

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEETING HELD MONDAY,**  
2 **MAY 6, 2019 AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL**  
3 **CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**  
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**  
5

6 **Present:** Commissioner Chris McCandless, Commissioner Mike Peterson,  
7 Commissioner Chris Robinson, Commissioner Harris Sondak, Commissioner  
8 Jeff Silvestrini, Commissioner Andy Beerman, Commissioner Jim Bradley,  
9 Commissioner Carlos Braceras, Commissioner Jenny Wilson, Commissioner  
10 Jackie Biskupski  
11

12 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Jesse Dean, Legal Counsel  
13 Shane Topham, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen  
14

15 **A. OPENING**  
16

- 17 **i. Commissioner Chris McCandless will conduct the meeting as Chair of the**  
18 **Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”).**  
19

20 Chair Chris McCandless called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. He reported that Deputy Director  
21 Jesse Dean was resigning to accept another job opportunity. Appreciation was expressed to Mr. Dean  
22 for his service. The process of finding his replacement had begun.  
23

- 24 **ii. The Commission will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of Monday,**  
25 **April 1, 2019.**  
26

27 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bradley moved to approve the minutes of the April 1, 2019 Central  
28 Wasatch Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilson. The motion  
29 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
30

31 **B. PUBLIC COMMENT**  
32

33 Brian Hutchinson was present from the CWC Stakeholders Council and reported that at the last  
34 meeting, two motions were passed that reflected the theme of the members. There was concern with  
35 the current process in that they were trying to develop the UDOT Environmental Impact Statement  
36 (“EIS”), which seemed to be premature based on the projects outlined. There also seemed to be  
37 anxiety about snow delay days but the issues were not addressed. Mr. Hutchinson commented that  
38 many of the Stakeholders feel they are not having an impact on the various parking and traffic  
39 measures proposed. He suggested they restart the process and include Highway 209 from 2000 East  
40 and 9400 South as well as a transit lane.  
41

42 John Knoblock reported that at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting they voted to conduct a  
43 Capacity Study in the Central Wasatch. They do not want I-215 to deliver an endless number of cars  
44 into the canyons. In the process of conducting an additional study, he hoped progress would not stop  
45 on the issues addressed such as toilets, trails, and transportation. The concept of summer shuttle  
46 busses was also mentioned. Mr. Knoblock did not understand how limiting the number of people in  
47 the canyon will reduce the amount of water flowing out. He encouraged the CWC Board and the

1 Council to work together to ensure that they continue moving forward on other projects and making  
2 sure that the needed funds are available.

3  
4 Julian Carr identified himself as a professional skier, a business owner, and an Alta Ambassador. He  
5 indicated that there has been discussion of potential chair lifts in Grizzly Gulch and Patsy Marley. As  
6 an avid outdoor enthusiast, one of the things that is unique about Alta is the side country access. He  
7 considered traffic and transportation to be a much larger issue that needs to be addressed. The hope  
8 was to see more transparency in the process.

9  
10 Andy Eatchel recently became aware of the process when he discovered maps for a proposed land  
11 swap. He asked that the details be more specific to allow the average citizen to understand what is  
12 being proposed. With regard to carrying capacity, he did not want it to apply just during the winter  
13 months. He had heard that 92% of the traffic on the highway is traveling to the ski resorts during the  
14 winter months. If that is the case, it should be the responsibility of the ski areas to help solve the  
15 problem by purchasing land at the bottom of the canyon and run shuttles up and down rather than  
16 make it the State's responsibility. He was aware that the issue is being addressed piecemeal and  
17 suggested it be combined into one EIS.

18  
19 Linda Thompson reported that she served on the Blue Ribbon Commission and helped rewrite FCOZ.  
20 She noted that the effort was organized by Mayor Corroon. She also served on the Mountainous  
21 Planning Commission, which was organized to write a new FCOZ and now a General Plan.  
22 Ms. Thompson stated that several items are needed in the canyons including highway improvements,  
23 parking, transit amenities for tourists, amenities for backcountry users, address water problems,  
24 provide more toilets, WiFi, accommodate normal town services, and county services. There are new  
25 defensible space requirements and a great deal of underbrush must be removed. While the Forest  
26 Service, County, and local municipalities have no money for this effort, the ski industry brings in \$1.5  
27 billion annually to the State. She asked the Board to use their influence to that end. The various  
28 problems that exist were described. Ms. Thompson urged the Board to take action to improve the  
29 situation.

