

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION RETREAT HELD MONDAY,**  
2 **OCTOBER 19-20, 2018 AT 2:00 P.M. TIMPANOGOS ROOM, HOMESTEAD RESORT**  
3 **LOCATED AT 700 NORTH HOMESTEAD DRIVE, MIDWAY, UTAH**  
4

5 **Present:** Commissioner Chris McCandless, Commissioner Mike Peterson,  
6 Commissioner Jim Bradley, Commissioner Jackie Biskupski, Commissioner  
7 Andy Beerman, Commissioner Chris Robinson (arrived late), Commissioner  
8 Jeff Silvestrini, Commissioner Harris Sondak, Commissioner Carlos Braceras  
9

10 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Jesse Dean, Legal Counsel  
11 Shane Topham, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Federal  
12 Lobbyist Bill Simmons (via video chat)  
13

14 **Excused:** Commissioner Ben McAdams  
15

16 **FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2018**  
17

18 CWC Chair Chris McCandless called the meeting to order at 2:13 p.m.  
19

20 **THE FUTURE OF THE CWC**  
21

22 **1. Welcome from Commissioner Chris McCandless (CWC Chair).**  
23

- 24 • **Retreat Goals and Opening Thoughts – Ralph Becker (CWC Executive Director).**  
25

26 CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker, identified the goals of the retreat as follows:  
27

- 28 i. Prepare a strategic plan based on the discussions that take place.  
29
- 30 ii. Identify policy objectives for the next year, specifically the draft legislation and  
31 preparing to bring something forward for Congressional consideration. He pointed  
32 out that the Mountain Accord has two primary points of emphasis. The first dealt with  
33 lands and resource issues. The second involves transportation. The governing board  
34 of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) will discuss both issues and the impact  
35 on the CWC relative to others involved.  
36
- 37 iii. Discuss community engagement and jurisdictional coordination.  
38
- 39 iv. Identifying future strategies and membership needs.  
40
- 41 v. Discuss efficiency in the operation of internal functions. The CWC’s Executive  
42 Committee (the “Executive Committee”) was established to help in this regard.  
43
- 44 vi. Determine how to best strengthen working relationships to ensure effective  
45 communication and expectations between the CWC’s members (the “Members”) and  
46 staff (“Staff”).  
47

1           vii.     Establish a common understanding regarding desired outcomes.

2  
3     **FUTURE FUNDING STRATEGIES**

4  
5     **1.     Membership Contributions List and Dues Update – Commissioner Chris McCandless**  
6     **(CWC Chair).**

7  
8     Chair McCandless reported that one of the major challenges has been funding. CWC Attorney Shane  
9     Topham prepared funding options and in concert with that, an accounts receivable draft was provided  
10    to the Members in advance of the meeting showing how much is owed and what has been paid based  
11    on previous commitments. That will continue until the end of the term. Once the mark is met and  
12    the outstanding revenues paid, that will be the end of the revenue stream unless there is a new plan  
13    for funding. He noted that the funding source was a one-time commitment with payments to be made  
14    over two years.

15  
16    Chair McCandless struggled to understand the UTA in-kind number and where the in-kind portion  
17    came in to play. CWC Deputy Director Jesse Dean commented that the in-kind contribution was in  
18    the form of additional bus service in Little Cottonwood Canyon. That decision was made prior to  
19    Staff joining the CWC. Chair McCandless questioned who received the benefit of that in-kind  
20    contribution. Commissioner Braceras clarified that prior to last year’s ski season, a study was  
21    conducted to look at consolidating bus routes and providing more bus service. The in-kind  
22    contribution provided additional bus service to last year’s season in an effort to increase ridership in  
23    Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.

24  
25    Mr. Dean commented that the City of Millcreek is not listed because a contribution amount had not  
26    been determined. Commissioner Silvestrini explained that they are prepared to make a contribution  
27    but questioned how the amounts were determined. That amount will need to be worked into their  
28    budget.

29  
30    Salt Lake Public Utilities Representative Carly Castle’s recollection was that it was based on what  
31    the various jurisdictions offered to pay, so there was no set calculation. Commissioner Silvestrini  
32    suggested it be based on population and noted that their population is between that of Cottonwood  
33    Heights and Sandy. Commissioner Braceras suggested there be a more defined process.

34  
35    **2.     Long-Term Funding Strategies – Shane Topham (CWC Attorney), Commissioner Chris**  
36    **McCandless (CWC Chair).**

37  
38    Mr. Topham reported that he conducted research and reviewed the Interlocal Cooperation Act in an  
39    effort to determine the legal funding sources for interlocal entities such as the CWC. Unfortunately,  
40    interlocal entities are not allowed to levy property taxes and special service districts can only be  
41    created by a city or a county. He was aware of no way for the CWC, directly or indirectly, to levy  
42    property taxes. The second alternative was fees for services. Under State law, the CWC would be  
43    required to go back to the legislative bodies and get approval to impose a fee or revenue stream. The  
44    third option was to incur debt, such as bonds. The CWC can pursue that alternative, however, there  
45    must be an income stream to pay the bonds. The fourth option involved outside funding from other  
46    governmental entities in the form of Federal and State appropriations, funding from related  
47    governmental entities, donations from member entities, funding from unrelated governmental entities,  
48    or donations from private sources.

1  
2 Mr. Dean addressed the budget and referred to what was passed in the spring. He reported that the  
3 Board will need to determine how to change the budget going forward. Staff can then present a  
4 revised budget at the beginning of the year. Chair McCandless suggested that a sub-committee be  
5 established to study the various revenue options. They can then report back at a future meeting and  
6 make recommendations to the Board. He expected to need a minimum of \$650,000 to \$700,000 per  
7 year. He noted that personnel costs alone are approximately \$450,000 annually. The need for one-  
8 time funding was also acknowledged to pay for various projects.  
9

10 Mr. Becker reported that now that the CWC is established, they are seeing expenses that far exceed  
11 what was anticipated. For example, legal fees are much higher than budgeted but it was recognized  
12 that that is a critical function.  
13

14 Commissioner Silvestrini asked if the proposed numbers can be sustained going forward.  
15 Commissioner Biskupski reported that for Salt Lake City that is a line item that is supported by the  
16 CWC. Commissioner Beerman stated that for Park City they needed to identify what they were trying  
17 to accomplish. He commented that it seemed to make sense to cover ongoing operational costs with  
18 membership dues. It seemed premature to have a budget discussion until a determination is made on  
19 what projects they will focus on and what the emphasis will be. Mr. Dean stated that the budget  
20 discussion was intended to take place later on, however, in terms of reviewing the draft budget, it was  
21 prepared as the CWC was forming. Mr. Becker expected to have a better idea of the parameters by  
22 the end of the retreat but was grateful to have a good foundation to start from.  
23

24 A question was raised about tolling. Commissioner Braceras explained that they have been working  
25 on an environmental document with a Notice of Intent being filed and in the Federal Register to begin  
26 the Environmental Impact Statement looking for transportation options in the Canyon.  
27 Approximately \$65 million was available to make capital improvements in Little Cottonwood  
28 Canyon. They had also been looking at various alternatives including tolling. They keyed into key  
29 projects that will make a significant difference but are not as significant as other options being  
30 considered.  
31

32 Commissioner Braceras explained that if they were to narrow the focus to areas within the  
33 environmental document, the first would be to look at reducing avalanches. The road is shut down  
34 12 to 24 times per year to perform avalanche control with Little Cottonwood Canyon being one of  
35 the riskiest road in the world in order of magnitude for avalanches. Avalanche risk is analyzed by the  
36 amount of snowfall, slopes that can reach the road, and the amount of traffic on the road. A team was  
37 sent to Europe to look at the potential of implementing avalanche sheds. They believe they can reduce  
38 the entire canyon avalanche risk by 55% and dramatically reduce the number of road closures.  
39

40 They would also look at making an improvement at the mouth of the canyon and run an auxiliary lane  
41 from the electric sign at the bottom to the Wasatch resorts to help with the flow of merging traffic.  
42 A ramp metering approach would be implemented at each of the canyon resorts for downhill traffic  
43 and parking lots so that the outload is smoother. They would also look into increasing the amount of  
44 parking at the Bridge Trailhead, Lisa Falls, and White Pine and restrict on-road parking  
45 commensurate with the number of additional stalls provided. New toilet facilities would be provided  
46 and those that exist at the trailheads would be improved. Another project would include a five-lane  
47 cross section that would run from Bengal Boulevard toward the mouth of the canyon.  
48

1 Commissioner Braceras stated that the traffic modeling they have done shows a major difference in  
2 mobility and avalanche safety of the canyon. At a cost of \$1.5 million, they would conduct a planning  
3 study of both Big and Little Cottonwood canyons. The intent would be to look at corridor planning  
4 and issues such as tolling and the long-term vision for operation of the canyons. He proposed that  
5 the CWC take the project on. Commissioner Braceras considered tolling to be the most effective way  
6 to address transportation in the Canyon. He noted that \$1 million was set aside for the design of a  
7 parking structure. Possible locations were identified as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon or  
8 2000 East and 9400 South. Parking structures are needed in addition to a fund source to provide more  
9 robust transit. It was noted that tolling will help fund a transit system.

10  
11 Commissioner Braceras reported that there is technology that can determine vehicle occupancy.  
12 Tolling can also be done using license plates. A policy could be established where more than four  
13 people in a vehicle can travel up the canyon for free. Fewer than that could result in a toll based on  
14 the number of available parking spaces at the top of the canyon or the amount of congestion. The  
15 revenue generated above the cost of operation of the system could go toward paying for transit  
16 solutions. Commissioner Bradley suggested that attention also be given to a public transportation  
17 option.

18  
19 It was noted that tolling would be an ongoing resource. Commissioner Braceras described a tollway  
20 restricted account where the funds raised would be contained within that tolling area and the funds  
21 generated would be used for transportation purposes. He did not envision it coming back as ongoing  
22 funding for CWC operations.

23  
24 Commissioner Silvestrini asked if a portion of the tolling money could be used to fund other CWC  
25 projects. Commissioner Braceras stated that that was a possibility if it was used for projects within  
26 the canyon area. Commissioner Silvestrini was interested in pursuing a pilot shuttle project in  
27 Millcreek Canyon with the idea being to subsidize and put a shuttle program out to bid. He  
28 commented that if the technology were in place, he would support tolling in the canyons.  
29 Commissioner Braceras reported that currently it is being done on I-15 but the technology is not  
30 inexpensive or easy to implement.

