupski, Bradley, McCandless and Peterson

35 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras and McAdams

36  
37 Commissioner Bradley expressed his support of Chair McCandless.

1 **F. Consideration of Resolution 2018-02, Amending the 2017-2018 Tentative**  
2 **Budget, Rescheduling the Time and Place of a Public Hearing on the Tentative**  
3 **Budget and Providing for Public Notice of Such Meeting:**

4 Laura Briefer stated the budget had not changed since the December 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, the  
5 revenues and expenses being the same, but the format was changed to meet  
6 standardized accounting principles. The tentative budget would be discussed and a  
7 public hearing would be held on February 28, 2018, at 9:00 a.m.

8  
9 Vice Chair Biskupski moved to approve Resolution 2018-02, amending the 2017-2018  
10 Tentative Budget, rescheduling the time and place of a public hearing on the Tentative  
11 Budget and providing for public notice of such meeting. Commissioner Bradley  
12 seconded the motion.

13 **RESULT: APPROVED**

14 **AYES:** Commissioners Beerman, Biskupski, Bradley, McCandless and Peterson

15 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras and McAdams

16  
17 **G. Discussion of Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws:**

18 Laura Briefer stated the amendment would change the annual meeting date from  
19 January to the first scheduled meeting on or after July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year in order to align  
20 with the fiscal year. It would also align with the founding meeting of this Commission.

21  
22 Commissioner Peterson moved to approve the bylaws amendment of changing the  
23 annual meeting date from the First of January to on or after July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. Vice  
24 Chair Biskupski seconded the motion.

25 **RESULT: APPROVED**

26 **AYES:** Commissioners Beerman, Biskupski, Bradley, McCandless and Peterson

27 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras and McAdams

28  
29 **H. Discussion of Criteria for Additional Members:**

30 Laura Briefer stated it was proposed at the December meeting to develop criteria for  
31 additional members. The Interlocal Agreement allowed additional members, but didn't  
32 specify criteria. The packet included proposed criteria, including being a government  
33 entity from Salt Lake or Summit Counties, having a common border with the CWC  
34 boundary, or having jurisdiction within the CWC boundary area, and contributing funds  
35 to the CWC. Limitations on the Commission were that the number of members should  
36 not exceed nine persons and an entity should have no more than one individual  
37 representing it on the Board, except for Salt Lake County, which was allowed two seats

1 per the Interlocal Agreement. Briefer stated the Town of Alta and Summit County had  
2 both expressed a desire to be on the Board.

3  
4 Commissioner Beerman stated both entities that were interested in being on the board  
5 met the proposed criteria and contributed financially. Commissioner Bradley agreed  
6 both entities would fit into the Board. Commissioner Peterson stated he would have  
7 further questions when he saw the applications. He favored an odd number, like nine,  
8 so there wouldn't be a tie vote. He indicated that UDOT was already a member, and  
9 wondered how it would fit the proposed criteria. Briefer stated UDOT was a  
10 governmental entity and had jurisdiction in the area. Vice Chair Biskupski stated the  
11 criteria and applicants could be voted on at the same meeting. Chair McCandless stated  
12 after the Commission voted on the applicants, then each entity would have to ratify the  
13 decision to accept them into the Commission. Commissioner Beerman clarified that  
14 only the four partners would have to ratify the new members; therefore UDOT and Park  
15 City would not need to ratify them.

16  
17 Briefer stated staff would reach out to the entities requesting membership and have  
18 them apply, and then staff would determine how the entities met the requirements.

19  
20 **I. Staffing Discussion:**

21 Laura Briefer stated a job announcement for CWC Executive Director was placed with  
22 many entities on January 22<sup>nd</sup> and there were many applicants. She asked how the  
23 Commissioners would like to participate in the screening and interview process. Vice  
24 Chair Biskupski requested to see all applications. Chair McCandless stated he would  
25 like the applicants screened. Commissioner Peterson asked to be involved in the final  
26 five to seven applicants. Chair McCandless indicated the applications of those that  
27 passed the screening would be distributed to the Board members. Briefer hoped to have  
28 the position filled at the April meeting. Commissioner Beerman indicated he would like  
29 to see all applicants that met the minimum qualifications, and noted a couple of special  
30 meetings should be scheduled for March for interviews and selection.

31  
32 Briefer reviewed the need for legal counsel, accounting and financial services, and  
33 intergovernmental services. She received letters of interest from law firms and  
34 recommended Shane Topham from Jones Waldo Law Firm to fill the position of legal  
35 counsel. She received various resumes for accounting services and recommended  
36 David Sanderson. She also recommended Bill Simmons to fill the position of lobbyist/  
37 intergovernmental services and noted he was the primary lobbyist for Mountain Accord  
38 in Washington.