30  
31 Kyle Maynard provided a written memo to staff wherein he addressed capacity. He urged the Board  
32 to think back to the directive and goals and what they want the canyons to look like. He asked that  
33 they consider a Capacity Study to add context to the issue under consideration.

34  
35 Mark C. Haik remarked that at the last CWC meeting he attended Chair McCandless announced his  
36 intention to resign at the end of 2019. His understanding was that this decision was based in part on  
37 the weariness of the process. Mr. Haik commented that there is a lot of animus emanating from real  
38 property owners. He has been a prolific GRAMA user and has recovered numerous documents that  
39 pertain to the three canyons. He has also been through the building application process in the Town  
40 of Alta during which he was falsely charged by three Town of Alta employees with a crime for  
41 building a house without obtaining a building permit. In reality, he hired a licensed Geotechnical  
42 Engineer to perform soil tests on his property. The case went to court and was dismissed. The Town  
43 of Alta then waited two years, until the last date possible, to withdraw the charge. He considered that  
44 to be animus. Mr. Haik commented that the reason for the animus is water.

45  
46 There were no further public comments.

1 **C. COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

2  
3 **i. Recognition of Kimi Barnett (SLCO), Laura Briefer (SLCPU), and Carly Castle**  
4 **(SLCPU) for their Public Service in Support of the CWC.**  
5

6 Kimi Barnett, Laura Briefer, and Carly Castle were presented with a gift in recognition of their  
7 contributions.  
8

9 Commissioner Peterson reported that he has been involved with the CWC since the beginning and  
10 thanked all three women as well as Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County who allowed them to  
11 facilitate the organization of the CWC. They were professional, transparent, and have been a pleasure  
12 to work with. He thanked them for their efforts. Photographs were taken.  
13

14 **D. STAFF MONTHLY REPORT**

15  
16 **i. Presentation by Executive Director Ralph Becker of His Monthly Report.**  
17

18 Executive Director Ralph Becker reported that over the past month staff has been working to kick off  
19 the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS rescoping as well as the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation  
20 Action Plan (“CCTAP”). Between staff and the consulting team, the EIS was moving forward  
21 expeditiously. Appreciation was expressed to Commissioner Braceras and John Thomas for their  
22 work. Mr. Becker reported that they are on schedule to have much of the analysis and work done by  
23 the end of 2020. A great deal will be occurring in the interim. The Board will be hearing more on  
24 the issue of parking and how the various pieces fit together. The Environmental Dashboard was also  
25 underway with a summary to be presented later in the meeting.  
26

27 Mr. Becker was pleased to announce that the office space is near completion. He expected to occupy  
28 the space by the end of the month.  
29

30 With regard to the State Legislation, Mr. Becker reported that one piece of legislation that passed this  
31 Legislative Session requires the Natural Resources and Energy Committee and Legislature to be  
32 notified of a proposal for a federal lands designation. A schedule was laid out to bring the work of  
33 the Board to House Chair Kevin Stratton and include committee review, a full-day site visit, and  
34 potential action.  
35

36 In terms of the Federal Legislation, in November 2018 the Board adopted a recommendation that the  
37 Congressional Delegation take up the legislation with amendments. They have also been working on  
38 technical changes to get the bill in the best shape possible for Congressional consideration.  
39

40 Other items that have come forward were identified that pertain to transportation issues. They were  
41 close to completing a draft with a narrative describing each change and ultimately make it available  
42 to the public for review.  
43

44 Commissioner Peterson noted that today’s meeting is the first that is being live streamed.  
45 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen commented that the live stream is accessible through the  
46 CWC’s website. Those desiring more frequent updates were invited to follow the CWC on Instagram,  
47 Facebook, and Twitter.  
48

1 Commissioner Silvestrini reported that he and Commissioner Beerman had the opportunity attend a  
2 meeting with Representative Curtis at the Utah League of Cities and Towns Convention. He  
3 suggested the CWC continue to work and build a consensus, which will important in terms of moving  
4 the legislation forward.