31  
32 Chair McCandless asked Commissioner Braceras if he would be willing to include Millcreek in the  
33 study. Commissioner Braceras stated that it would not be feasible because it is not a State road.  
34 Commissioner Bradley pointed out that the fact that it is a County road rather than a State road  
35 provides latitude in other areas. Commissioner Braceras stated that it could be done under one study  
36 if they can show that other funding sources are available.

37  
38 Mr. Becker recommended there be further discussion on how it relates to budgeting such as special  
39 project opportunities. He also suggested they leverage the CWC's ability to work in public and  
40 private arenas to provide seed money or amplify or coordinate resources among other entities.  
41 Commissioner Bradley commented that a great deal of what do is provide benefit to a business in the  
42 resort industry.

43  
44 Commissioner Sondak was confused as to why the resorts do not own a parking lot and run a shuttle  
45 service. Commissioner Braceras explained that they spend a great deal on transit service on an annual  
46 basis. In essence, every employee and passholder receives free transit. It was noted that they are also  
47 paying fees to use federal ground but they do not pay a lot in property tax. Chair McCandless  
48 suggested that Mr. Dean and Ms. Nielsen conduct research and send updated information to the

1 Members. Mr. Braceras stated that in terms of ridership he was aware that the Mountain Accord  
2 process collected a substantial amount of information.

3  
4 Commissioner Sondak commented that it is a capacity constraint on the road and how busses gain  
5 access. Moving from the current percentage to a high percentage would require a bus leave every 30  
6 seconds, which is totally unrealistic. His recollection was that the aspirational level was 20% because  
7 of the number of busses. The congestion problem was the result of throughput.

8  
9 Commissioner Peterson referred to Commissioner Braceras' offer to involve the CWC in the Big and  
10 Little Cottonwood Corridor Plan. Because funding is already committed, he considered it a great  
11 opportunity for the CWC to be directly involved. It was clarified that the CWC would take on the  
12 Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon Corridor Plan to be completed the winter of 2021 with the CWC  
13 managing the \$1.5 million UDOT contribution. A UDOT employee would serve as the team lead to  
14 guide the process. Mr. Becker stated that the transportation focus of the Mountain Accord and the  
15 CWC is an area in which they need to engage. This seemed like a perfect opportunity and forum to  
16 accomplish that in concert with UDOT and the other entities. UTA and the Forest Service would be  
17 heavily involved. The funding could also be expanded to include Millcreek and other areas, which  
18 could potentially result in a more comprehensive and coordinated result.

19  
20 Commissioner Silvestrini thought it would satisfy some of the public angst about transportation.  
21 Commissioner Beerman thanked Commissioner Braceras and remarked that a large part of the  
22 Mountain Accord planning effort and the CWC was intended to deal with transportation issues. It  
23 would have been a very daunting challenge to raise the funding and go through the studies and public  
24 engagement to move it forward. It was also agreed that Little Cottonwood Canyon is the most critical  
25 area. If UDOT can secure the funding, handle the public engagement, and involve the CWC in the  
26 broader planning it will allow them to focus on Big Cottonwood, Millcreek, and environmental issues  
27 in connection with the Wasatch Back. He considered this to be a huge step forward.

28  
29 Commissioner Sondak remarked that in his area they are looking forward to the fourth quarter sales  
30 tax, which they can apply to transportation. While the CWC doesn't collect that tax, the member  
31 communities will. It was recommended that the CWC help determine the scope of the planning study.  
32 Chair McCandless commented on the scope of work and the timeframe. Commissioner Braceras  
33 wanted to make sure it is done properly and move as quickly as practicable.

34  
35 Commissioner Biskupski asked if an MOU would be required. Mr. Topham expected there to  
36 ultimately be some sort of formal document between UDOT and the CWC. Chair McCandless  
37 anticipated a recommendation on the Staff level at the November or December meeting. They would  
38 try to formalize an agreement with UDOT as it relates to this proposal. Commissioner Peterson  
39 volunteered to work with Staff on the document.

40  
41 Chair McCandless next invited discussion on how to determine how much each member should pay  
42 if no other resources are available. He also suggested a committee be formed with participation of  
43 the Members to establish an ongoing budgetary process. His opinion was that having the CWC  
44 maintain those numbers for the ongoing costs would be difficult. The precursor to the CWC structure  
45 was the Jordan River Commission who divided it into two. They minimized the first pot, which was  
46 just enough to pay the bills. Everything else was capital raised through other resources with much of  
47 it being matching funds. Commissioners Silvestrini and Sondak offered to be involved with the

1 committee. Commissioner Peterson clarified that the pledged amounts were to be paid over a two-  
2 year period.

3  
4 Kimi Barnett from Salt Lake County pointed out that Salt Lake County has been contributing for a  
5 number of years and they increased their contribution to \$200,000 per year a few years back. She  
6 welcomed a more definitive formula.

7  
8 Chair McCandless invited input on contribution methodology going forward. He commented that  
9 operational costs are approximately \$500,000 per year in addition to capital projects. Commissioner  
10 Bradley suggested there be a fee schedule based on appropriate methodology that is affordable.  
11 Mr. Dean commented that in terms of their baseline for staffing, currently there are three Staff  
12 members and legal fees for which \$40,000 was budgeted. He stated that that is not at all realistic and  
13 estimated that the actual cost will be \$100,000 to \$120,000 per year. That, coupled with the new  
14 proposal to add a transportation expert will impact the budget. He noted that the legal fees are  
15 currently driven by outside forces.

16  
17 It was estimated that in the last six weeks there have been 4,000 pages of materials submitted as a  
18 result of GRAMA requests. Chair McCandless reported that the previous week he submitted 40 to  
19 45 pages of texts. Commissioner Bradley asked if there will be an ongoing expense for GRAMA  
20 requests. Chair McCandless was unsure but stated that when requests are received, they have  
21 responded and submitted them to legal counsel. Mr. Becker stated that they have been including far  
22 more than is required in terms of the open records and open meetings requirements on the CWC and  
23 Utah Public Notice websites.

24  
25 Chair McCandless reported that a committee is being formed to review and formulate a  
26 recommendation on the budget to address ongoing and capital expenses.

27  
28 The attendees took a short break.

## 29 30 **FEDERAL AND STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

- 31  
32 1. **Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Legislation.**  
33  
34 2. **NCRA Legislation + Outstanding Issues – Ralph Becker (CWC Executive Director).**  
35  
36 • **Federal Legislation Timeline.**  
37

38 Chair McCandless reported on work that has taken place regarding the Central Wasatch National  
39 Conservation and Recreation Area Legislation. Over the past several months the following seven  
40 primary issues have been identified, which need to be resolved prior to submittal:

- 41  
42 1. Bonneville Shoreline Trail wilderness reduction and offset.  
43 2. White Pine mountain biking issue.  
44 3. Assurance of protecting private rights and improvements of South Despain Ditch Company.  
45 4. Removal of silver of land in Little Cottonwood Canyon from Lone Peak Wilderness for  
46 transportation corridor.  
47 5. Cardiff Canyon Property Owners Access.

- 1 6. Millcreek fire prevention.
- 2 7. Alta Ski Lifts-Grizzly Gulch resolution.

3  
4 The intent was to discuss the issues as a Board and give specific direction in order to come up with a  
5 plan and legislation language that will work for as many players as possible.

6  
7 Mr. Becker described the background work that has taken place. He reported that since June, the  
8 Members and Staff have been involved in dozens of meetings to inform and meet with the public. It  
9 has ranged from formal comment at CWC meetings to informal sessions such as meeting with  
10 community councils along the east bench. They have also met with individuals. The goal was to  
11 keep people informed and to get feedback. With the hiring of additional Staff the website was up and  
12 running and has helped disseminate information and communicate the work being done. A three-  
13 page chronology was prepared showing interactions they have had in an effort to address the Alta Ski  
14 Lifts/Grizzly Gulch, issue which has been very challenging.

15  
16 Mr. Becker described the Bonneville Shoreline Trail wilderness reduction and offset and the White  
17 Pine mountain biking issue. The two were discussed together as they are connected together in many  
18 respects. With regard to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail issue, meetings have been held and a corridor  
19 has been identified which is significant in terms of carving areas out of existing wilderness.  
20 Mr. Becker explained the CWC should craft a recommendation to be included in the draft legislation  
21 to be submitted for Congressional consideration.

22  
23 Chair McCandless stated that a map is available on the CWC website showing portions of trail that  
24 have been identified along the Wasatch Front as part of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, which would  
25 decrease the acreage from the existing wilderness areas. The challenge was that bikes are not allowed  
26 in a wilderness area. In response to a question raised, Mr. Becker stated that there will be no net loss,  
27 however, it is a net loss from an existing wilderness area. The intent would be to offset that. Chair  
28 McCandless wanted to resolve issues beforehand.

29  
30 Mr. Becker next described the transportation corridor of Little Cottonwood Canyon and stated that  
31 they included a small sliver of ground along the Little Cottonwood Canyon Corridor to potentially  
32 remove from the wilderness depending on what is needed for transportation solutions in the Canyon.  
33 As the analysis and work have unfolded there was great confidence that they are nowhere near  
34 affecting that wilderness with any of the solutions being considered, which means it is a problem that  
35 no longer needs to be resolved. He explained that there is a 500-foot buffer between the road and the  
36 wilderness boundary. At one point there was debate as to whether the corridor would change. That  
37 issue, however, had resolved itself.

38  
39 Commissioner Braceras noted that the environmental document on which they planned to base the  
40 update of Notice of Intent will not need any of the wilderness area. The corridor planning could be  
41 broad. He expected the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be done by end of 2019.  
42 Mr. Becker commented that he and others have pushed the point about preserving the corridor,  
43 however, those who do not want any reduction of wilderness are asking for a justification. Currently,  
44 they do not have one based on current available information.

45  
46 Mr. Becker reported that the private property owners in Cardiff Canyon have approached the CWC  
47 about a possible resolution to their access issues and whether they can address the issue through the  
48 legislation. A working group led by Commissioner Silvestrini with Commissioner Robinson has

1 scheduled a meeting for November 5 to determine whether there are options to accommodate their  
2 interests without adversely impacting everyone else as it relates to the legislation. After meeting with  
3 Chair McCandless and Staff, they submitted proposals containing possible options. The intent was  
4 to determine whether there was an opportunity for resolution. They have a fairly complicated access  
5 solution that was worked out after years of conflict. They obtained a Special Use Permit from the  
6 Forest Service to gain access to their private property, which consists of an old gated road with no  
7 other vehicular traffic.