1 Chair McCandless stated Topham would be a great attorney. David Sanderson stated  
2 he worked in government for over 30 years. At this time he serviced 10 entities.

3  
4 Vice Chair Biskupski asked if there were questions about the contract for lobbyist.  
5 Briefer stated staff would prepare a contract for the lobbyist. Commissioner Beerman  
6 asked if the fee was the same as it was for Mountain Accord. Chair McCandless asked  
7 to discuss the job description for the lobbyist. Commissioner Bradley asked if a motion  
8 should be made that would allow a lobbyist to address HB 135 and HB 136. Chair  
9 McCandless felt the service was not necessary for this year. Vice Chair Biskupski stated  
10 Salt Lake City was already opposing the bill. Chair McCandless requested that the  
11 lobbyist position be discussed further at the next meeting. The Commissioners agreed  
12 to the request. Commissioner Beerman stated the cities were working in concert with  
13 CWC interests at the Legislature.

14  
15 Vice Chair Biskupski moved to approve the staff appointments of Shane Topham for  
16 legal counsel and David Sanderson for accounting services. Commissioner Peterson  
17 seconded the motion.

18 **RESULT: APPROVED**

19 **AYES:** Commissioners Beerman, Biskupski, Bradley, McCandless and Peterson

20 **EXCUSED:** Commissioners Braceras and McAdams

21  
22 **J. Discussion of Stakeholder Council Application:**

23 Kimi Barnett presented an updated application form that would assist CWC in the  
24 selection process. She reviewed the questions as well as the score sheet and  
25 recommended the applications be sent to the future executive director, who would  
26 oversee the council. Barnett indicated that the stakeholder council would consist of 28-  
27 35 individuals per the Interlocal Agreement. Commissioner Beerman asked if the Board  
28 would serve on the group. Barnett stated the executive director would manage the  
29 group, and on occasion commissioners could attend the meetings.

30  
31 **K. Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Update:**

32 Laynee Jones reviewed the purpose of CWC and indicated the cars that visited Big and  
33 Little Cottonwood Canyons for recreation were impacting the canyons. Two million cars  
34 visited during the summer and 1.7 million cars visited during the winter. Buses carried  
35 1,500-2,000 riders on peak days. Back country trailheads were full so cars were parked  
36 illegally. As the project moved forward, she wanted to also address parking and toilets.

37  
38 Jones proposed reducing cars by increasing the bus system, ridership and carpooling.  
39 Many asked if cars could be banned and a shuttle service used. The shuttle cost was

1 estimated at \$30 million. The cost for increasing bus service by 20% would be \$20  
2 million in new buses plus operating costs. She recommended a bus lane for buses that  
3 would come every three to five minutes. She also recommended a plan for resident  
4 access at the base of the canyons, as well as bus stops with amenities such as  
5 restrooms, crosswalks, and wheelchair accessibility.

6  
7 Commissioner Beerman asked if the three to five minute bus headways would happen  
8 only during peak hours or if the schedule would be fixed all day. Jones indicated the  
9 increased service would be during a three hour period in the winter. Commissioner  
10 Beerman noted the cost estimates, but didn't see estimates for offsets like tolling. Jones  
11 thought UDOT might implement a tolling system that would vary based on demand.  
12 Chair McCandless asked if Jones had looked at HB 136. Jones commented that she  
13 read it and participated in conversations when the bill was drafted. She stated there was  
14 not enough transit service at this time in the valley so the request for more transit in the  
15 canyons might not get funding. Chair McCandless stated he talked with Carlos Braceras  
16 from UDOT and it could be up to two years before the transit was figured out, and asked  
17 if there were any short term remedies. Jones stated there should be 15 minute  
18 headways in both canyons going all day to solve the problem without the need for  
19 additional buses, but she didn't know if there was operating funding for that. Also, there  
20 was a concern about putting people up there without toilets, crosswalks and wheelchair  
21 accessibility.

22  
23 John Thomas, UDOT Project Manager for Little Cottonwood Canyon IS, stated he was  
24 working on solving the transportation issues. A notice of intent would be filed in March.  
25 Then UDOT would develop a purpose of meeting. In April, they would work on  
26 alternatives and collect field data. In October, recommendations would be given. Vice  
27 Chair Biskupski asked if the crosswalks would be part of the project. Thomas stated  
28 everything would be analyzed and discussed thoroughly. Vice Chair Biskupski asked  
29 who was maintaining restrooms in the canyons. Briefer stated many were owned and  
30 operated by the Forest Service, who had a maintenance agreement with Salt Lake City.

31  
32 Commissioner Peterson asked about the funding for this project. Thomas stated the  
33 Little Cottonwood Canyon project received \$65 million. Chair McCandless asked what  
34 the estimated budget would be. Thomas stated \$65 million could make a lot of progress  
35 in this canyon.

