



1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”)**
4 **BUDGET/FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020**
5 **AT 3:30 P.M. VIA ZOOM**
6

7 **Present:** Chair Jeff Silvestrini, Jim Bradley, Mayor Harris Sondak, Ralph Becker

8
9 **CWC Staff:** Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen,
10 Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson
11

12 **Attendees:** Bobby Sampson, Jenna Malone
13

14 • **OPENING**

15
16 1. **Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, as Chair of the Budget/Finance Committee, will Call the**
17 **Meeting to Order.**
18

19 Chair Jeff Silvestrini called the meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.
20

21 2. **Mayor Silvestrini will Inform the Committee of a Contract with BlinkTag, a**
22 **Mountain Transit System Budget Line Item: a Sole Source Contract Approved by**
23 **Chair Chris Robinson Following Review by Shane Topham, Attorney.**
24

25 • **JULY 2020 FINANCIALS AND STAFF REPORT UPDATE**
26

27 Chair Silvestrini discussed a potential contract with BlinkTag. He had read the contract and
28 reported that Exhibit A describes the project. Deputy Director, Blake Perez explained that it is a
29 Design Your Transit tool that is an online platform where users can weigh in. It is both a survey
30 and a dynamic game where users choose the type of service, transportation modes, providers, and
31 management they like. The tool would then calculate fiscal constraints and benefits, which are
32 objectives of the Mountain Transportation System.
33

34 Chair Silvestrini’s understanding was that they were prepared to spend approximately \$5,000 on
35 the tool. Mr. Perez noted that the cost would be just under \$5,000 with the funds coming from the
36 \$40,000 budgeted for the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) process. Mr. Perez stated
37 that only the Chair of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”), Chris Robinson, would need to
38 sign off on it. He confirmed that the Budget/Finance Committee needs to recommend the contract
39 to the Chair of the CWC.
40

1 Ralph Becker noted that the project was within the budget for Mountain Transportation Service.
2 He reported that uses for the planned budget had already been approved. Approval of the BlinkTag
3 contract was recommended by the Transportation Committee. Mr. Perez reported that he used the
4 Design Your Own Transit tool during his time with the Salt Lake City Transportation Division
5 when they were working on their Transit Master Plan and it was a successful engagement tool.
6 Mr. Perez had spoken to consultants in San Francisco, who had used the tool on a lot of projects,
7 and it received positive reviews. Mayor Sondak asked if the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) had
8 something equivalent that was available to the public. Mr. Perez stated that he was not aware of a
9 similar system. Mayor Sondak asked if the tool would cross transit agencies. Mr. Becker stated
10 that it would in some respects as the City has its own transit system.

11
12 Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson noted that the Design Your Own Transit tool was an
13 engaging game that would interact with users in a different way than traditional written public
14 comments. Chair Silvestrini noted that the tool would encourage people to participate and would
15 allow feedback from a broader sample size. Mr. Becker stated that they were trying to find newer
16 and better ways to engage people, given the fact that it was not possible to see residents face to
17 face, due to COVID-19 concerns. Chair Silvestrini noted that Ms. Mickelson sent out financial
18 information.

19
20 Jim Bradley asked if the project was just for transit or if it included other modalities as well.
21 Mr. Perez clarified that it is for the Mountain Transportation System initiative and it was a transit-
22 focused game that included bus, aerial, and rail management. He noted that they were pushed by
23 an individual, David Stein, to pursue Tesla’s Boring Company, which the Utah Department of
24 Transportation (“UDOT”) was looking into.

25
26 Ms. Mickelson noted that she included the July financials to show receipt of \$25,000 from Summit
27 County. She added that on August 18, 2020, Chair Silvestrini and Chris Robinson would make a
28 presentation to Sandy City. The presentation would likely be the decision point for their member
29 contribution. Chair Silvestrini reported that they had previously spoken to the Salt Lake County
30 Council and decided to do something similar with Sandy City.

31
32 • **DRAFT OF CWC ANNUAL REPORT PORTION COVERING**
33 **BUDGET/FINANCE/OPERATIONS**

34
35 Mr. Perez stated that an audit would coincide with the Annual Report. The Commission would
36 receive a full audit report from the auditor/Greg Ogden at the September Commission Meeting.
37 Ms. Mickelson noted that Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen was developing a
38 comprehensive Annual Report. A rough draft of the Budget/Finance Committee portion had been
39 distributed to Committee Members. Ms. Mickelson reported that the rough document included
40 three flowcharts of operational updates: payables flow, deposits flow, and access to the Public
41 Trust Investment Fund. Mr. Perez noted that the audit would highlight some of the bullet points
42 Ms. Mickelson outlined in the document and flow charts.