8  
9 Chair McCandless stated that another option was to take some of the problems associated with Albion  
10 Basin and use those properties as a mechanism for a land exchange. He explained that up to four can  
11 participate on the sub-committee. He explained that there are existing lots in the Albion Basin that  
12 for many years water and building permits have been sought. The representatives from the Cardiff  
13 Owners' Association have stated that the potential is to trade the bulk of them in concert with the land  
14 exchange for their right-of-way, which would could potentially resolve an age-old Albion Basin  
15 subdivision issue.

16  
17 In response to a question raised, Mr. Becker stated that it is a 14-foot Special Use Permit. It will not  
18 work as a road to serve developed properties, which is what they claim they are interested in. To this  
19 point they have not asked for water. Mr. Dean stated that there are no substantive details on the  
20 specific properties, the acreage, or the details of what they would like to exchange for the road. The  
21 upcoming meeting on November 5 will flesh out some of those details.

22  
23 Commissioner Robinson brought up the issue of private property rights. He stated that the Town of  
24 Alta would be glad to see privately owned undeveloped lots in the Albion Basin. Mr. Becker stated  
25 that with regard to private property rights, in very specific terms in the legislation they have included  
26 every provision possible that all private property rights be recognized and not adversely impacted by  
27 the legislation inside or adjacent to the boundaries of the special designation.

28  
29 Mr. Becker reported that White Pine is a unique situation and, on several occasions, there have been  
30 questions raised about the fact that even though there is a lot of specificity in the provision relative to  
31 the White Pine Special Management Area. The South Despain Ditch Company wants to make sure  
32 that what is written allows them to continue to access the dam they have been using for over a century  
33 and allows them to handle necessary maintenance and improvements over time with the dam. Efforts  
34 had been made to strengthen that in recent drafts. Two meetings have taken place and Mr. Becker  
35 was scheduled to meet with the ditch company's attorney the following week to discuss suggested  
36 changes. The intent was to make sure that their understanding and desired protection for the reservoir  
37 remain if the legislation passes.

38  
39 Commissioner Braceras stated that artillery is discharged in the lower portions of White Pine. He  
40 assumed they would be able to continue to do that. Mr. Becker stated that there are provisions in  
41 other parts of the legislation relating to avalanche control.

42  
43 Mr. Becker reported on Millcreek Canyon fire prevention efforts and stated that the owner of Log  
44 Haven Restaurant has been concerned about fire and protecting their asset. They are also interested  
45 in how the designation will affect fire suppression and preventive measures to be taken to give them  
46 the ability to protect their property in the event of a fire. Mr. Becker had discussions with Ed Marshall  
47 and his wife who own the restaurant who plan to will explore possible options. The Forest Service



1 was included in those discussions. An additional buffer may be required to allow for work to take  
2 place that normally could not be in a wilderness area.

3  
4 Commissioner Robinson found some of the ideas to be worthwhile irrespective of the legislation. He  
5 asked if they were all tied to the legislation. Mr. Becker stated that each of the items requires a  
6 legislative fix.

7  
8 The Board next discussed the Alta Ski Lifts/Grizzly Gulch resolution. He reported on the chronology  
9 of the work performed since June, which could be made available to the Commission. He explained  
10 that there are four options that remain. The basic issue was that through Mountain Accord and the  
11 initial legislation there was an agreement with Alta Ski Lifts to have a land exchange. More recently  
12 this year, Alta Ski Lifts changed its mind and has indicated that they do not want to exchange the  
13 private lands out of Grizzly Gulch. After the CWC was informed of that, a series of meetings,  
14 discussions, and emails took place in an effort to find another alternative as it relates to Grizzly Gulch.  
15 To date, those discussions and efforts have not resulted in a resolution or a proposal that can be agreed  
16 upon by the primary players. The CWC tried to play the role of an independent facilitator but the  
17 efforts had been unsuccessful.

18  
19 The four approaches were identified. The boundaries of options would be to accept the proposed land  
20 exchange and ski area boundary adjustments proposed by Alta Ski Lifts. That was not acceptable  
21 from the start and would involve ski area development in Grizzly Gulch. Another option would be  
22 to exclude the Alta Ski Lifts exchange and hold Alta Ski Lifts harmless with the ability to move  
23 forward at a future date. The rest of the legislation would move forward and be addressed at a future  
24 date.

25  
26 Mr. Becker considered the best map to be the one generated by Save Our Canyons, which was  
27 displayed. Commissioner Robinson asked if they should be concerned about leaving Alta Ski Lifts  
28 with ownership of minerals under lands that Solitude or Snowbird would trade to the Forest Service.  
29 Mr. Becker stated that mineral rights issues were not of concern today or in the foreseeable future. It  
30 is a complicated issue because the Forest Service in their administrative approach to addressing land  
31 exchanges will not accept anything less than full estate. If legislatively Congress were to allow the  
32 acceptance of a split estate, it could work.

33  
34 Commissioner Bradley referred to a letter from the President of Alta Ski Lifts, Mike Maughan, who  
35 stated that the inclusion of Alta Ski Lifts' private lands in Grizzly Gulch has always been on the  
36 condition of transportation such as a tunnel between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Mr. Becker  
37 stated that that was not the bottom line and depends on the timing and nature of the discussion. Since  
38 the Mountain Accord, it has always been important to both Alta Ski Lifts and Snowbird that  
39 transportation issues get resolved. The Mountain Accord was recognition that the two would run on  
40 parallel tracks. Both would be pursued but not tied together as a condition.

41  
42 Commissioner Robinson questioned whether the issue was the connection to Big Cottonwood Canyon  
43 or transportation improvements. Commissioner Sondak explained that the Mountain Accord clause  
44 that Alta Ski Lifts relied on in asserting that they are not renegeing on an agreement states that their  
45 commitment to exchange its private land with the U.S. Forest Service is conditioned upon transit  
46 improvements (including a tunnel or other type of connection between Big and Little Cottonwood  
47 Canyons). He believed that they recognize that their position is different today than it was but they  
48 are relying on that to show that it is not simply bad faith. Alta Ski Lift's position is that they want to

1 own Grizzly Gulch and a connection to Big Cottonwood Canyon to move skiers between the two  
2 points. Commissioner Robinson questioned whether the Town of Alta weighed in on whether those  
3 transportation improvements had to be a tunnel or a connection. The town supported the idea that the  
4 two would go together.

5  
6 Chair McCandless described the process after which Alta Ski Lifts would have the option of accepting  
7 the proposed exchange. Mr. Becker stated that the discussions relative to Alta Ski Lifts in the land  
8 exchanges were as intense at the end of Mountain Accord as they are today. A point that was  
9 important in Alta Ski Lifts' support of Mountain Accord was that there will be a period of several  
10 years before they sign off on a land exchange to determine whether to do the land exchange.

11  
12 Commissioner Braceras reported that he spoke to Mr. Maughan earlier in the day and he did not  
13 support the second proposal and would be adamantly opposed. Commissioner Sondak stated that  
14 they are committed not to developing Grizzly Gulch as lift served terrain today but the Board is  
15 committed to keeping that available should they wish to develop in the future.

16  
17 Chair McCandless pointed out that the challenge is that all four of the options include two very diverse  
18 and opposing perspectives from two very substantive groups. If they exclude Alta Ski Lifts from the  
19 Conservation Recreation Area, he believed that would satisfy the environmental groups. If they  
20 include Alta Ski Lifts based upon what they want, the environmental groups will oppose it and  
21 threaten the legislation under either circumstance. The goal was to come up with a solution and  
22 legislation that ideally will work for both.

23  
24 Commissioner Beerman pointed out that the Town of Alta and Alta Ski Lifts were at different places  
25 during the negotiations. He asked if it would be acceptable to the Town of Alta if an impasse were  
26 reached and the exchanges were not agreed to. Commissioner Sondak reported that the Town of Alta  
27 needs to work cooperatively with their main revenue and job source. The viability of the ski area is  
28 an important factor in the decision made by the Town of Alta. People in the Town of Alta like having  
29 Grizzly Gulch as it is today but they recognize that much of the ground is private property. They  
30 have not had a public process to get input from the residents since the Mountain Accord wrapped up  
31 and there seemed to be confusion about jurisdictions and a lot of public engagement had been  
32 encouraged over decisions that are not the town's, which creates contention. He agreed with Chair  
33 McCandless that if Alta Ski Lifts is left out of the process, they have represented to him that they  
34 have support from the other ski areas not proceed with the legislation.

35  
36 Mr. Becker had not heard that from the other ski areas in private conversations. They each have stated  
37 that they feel strongly about the legislation, which overall will solve a lot of issues. They believe it  
38 is worth proceeding without Alta Ski Lifts if necessary but that is not preferable. Commissioner  
39 Sondak preferred to see Alta Ski Lifts included if they can find a way to make that happen.

40  
41 Commissioner Beerman remarked that one of the challenges over the years in negotiations with Alta  
42 Ski Lifts has been figuring out who the decision makers are and determining whether they all agree.  
43 It seemed that there had been a lot of shifting on positions. He asked if they were talking to all of the  
44 decision makers and getting a consistent message. Chair McCandless and Commission Sondak were  
45 not sure. Commissioner Robinson reported that he spoke to a board member the previous day who  
46 indicated that Mr. Maughan adequately spoke for them. He remarked that if they understand the  
47 motivation behind what they are asking for, they can find other ways to meet it. Currently, he did not  
48 understand their motivation.

1  
2 Commissioner Beerman commented on the ski-in connection to Solitude but questioned whether  
3 Solitude wants that connection. In Park City, they had a near consensus to connect Deer Valley and  
4 Park City and then the ownership changed and now they don't want it. Mr. Becker indicated that in  
5 discussions they have had with Solitude they have never expressed an interest in that connection.  
6 They have also stated clearly that with or without the Alta Ski Lifts land exchange they want to see  
7 the legislation move forward.

