

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION SHORT-TERM PROJECTS  
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2020 AT 10:30 A.M. IN THE  
SALT LAKE CITY AND COUNTY BUILDING, CANNON ROOM LOCATED AT  
451 SOUTH STATE STREET, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH**

**Present:** Chair Jim Bradley, Salt Lake County  
Beckee Hotze, U.S. Forest Service  
Bobby Sampson, Salt Lake County  
Marshall Alford, U.S. Forest Service  
Lindsey Nielsen, Central Wasatch Commission  
Carly Lansche, Central Wasatch Commission  
Mary Young, Wasatch Graffiti Busters  
Bob Walker, Wasatch Graffiti Busters  
Kyle Maynard, Friends of Alta  
Ralph Becker, Central Wasatch Commission  
Blake Perez, Central Wasatch Commission  
Kaye Mickelson, Central Wasatch Commission  
Patrick Nelson, Salt Lake City  
Martin Jensen, Salt Lake County  
Laura Briefer, Salt Lake City  
Carl Fisher, Save Our Canyons  
Alan Sanderson, Citizen  
Catherine Kanter, Salt Lake County  
Erin Mendenhall, Salt Lake City  
Andy Beerman, Park City  
Marci Houseman, Central Wasatch Commission

**1. INTRODUCTIONS AND NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

Chair Jim Bradley called the meeting to order at 10:37 a.m. He reported that he would be asking Marci Houseman to serve as Co-Chair.

Those present introduced themselves.

**2. DECEMBER COMMITTEE MEETING RECAP.**

Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Executive Director, Ralph Becker gave a recap of the December meeting and stated that an initial meeting was held where they indicated that the goal of the committee was to look at short-term projects. They were encouraged to identify projects where there could be immediate successes. He explained that the CWC does not have a lot of money dedicated to this. There is \$60,000 in the current budget but there was anticipation that the CWC will take additional money out of reserves to dedicate toward special projects. The specific projects selected will depend on the work of the committee. The CWC Board will work with jurisdictions and other entities to accomplish the goals that are pursued. It was determined by the group that the next step would be to send out a request for ideas for people to respond to.

CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen reported that the goal at the December meeting was to review the approach to the committee concept. The committee collectively determined that short-

1 term projects will be largely noticeable by the public and follow the goals set out by Mountain Accord.  
2 The projects should address transportation in the canyons, protect ecosystems and the environment in  
3 the study area, work to sustain the economic viability of the canyons, and steward the year-round  
4 recreational access of the canyons. The idea behind calling for ideas was to gather information on  
5 lesser-known projects.  
6

7 Mr. Becker reported that CWC staff is currently working on short-term transportation solutions. For  
8 example, bus service in the canyons has been increased by 25 to 50%. In addition, the CWC provided  
9 the needed funding to match the UTA contribution to provide the enhanced service. He stated that  
10 the CWC has been able to move quickly compared to city and county governments. Mr. Becker  
11 explained that the Environmental Dashboard represents a very specific project with long-term  
12 benefits.  
13

14 Marci Houseman, a Council Member from Sandy City joined the meeting and was introduced.  
15

16 Mr. Becker reported that they went through a process of determining committee membership and  
17 concluded that the only actual members would be the Board Members themselves. As a result, there  
18 are only three members of the committee. All around the table were not formal members but because  
19 the CWC Board operates by consensus, that is how it will operate.  
20

### 21 **3. CALL FOR PROJECT IDEAS.**

22

23 Ms. Nielsen reported that the criteria for short-term projects generally fall within the confines set out  
24 in Mountain Accord. They include Transportation, Recreation, Environment, and Economy specific  
25 to the focus area for the CWC, which is largely the tri-canyon area. The line-item budget amount in  
26 the budget is \$60,000, which is set aside for special projects. The ideas should have a maximum  
27 budget of no more than \$60,000 unless there is dedicated and identified in-place community funds.  
28 Ms. Nielsen further explained that this committee will decide how to prioritize the ideas from the  
29 community and the Forest Service. One major project could be chosen that will potentially utilize all  
30 of the allocated funds. They could also seek out several smaller projects that could be completed in  
31 the canyons. Mr. Bradley was informed by Mr. Becker that more money could potentially be provided  
32 from the reserves based on the quality of the ideas. Depending on the projects selected, some policy  
33 changes may be necessary for implementation.  
34