5  
6 **E. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE AND DISCUSSION**

7  
8 **i. Stakeholders Council Vice Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Provide an Update on the**  
9 **February Stakeholders Council Meeting and Work Moving Forward.**

10  
11 **ii. Staff will Provide Recommendations for Next Steps Regarding Analysis of Visitor**  
12 **Capacity in the Central Wasatch Mountains.**

13  
14 Stakeholders Council Vice Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker presented an update of the April Stakeholders  
15 Council Meeting. Representatives from the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) were present and  
16 reported on transit and service options looking specifically at ridership and coverage. Representatives  
17 from UDOT and the consulting teams managing the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS and the CCTAP  
18 were in attendance and provided the stakeholders with an overview of the outcomes of the April 9  
19 Transportation Open House. The stakeholders were also invited to participate in a mini Open House,  
20 where they could leave comments. A member of the Stakeholders Council recommended that a  
21 Visitor Capacity Study be undertaken in tandem with the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. The motion  
22 passed 16-to-8 with 11 abstentions.

23  
24 Dr. Bricker reported that Deputy Director Jesse Dean will provide recommendations for the next steps  
25 regarding the visitor capacity process in the Central Wasatch Mountains. In response to a question  
26 raised, Dr. Bricker stated that the discussion focused on the quality of visitor experience and  
27 maintaining ecological integrity. What will be studied will involve a process that needs to be  
28 developed and presented as a proposal.

29  
30 Commissioner Peterson asked if the Stakeholders Council was allowed to pass the resolution without  
31 it being on the agenda. Dr. Bricker stated that the discussion got off track at the meeting but proper  
32 procedures will be followed in the future. Commissioner Bradley was pleased to hear that the  
33 Stakeholders Council was having lively and ambitious discussions.

34  
35 Mr. Becker referenced a two-page memo from staff dealing with the process for the Carrying Capacity  
36 Analysis. He explained that staff has had discussions with members of the Stakeholders Council, the  
37 Forest Service, UDOT, Salt Lake City, and others about how to best address the Capacity Analysis.  
38 On June 19, Dr. Bricker will lead the process of determining how to conduct a Capacity Analysis and  
39 tie it in with the work of UDOT, the CWC, and the Salt Lake City Watershed Plan. At the July  
40 meeting, an outline of the process will be presented that will include a presentation by the Forest  
41 Service.

42  
43 Commissioner Braceras asked that in the July meeting the proposed cost be addressed as well as  
44 funding.

45  
46 Commissioner Wilson was interested in hearing from the Forest Service and suggested they pursue a  
47 more authoritative process.

1 Commissioner Robinson asked if the recommendation from the Stakeholders Council was to delay or  
2 modify the scope of work for the UDOT EIS. Dr. Bricker explained that it was being considered as  
3 part of the process. It seemed to Commissioner Robinson that if there was to be a course correction,  
4 it should occur quickly and with input from UDOT. He was concerned about the amount of time it  
5 will take before anything significant occurs to improve the transportation situation.

6  
7 Commissioner Beerman asked if there were any discussions about the environmental dashboard in  
8 the NEPA baselines as part of the carrying capacity. He recalled that a significant amount of time  
9 was spent on this issue during the Mountain Accord by the environmental system group. Ultimately,  
10 they determined that carrying capacity was the most effective way to evaluate the impact on the  
11 canyons. The group recommended they start with a dashboard and then look at capacity through that  
12 filter. Dr. Bricker agreed and stated that baselines were a key theme in understanding where people  
13 are going and how long they are staying.

14  
15 Commissioner Peterson thanked Dr. Bricker for her efforts. He attended the most recent Stakeholders  
16 Council and commented that the Chair and Vice Chair did an admirable job of conducting the  
17 meeting. There seemed to be an underlying feeling that the EIS process should continue and a  
18 capacity study should be conducted separately and simultaneously. He applauded the efforts of the  
19 group as a whole.

20  
21 Chair McCandless appreciated the hard work of the Council. He concluded that the canyon is one of  
22 the most dangerous in the world of its type and people are being put in harms way. Although he  
23 agreed with conducting the Capacity Study, he stressed that they cannot wait to resolve some of the  
24 safety issues that exist. Safety was identified as his top priority.