36  
37 **L. Other Business**

38 With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

39  
40 \_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle Kellogg, Park City Recorder

**2017-2018 FISCAL YEAR  
BUDGET**

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION  
MOTION SHEET**

**DATE:** February 28, 2018

**RE:** Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2018-03.

---

**Motion 1**

I move that the commission adopt resolution No. Resolution 2018-03, adopting the budget for the 2017-2018 fiscal year.

**Motion 2**

I move that the Commission (provide alternative).

# CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION

## RESOLUTION No. 2018-03

### A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A FINAL BUDGET FOR THE PERIOD OF 1 JULY 2017 THROUGH 30 JUNE 2018

**WHEREAS**, Part 5 of Chapter 13 of Title 11, UTAH CODE ANNOTATED, entitled “Fiscal Procedures for Interlocal Entities” (the “*Act*”), provides, among other things, that (a) the budget officer of an interlocal entity shall prepare and file with the entity’s governing body a tentative budget for the upcoming fiscal year; (b) the entity’s governing body shall review, consider (and amend, as advisable) and adopt such tentative budget; (c) such tentative budget shall be available for public inspection before adoption of a final budget; (d) the entity’s governing body shall hold a public hearing concerning the tentative budget following at least seven days’ prior notice in a newspaper of general circulation; and (e) following such public hearing, the entity’s governing body may adopt a final budget as provided in the Act; and

**WHEREAS**, at a meeting of the governing body (the “*Board*”) of the Central Wasatch Commission (the “*CWC*”) on 18 December 2017, Jim Bradley, the CWC’s budget officer, filed with the Board a tentative budget (as amended, the “*Tentative Budget*”) for the CWC for the period of 1 July 2017 through 30 June 2018 as required by the Act; and

**WHEREAS**, as part of its 18 December 2017 regular meeting, the Board reviewed and considered the Tentative Budget; tentatively adopted the Tentative Budget; scheduled a public hearing concerning the Tentative Budget; ordered that a copy of the Tentative Budget be available for public inspection pending such public hearing; and ordered that all required public notice of such public hearing be given; and

**WHEREAS**, at part of its 5 February 2018 regular meeting, the Board reviewed and considered a proposed amended Tentative Budget and adopted its Resolution 2018-02 amending the Tentative Budget, rescheduling the time and place of a public hearing on the Tentative Budget, ordering that a copy of the amended Tentative Budget be available for public inspection pending such public hearing, and providing for public notice of such hearing; and

**WHEREAS**, a copy of the original Tentative Budget was available for public inspection in the office of the CWC’s budget officer from 18 December 2017 until 5 February 2018, and a copy of the amended Tentative Budget has been available for public inspection in the office of the CWC’s budget officer since 5 February 2018; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board set 9:00 a.m. on 28 February 2018 in the city council chambers at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah as the time and place of a public hearing regarding adoption of the final budget (the “*Budget*”) for the CWC’s current fiscal year, subject to subsequent amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, notice of the public hearing concerning the Budget was timely published in the *Deseret News* and *Salt Lake Tribune*, and on the Utah Public Notices Website established under UTAH CODE ANN. §63F-1-701, as required by statute; and

**WHEREAS**, the public hearing was held at that location beginning at approximately 9:00 a.m. on 28 February 2018 in order to receive public comment on the Budget as set forth in the published notice; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing, all interested persons were given an opportunity to be heard concerning such proposed final Budget, a copy of which is annexed hereto; and

**WHEREAS**, on 28 February 2018, following the public hearing, the Board met in regular session to consider, among other things, approving the Budget as proposed; and

**WHEREAS**, after careful consideration, the Board finds that it has satisfied all legal requirements to adopt the Budget, and that it is in the best interests of the CWC, its members and its constituents to adopt the Budget as proposed;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Commissioners of the Central Wasatch Commission as follows:

Section 1. **Adoption of Budget.**

A. The Budget be, and hereby is, adopted as the CWC's final budget for the period of 1 July 2017 through 30 June 2018, subject to amendment.

B. Copies of the final Budget adopted hereby shall be certified and filed with the CWC's members and the Utah State Auditor within 30 days after adoption, and shall be available for public inspection during regular business hours at the offices of the CWC's secretary (Ben McAdams, 2001 South State Street, N2-100, Salt Lake City, UT 84114).

C. The CWC's officers are hereby directed to take any other necessary actions pertinent to the adoption of the Budget, including, without limitation, such notification, reporting and publishing as may be required by applicable law.

Section 2. **Action of Officers.** All actions of the officers, agents and employees of the CWC that are in conformity with the purpose and intent of this Resolution, whether taken before or after the adoption hereof, are hereby ratified, confirmed and approved.

Section 3. **Severability.** All parts of this Resolution are severable, and if any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Resolution shall, for any reason, be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of any such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect the remaining sections, paragraphs, clauses or provisions of this Resolution.