35 Carl Fisher asked if any policy changes were anticipated to aid in the implementation. Ms. Nielsen  
36 stated that that will largely be up to the committee. Chair Bradley suspected that they would be  
37 looking for shovel ready projects, however, others would be considered. Mayor Mendenhall  
38 suggested that the bulleted list of projects include issues and criteria and reference the alignment with  
39 Mountain Accord.  
40

41 Mayor Andy Beerman joined the meeting.  
42

### 43 **4. THE UTAH OUTDOOR RECREATION GRANT.**

44

45 Beckee Hotze, from the U.S. Forest Service, gave an overview of the Utah Outdoor Recreation  
46 (“UOR”) Grant. She asked that to the last bullet include verbiage include a Letter of Support from  
47 the Forest Service. They have an extensive program and a Letter of Support will expedite the process.  
48 Ms. Hotze explained that they work with partners on the UOR Grant. It has been helpful to find long-

1 term since funding has decreased by one-third over the last 10 years. There have also been changes  
2 to the way areas are funded. Ms. Hotze pointed out that currently there are more firefighters than  
3 ever before. Under the Recreation Enhancement Act, Congress has given the Forest Service authority  
4 to charge fees at specific sites, however, the Washington office does not want to put that forward and  
5 prefers local government agencies drive that. She compared it to State parks and making them  
6 sustainable recreation destinations. She stated that those funds could be used as a match.

7  
8 Ms. Nielsen explained that in addition to a potential release of a call for ideas and soliciting ideas  
9 from stakeholders, they would like to amass a cache of projects that are largely shovel ready and do  
10 not require and in-depth analysis. There is a funding opportunity at the State level to pursue the UOR  
11 Grant for which the cycle has already opened for the grant disbursement. The deadline is March 20,  
12 2020. The grant includes three tiers, two of which they would be eligible for. The tiers were identified  
13 as follows:

- 14 1. Tier 1 – New Infrastructure for Access to Recreation.
- 15 2. Tier 2 – Maintenance for Existing Infrastructure in the State of Utah.
- 16 3. Tier 3 – Pertains to Education Programs. (Determined not to be a good fit for the CWC.
- 17

18  
19 Ms. Nielsen stated that there is also a regional asset that involves a large-scale project in excess of \$2  
20 million. The disbursement in that regional asset tier would be \$500,000 for Tiers 1 and 2. The  
21 disbursement is up to \$150,000 with a required 50% match. It is beneficial for there to be large  
22 community support and buy-in for successful applications and disbursements. In speaking with the  
23 Forest Service and other stakeholders, they identified projects that appear to be a good fit. Because  
24 there is a potential for funding, the grant was included on the agenda to gauge the committee's interest.

25  
26 Ms. Nielsen reported that because of the 50% match, it would be necessary for some of the funds to  
27 be allocated for special projects in the current budget. Potentially it could consume some of the funds  
28 allocated for other projects. Chair Bradley stated that if they are interested in using that source they  
29 will have to act quickly.

30  
31 Ms. Houseman reported that the Utah League of Cities and Towns released a recent podcast featuring  
32 Tom Adams. It was very helpful in increasing her understanding of the grant. Staff was also well  
33 versed on the grant.

34  
35 Carl Fisher stated that Save Our Canyons would be willing to raise funds to help with the match.