25  
26 Mr. Becker stated that a timeline was established and asked for direction from the Board. Over the  
27 next two months they would be working through the various issues to bring back a recommendation.  
28 At the June meeting, a presentation was to be made by Dr. Bricker on the current research. The Forest  
29 Service will also be present to make a full presentation on how the analysis will be performed, what  
30 has been done in the Wasatch, and how to move forward.

31  
32 Commissioner Wilson identified a conflict between the vision of various entities with respect to  
33 carrying capacity. At some point, a determination will need to be made as to who will decide. Her  
34 sense was that the Forest Service will likely make that determination. If that is the case, she asked if  
35 there is a more expedite process.

36  
37 Chair McCandless expressed appreciation to Dr. Bricker and the Stakeholders Council for their  
38 efforts.

39  
40 Lance Kovel identified himself as the Special Projects Coordinator for the Wasatch Cache National  
41 Forest. He described the process and stated that currently anyone can make a proposal. Ultimately,  
42 a Forest Service Supervisor will make a determination on feasibility. Guidance will be provided to  
43 help guide the process.

44  
45 Mr. Becker explained that the Forest Service looks at the issue from a recreational and impact  
46 perspective. Ultimately, they will make a decision with respect to public lands. Salt Lake City looks  
47 at it from a water quality and watershed protection point of view. They have conducted two watershed  
48 management plans since the 1980s and are now embarking on a third. They settled on the schedule

1 that the Forest Service feels they can best meet. July 1 was the earliest the group felt they could  
2 provide the Board with a recommendation.

3  
4 Commissioner Wilson was comfortable with the timeline but suggested that a streamlined document  
5 be shared with the Stakeholders Council describing the process. She questioned how critical it is to  
6 the Board moving forward. She wanted to avoid unnecessary steps in the process.

7  
8 Commissioner Sondak recalled that Friends of Alta was advocating for a Capacity Study to be part  
9 of the UDOT EIS. What he is now hearing is that regardless of what UDOT does, the Forest Service  
10 has to run a NEPA process and come up with their own analysis. Mr. Kovel explained that UDOT is  
11 the lead agency for the EIS. If there are any impacts on Forest Service land, outside of the corridor,  
12 it will be necessary to tier onto the EIS or make a decision based on the EIS. Procedural issues were  
13 discussed. It was anticipated that any impacts on forest lands will be addressed in the EIS.

14  
15 Timing issues were discussed. Commissioner Sondak pointed out that there is a complicated  
16 jurisdictional issue.

17  
18 Commissioner Biskupski referenced specific language and stated that the CWC recommends that the  
19 EIS be modified to include a Visitor Capacity Study to be done simultaneous to the EIS. Ultimately,  
20 she believed the CWC was being asked to recommend that visitor capacity be part of the EIS.  
21 Procedural issues were discussed.

22  
23 Commissioner Silvestrini proposed that staff be directed to proceed in accordance with the next steps  
24 schedule. He was not in favor of slowing down the EIS process until he has a better understanding  
25 of what the Stakeholder Council wants to see in terms of a capacity study. A formal motion was not  
26 made as the matter was not scheduled for action.

27  
28 Commissioner Peterson asked that UDOT Project Manager John Thomas share his insight on capacity  
29 relative to the EIS process. He explained that UDOT is conducting an EIS for transportation in Little  
30 Cottonwood Canyon. The intent is to identify five alternatives and determine one that is appropriate  
31 for action. He pointed out that the challenge is to identify the impact of the White Pine trailhead.  
32 They are implementing water quality best management practices and no surface runoff treatment was  
33 being done currently. Mr. Thomas noted that there are only two restaurants in Little Cottonwood  
34 Canyon and increasing the number of toilets from two to six. They will also be studying a wide range  
35 of direct and cumulative impacts that will allow them to study the impact on forest land outside of  
36 the White Pine area. He noted that they are establishing a very transparent process. With regard to  
37 carrying capacity, UDOT's role is transportation. Carrying capacity addresses that, however, the  
38 determination of appropriate use is outside of their jurisdiction. UDOT has a process in place to  
39 identify many of the impacts and issues.

40  
41 Commissioner Robinson commented that in the past he has seen agencies such as the Forest Service  
42 become a cooperative agency. He asked if that was typical. Mr. Kovel was not aware that that has  
43 happened before but reiterated that they are a cooperating agency with UDOT on the EIS.