8  
9 Commissioner Robinson's understanding was that the connection is important to both sides. He  
10 stated that Alta Ski Lifts has expressed an interest in expanding skier services in Grizzly Gulch.  
11 Mr. Becker stated that they do not currently have the right to make the connection. He and Chair  
12 McCandless proposed a number of options to provide ways for Alta Ski Lifts' interests in Grizzly  
13 Gulch without having ski lift access, however, in the end the concept was not acceptable. Chair  
14 McCandless stated that the concept was to take the existing Special Use Permit, which allows  
15 avalanche control on Patsy Marley with no skiing. The idea was to amend the Special Use Permit to  
16 allow organized skiing on Patsy Marley Ridge and go on the south side from the ridge into the resort  
17 and have it lift served. In the back-country people could leave the area and ski into Grizzly Gulch.  
18 Presently, Grizzly Gulch has snow machine grooming to the top of the ridge that intersects with  
19 Honeycomb Canyon. He noted that it is used for snow cat skiing, which is permitted. This option  
20 would expand the area because they would have the Special Use Permit modification subject to Forest  
21 Service approval. That option was presented to the environmental community who did not like it but  
22 were willing to consider it. That option was not acceptable to Alta Ski Lifts.

23  
24 Commissioner Robinson questioned whether there was enough in the proposal to benefit Alta Ski  
25 Lifts or whether they were willing to accept the status quo. Commissioner Biskupski stated that  
26 Mr. Maughan believes that developing Grizzly Gulch will make them more money than what they  
27 could at the base. Commissioner Sondak remarked that their private land surrounds small islands of  
28 Forest Service land, which is one impediment to developing Grizzly Gulch. The other problem is  
29 that where they would want to have a lift base is on Forest Service property, which is not part of the  
30 Special Use Permit. That parcel, which is not overly large, is a critical point of contention between  
31 the ski area and the environmental community. It seemed to Commissioner Robinson that Alta Ski  
32 Lift's position is jeopardizing the whole endeavor.

33  
34 Mr. Becker stated that in the Mountain Accord and in the legislation, in order to exchange out of  
35 Grizzly Gulch they would have received property within the base area and water plus the potential  
36 for Town of Alta approval for up to 100 units of lodging plus commercial development in the base  
37 area. Financially they were offered a nice carrot but at the end of the day they are withdrawing from  
38 that agreement. They indicated that they are not interested at this time in base area development.  
39 Because they are a ski area, they want to provide for skiing.

40  
41 The first option was to grant Alta Ski Lifts' requested approach leaving all of Grizzly Gulch private,  
42 trade Forest Service lands to Alta Ski Lifts at the mouth of Grizzly Gulch with small inholdings on  
43 the south side of Grizzly Gulch. The ski area boundary would be expanded up the Patsy Marley  
44 Ridge.

45  
46 The second option was to approve an alternative that would hold the status quo for Alta Ski Lifts in  
47 Grizzly Gulch. There would be no trade of Forest Service land in the bottom, mouth, or south side  
48 of Grizzly Gulch. The north side, the Emma Ridge and Superior Peak side, would be exchanged.

1 The issues relating to development in Grizzly Gulch including the private property on the south side  
2 would remain. That option was not acceptable as an option with the primary dispute being over the  
3 strip of land at the mouth of Grizzly Gulch. Alta Ski Lifts believes they can do an exchange or get  
4 permission from the Forest Service to go over that ground but they were adamant that it be included  
5 in a land exchange. The environmental community was opposed to that. Mr. Dean indicated that  
6 Staff would prepare maps that are owned by the CWC to ensure consistency.

7  
8 Mr. Becker stated that under this proposal they would be able to make a ski area boundary proposal,  
9 however, it would be part of a proposal at the time they wish to develop in Alta and cross the Forest  
10 Service property. Commissioner Sondak was informed by Chris Adams that he did not think his  
11 board would agree to that exclusion. Mr. Becker's understanding of the conservation group's position  
12 was that they do not want that to be part of the land exchange if it becomes private land. They would  
13 agree to it if it were to remain Forest Service land and it would be dealt with at the time of a proposal  
14 to develop across that area. Mr. Sondak stated that that was not his understanding.

15  
16 The third alternative would preserve the capacity to pursue future development as it exists today and  
17 if the designation never happens. Commissioner Robinson commented that what was lacking was  
18 verbiage to that effect. They would be left with everything they have today plus the right to petition  
19 the Forest Service to pursue exchanges or Special Use Permits on federal land. If that were added, it  
20 seemed to be a viable alternative. He believed Alta Ski Lifts has a lot to gain from it as proposed,  
21 however, no harm would be done to them by bypassing it. Commissioner Robinson stated that he  
22 would agree to support some iteration of alternative number three with the language suggested. He  
23 considered that to be a sound way forward.

24  
25 Mr. Becker reported that Staff tried to describe it that way on several occasions and thought they were  
26 making process; however, Ski Lifts has always come back with additional features or changes that  
27 made it impossible for other jurisdictions to accept. Commissioner Robinson stated that a new version  
28 of the legislation along the lines of number three with the suggested edits would be a reasonable  
29 approach. Mr. Becker responded that if they were to move forward and attempt a redraft of number  
30 three, they would flesh it out as he described.

31  
32 Chair McCandless stated that the challenge was for the Board to make a decision very soon with  
33 respect to the language for the remaining seven issues. If the CWC drafts the language from the third  
34 option, which he believed should work for both Alta Ski Lifts and the Town of Alta, they make the  
35 decision to approve it public hearings and hopefully all of the legions fall in line with what has been  
36 discussed. He commented that there is a bigger picture than just Alta Ski Lifts. The goal is to clean  
37 up wilderness areas, protect water sheds, and fixing transportation problems. He felt it would be  
38 tragic to lose the bill as a result of one single issue, which is the two-acre parcel on Summer Road  
39 that is owned by the Forest Service and not Alta Ski Lifts.

40  
41 Commissioner Robinson agreed and stated that the burden is on Alta Ski Lifts to determine whether  
42 they are better off with the status quo.

43  
44 Commissioner Beerman commented that this is Alta Ski Lifts' leverage, which works both ways.  
45 Their desire to go across Grizzly Gulch is compromised in a status quo scenario and may not be  
46 workable. He considered it to be a bit of a bluff that will come out when they get to the point of  
47 legislation. He had heard that it is about the environmental community versus Alta Ski Lifts, however,  
48 he would not characterize it that narrowly. What he observed throughout the Mountain Accord

1 process was that the general public largely did not want to see that connection go in here. The majority  
2 of the public wanted transportation solutions, which had very little to do with Grizzly Gulch.

3  
4 Commissioner Biskupski remarked that if it is taken out and there is the risk of Grizzly Gulch being  
5 developed and a lift or a tunnel constructed, she doubted the public would be glad they did not solve  
6 that problem.

7  
8 Commissioner Braceras remarked that a great deal of work has been done and a lot of public  
9 involvement but on separate issues. His intent was to bring back draft language and ask the Board  
10 for approval to present it for public comment. He pointed out that the issue does not involve only  
11 Alta Ski Lifts and the conservation community. There are other constituencies involved and if they  
12 are not on board it will be difficult to garner support from their delegation.

13  
14 Chair McCandless wanted Alta Ski Lifts to be involved but there must be a balance between diversion  
15 groups and varying interests. Mr. Becker kept copious notes from meetings where they discussed a  
16 variety of ideas and options. They cannot, however, make concessions that are in opposition to what  
17 the public wants. The challenge will be to bring the two together. He suggested that the language  
18 drafted in the next week for consideration by the CWC before it goes out for public comment should  
19 include Option Number Three. He also considered Option Number Four to be a viable alternative.

20  
21 It was Commissioner Beerman's understanding that representatives from Alta Ski Lifts have been in  
22 Washington, D.C. trying to proceed with the land exchanges irrespective of this. Option Number  
23 Three would not preclude them from making that attempt. Chair McCandless agreed. He stated that  
24 they could develop based on the Town of Alta's prospective approval of Grizzly Gulch. They do not  
25 need the legislation to make certain improvements there because they own it. The CWC has  
26 maintained that they will protect private property rights. They have ownership and the ability to do  
27 whatever is legally permissible. The next step would be to draft language that provides another  
28 opportunity to satisfy both Alta Ski Lifts and the public interests.

29  
30 Commissioner Biskupski asked about the timing of the legislation. Chair McCandless hoped to get  
31 something to Congress now rather than later since the issues will change over time. In response to a  
32 question raised, Mr. Becker stated that the Stakeholder Council will not meet until sometime next  
33 year. He doubted that anyone being considered for the Stakeholder Council has not been directly  
34 involved in the discussions on the drafts of the legislation.

35  
36 Mr. Dean clarified that another draft will be prepared as well for another round of public comment.  
37 The outstanding seven issues had not yet been addressed in the most recent draft. It was clarified that  
38 the August 2 draft did not include the desired land exchange with Grizzly Gulch. Mr. Becker stated  
39 that the July 13 draft did. The August 2 draft would have removed the Alta Ski Lifts land exchange  
40 from the bill. The next version will more closely reflect today's discussion in a bill without an Alta  
41 Ski Lifts land exchange but they would very explicitly hold Alta Ski Lifts harmless. The new draft  
42 would also eliminate the 100 lodging connections and water since Alta Ski Lifts has indicated that  
43 they do not consider that important.

44  
45 Commissioner Robinson suggested they prepare a draft as soon as possible for review so that when  
46 the timing is right, they will be ready. Commissioner Biskupski commented that Alta Ski Lifts does  
47 want more water for snowmaking. Her concern was that if Alta Ski Lifts is left out, they will kill the  
48 bill. She did not believe their Congressional delegation will put the bill forward and pass it without

1 Alta Ski Lifts' support. Commissioner Robinson agreed but believed that at this stage it is the right  
2 thing to do because it raises the stakes for everyone to come together.

3  
4 Commissioner Bradley was troubled by the fact that Alta Ski Lifts is lobbying for their own interests  
5 with no coordination. That shows that this is a business to them and every decision they make is a  
6 business decision. They clearly are interested in their best financial interest and want to keep all of  
7 their options open. They do not care about the legislation as long as they come out on top in terms of  
8 whatever business plan they are promoting. He was concerned that a lot of time was being spent on  
9 the legislation while there are other important topics to discuss.

10  
11 It seemed to Commissioner Beerman that what was presented earlier by Commissioner Braceras takes  
12 some pressure off of the legislation. For a long time, the realignment and transportation issues in  
13 Little Cottonwood Canyon were delaying everything. He thought they should move forward in a  
14 timely manner but there is not the same urgency. He personally felt they were in a better position  
15 than they have been.

16  
17 Chair McCandless agreed. He commented that transportation is the higher priority but because of the  
18 work that has been done it is not completely separate. He pointed out that the transportation issues  
19 are going to be resolved with or without the legislation.