36  
37 Ms. Hotze's understanding of large projects was that if it is required to be new construction, the Silver  
38 Lake Boardwalk Project would not be eligible. As a result, they would fall under the \$150,000  
39 maximum. Ms. Nielsen clarified that all three tiers are up to \$150,000 with a 50% match. The  
40 regional asset tier, which is the large-scale project, is over \$2 million.

41  
42 Mayor Beerman suggested they make application even if it is not a direct fit. Park City has been  
43 through the grant process and received a few grants for trailheads, bathrooms, and parking on  
44 Bonanza. It is a relatively easy process and many of the projects being considered are a perfect fit.

45  
46 Mr. Nielsen had heard strong support for the CWC to submit an application for the UOR Grant. He  
47 commented that the Silver Lake Boardwalk Project would only qualify if it is not required to be new  
48 construction.

1  
2 Martin Jensen from Salt Lake County stated that they applied for the grants for years and have found  
3 them to be very straight forward. This was the first year so he expected there will need to be some  
4 fine-tuning.  
5

6 **5. THE SILVER LAKE BOARDWALK PROJECT.**  
7

8 Ms. Nielsen stated that the Silver Lake Boardwalk Project is a \$3 million project, according to the  
9 Forest Service, to fully rebuild. The concept behind the project was to take time to form a  
10 subcommittee dedicated to strategizing and ultimately submit a meaningful application that includes  
11 the required matching funds.  
12

13 Ms. Hotze stated that the project has been divided into nine phases. Phase 1 is the most expensive  
14 and involves rehabilitating the existing boardwalk and the pilings beneath it. The cost was estimated  
15 to be \$93,000. The project would not be eligible for the large-scale regional asset grant as it is  
16 required to be in excess of \$2 million. Ms. Nielsen stated that the intent of the subcommittee would  
17 be to strategize and clearly and concisely apply the next grant cycle. They would also identify other  
18 grants that would be applicable to this project. Ms. Hotze was not certain they could do a phased  
19 project because the total cost exceeds \$3 million.  
20

21 Mayor Mendenhall asked if they should apply for the entire amount and then offer the option of a  
22 phased approach. Mr. Jensen did not object to pursuing that option. He stated that the Governor's  
23 Office is open to feedback and several agencies are experienced in the process. Mayor Beerman  
24 suggested that representatives meet with the Office of Outdoor Recreation to discuss fine tuning.  
25 Ms. Nielsen reported that she and Mr. Perez had a conversation with the Grant Program Managers.  
26 They were receptive to the idea and saw it as a fit in terms of the grant parameters.  
27

28 Mr. Fisher expressed support for moving forward. Laura Briefer stated that it is ready for this year.  
29 The potential of completing the work in phases was mentioned. Ms. Hotze stated that the cost of  
30 some phases is only \$30,000.  
31

32 Mayor Mendenhall recognized that there seemed to be a consensus on the Silver Lake Project but  
33 asked if there were other projects as well. Ms. Nielsen stated that numerous projects have been  
34 identified that will be a clear fit for other tiers of the UOR Grant. Namely, there is a need at White  
35 Pine to rebuild a bridge. It is largely ready to go and there is no NEPA required. The cost was  
36 estimated to be in excess of \$60,000.  
37

38 In response to a question raised, Ms. Hotze explained that the first priority of the Forest Service is  
39 watershed protection. Their second priority is recreation. With respect to White Pine Bridge, the  
40 main bridge and a culvert have been washed out as a result of flooding. The intent was to replace  
41 both with one bridge that will span the entire width of the flood plain. It will be more sustainable and  
42 allow access for recreational use.  
43

44 Ms. Briefer reported that Salt Lake Public Utilities has \$45,000 in its budget allocated for a canyon  
45 project match. She suggested that be kept in mind as they are prioritizing. They also have funding  
46 for Silver Lake signage.  
47

1 Ms. Nielsen explained that the two projects being discussed include two separate tiers for the same  
2 grant. It would be up to the committee to determine whether to submit two different proposals for  
3 the same grant in tiers. Ultimately, however, it seemed that they would be competing against  
4 themselves.