44  
45 Chair McCandless did not want to do anything that would slow down the process. Commissioner  
46 Biskupski did not see how the Visitor Capacity Study would slow the process down. She commented  
47 that what people are trying to avoid is the degradation that is taking place in Zion because this type

1 of work was not done. In the end, they do not want the canyon to be destroyed. Chair McCandless  
2 was confident that the process can be dual tracked as well.

3  
4 Commissioner Bradley suggested the staff report include a clarifying statement on the relationship  
5 between the Transportation Action Plan and the EIS.

6  
7 **F. DISCUSSION AND AMENDMENT TO 2019 STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ANNUAL**  
8 **MEETING SCHEDULE.**

9  
10 **i. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2019-14 Amending the Regular Meeting**  
11 **Location for the CWC Stakeholder Council for 2019.**

12  
13 Mr. Dean suggested that the above matter be tabled to the next meeting as staff was still working to  
14 secure a larger meeting space. He thanked Millcreek for hosting the Stakeholder Council Meetings  
15 but noted that they have quickly outgrown the Promise Room. They were also seeking a space that  
16 will accommodate a new time for meetings.

17  
18 **MOTION:** Commissioner Robinson moved to continue agenda item F to the next meeting.  
19 Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
20 Board.

21  
22 **G. TRANSPORTATION UPDATE AND DISCUSSION.**

23  
24 **i. April 9 Open House Presentation.**

25  
26 **a. UDOT Project Manager John Thomas will Provide a Presentation of the**  
27 **Little Cottonwood EIS and Cottonwood Canyons TAP Open House held**  
28 **at Cottonwood Heights City Hall.**

29  
30 Dave Smith from Penna Powers reported on the Open House and public comment period held on the  
31 Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS and the CCTAP. He identified himself as a member of the team that  
32 is working on the study and responsible for ensuring that the public is aware of open houses and  
33 public comment periods. The methods used to communicate the open house, which was held on April  
34 9, were identified. In addition to public notices in the newspapers, they have a website that contains  
35 both studies and information. They also use social media channels to alert the public of opportunities  
36 to view information and participate. Materials were sent to stakeholders and a media briefing was  
37 held prior to the Open House.

38  
39 The TAP comment period ran from March 5 to May 3. The EIS comment period would remain open  
40 until they receive the revised Notice of Intent (“NOI”) publication. At that point, UDOT intends to  
41 submit it to a national register. Once it is published, the comment period will be extended for 30  
42 days.

43  
44 Methods of providing comment were described. The official means of comment by law were  
45 identified as email, the U.S. Postal Service, the website, stakeholder meetings, and post-it notes  
46 provided at the Open House. Social media and phone calls are unofficial ways to provide comment.  
47 Although they are taken into consideration, they are not entered into the official record. It was  
48 reported that the Open House lasted for more than four hours with over 400 in attendance. To date,

1 over 1,200 comments have been received between the two studies. Of the 1,200 comments received,  
2 over 650 pertained to the EIS. Comments pertained to some of the following: snow sheds, additional  
3 lanes, speed limits, multi-modal options, safe connections between neighborhoods, and trailhead  
4 parking. Various transit options were also discussed such as bus, rail, and gondola. Tolling was also  
5 considered.

6  
7 The public comment period was closed for the CCTAP and the Comment Report was to be made  
8 public on their website as soon as it is available. Once the EIS process is complete, they will compile  
9 that comment report. Once they are ready to be released, proper notice will be given after which there  
10 will be a 30-day comment period on the goals of the CCTAP. Mr. Smith reported that there will be  
11 upcoming TAP stakeholder meetings where they will meet individually with various stakeholder  
12 groups and address their issues and concerns.

13  
14 At 5:38 p.m. Commissioner Braceras was excused from the remainder of the meeting.

15  
16 **ii. UTA Ski Service Update and Discussion.**

17  
18 **a. UTA Regional General Manager Lorin Simpson and UTA Director of**  
19 **Planning Laura Hanson will Provide a Presentation of UTA Ski Service in**  
20 **the Cottonwood Canyons.**

21  
22 UTA's Salt Lake City Regional General Manager Lorin Simpson was present and indicated that he is  
23 responsible for bus service in Salt Lake County, which includes ski service. He shared information  
24 on the history of ski service ridership. Ten years ago, ridership was about 187,000 during the ski  
25 season. This last ski season there were over 320,000. There was an increase in ridership around  
26 2016-2017 when the service routing was changed. Previously, there were eight different routes  
27 serving the two canyons. That was reduced to three routes with more trips being made up and down  
28 the canyon. Ridership grew significantly and has increased every year since. Frequency and all day  
29 service was determined to be effective and should be part of the solution going forward. Mr. Simpson  
30 reported that they were looking at alternatives for next season.