Section 4. **Repealer.** All resolutions of the CWC or parts thereof in conflict with this Resolution are, to the extent of such conflict, hereby repealed.

Section 5. **Effective Date.** This Resolution, assigned no. 2018-03, shall take immediate effect as soon as it shall be published or posted as required by law and deposited and recorded in the office of the CWC's secretary, or such later date as may be required by Utah statute.

**PASSED AND APPROVED** this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
**Chris McCandless**, Chair of the Board

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ben McAdams**, Secretary

**VOTING OF THE BOARD:**

Andy Beerman	Yea	___	Nay	___
Jackie Biskupski	Yea	___	Nay	___
Carlos Braceras	Yea	___	Nay	___
Jim Bradley	Yea	___	Nay	___
Michael J. Peterson	Yea	___	Nay	___
Ben McAdams	Yea	___	Nay	___
Chris McCandless	Yea	___	Nay	___

**DEPOSITED** in the office of the Secretary this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

**FILED AND RECORDED** this \_\_\_ day of February 2018.

# CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSON

<b>Central Wasatch Commission FY 2017/2018 Budget</b>			
---	--	--	--

Revenues	Actual FY 2016	Budget FY 2017	Budget FY 2018
<b>Intergovernmental Revenue</b>			
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Miscellaneous	-	-	-
<b>Total Intergovernmental</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Charges For Service</b>			
Memberships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,850,000
Miscellaneous	-	-	-
<b>Total Charges for Service</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,850,000</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Revenue</b>			
Interest earnings	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000
Miscellaneous	-	-	-
<b>Total Miscellaneous Revenues</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,000</b>
<b>Contributions &amp; transfers</b>			
Contributions	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Appropriate fund balance	-	-	-
<b>Total Contributions &amp; Transfers</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Total Enterprise Fund Revenues</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,860,000</b>

<b>Central Wasatch Commission FY 2017/2018 Budget</b>			
---	--	--	--

Expenditures	Actual FY 2016	Budget FY 2017	Budget FY 2018
Administration	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 864,822
<b>Total Enterprise Fund Expenses</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 864,822</b>
<b>Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 995,178</b>

Assumptions: Expenses start accruing as of February 2018

**Central Wasatch Commission**  
**FY 2017/2018 Budget**

Detail of Expenditures	Actual FY 2016	Budget FY 2017	Budget FY 2018
<b>Personnel</b>			
Salaries	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75,000
Benefits	-	-	33,750
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 108,750</b>
<b>Operating &amp; maintenance</b>			
Postage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150
Public notices	-	-	750
Printing	-	-	750
<b>Total Operating &amp; maintenance</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,650</b>
<b>Charges for Service</b>			
Rent	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,720
Utilities	-	-	1,800
Cell phone	-	-	450
Computer/software	-	-	3,000
Office supplies	-	-	2,000
Mileage	-	-	1,125
Events, workshops, memberships	-	-	1,125
Legal support	-	-	15,000
Insurance	-	-	5,500
Financial support	-	-	10,000
Outreach/website	-	-	12,000
Consulting fees	-	-	21,702
<b>Total Charges for Service</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 98,422</b>
<b>Projects</b>			
Technical consulting expenses	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000
Grant disbursements	-	-	300,000
Federal legislation	-	-	96,000
Environmental dashboard	-	-	60,000
<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 656,000</b>
<b>Total Enterprise Fund Expenses</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 864,822</b>

**POLICY FOR  
ADDITIONAL  
MEMBERS**

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION  
MOTION SHEET**

**DATE:** February 28, 2018

**RE:** Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2018-04a, or in the alternative, Resolution No. 2018-04b.

---

**Motion 1**

I move that the commission adopt Resolution No. 2018-04a, adopting a policy for criteria and process for adding additional members to the CWC under Article V of the Central Wasatch Commission interlocal agreement.

**Motion 2**

I move that the commission adopt Resolution No. 2018-04b, adopting a policy for criteria and process for adding additional members to the CWC under Article V of the Central Wasatch Commission interlocal agreement.

**Motion 3**

I move that the Commission (provide alternative).

# JONES WALDO HOLBROOK & McDONOUGH

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
170 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1500  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84101  
TELEPHONE 801-521-3200  
FAX 801-328-0537  
www.joneswaldo.com

## MEMORANDUM

---

To: Central Wasatch Commission Board of Commissioners

From: Wm. Shane Topham, CWC Attorney

Date: February 23, 2018

Subject: ***Criteria and Process for Adding Additional Members***

---

The “Central Wasatch Commission Interlocal Agreement” (the “*ILA*”), which is the base governing document of the Central Wasatch Commission (the “*CWC*”), provides that the CWC has four founding members (Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Sandy and Cottonwood Heights), but that additional members (“*Additional Members*”) may be added following (a) the affirmative vote of a majority of all of the commissioners (“*Commissioners*”) then serving on the CWC’s board of Commissioners (the “*Board*”); (b) approval by the legislative body of all of the then members (“*Members*”) of the CWC; (c) approval of the ILA by resolution of the governing body of the proposed new Additional Member (the “*new Additional Member*”); and (d) the new Additional Member’s entry into the ILA.