20  
21 Commissioner Peterson suggested that the Board take a position on the direction they are moving.  
22 Chair McCandless suggested the Board be given two options including revised options showing  
23 Option Numbers Two and Three. They should be articulated to incorporate the ideas discussed so  
24 that they blend together. He suggested they be unanimous as a group, which will make it difficult for  
25 any legislator to stand against them.

26  
27 Commissioner Braceras commented on the process and stated that Congress has three calendar weeks  
28 scheduled. They still have to deal with several appropriation bills and he questioned whether they  
29 will consider this. He believed that taking the time in terms of public involvement is important. They  
30 should also try to get on both the Democrat and Republican House and Senate caucuses during the  
31 next interim committee meeting and perhaps do some briefings. Mr. Becker reported that they met  
32 earlier in the week with the minority caucus. They tried to set up meetings with the majority caucuses  
33 and the mayor as well.

34  
35 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Biskupski, it was clarified that two versions of the  
36 bill will be prepared for Board's consideration only. A work meeting will then be scheduled to discuss  
37 Options Two and Three. Procedural issues were discussed. Mr. Becker stated that drafts would be  
38 available as soon as the end of the following week for review by the Board and for the public prior to  
39 the November 5 meeting in order to begin to get feedback.

40  
41 CWC Federal Lobbyist Bill Simmons commented that it would be very difficult for Alta Ski Lifts to  
42 be held harmless. His opinion was that Alta Ski Lifts is not in as strong of a position to negotiate as  
43 they think they are if everyone else is in agreement. He commented that what transpires in early  
44 November will clarify what will take place the remainder of this year and next year. He believed that  
45 the more work they do this year the better position they will be in next year. He suggested that a  
46 consensus be reached as soon as possible among the Board, which would give them the chance to  
47 move forward. Mr. Simmons stated that these types of bills typically do not move through the House  
48 in an off year but generally in the Senate it takes multiple pieces of legislation grouped together before

1 anything happens. While it would be better to have the cooperation of Alta Ski Lifts, the whole is  
2 much stronger than one player.

3  
4 The CWC's retreat adjourned for the day at approximately 6:00 p.m.

5  
6 **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2018**

7  
8 **BREAKFAST**

9  
10 **1. Welcome and Recap of Day 1 from Commissioner Chris McCandless (CWC Chair).**

11  
12 Mr. Dean gave a recap of the previous evening's meeting. The important components pertained to  
13 two refined options regarding Alta Ski Lifts and Grizzly Gulch. The Board Commission identified  
14 the need for a contribution formula based on a variety of factors including population, capacity, and  
15 other yet to be determined factors. A sub-committee was to be created to address this funding formula  
16 as well as a more detailed budget. Commissioners Silvestrini and Sondak volunteered to serve on the  
17 sub-committee. Mr. Dean acknowledged from the previous meeting that Commissioner Braceras was  
18 able to offer funding on behalf of UDOT. The current funding options included fees for service, the  
19 ability to issue bonds or other debt instruments, and the potential to receive grants/gifts/other types  
20 of funding from various sources. The CWC currently has no ability to levy property taxes.

21  
22 Commissioner Braceras reported that the EIS filing of the Notice of Intent will be refocused on the  
23 possibility of installing avalanche sheds, which were expected to decrease the avalanche risk by up  
24 to 55% as well as a significant number of canyon closures. They will look at the Y at the intersection  
25 of SR-210 and SR-209 and construct an auxiliary lane to the Wasatch Resorts driveway. The intent  
26 was to help with the issue of merging of traffic. They will also look at improvements in the upper  
27 lots at Alta Ski Lifts and Snowbird to help with the download and the Red Snake issue. It was  
28 anticipated that the installation of metering devices will be relatively cost effective. Another project  
29 would also include the widening of Wasatch Boulevard at an estimated cost of \$20 million.  
30 Commissioner Braceras reported that UDOT will provide \$4.5 million in funding. They will in turn  
31 ask that the CWC take on the corridor planning efforts for both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon  
32 and look at long-term transportation needs in the canyons taking tolling, parking garages, increased  
33 transit and transit types into consideration. He agreed to work with Staff to on providing structure in  
34 terms of what corridor planning could look like and provide the engineering expertise.

35  
36 Mr. Becker commented that an issue that has existed since the Mountain Accord was the connection  
37 between the two resorts. He asked if the corridor planning would look at future possible connections.  
38 Commissioner Braceras stated that that was not part of their vision. They struggled with the  
39 connection being between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon or a ski connection and they did not  
40 see that as serving the transportation goal which is their purpose. Mr. Becker stated that the  
41 connection issue would be explored further.

42  
43 Commissioner Biskupski brought up the issue of restrooms and asked Commissioner Braceras if he  
44 was working with another group on that. Commissioner Braceras stated that their EIS group has been  
45 working with all of the stakeholders in cooperation with the Forest Service.

46  
47 Timing issues were discussed. It was confirmed that nothing can proceed until the EIS is completed.  
48 Commissioner Braceras commented on the Corridor Planning Study, which will take longer because

1 it will be broad and long term. There is also an EIS that will be more focused that they will work to  
2 complete as quickly as possible. He anticipated construction will take place in 2021 if they are able  
3 to complete the EIS process.

4  
5 Commissioner Bradley suggested they explore ways to show activity. Commissioner Braceras stated  
6 that they can if there are elements that can be broken out that have no controversy and little or no  
7 impact on the environment. Commissioner Bradley asked if there would be any value to looking at  
8 Millcreek Canyon as a model of what might occur in the larger canyons. Commissioner Silvestrini  
9 stated that in his discussions with the Forest Service there are things they can do on a trial basis;  
10 however, in order to do something permanent they must go through a permitting process that requires  
11 an EIS.

12  
13 Commissioner Braceras reminded the Commission that \$500,000 is earmarked for the design of a  
14 parking structure. He asked if the Commission would be open to considering alternatives with pros  
15 and cons of being the decision body and beginning the design of the parking structure. He suggested  
16 two possible options including one at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon that could serve both  
17 Big and Little Big Cottonwood Canyon or a second larger structure at 2000 East and 9400 South.

18  
19 Commissioner Sondak stated that the Town of Alta and the resorts have been paying for metering.  
20 The UPD and their officers are in Snowbird frequently. The Town of Alta would appreciate a subsidy  
21 and an advancement of that if there are funds available, which would make an immediate difference.  
22 It was reported that last year, Alta Ski Lifts paid about one-third of their costs and Snowbird paid  
23 about 20%.

24  
25 Commissioner Beerman commented that as a group they face a credibility issue. He suggested they  
26 pick a few positive projects and move forward with them. One option was bathrooms even if just  
27 temporary for events. In Park City, they installed restrooms at Bonanza Flat after purchasing the  
28 property and they have been heavily used. He expected that adding bathrooms to the canyons will be  
29 very positive. Trails was another option. For a relatively small amount they can make a huge impact.  
30 Increasing bus service up the canyons also seemed beneficial. Commissioner Beerman mentioned  
31 that there is currently an opportunity to purchase inholdings in the Canyons.

32  
33 Commissioner Peterson commented on the trail issue and reported that the Utah Trails Community  
34 Council recently presented a funding request that will be recommended to the Salt Lake County  
35 Council in the next few months. Because of the most recent Senate Bill, of the \$40 million Salt Lake  
36 County has, 25% will be earmarked for trails. Within the next 60 days applications could be  
37 submitted.

38  
39 Commissioner Bradley agreed that they should move forward quickly but wanted it to be meaningful.  
40 The first project to be announced will be a parking garage. While necessary, the public may not be  
41 amenable to it. It was noted that the CWC is a body that can apply for grants. Mr. Becker commented  
42 that the CWC can pursue various opportunities. A lot of money has been put into improvements  
43 around the water shed. He suggested they combine that effort with UDOT and federal funds to have  
44 a greater impact. He stressed the importance of getting the word out. He also suggested pursuing  
45 private funding.

46  
47 Commissioner Braceras felt there was potential for private funding and suggested they consider  
48 branding. Chair McCandless agreed and thought it was important for the CWC to have their name



1 associated with projects they are involved in. Mr. Becker stated that grant requests would be part of  
2 their budgeting exercise. It was emphasized that Salt Lake County has several million dollars to be  
3 allocated immediately for trails. Commissioner Braceras stated that UDOT can offer resources to  
4 help with the preparation of grant requests. Commissioner Silvestrini also offered Millcreek's  
5 assistance with grant writing.

6  
7 Chair McCandless recommended that between now and the December meeting they should compile  
8 a list of potential projects including trails, bathrooms, trailhead improvements, traffic calming, and  
9 traffic management.

10  
11 Commissioner Biskupski asked for an update on Millcreek fire prevention efforts. Mr. Becker  
12 reported that the matter is primarily being driven by the owners of Log Haven who have invested a  
13 great deal of their own resources in fire suppression and prevention needs around their property. They  
14 have been concerned with the designation and nearby wilderness and the potential for it to inhibit  
15 their ability to protect their property. Staff has been working with them and they will be meeting with  
16 the Forest Service to determine whether to make adjustments to the wilderness boundary and provide  
17 an adequate buffer.

18  
19 Commissioner Bradley questioned whether the primary issue is fire suppression or expansion.  
20 Commissioner Biskupski stated that it is both and reported that in Salt Lake City there have been  
21 three significant fires on the border. Commissioner Bradley offered to be involved in meeting and  
22 coming up with solutions.

23  
24 Mr. Becker next addressed the Alta Ski Lifts/Grizzly Gulch issue and stated that Staff has attempted  
25 to capture the issue in two options. The basic differences between the two alternatives were described.  
26 Commissioner Braceras remarked that it appears that Alta Ski Lifts is losing private property and  
27 getting no benefit from Option Number 1. Mr. Dean explained that Alta Ski Lifts will be excluding  
28 their Grizzly Gulch lands from the exchange as well as the designation. The remainder of their ski  
29 area boundary will be within the NCRA designation. A question was raised as to whether this option  
30 would include the ability for the ski area to gain property on the south side of Highway 210. It  
31 appeared that they were losing private land along Emma Ridge and getting nothing in return.  
32 Mr. Dean clarified that it would remain in the exchange in the current resort boundary and have the  
33 ability to participate in the exchange for the base lands. It would be subject to the process that the  
34 Forest Service would include and be a lesser amount than if they were to include Grizzly Gulch. Each  
35 resort will give up certain lands that are subject to the process of the Forest Service.