31  
32 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Sondak, Mr. Simpson stated that they know there  
33 is significantly more opportunity, however, they are constrained by the number of busses and funding.  
34 It was confirmed that scheduling is impacted primarily by money and demand. They typically begin  
35 early service on a limited basis and bid their work with the operators through a collective bargaining  
36 agreement. He noted that they focus their resources where it matters most. Commissioner Sondak  
37 suggested UTA consider weekend service during Oktoberfest.

38  
39 Commissioner Wilson reported that she met with Carlton Christensen and Matt Segal earlier in the  
40 day to address the issue. She was informed that there are two routes each for Big and Little  
41 Cottonwood Canyons. There is a 15-minute frequency and a summer employee bus to Snowbird as  
42 well. There are 20 ski busses that are specially configured. The cost of each bus is \$400,000 to  
43 \$500,000 and there is currently a one-year wait on busses once they are ordered. Commissioner  
44 Wilson reported that recently she had a conversation with senior staff in her office about routes and  
45 expansion, which she was in favor of. Her impression after the meeting was that UTA is willing to  
46 do more in the canyon but the primary issue is resources. She asked that they look at specific  
47 scenarios.

1 UTA Planning Director Laura Hanson reported that they are doing a planning study currently to  
2 address how to prioritize resources throughout their service area. They are trying to determine  
3 whether to focus on ridership and frequency or spread it out. There is a survey online that all were  
4 encouraged to respond to and share with their constituents.

5  
6 **b. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Lead a Discussion**  
7 **Surrounding Short-Term Improvements to Transit Service in the**  
8 **Cottonwood Canyons for the 2019-2020 Ski Season.**  
9

10 Mr. Dean reported that a working group has been established to identify short-term transportation  
11 solutions for the 2019-2020 season. At this point, however, there was no concrete information to  
12 share with the Board. An outline service vision for the canyons was provided.

13  
14 Mr. Becker mentioned that the Chair participated in the meeting with all of the general managers from  
15 the ski resorts, UTA, UDOT, the Forest Service, and others. They began a discussion about how the  
16 collective group can be most effective in improving transit service. Several short-term solutions were  
17 being considered.

18  
19 **iii. Parking Study Task Presentation.**  
20

21 **a. Desman Associates Senior Planner Scott Martin will Provide a**  
22 **Presentation on the Parking Strategy for Cottonwood Canyons**  
23 **Transportation Action Plan.**  
24

25 Preston Singer gave a brief introduction to parking strategies. He referred to mobility hubs and the  
26 fundamentals of parking. He explained that parking is a key component to mobility hubs. The intent  
27 is to address transportation management for the canyons, which includes parking and mobility hubs.  
28 Mobility hubs were described as places with multiple compatibility options. The parking plan first  
29 identified the demand and needs.

30  
31 Commissioner Robinson was excused from the remainder of the meeting at 6:02 p.m.  
32

33 Scott Martin addressed parking issues and parking technology. He commented that structured parking  
34 is expensive with the minimum cost per space for a structure being \$22,000 to \$25,000. Above  
35 ground parking was determined to be less expensive. Parking that is one level below ground costs  
36 50% more while parking two levels below grade increases the cost by 100%. He estimated the need  
37 for 2,000 to 2,500 spaces. Surface parking tends to cost around \$5,000 per space. At the gravel pit  
38 site, they could consider a surface parking lot. It was reported that one acre of property can generally  
39 accommodate 120 surface parking spaces. Another factor that can limit the size of a parking structure  
40 is acceptable walking distance.

41  
42 Mr. Martin noted that parking structures can be modular and horizontal expansions are much more  
43 feasible and less disruptive than a vertical expansion.  
44

45 Commissioner Sondak was excused from the remainder of the meeting at 6:06 p.m.  
46

47 Commissioner Peterson voiced concern on behalf of the city of Cottonwood Heights with parking.  
48 He noted that they have numerous questions and want to be actively involved.