Under the ILA, each Member is entitled to appoint a Commissioner to the Board. The ILA also provides that additional Commissioners may be appointed who do not represent a specific Member. Concerning these so-called “Appointed Commissioners,” the ILA provides that (a) the Members “*shall appoint a Commissioner to represent the interests of the portion of the Project Area located to the East of the Wasatch Range (i.e., the so-called “Wasatch Back”). Park City and Summit County may jointly nominate an elected or appointed public official for appointment to the Board for this Appointed Commissioner*”; and that (b) the Members also “*shall appoint a Commissioner to represent the interests of the Utah Department of Transportation*.” Appointed Commissioners are appointed to the Board in the same way that an Additional Member is added to the CWC. In fulfillment of that provision of the ILA, Commissioner Beerman (the mayor of Park City) has been qualified as an Appointed Commissioner to represent the “Wasatch Back,” and Commissioner Braceras (UDOT’s director) has been qualified as an Appointed Commissioner to represent the interests of UDOT.

Following formation of the CWC, several governmental entities have expressed interest in joining the CWC as Additional Members. Summit County and Town of Alta both have submitted applications for membership, and the cities of Park City, Holladay and Millcreek also apparently have expressed such interest. Consequently, at its 5 February 2018 regular meeting, the Board discussed adopting criteria and a process for adding Additional Members to the CWC.

The surest way of enacting criteria for adding Additional Members would be to amend the ILA. If amending the ILA isn't feasible or desired for this issue, then the next best approach would be to adopt such criteria by Board resolution, based on Article VI of the ILA which empowers the Commission to adopt, amend and repeal bylaws, resolutions, rules and regulations with respect to its powers and functions not inconsistent with the Interlocal Cooperation Act (UTAH CODE ANN. 11-13-101 et seq.) or the ILA.

On the assumption that amending the ILA for the purpose of adopting criteria for adding Additional Members isn't desired, a resolution adopting such criteria and process has been prepared. Preparation of this draft resolution has, however, raised the issue of what impact, if any, does the fact that an Appointed Commissioner already represents the interests of the "Wasatch Back" have on any future proposal to add Summit County, Park City, and/or any other governmental entity in that geographic region as an Additional Member of the CWC? Related questions are:

a. Should the admission of a "Wasatch Back" Additional Member be viewed as fulfilling the ILA's mandate for a Commissioner to represent the interests of the "Wasatch Back"?

b. If so, what is the status of the current "Wasatch Back" Appointed Commissioner if the new Additional Member from the "Wasatch Back" appoints another Commissioner to represent its interests on the CWC?

c. If not, does the existence of an Appointed Commissioner for the "Wasatch Back" in any way limit how many Additional Members may be admitted from the "Wasatch Back"?

The first attached version of this proposed resolution (called Resolution 2018-04-A) contains verbiage (the "*Optional Provision*") in section 1(d) concerning the "Wasatch Back" representation issue, and provides that if either Summit County or Park City becomes an Additional Member of the CWC, then the ILA's provision concerning a "Wasatch Back" Additional Commissioner will be deemed fulfilled and the "Wasatch Back" Appointed Commissioner's tenure on the Board will be deemed terminated.

The second attached version of this proposed resolution (called Resolution 2018-04-B) does not contain the Optional Provision and in fact specifically allows joint representation of the interests of the "Wasatch Back" by allowing the Appointed Commissioner to continue on the Board notwithstanding the admission of, for example, Summit County and/or Park City as Additional Members. Resolution 2018-04-B is an alternative to Resolution 2018-04-A.

Either, but not both, of the attached resolutions may be enacted by the Board.

# CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION

## RESOLUTION NO. 2018-04-A

### A RESOLUTION SPECIFYING CRITERIA AND A PROCESS FOR ADDING ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO THE COMMISSION

**WHEREAS**, Article V of the “Central Wasatch Commission Interlocal Agreement” (the “*ILA*”) provides that additional members (“*Additional Members*”) may be added to the Central Wasatch Commission (the “*Commission*”) following (a) the affirmative vote of a majority of all of the commissioners (“*Commissioners*”) then serving on the Commission’s board (the “*Board*”) of Commissioners; (b) approval by the legislative body of all of the then members (“*Members*”) of the Commission; (c) approval of the *ILA* by resolution of the governing body of the proposed new Additional Member (the “*new Additional Member*”); and (d) the new Additional Member’s entry into the *ILA*; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Article VI of the *ILA*, the Commission is empowered to adopt, amend and repeal bylaws, resolutions, rules and regulations with respect to its powers and functions not inconsistent with the Interlocal Cooperation Act (UTAH CODE ANN. 11-13-101 et seq.) or the *ILA*; and