43

1 • **FUNDRAISING THOUGHTS AND STRATEGY DISCUSSION**

2
3 Mr. Perez presented a document showing the two types of fundraising being pursued. Using the
4 example of short-term projects, Mr. Perez felt that the Visitor Use Study had a lower dollar amount
5 that could be fundraised around. He reported that the CWC initially wanted to fund half of Phase 1,
6 contingent upon Sandy City’s contribution. Mr. Perez noted that the latter looked promising,
7 however, a short-term fundraising strategy was also important. Mr. Perez stated that the Visitor
8 Use Committee of the Stakeholders Council were strategizing around fundraising.

9
10 Mr. Perez reported that Carl Fisher, from Save Our Canyons, was willing to fundraise the other
11 half of Phase 1 for the Visitor Use Study. Mr. Perez believed Mr. Fisher had already begun raising
12 funds. A goal was set for October 1, 2020. After that, the full amount would potentially be in
13 hand and a Request for Proposal (“RFP”) would take place for Phase 1. Chair Silvestrini noted
14 that the goal was to raise \$20,000. Mr. Perez believed the CWC Board had agreed to set aside
15 approximately \$100,000 from reserves to pursue the Visitor Use Study and Environmental
16 Dashboard projects. \$30,000 was dedicated to the Visitor Use Study. Mr. Perez hoped the RFP
17 would go out in October and a partner would be chosen by November 1, 2020. Mr. Perez
18 confirmed that \$50,000 was the cost suggested in the prospectus.

19
20 Mr. Becker reported that the range was between \$35,000 and \$50,000. Not knowing what the
21 exact cost would be, it was beneficial to budget for the higher amount and see what was received
22 in terms of proposals and costs. Chair Silvestrini reported that they discussed trying to fundraise
23 half of the project but he was comfortable if \$20,000 was raised, as it was close to half of the
24 necessary funding. Mr. Becker noted that they received a pledge of \$2,000 from the Wasatch
25 Mountain Club, which would be in addition to the money Mr. Fisher was trying to raise.

26
27 The Committee discussed whether the U.S. Forest Service was on board for a Visitor Use Study.
28 Mr. Becker reported that there had been a conversation with Stakeholder Council Members, Co-
29 Chairs, staff, and Lance Kovel, Acting U.S. Forest Service District Ranger. Mr. Becker
30 commented that the Forest Service is nervous about the Visitor Use Study. They had discussed
31 framing the study so it would not impinge on U.S. Forest Service decision-making. He felt that
32 the conversation had been productive. The U.S. Forest Service had concerns that a Visitor Use
33 Study would lead to recommendations that would trigger action from the National Environment
34 Policy Act (“NEPA”) or lead to an amendment of their plan. A suggestion was made that the study
35 not include a proposed recommendation.

36
37 Chair Silvestrini asked if whether the Millcreek Canyon Committee had made the U.S. Forest
38 Service nervous with the letter they sent. Mr. Becker did not believe so, because Stakeholders
39 Council Member, Ed Marshall, had done a good job of reaching out to the Forest Service. Chair
40 Silvestrini hoped that Committee action in sponsoring a Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”)
41 grant would go a long way toward easing Salt Lake District Ranger, Bekee Hotze’s concerns at
42 the Forest Service Office. He reported that there had been discussions about a shuttle project.
43 Ms. Hotze stated that a FLAP grant would be needed first. Mr. Perez commented that in the
44 Mountain Transportation System concepts for Millcreek, a shuttle would still be possible.
45 However, they recognized that several mobility and safety improvements would need to be made

1 before a shuttle program could be rolled out. Chair Silvestrini noted that may require a future
2 fundraising project.

3
4 Mr. Becker reported that Ms. Hotze was no longer the Salt Lake District Ranger. She stepped into
5 another position and Lance Kovel was the Acting Salt Lake District Ranger. Chair Silvestrini
6 asked if Ms. Hotze was coming back into the position. Mr. Becker confirmed that she was.
7 Mr. Perez believed she would be back within the month.

8
9 Mr. Perez stated that the second type of fundraising was long-term, which was focused on the
10 Environmental Dashboard. He noted that they were hoping to work with a 501(c)(3) partner to act
11 as a tax-deductible donation base. He reported that they had also looked at crowd-funding.
12 Ms. Mickelson reported that she had been looking at whether or not crowdfunding would be
13 possible in relation to their own website. She noted that there seemed to be compliance issues that
14 went along with that. Ms. Mickelson had heard from crowdfunding sources that it would be easier
15 to go through a third-party platform. She believed a conversation could be had with the University
16 of Utah about their crowdfunding and noted that there were other third-party sources to potentially
17 contract with. She reported that some crowdfunding and social media funding avenues have
18 compliance, registration, and licensing issues with the State and Federal government. She believed
19 that eventually, a recommendation would be made to crowdfund with a third-party platform.