36  
37 Mr. Becker explained that the Emma Ridge lands they own will be exchanged for base line property.  
38 They will be exchanging out of the north side of the canyon and get base property. Commissioner  
39 Sondak pointed out that they will be proposing to give up property they own inside of the ski area  
40 boundaries, which will be important to the ski area in terms of increasing the value they are giving up  
41 even if the only area where they are receiving land is at the base. Mr. Becker understood that was  
42 part of their proposal, however, the conservation community views that as a complete non-start.  
43 Commissioner Sondak remarked that the Town of Alta considers that to be an important aspect of the  
44 proposal.

45  
46 Mr. Becker commented that if they were include that in the exchange, the conservation community  
47 would walk away. Commissioner Sondak questioned whether that was true in terms of the Town of  
48 Alta but agreed that it is true with regard to Save Our Canyons. Chair McCandless commented that

1 the properties within Alta's boundary that are privately owned may be owned by the Town of Alta  
2 and may not need to go through the Forest Service process. It diminishes their base holding land  
3 exchange and is supported by the environmental community because they are concerned about having  
4 already impacted properties further impact the base.  
5

6 It seemed to Commissioner Robinson, after having read earlier iterations of the bill, that lands both  
7 offered and selected for federal and non-federal were identified in the bill along with a list of lands  
8 that Alta Ski Lifts is giving up and getting. He suggested they identify what Alta is losing.  
9 Commissioner Sondak explained that the ski area wants to put in additional value in other lands that  
10 have some financial value. This would allow them to get more acreage at the base in exchange. Chair  
11 McCandless pointed out that the equation that the Forest Service uses to evaluate properties for the  
12 exchange is value for value.  
13

14 Commissioner Robinson was of the understanding that it was more explicit in terms of what the  
15 resorts are getting in return. Mr. Becker stated that areas to be exchanged were identified on a map  
16 as well as the areas to be traded for the base area lands. The bill did not specify the acreage or where  
17 within the base area the properties will be located. In the bill under the old version of the land  
18 exchange at Alta Ski Lifts there is a 160-acre area identified. They might end up with a fraction of  
19 that based on the values in the base area.  
20

21 Commissioner Robinson commented on the mechanics of valuating the property and questioned how  
22 an appraiser can determine its value. Commissioner Sondak stated that it is currently zoned for 50  
23 acres for a single-family dwelling. Mr. Becker explained that the Forest Service uses the Uniform  
24 Appraisal Guide, which is very specific. He stated that the ski areas, on the basis of the original  
25 proposals that came out of the Mountain Accord, submitted proposals to the Forest Service who has  
26 been working on the exchange proposals for more than two years. They are now ready to meet with  
27 representatives from the ski areas to discuss their findings. The detailed process was described.  
28

29 Commissioner Biskupski remarked that there is no way to protect those areas from development once  
30 they are inside the ski boundary areas. Mr. Becker commented that the conservation community's  
31 view is that no resort development proposals have ever been turned down by the Forest Service within  
32 ski area boundaries. Commissioner Sondak suspected that the ski area will vigorously fight both  
33 proposals. Each one leaves out things that the Town of Alta finds valuable that he did not consider  
34 particularly harmful to include. He explained that the Town of Alta has a number of privately held  
35 parcels in Albion Basin that create a problem. They are less problematic as long as Salt Lake City  
36 has extraterritorial jurisdiction. Because that can change, they would prefer to have as little private  
37 land in Albion Basin as possible as it is beneficial to the Town of Alta.  
38

39 Chair McCandless suggested that Commissioner Sondak review Options 1 and 2 and make  
40 modifications that might work. With regard to appraised values, the Forest Service will appraise the  
41 property. Commissioner Biskupski remarked that in all of the conversations she has had with her  
42 team, the additional water for Alta Ski Lifts for snowmaking and culinary use always contemplated  
43 Grizzly Gulch in exchange. He noted that exchanging pockets of land inside the boundary and should  
44 result in additional water was not accurate. Commissioner Sondak clarified that he was referring to  
45 whether they could get a base land for it. Commissioner Biskupski stated that even though water is  
46 not mentioned, it is something that will have to evolve.  
47

1 Commissioner Sondak was certain that the ski area is aware that if Grizzly Gulch is not included, the  
2 water for a 100-room hotel will not be on the table. He stressed that the lifeblood of their town is  
3 skiing and if they do not have water for snowmaking there will be no skiing in the foreseeable future,  
4 which puts the Town of Alta in jeopardy. Chair McCandless stated that in their conversations with  
5 Alta Ski Lifts they have made it clear that the water for the hotel at Grizzly Gulch is off the table.

6  
7 The Commission Members were asked to analyze Options 1 and 2 and submit their comments to Staff  
8 with future discussion to take place at a future meeting. It was acknowledged that the primary  
9 stakeholder is Alta Ski Lifts, the Town of Alta, and Salt Lake City because they are the watershed  
10 entity.

11  
12 Commissioner Sondak commented that the language in Option 2 is not accurate in terms of leaving  
13 Alta Ski Lifts harmless in the legislation. He stated that that is not true from the ski area's point of  
14 view. He explained that excluding all of Alta Ski Lifts' private lands from the NCRA does not leave  
15 them harmless because they currently would like their Special Use Permit area to include Forest  
16 Service ground that is not already included in the Special Use Permit since it is property that they do  
17 not own. Including that area in the NCRA would be perceived by the ski area as harmful. Mr. Becker  
18 stated that they will try to draw a boundary within which other elements of the designation would not  
19 apply. He explained that the intent would be to hold Alta Ski Lifts harmless so that if they wish to  
20 make application to expand the ski area boundary in Grizzly Gulch for resort skiing, which they  
21 currently do not have, that opportunity would be available in the future.

22  
23 Mr. Dean explained that the current Forest Service plan does not allow for ski boundary expansion,  
24 which is another component that could be added. Mr. Becker's recollection was that a proposal was  
25 denied by the Forest Service because of the current plan language. If the desire was to maintain the  
26 status quo, that would be an issue for Alta Ski Lifts but it would also be an issue for those on the other  
27 side of the issue. Commissioner Sondak stated that it would have to stay out of the NCRA. They  
28 could apply for a plan amendment as well. He clarified that the specific area is owned by the Forest  
29 Service and is located at the mouth of Grizzly Gulch. It is not part of the privately-owned ground in  
30 Grizzly Gulch. Mr. Dean stated that additional revisions were needed to clarify the intent. He noted  
31 that base lands at Grizzly Gulch are federal lands.

32  
33 Mr. Becker reported that Staff will work toward having a draft of the legislation ready for Board and  
34 public review at the November 5 meeting. Chair McCandless reiterated that the intent is to take  
35 Options 1 and 2 and have Mayor Biskupski and her team, the Town of Alta, and Mr. Dean review  
36 each alternative and make refinements that meet their needs. Once those modifications have been  
37 made, they will be combined and sent to the Commission Members for review. The goal was to  
38 accomplish this prior to the November 5 meeting in order to insert it into a new draft of the federal  
39 legislation.

40  
41 Mr. Becker suggested the possibility of a clarified Option 2. He noted that issues about the exchange  
42 of properties inside the boundary could be further considered over time as legislation is refined.  
43 Mr. Becker indicated that they have not written into any of the legislation the snowmaking water  
44 issue. All of the ski areas are anxious for that to be addressed and formalized in some manner.

45  
46 Commissioner Biskupski explained that they are discussing additional water that is needed for the  
47 resorts in general, however, putting forward additional snowmaking ability for Grizzly Gulch is  
48 different. Mr. Becker stated that water is used for snowmaking and then stored as snow. His

1 recollection was that there is still a net loss because of evaporation. He noted that it is partially  
2 consumptive.

3  
4 Commissioner Beerman commented that Option 1 will be difficult for the public to understand.  
5 Option 2, however, may bring Alta Ski Lifts back to the table. He suggested they look at how they  
6 can best be prompted to return to the negotiations. Chair McCandless stated that that has been done.  
7 Over the past six months there have been countless meetings and they have now come back to the  
8 table. He described the process, which has been challenging. Commissioner Beerman considered  
9 Option 2 to be a better alternative.

10  
11 Chair McCandless suggested that a decision be made in terms of whether to run the legislation. They  
12 want to include Alta Ski Lifts but in the end they may not participate. A letter was received from  
13 Alta Ski Lifts who expressed a desire to be taken out of the legislation. Chair McCandless questioned  
14 whether an agreement can be reached since Alta Ski Lifts' position continues to change and evolve.  
15 His opinion was that there is a bigger issue than Grizzly Gulch.

16  
17 • **Future State and Federal Legislation within CWC Boundaries – Jesse Dean**  
18 **(CWC Deputy Director).**  
19

20 Mr. Dean commented on the road list petition and stated that issues will come before the CWC  
21 without having a process. The Commission should either take a public position or gather background.  
22 As part of the Strategic Plan, the intent was to make it more of an actual system that will include not  
23 only the Stakeholder Council which will recommend positions and bring legislation to Staff but work  
24 it through a system where Staff could ultimately present it to the Commission. The Commission can  
25 then decide whether to take a position on the issues. Staff was currently receiving requests from  
26 various agencies and partners asking them to take positions on issues without there being a process  
27 in place. Commissioner Biskupski asked Mr. Dean to work with her team regularly. Mr. Becker  
28 stated that they have been very involved with all of the jurisdictions and the coordination and  
29 communication have been extraordinary.

30  
31 Commissioner Braceras suggested the CWC be careful in terms of the issues with which they take  
32 positions on. If they are not within the CWC's focus, they may find themselves in a difficult situation.  
33 He also inquired about the makeup of the Stakeholder Council. He noted that the Stakeholder Council  
34 crafting a recommendation makes it difficult for the CWC to take a contrary position. He hoped the  
35 Council will be broadly represented. Mr. Dean stated that a full Stakeholder Council had not yet been  
36 selected. A Steering Committee was established comprised of Staff from several different  
37 jurisdictions who reduced the pool from 100 to 50 or 60 applicants. The CWC is broad in terms of  
38 representation and interest in the Central Wasatch. A specific process had not yet been outlined for  
39 how the Stakeholder Council will ultimately recommend positions. The intent was to start the process  
40 and narrow the scope for the CWC so that they are not put in an awkward position.