**WHEREAS**, at its 5 February 2018 meeting, the Board considered adopting criteria and a process for adding Additional Members to the Commission; and

**WHEREAS**, after careful consideration, the Board finds that it is in the best interests of the Commission, its members and its constituents to so act;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Commissioners of the Central Wasatch Commission that the Commission hereby adopts the following criteria and process for adding Additional Members to the Commission:

1. **Minimum Criteria.** The minimum criteria for adding Additional Members to the Commission are as follows:

(a) The total number of all Members (including both original Members and Additional Members) shall not exceed nine (9). The total number of all Commissioners (including both Member Commissioners and Appointed Commissioners) also shall not exceed nine (9); and

(b) Each Additional Member must be a governmental entity located in Salt Lake County or Summit County; and

(c) Each Additional Member must have a common border with the boundary of the Commission specified in the *ILA* or have legal jurisdiction within such boundary of the Commission; and

(d) Except for Salt Lake County, which the *ILA* permits to have two Commissioners, no Member shall have more than one individual representing it on the Board. Without limiting the foregoing, although the *ILA* provides that an Appointed Commissioner jointly

appointed by Park City and Summit County will represent the interests of the so-called “Wasatch Back,” if either Park City or Summit County subsequently becomes an Additional Member of the Commission, then representation of the interests of the “Wasatch Back” shall be deemed fulfilled through admission of either Park City or Summit County, as applicable, as an Additional Member of the Commission with the right to appoint one of its own elected officials as a Commissioner representing such Additional Member, and the status as a Commissioner of the individual formerly representing the joint interests of Park City and Summit County shall be deemed automatically terminated.

2. **Process.** The process for adding Additional Members to the Commission is as follows:

(a) Upon receipt of a written application from the governing body of a proposed new Additional Member which complies with the minimum criteria specified in section 1 above (the “*Minimum Criteria*”), the Board may consider such application in public meetings occurring over such timeframe as the Board, in its sole discretion, may deem reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

(b) The Board’s consideration of the application of such proposed new Additional Member shall be based on the the Minimum Criteria and such additional criteria as the Board, in its sole discretion, may deem reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

(c) Following such consideration, the Board shall vote whether to offer Commission membership to the proposed new Additional Member. If a majority of the Board does not affirmatively vote to offer Commission membership to the proposed new Additional Member, then the proposed new Additional Member’s application for membership shall be deemed denied and that proposed new Additional Member shall be barred from re-applying for membership for a period of three years after such denial.

(d) If a majority of the Board affirmatively votes to offer Commission membership to the proposed new Additional Member, then the proposed new Additional Member’s application for membership shall be deemed provisionally approved, subject to:

(i) Approval of the proposed new Additional Member by the legislative body of all of the Members; and

(ii) Approval of the ILA by resolution of the governing body of the proposed new Additional Member; and

(iii) The proposed new Additional Member’s entry into the ILA.

This Resolution, assigned no. 2018-04-A, shall take immediate effect as soon as it shall be published or posted as required by law and deposited and recorded in the office of the Commission’s secretary, or such later date as may be required by Utah statute.

**PASSED AND APPROVED** this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
**Chris McCandless**, Chair of the Board

**ATTEST:**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Ben McAdams**, Secretary

**VOTING OF THE BOARD:**

Andy Beerman	Yea ___	Nay ___
Jackie Biskupski	Yea ___	Nay ___
Carlos Braceras	Yea ___	Nay ___
Jim Bradley	Yea ___	Nay ___
Michael J. Peterson	Yea ___	Nay ___
Ben McAdams	Yea ___	Nay ___
Chris McCandless	Yea ___	Nay ___

**DEPOSITED** in the office of the Secretary this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

**FILED AND RECORDED** this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

# CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION

## RESOLUTION NO. 2018-04-B

### A RESOLUTION SPECIFYING CRITERIA AND A PROCESS FOR ADDING ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO THE COMMISSION

**WHEREAS**, Article V of the “Central Wasatch Commission Interlocal Agreement” (the “*ILA*”) provides that additional members (“*Additional Members*”) may be added to the Central Wasatch Commission (the “*Commission*”) following (a) the affirmative vote of a majority of all of the commissioners (“*Commissioners*”) then serving on the Commission’s board (the “*Board*”) of Commissioners; (b) approval by the legislative body of all of the then members (“*Members*”) of the Commission; (c) approval of the ILA by resolution of the governing body of the proposed new Additional Member (the “*new Additional Member*”); and (d) the new Additional Member’s entry into the ILA; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Article VI of the ILA, the Commission is empowered to adopt, amend and repeal bylaws, resolutions, rules and regulations with respect to its powers and functions not inconsistent with the Interlocal Cooperation Act (UTAH CODE ANN. 11-13-101 et seq.) or the ILA; and