5  
6 Ms. Hotze stated that the U.S. Forest Service cannot be an applicant but they would support the  
7 project. Mayor Mendenhall recommended they combine funds from the Forest Service, the CWC,  
8 and Salt Lake Public Utilities. A \$50,000 match would be sought from the CWC.

9  
10 Laura Briefer stated that there are a number of granting agencies and opportunities. She suggested  
11 they be strategic about the types of projects they apply for. For example, the Watershed Restoration  
12 Initiative has funding that can be applied for. She recommended that a list be compiled of potential  
13 grant opportunities.

14  
15 Mayor Beerman recalled that at the last meeting a list of projects was prepared. He suggested that  
16 the list be prioritized.

17  
18 Catherine Kantor recommended they have a more in-depth discussion about priorities before  
19 identifying projects.

20  
21 Ms. Nielsen reported that they have been discussed the large-scale project being the Silver Lake  
22 Boardwalk. A different project was being considered that would fit into the smaller-scale tier for the  
23 same UOR grant. They also discussed putting out a call for project ideas from the public at large and  
24 other stakeholders.

## 25 26 **6. POTENTIAL SHORT-TERM PROJECTS.**

27  
28 **a. Trail Work.**

29  
30 **b. Toilets.**

31  
32 **c. Signage.**

33  
34 **d. Graffiti Abatement.**

35  
36 The committee next addressed existing short-term projects, namely signage and graffiti abatement  
37 work. Both are issues in the canyons and the project area and fits nicely into the purview of the  
38 committee. A need for signage reprinting was identified due to language printed on the signs being  
39 out of date or vandalized. It was noted that signs are not expensive and would be of value to visitors.

40  
41 Ms. Hotze reported that there are geology signs in the canyons that have been vandalized. She has  
42 been working with the Utah Geological Survey and the University of Utah to update that language.  
43 They still need to do the design work. The estimated cost of replacing three of the signs is \$4,000.  
44 There are also trailhead kiosks. The desire was to update them with relevant information as well.  
45 Marshall Alford from the U.S. Forest Service estimated materials and supplies will cost \$1,000 to  
46 \$2,000 if existing infrastructure is utilized.

1 Ms. Nielsen stated that in addition to signage she has had many conversations with those present  
2 about the ongoing effort to address graffiti activity taking place in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons  
3 and the surrounding areas. She reported that there is a chemical that effectively and safely removes  
4 graffiti. It is quite expensive and has been helpful in removing graffiti in the forest.

5  
6 Mary Young from Wasatch Graffiti Busters stated that their goal is to remove graffiti as quickly as  
7 possible since leaving it encourages more activity. They plan to apply for the UOR grant to help  
8 cover the cost of the chemicals and power washers. Ms. Nielsen stated that the cost of removing 300  
9 tags by Wasatch Graffiti Busters is about \$3,000.

10  
11 Ms. Young reported that they encouraged the County Council to provide \$50,000 in overtime funds  
12 to the UPD. There is currently \$31,000 remaining. One of the problems is that people may see graffiti  
13 or vandalism taking place, however, those involved should never be confronted. They have been  
14 working to take a picture of the graffiti and share that information on the CWC website.

15  
16 Ms. Nielsen indicated that there are several community groups focused on this issue. She considers  
17 the issue of graffiti to be a nice fit for this project. It will be up to the committee to determine which  
18 projects to pursue.

19  
20 **7. OTHER BUSINESS.**

21  
22 The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, February 19 at 2:30 p.m.

23  
24 **8. ADJOURNMENT.**

25  
26 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:36 a.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Short-Term Projects Committee Meeting held Wednesday, January 29, 2020.*  
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes  
6 T Forbes Group  
7 Minutes Secretary

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