41  
42 Mr. Becker explained that they are trying to be very clear in terms of roles and allow for very broad  
43 and diverse representation that is balanced. The CWC will choose the Chair and Vice Chair, which  
44 he considered to be a critical element to ensure that the group is balanced. Commissioner Robinson  
45 remarked that to exclude the CWC's staunchest critics from serving on the Stakeholder Council would  
46 be a mistake. Mr. Becker stated that in the preliminary screening they are including people regardless  
47 of what they think of the CWC and its mission, including their critics.

1  
2 Timing issues were discussed. Commissioner Beerman suggested this be a priority. Mr. Dean stated  
3 that the 35-member Stakeholder Council will be selected in time for the November 5 meeting. Over  
4 the subsequent month they hope to identify a Chair and Vice Chair and prepare an initial meeting  
5 schedule. Chair McCandless commented that everything they do will be based upon the Mountain  
6 Accord which mandated the Stakeholder Council.

7  
8 Commissioner Biskupski was aware of some who applied who serve in elected or appointed roles.  
9 Her understanding was that that the Stakeholder Council will be the public voice. Mr. Dean stated  
10 that they are addressing four main categories including (1) private interests; (2) non-governmental  
11 entities; (3) private business; and (4) the public at-large. Applicants must fit into one of those four  
12 categories. They were specifically not seeking multiple representation from their jurisdictions. The  
13 next step will be for the Executive Committee to review the applicants and make recommendations.

14  
15 Commissioner Robinson asked if there was a way to write the legislation and authorize exchanges of  
16 other parcels into the base areas of the resorts, which would create a market that would provide at  
17 least an avenue should the third-party landowners wish to take advantage of it and get out. He  
18 questioned whether there should be language in the bill authorizing small land exchanges. Chair  
19 McCandless stated that increasing the density of development in the resort area will not be supported  
20 by the public. In addition, the NEPA process is very expensive. Commissioner Robinson commented  
21 that the resorts will have to be the proponents. Mr. Becker suggested there be a generic provision in  
22 the legislation that recognizes the value of pursuing these types of exchanges.

23  
24 Commissioner Sondak stated that he had a conversation with Mike Maughan about the Albion Basin  
25 properties and anything the CWC can do to encourage the inclusion of Alta Ski Lifts would be a  
26 positive step.

## 27 28 **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

### 29 30 **1. Improved Public Engagement Strategies – Lindsey Nielsen (CWC Communications** 31 **Director).**

- 32
- 33 • **Future Public Meeting Public Involvement.**
- 34 • **CWC Community Engagement Activities.**
- 35

36 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen, described community outreach efforts and reviewed  
37 public involvement at public meetings. Instances were identified where Staff has gone into the  
38 community and met with the public. Ms. Nielsen reported that by law the CWC is required to involve  
39 the public in decisions they make. Different types of involvement were identified as follows:

- 40
- 41 □ Involvement – One-way communication that involves sharing information with the public.
- 42 □ Consultation – Two-way communication where the public is invited to share information  
43 and give feedback.
- 44 □ Collaboration – Three-way communication that involves presenting information and  
45 asking the public to come together and talk with each other and the CWC.
- 46

47 Ways to improve how the CWC is involving the public were described as:

- 1
- 2     □     Changing the room setup so that the Board sits at eye level with the public, remove the
- 3           podium, make meetings less formal, and go to where the public is.
- 4     □     Provide information to the public in advance of the meeting.
- 5     □     Make the public aware of their impact on a project.
- 6     □     Use more collaborative communication techniques during public meetings.
- 7

8     A three-way communication method was described that would involve the Board first addressing the  
9     orders of business and then the public comment period at which time those present would be divided  
10    into small groups. The groups would then be given a specific question with a facilitator and note  
11    taker. Each group would be tasked with discussing the questions and having a robust discussion.  
12    This method gives all the opportunity to speak and for all factions of the community to be heard. The  
13    group leaders would then present a unified discussion theme to the Board.

14  
15    Commissioner Silvestrini had a great deal of experience with this method and stated that people do  
16    not generally like this method and want to hear the questions and comments from all of the other  
17    participants in the audience. He had seen people revolt when they are put in this kind of situation.  
18    He felt this method can work in some instances but doubted it would be successful in a regular Board  
19    meeting situation.

20  
21    Chair McCandless wondered if this method would work when presenting the draft of the federal  
22    legislation. He suggested the meeting be conducted similar to a town hall meeting in order to  
23    accommodate a larger group. He liked the idea of hearing from people who normally do not comment.

24  
25    Commissioner Braceras suggested that the next draft be available for comment in order to identify  
26    areas that have been changed based on comments received. Mr. Becker stated that that has been done  
27    and will be done again. In addition, every public comment received has been recorded in terms of  
28    who made it and the comment by topic. Staff provided a response to every comment in spreadsheet  
29    form, which is available on the Utah Public Notice website. A column was also added to identify  
30    how the issue has been addressed in the legislation.

31  
32    Mr. Dean stated that the goal is to identify items to include in the strategic plan and specifically a  
33    community engagement section for which Ms. Nielsen will be the Staff lead in the drafting process.  
34    It will ultimately be adopted by the CWC as best practices.

35  
36    Ms. Nielsen described another method card storming, which involves dividing into groups, proposing  
37    a question, and asking people to write down their responses on cards. Participants can then physically  
38    display their cards, which are then grouped into themes. This method organizes responses into natural  
39    groups and shows how many have similar positions on a question.

40  
41    Ms. Nielsen remarked that the two methods described involve every person present at a meeting.  
42    Commissioner Beerman stated that variations of both methods were used in Park City during the  
43    Mountain Accord process with their public outreach. He questioned where they are in the process  
44    since he considered the Mountain Accord to be a very expansive multi-year engagement and planning  
45    process. He worried that if they get too expansive in terms of the questions raised, they change the  
46    expectation.

1 Chair McCandless commented that the CWC’s purpose has already been established in the Mountain  
2 Accord. The CWC has been tasked with implementing the aspects of the Mountain Accord. To  
3 expand or go outside of that document is outside of the CWC’s purview based on the interlocal  
4 agreements they all signed. His opinion was that to look outside or modify the document is  
5 disingenuous to the signers of the document.

6  
7 The attendees took a short break.

8  
9 **2. Stakeholder Council Membership Next Steps – Jesse Dean (CWC Deputy Director).**

10  
11 Mr. Dean reported that the selection committee meeting was held on October 11. That committee  
12 consisted of Mr. Dean and Ms. Nielsen in addition to Kimi Barnett from Salt Lake County, Carly  
13 Castle from Salt Lake City Public Utilities, Matt Dias from Park City, and Janna Young from Summit  
14 County. They took the 100 applications they received and reviewed them based on the criteria  
15 included in the meeting packets. They looked at the diversity of the stakeholders in terms of interest  
16 or use in the Wasatch as well as their professional backgrounds, residence, and other factors. The  
17 next steps were to forward the recommended names from the steering committee to the Executive  
18 Committee for further review and ultimately narrow the group down to 28 to 35 members. The  
19 steering committee’s recommendation was to max the group out at 35 members. The goal was to  
20 appoint the chair and vice chair this year and establish a work plan for the first six to 12 months. The  
21 intent would be to have the group appointed on or before the November 5 meeting.

22  
23 With regard to the Executive Committee, Chair McCandless stated that the board membership was  
24 previously seven and decreased the number of members. He suggested that number be increased to  
25 at least four or five. Commissioner Bradley offered to serve on the Executive Committee.

26  
27 **ADMINISTRATION**

28  
29 **1. Budget Report and Outlook – Jesse Dean (CWC Deputy Director).**

30  
31 Mr. Dean presented the budget report and referenced the detailed expenses. The budget adopted for  
32 fiscal year 2019 showed the projected revenue as just under \$400,000. That does not include what  
33 they expect to be much higher attorney fees than were budgeted for. The other budget items were  
34 generated before there was CWC Staff. The estimated cost for ongoing maintenance and operational  
35 costs was \$500,000. There are currently three Staff members although there was some question as to  
36 whether there are additional staffing needs. There were currently three projects specified consisting  
37 of in-kind bus fares from UTA, federal legislation, and the environmental dashboard. Several other  
38 projects were identified earlier in the day such as short-term wins in the canyon consisting of trail  
39 maintenance and restrooms. None, however, were reflected in the current budget. The intent would  
40 be for Staff to present an updated budget that can ultimately be adopted.

41  
42 Commissioner Bradley inquired about consulting fees, which were zero. Mr. Dean indicated that that  
43 is inaccurate and does not include the Lobbyist contracts which would need to be added.  
44 Commissioner Bradley expressed concern with their ability to produce information in order to make  
45 decisions. He hoped to look at the baseline as the canyons currently exist since what that evolves into  
46 will be an indication of their carrying capacity. He considered that to be extremely important.

1 Mr. Dean explained that the environmental dashboard was a project that was left over from the  
2 Mountain Accord that had not yet materialized within the CWC. It will be an actual online dashboard  
3 tool that tracks vitality indicators and environmental quality indicators in the Central Wasatch and  
4 will change according to environmental indicators. Mr. Dean agreed to provide a detailed update at  
5 the next meeting. The following week Staff would be meeting with the Environmental Dashboard  
6 Steering Committee and working with the consultants to get it built out in the next three to six months.  
7

8 Commissioner Beerman's recollection was that money was given to Salt Lake County for hosting and  
9 stated that much of the base line work had been done. Ms. Barnett reported that Salt Lake County  
10 managed the contract with the consultants with the intention being to transfer it to the CWC, which  
11 they have done. A great deal of work had been done by the steering committee. At one point they  
12 were at a crossroads in terms of how to proceed with the initiative. Ms. Barnett stated that it is  
13 unprecedented and she considered it a gift to the CWC as perhaps the first tangible product the average  
14 person can access, understand, and learn from.  
15

16 Mr. Dean reported that what remains is to put the data into digital format. Mr. Becker stated that an  
17 enormous amount of expertise was donated to help build the environmental dashboard. Recently,  
18 they added another component as a result of peer review work conducted by experts. There has been  
19 no exposure to the public to get feedback.  
20

21 With regard to the budget, items that were over budget or not anticipated were identified. Procedural  
22 issues were discussed. Chair McCandless suggested they advertise and reopen the budget and then  
23 amend it. He hoped to see that occur in January. He also suggested they discuss policy as it relates  
24 to projects. He remarked that it is easy to get assistance from the community and they do a match.  
25