**WHEREAS**, at its 5 February 2018 meeting, the Board considered adopting criteria and a process for adding Additional Members to the Commission; and

**WHEREAS**, after careful consideration, the Board finds that it is in the best interests of the Commission, its members and its constituents to so act;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Commissioners of the Central Wasatch Commission that the Commission hereby adopts the following criteria and process for adding Additional Members to the Commission:

1. **Minimum Criteria.** The minimum criteria for adding Additional Members to the Commission are as follows:

(a) The total number of all Members (including both original Members and Additional Members) shall not exceed nine (9). The total number of all Commissioners (including both Member Commissioners and Appointed Commissioners) also shall not exceed nine (9); and

(b) Each Additional Member must be a governmental entity located in Salt Lake County or Summit County; and

(c) Each Additional Member must have a common border with the boundary of the Commission specified in the ILA or have legal jurisdiction within such boundary of the Commission; and

(d) Except for Salt Lake County, which the ILA permits to have two Commissioners, and the Appointed Commissioner representing the “Wasatch Back,” no Member shall have more than one individual representing it on the Board.

2. **Process.** The process for adding Additional Members to the Commission is as follows:

(a) Upon receipt of a written application from the governing body of a proposed new Additional Member which complies with the minimum criteria specified in section 1 above (the "*Minimum Criteria*"), the Board may consider such application in public meetings occurring over such timeframe as the Board, in its sole discretion, may deem reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

(b) The Board's consideration of the application of such proposed new Additional Member shall be based on the the Minimum Criteria and such additional criteria as the Board, in its sole discretion, may deem reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

(c) Following such consideration, the Board shall vote whether to offer Commission membership to the proposed new Additional Member. If a majority of the Board does not affirmatively vote to offer Commission membership to the proposed new Additional Member, then the proposed new Additional Member's application for membership shall be deemed denied and that proposed new Additional Member shall be barred from re-applying for membership for a period of three years after such denial.

(d) If a majority of the Board affirmatively votes to offer Commission membership to the proposed new Additional Member, then the proposed new Additional Member's application for membership shall be deemed provisionally approved, subject to:

(i) Approval of the proposed new Additional Member by the legislative body of all of the Members; and

(ii) Approval of the ILA by resolution of the governing body of the proposed new Additional Member; and

(iii) The proposed new Additional Member's entry into the ILA.

This Resolution, assigned no. 2018-04-B, shall take immediate effect as soon as it shall be published or posted as required by law and deposited and recorded in the office of the Commission's secretary, or such later date as may be required by Utah statute.

**PASSED AND APPROVED** this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
**Chris McCandless**, Chair of the Board

**ATTEST:**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Ben McAdams, Secretary**

**VOTING OF THE BOARD:**

Andy Beerman	Yea ___	Nay ___
Jackie Biskupski	Yea ___	Nay ___
Carlos Braceras	Yea ___	Nay ___
Jim Bradley	Yea ___	Nay ___
Michael J. Peterson	Yea ___	Nay ___
Ben McAdams	Yea ___	Nay ___
Chris McCandless	Yea ___	Nay ___

**DEPOSITED** in the office of the Secretary this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

**FILED AND RECORDED** this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February 2018.

# **LOBBYIST SCOPE OF WORK**

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION**  
**MOTION SHEET**

**DATE:** February 28, 2018

**RE:** Motion to accept staff recommendation to contract with Bill Simmons.

---

**Motion 1**

I move that the Commission accept the staff recommendation to contract with Bill Simmons as a lobbyist for the CWC.

**Motion 2**

I move that the Commission (provide alternative).

## **Federal Government Relations Proposal to Central Wasatch Commission**

Prepared By: Bill Simmons, Managing Principal, Dutko GR

### **Approach**

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to provide you with this proposal for representation of the Central Wasatch Commission in Washington, DC.

Through our collaborative efforts, Congressman Jason Chaffetz, Congresswoman Mia Love and Congressman Chris Stewart introduced H.R. 5718 – The Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act - in July 2016 that created The Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area. The House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Federal Lands held a hearing in November 2016 with the understanding that it would be considered by the 115th Congress.

Since Congressman Jason Chaffetz announced his resignation, we have continued our work moving the legislation forward and have been working with Congresswoman Love, Congressman Curtis, Congressman Stewart and Congressman Bishop and Senators Hatch and Lee to advance the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act.

In order to get the legislation signed into Law, we will need to accomplish many things. I have attempted to the best of my ability lay out the process below.