1  
2 With regard to cost, Mr. Martin stated that the intent is to make the parking as efficient as possible in  
3 order to reduce the cost per space.  
4

5 **H. ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD PROJECT UPDATE AND DISCUSSION**

- 6  
7 **i. CWC Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen will Provide an Update on the**  
8 **Status of the Environmental Dashboard Project.**  
9

10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wilson moved to table the above item to the next meeting. Commissioner  
11 Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
12

13 **I. CWC QUARTERLY BUDGET UPDATE**

- 14  
15 **i. Presentation by CWC Budget Officer Dave Sanderson Concerning the CWC's**  
16 **FY 2019 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Financial Report and FY 2018/2019 Budget Comparison.**  
17

18 Budget Officer Dave Sanderson presented the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Financial Report and the Board was  
19 provided with copies of the Budget Report, the check register for the fiscal year, the balance sheet,  
20 and the Profit Loss Statement. So far this year they show a loss of \$347,000 due to the lack of revenue.  
21 The three financial programs that are underway were identified as the website, streaming, and the  
22 environmental dashboard. Mr. Sanderson expected to finish the year with about \$1.1 million in the  
23 bank. He pointed out that approximately \$850,000 is needed annually to cover expenses and avoid  
24 the use of reserves.  
25

26 **J. CWC 2019-2020 BUDGET DISCUSSION AND ACTION.**

- 27  
28 **i. Presentation by Budget Officer Dave Sanderson Regarding the Proposed**  
29 **Tentative Budget for the CWC for FY 2019-2020.**  
30

31 Mr. Sanderson reported that by State statute, the Board is required to adopt a Tentative Budget. This  
32 is typically done in the month of May after which a public hearing is scheduled. The final budget  
33 must be adopted in June. The Budget Committee met twice and reviewed the budget. It was  
34 anticipated that there will be \$840,000 in membership fees during the year that will cover expenses  
35 for the fiscal year. The anticipated budget is \$905,000, which consists of \$840,000 in membership  
36 fees and miscellaneous and interest income.  
37

38 In response to a question raised, Mr. Sanderson stated that the budget assumes that member  
39 contributions will remain the same as discussed during the Budget Committee Meeting.  
40 Commissioner Silvestrini wanted to make sure that the other Board Members were on task to  
41 contribute the amounts proposed.  
42

43 In response to a question raised by Mayor Wilson, Commissioner Bradley indicated that his  
44 understanding was that Mayor McAdams budgeted the contribution amount previously.  
45

46 Commissioner Peterson stated that Cottonwood Heights has included the recommended amount in  
47 their Tentative Budget. Commissioner Beerman stated that the recommended contribution is also in

1 their Tentative Budget and he expects thorough discussion. He was unsure of the feeling of the  
2 Summit County Council.

3  
4 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Beerman about GRAMA responses and  
5 establishing a reasonable cost recovery, CWC Attorney Shane Topham stated that the Board has  
6 adopted a GRAMA Fee Schedule but he doubted they would recover anywhere near what they had  
7 spent.

8  
9 Mr. Sanderson stated that public comment can be taken on the Tentative Budget until the public  
10 hearing. The final budget must be adopted prior to June 30.

11  
12 **ii. Consideration of RESOLUTION 2019-15 Approving a Tentative Budget for the**  
13 **CWC for FY 2019-2020, Setting the Time and Place of a Public Hearing, and**  
14 **Directing Public Notice of Such Hearing.**  
15

16 **MOTION:** Commissioner Peterson moved to adopt RESOLUTION 2019-16 approving a Tentative  
17 Budget for the CWC for FY 2019-20, setting the time and place of a public hearing and directing  
18 public notice of such hearing. Commissioner Silvestrini seconded the motion. Vote on motion:  
19 Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Commissioner Biskupski-Aye, Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Chair  
20 McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Commissioner  
21 Beerman-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioners Robinson, Sondak, and Braceras  
22 were not present for the vote.

23  
24 **K. ADJOURNMENT**  
25

26 **MOTION:** Commissioner Biskupski moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wilson seconded the  
27 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

28  
29 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Meeting held Monday, May 6, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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