26 Commissioner Beerman commented that the outline of potential improvements provided by  
27 Commissioner Braceras will significantly impact, hopefully in a positive way, their approach to  
28 legislation. It was suggested that the proposed UDOT projects also be reviewed at the next meeting.  
29

30 Commissioner Biskupski remarked that having an estimated budget for the second quarter will help  
31 the Board better understand what is to come.  
32

33 Commissioner Braceras commented that ongoing costs will help them better understand in future  
34 years how to see flags in the budget and allow them to make adjustments to stay within budget. It  
35 was clarified that the Executive Committee has purview over budget review.  
36

37 Commissioner Peterson expressed concern with project management based on staff's workload. He  
38 recommended that resources be explored to facilitate such things as grant writing, project  
39 management, coordination, etc. Mr. Becker stated that that was a conclusion reached from the last  
40 two days of discussion. They now have a clearer direction of their responsibilities, which will allow  
41 them to now assign budgets. They will be getting unsolicited project proposals as well as some  
42 suggested by the Commission. He recommended that going forward they have a process in place as  
43 well as criteria for selecting projects to get involved in. The Board can then determine how to  
44 prioritize those projects. Commissioner Peterson stated that a big part of that are the opportunities  
45 that exist that they need to have resources available for in order to acquire or partner with other  
46 entities. Mr. Becker expected to bring the matter back to the Board in December or January.  
47



1 Mr. Dean identified a \$10,000 discrepancy of Total Miscellaneous Revenues that was due to a  
2 contribution.

3  
4 Chair McCandless shared an experience he had working with the Jordan Education Foundation where  
5 they hired a grant writer who was paid on commission. The results were amazing. He suggested the  
6 possibility of using that type of resource. Commissioner Robinson had also had past success in that  
7 regard. Commissioner Peterson stated that many of the grants are very basic. He felt that a good  
8 program manager could be involved in defining priorities. Chair McCandless was concerned about  
9 overloading Staff. Mr. Becker agreed to follow up in a future discussion about how best to approach  
10 grants.

11  
12 With regard to the project list to be addressed in January, Chair McCandless recalled that Laura  
13 Hansen, who previously work for UTA and served as the director of the Jordan River Commission,  
14 was involved in grants applications. Grants with a matching component included providing the  
15 expertise and management, which worked out well.

16  
17 Commissioner Bradley recommended a line item be added to address consulting/program  
18 management expenditures rather than include these types of costs under the employees line item.  
19 Mr. Becker agreed that that makes the most sense.

20  
21 Because the CWC is a new organization, Commissioner Beerman suggested the budget remain  
22 somewhat lean. He stressed the importance of striking a balance in terms of investing money and  
23 tangible short-term projects and Staff. Over time, he expected to need to increase Staff.

24  
25 In response to a comment by Commission Robinson, Chair McCandless stated that the concept  
26 discussed the previous day was to establish a sub-committee to study the budgetary needs and how  
27 the ongoing costs will be divided among the members. Early next year there will be additional  
28 budgetary discussions as a result of the sub-committee on how to maintain the integrity of the CWC  
29 and pay their employees. Currently, funding was available through 2019 based on previous  
30 contributions. He suggested those funds be held in reserve so that the funds are available.

31  
32 Mr. Becker stated that the budget committee has been established and he thought it would be helpful  
33 to involve someone from the Wasatch Back. Commissioner Robinson agreed to participate.

34  
35 Chair McCandless suggested that the consent calendar for the November 5 meeting include the sub-  
36 committees that have been proposed over the past two days. He asked that a resolution be prepared  
37 formalizing them.

38  
39 Mr. Dean reported that the sub-committee for future funding and to determine the budget include  
40 Commissioners Silvestrini, Sondak, and Bradley. Commissioner Robinson also suggested that the  
41 sub-committee explore fees. He thought there should be some way to meld the tolling for  
42 transportation improvements into a user fee.

1     **2. Commission Function.**

- 2
- 3         •     **Day-to-Day CWC Functional Improvements – Jesse Dean (CWC Deputy**  
4             **Director).**

5

6     Mr. Dean stated that the above item was addressed over the last few days.

- 7
- 8         •     **Ex-Officio Membership – Ralph Becker (CWC Executive Director).**

9

10    Mr. Becker reported that there was previous discussion about the membership of the CWC. He  
11    pointed out that there are several major players in the Central Wasatch area who are not elected  
12    officials. As a result, there was some question about how best to engage them as contributing  
13    members of the Commission but not necessarily voting members. He commented that there are  
14    several entities that are not elected bodies but that play major roles. These agencies consist of the  
15    following:

- 16
- 17         •     UTA – deemed to be a critical player in terms of reaching a solution in the mountains.
  - 18         •     The U.S. Forest Service – has a set of requirements that keep them from wanting to be a voting  
19             member of any group.
  - 20         •     The Metropolitan Water District – has been an active participant financial and otherwise in  
21             the Mountain Accord.

22

23    Mr. Becker suggested involving ex-officio members who are not elected members but who will be  
24    part of the discussion. He stated that they would not vote on decisions. He suggested that ex-officio  
25    members be limited to governmental entities as opposed to non-profits in part because of the  
26    requirements relating to government records, open meetings, etc.

27

28    Commissioner Biskupski commented that the CWC has already changed significantly as an  
29    organization from where they began in terms of growth. She did not see the value in including ex-  
30    officio members and saw more risk and accountability since the Members will ultimately be held  
31    accountable. She suggested that ex-officio members be experts that the CWC reaches out to for  
32    information and advice but she did not want to involve another layer of government.

33

34    Commissioner Silvestrini questioned whether involving ex-officio members would be of benefit. He  
35    understood the value of some entities participating but was unsure where to draw the line.

36

37    Commissioner Beerman commented that they originally began with a 26-member Mountain Accord  
38    executive board for which they were constantly criticized. They were then reduced to a small  
39    commission that was to initially five people but has since increased to ten. He wondered if there was  
40    a way to address the issue through the Stakeholder Council. Mr. Dean questioned where the line  
41    would be drawn and was concerned about there being a challenge between the identities of the Board  
42    and the Stakeholder Council. Commissioner Beerman felt that to this point the spirit of what has been  
43    done thus far has been public and private and the balance has been important.

44

45    Chair McCandless reported that ex-officio members participated in the Jordan River Commission  
46    with two-thirds being elected officials and one-third being ex-officio members, which worked well.  
47    He did, however, recognize the wisdom behind not growing to the point that it is unmanageable. He

1 was concerned about the potential for ex-officio members to be identified on the Stakeholder Council,  
2 which is supposed to be limited to the public.

3  
4 Commissioner Braceras stated that part of the discussions between himself and the founding four  
5 members pertained to the reasoning behind keeping it small. It was communicated clearly to him that  
6 he was to represent transportation in its entirety and it was his responsibility to make sure that UTA  
7 was involved. He remarked that everything the CWC does is in partnership with UTA.

8  
9 Mr. Becker commented that staffs from the various jurisdictions that are involved have been meeting  
10 periodically. Their intention was to continue to meet and further support the work of the CWC.  
11 Mr. Dean explained that the intent is not to tap out the interests the staff from the various jurisdictions  
12 but talk with each other in a regular consistent format.

13  
14 Commissioner Peterson recalled that the original intent was to keep it small and efficient. He  
15 supported Commissioner Biskupski's position and invite expertise on an as-needed basis rather than  
16 make the body bigger.

17  
18 The meeting adjourned and reconvened at approximately 11:30 a.m.

## 19 20 **LUNCH AND CLOSING REMARKS**

### 21 22 **1. CWC Chair Chris McCandless and Executive Director Ralph Becker.**

23  
24 Commissioner Sondak reported that he served on the town council for the Town of Alta during the  
25 Mountain Accord process as he was not the mayor. He noted that the Town of Alta needs to have  
26 conversations about the nature of the legislation. He looked forward to finalization of the bill.

27  
28 Ms. Barnett was involved from the start of the Mountain Accord and was pleased to hear about short-  
29 term wins and pursuing projects that the public can see the benefit of. The creation of the CWC was  
30 not easy and involved the work of many people. She was glad to be involved.

31  
32 Commissioner Peterson thought it was important to continue to make progress on the legislation. He  
33 stressed the importance of staying focused and moving forward to build on the Mountain Accord. He  
34 appreciated Commissioner Braceras being present and providing clarification and information on  
35 UDOT's efforts and for his willingness to involve the CWC more directly in the Canyons Corridor  
36 Plan. He considered that to be an asset they can build on. He liked the focus being on how to be  
37 more productive. He identified other secondary canyons in the foothills that are easier to access and  
38 hoped they could be addressed as well. He was pleased to be involved and was impressed by the  
39 level of interest and support of the group.

40  
41 Commissioner Bradley expressed appreciation to Staff and those involved in the planning and  
42 execution of the retreat.

43  
44 Commissioner Beerman was pleased to have participated for the last seven years and acknowledged  
45 that it is important and meaningful work. He was encouraged and looked forward to accomplishing  
46 what they have been planning for a number of years. He felt that having as many small wins as  
47 possible now will help regain momentum and lead to making bigger decisions. He congratulated and  
48 acknowledged Staff for their work.

1  
2 Commissioner Braceras thanked Chair McCandless for his efforts and for Staff planning the retreat,  
3 which he considered to be very important. He suggested they focus on small wins and take credit for  
4 them. Making the public aware of what has been accomplished will help the CWC continue to be  
5 successful in the long term. He suggested a communication tool be employed that specifies who they  
6 are and what they are trying to accomplish.  
7  
8 Commissioner Robinson was grateful that Summit County was invited to represent the Wasatch Back.  
9 He felt that the retreat had been productive and looked forward to making things happen in the future.  
10  
11 Mr. Becker stated that the past two days have been enormously valuable to Staff. He appreciated the  
12 Board members taking the time out of their busy schedules to attend. He felt that as staff that they  
13 have come away with very clear direction that will be translated effectively for all to review and  
14 consider. The next step will be to blend what was discussed into a strategic plan that will be  
15 continually updated. He commented on their commitment to the mountains and wanted to ensure that  
16 they can be enjoyed for generations to come. He thanked the Board for their efforts.  
17  
18 Chair McCandless echoed the comments made and expressed appreciation for his relationships with  
19 each of the Members. He thanked the Board for their efforts.  
20  
21 The Central Wasatch Commission retreat adjourned at approximately 11:45 a.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Retreat held Friday, October 19, and Saturday October 20, 2018.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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