In addition to meetings and conversations that will need to take place with the Utah Congressional Delegation to keep this legislation moving forward, we will need to work with the House Natural Resources Committee to overcome the concerns that were voiced by the Chairman of the House Federal Lands Subcommittee, Congressman Tom McClintock (R-CA), during the Congressional Hearing on H.R. 5718.

Specifically, we will work with the Subcommittee staff to help resolve the Chairman's concerns. This process of meetings and conversations will provide the necessary exchange of information required to answer all the Chairman's questions and concerns.

Additionally, we will need to work with and secure the full support of the Ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee, Congresswoman Colleen Hanabusa (D-HI). This will entail a significant number of meetings and communications to provide the Congresswoman with the relevant and necessary information to win her support.

The Congressional calendar is already very crowded and once we obtain full support from the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Federal Lands Subcommittee, we will work with Chairman Rob Bishop to place this legislation on the Committee Calendar. It is also imperative that we have the full support from the Ranking Democrat on the Full House Natural Resources Committee, Congressman Raul Grijalva (D-AZ).

Once the legislation has been placed on the Committee Calendar, we will work with any Members of the Full Natural Resources Committee who may have concerns with the legislation. The Subcommittee and Committee staffers will help us identify those Members with concerns, and once identified, we will work with them individually to resolve their concerns.

Once the legislation has passed through the Full House Natural Resources Committee, it will need to be put on the 'Suspension Calendar' for consideration by the Full House. The suspension calendar is used for consideration of 'non-controversial' legislation in the House. We will work Chairman Bishop and House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-CA) to advance this legislation before the Full House for a vote. At the same time, we will need to coordinate with Ranking Democrat Grijalva to assure that Minority Leader Pelosi and Minority Whip Hoyer are also supportive of the legislation.

Once the vote has been scheduled, we will work with any of the 435 Members of the House that may have concerns that could pose a material risk for passage of the legislation. Depending upon the concern, this could entail considerable work to resolve the concerns of any particular Member or Members of Congress. Normally, once a bill has passed through the Natural Resources Committee and has the support of the Chairman and Ranking Democrat, many of the concerns have been resolved and any further concerns by individual Members can be more easily dealt with through a direct meeting with them and providing the necessary background.

As the legislation is making its way through the House, we will continue our work with Senators Hatch and Lee to begin the process of consideration in the Senate. All along the process, we will need to make sure that both Senators and their staffs are involved in the conversations regarding any resulting changes in the legislation and assure that they remain supportive of the bill.

We will need to secure the support of the Chairman and Ranking Democrat on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) and Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA), respectively. They will need to be briefed and fully supportive of the legislation. Just like in the House, this will require meetings and communications to resolve any concerns.

Because of the uniqueness of the Senate rules, passage of legislation in the Senate is more complicated than moving legislation through the House. Senators Hatch and Lee will need to work with the Leadership of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee as well as Senate Leadership to secure consideration of the legislation by the Full Senate. This is a very involved and complicated process that will require considerable work to navigate.

In addition to our work with the House and Senate, we will coordinate very closely with the Administration. The lead agency on the legislation is the Forest Service and we will meet and communicate regularly with key political staff within the Forest Service and Department of Agriculture to gain their support for the legislation.

These necessary efforts will require very close coordination with the Central Wasatch Commission on a near daily basis to assure success.

I have a long history working on natural resources and land management issues in Utah and throughout the Country in front of Congress and the Administration. My experience with Congress and the Administration dates back to 1990.

## **Biography**

### **Bill Simmons, Managing Principal, Dutko Government Relations**

Bill has nearly two decades of lobbying and government relations experience working at Dutko. He brings expertise and specialized knowledge in the development and execution of campaign strategies in the field of government relations.

He draws upon an entrepreneurial background combined with his government service to assist clients in achieving their goals. Bill serves as the firm's Managing Director and in that capacity, manages the day-to-day operations of Dutko Government Relations.

After working in business, he spent nearly a decade working on Capitol Hill. Bill served in a variety of capacities, working with several Members of Congress including as the Staff Director for the House Resources' Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health under Chairman of the Resources Committee, Don Young (R-AK).

Outside of government service, Bill worked on the Economic Staff of the National Association of Realtors; a Marketing Associate for Ivory & Company; and as a stockbroker for a regional investment bank.

Bill is very active outside of work as well, participating as a youth coach for many sports as well as serving in his Church and Community.

Bill holds a B.A. in International Economics from the University of Utah and an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters from Western Governors University (WGU).

## **Terms**

For the comprehensive federal government relations support described above, I propose an annual fee of \$97,000 which will be billed in 12 equal installments of \$8,083.33.

# **NEXT MEETING**

**CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION  
MOTION SHEET**

**DATE:** February 28, 2108

**RE:** Motion to set the next meeting.

---

**Motion 1**

I move that the Commission set the next meeting to April 23, 2018 at Salt Lake County.

**Motion 2**

I move that the Commission (provide alternative).