20
21 Ms. Mickelson suggested looking at the Visitor Use Study like a long-term project, similar to the
22 Environmental Dashboard. She believed it would be beneficial to have someone from the
23 Budget/Finance Committee act as a Liaison. She suggested Mayor Sondak serve in that capacity.
24 Another piece of long-term project fundraising involved the Executive Committee having
25 oversight. Ms. Mickelson noted that this was because the projects would be longer, require more
26 monetary matching funds, and be slightly more complex. She recommended that the
27 Budget/Finance Committee be involved in looking at funding and the Executive Committee be
28 involved in oversight.

29
30 Ms. Mickelson discussed listing short-term projects on the CWC website to show what was being
31 done, what funding dollars had come in from the CWC, as well as a line that stated which projects
32 were still available for additional funding. She believed this would encourage others to allocate
33 funding resources. Ms. Mickelson reported that the Committee was heading in a direction where
34 they would become facilitators for funds that became available from other entities. Mr. Becker
35 agreed and noted that the CWC was becoming a collection and funneling entity, where they funded
36 projects that were prioritized in the area.

37
38 Chair Silvestrini asked if staff felt they had the experience needed to do grant writing. It was noted
39 that several staff members have grant writing experience. Ms. Mickelson noted that the issue
40 regarding the 501(c)(3) was that many private foundations would only give to a 501(c)(3) that had
41 specific IRS designation. There had been a conversation regarding this issue. However,
42 Ms. Mickelson noted that when a foundation was formed from an organization that was intended
43 to have the foundation support it, this would result in two board groups. The Foundation Board
44 Group could become a difficult partner as they may want the board to do something they do not
45 feel is necessary. She believed it was important to be careful when establishing another entity but
46 noted that they may eventually reach a point where they would need to form a 501(c)(3).

1
2 Ms. Nielsen reported that based on the direction received from the Commissioners during the last
3 Board Meeting, new means of fundraising were being explored. Friends of Alta expressed interest
4 in the Environmental Dashboard project. On August 27, 2020, Friends of Alta would be hosting
5 a digital informational presentation where a staff member from Friends of Alta would provide an
6 introduction to audience members about why they are interested in the Environmental Dashboard.
7 Ms. Nielsen would provide a brief history of the project during this presentation. Jim Ehleringer
8 and Phoebe McNeilly, the project leads at the University of Utah, would share presentations that
9 they had given during Commission Meetings. Ms. Nielsen noted that there would be a Q&A
10 session from audience members as well. Peter Corroon, a Board Member for Friends of Alta, is
11 scheduled to facilitate the discussion. He would also ask for fundraising from the Friends of Alta
12 network and viewers in the digital audience. Friends of Alta had been asked to help raise \$50,000.
13

14 Mr. Becker reported that the committee was moving in an entrepreneurial way to accomplish more.
15 He noted that they could leverage CWC monies to get more done in a shorter time period. Chair
16 Silvestrini commented that finding new ways to engage people was especially important due to
17 COVID-19 as well as economic circumstances. He believed that as the Committee established a
18 track record, fundraising work would become easier. Ms. Mickelson agreed.
19

20 Commissioner Bradley asked about potential grants. He wondered if they would be conducted in-
21 house and what the process would look like. Mr. Becker reported that it was an approach the CWC
22 wanted to pursue. He noted that they did not have the in-house capability to do much but they did
23 have people, such as Ms. Mickelson, who had done fundraising for different kinds of projects in a
24 similar mode. He stated that they may eventually get to a point where additional expertise was
25 needed. If and when that happens, they would come back to the Board to discuss opportunities.
26 Mr. Becker reported that when he served as Mayor and they were doing fundraising, the City did
27 not have in-house capabilities. He noted that they brought in expertise as needed. Mr. Becker
28 stated that the Committee would remain mindful of when they may need to enhance capabilities
29 to take full advantage of potential fundraising avenues.
30

31 Ms. Mickelson reported that staff was focused on available grants as well as keeping track of
32 deadlines and application processes. She also noted that they were in the process of building a
33 database of information. Mr. Bradley commented that even though the CWC is only a two-year-
34 old organization, the organization has notable members, including mayors of cities and towns.
35 Chair Silvestrini felt that the Committee was on the right track with the tangible things that were
36 put on the table for both short and long-term projects. Mr. Perez commented that building a track
37 record with short-term projects will enhance fundraising moving forward. Commissioner Bradley
38 believed it was important that the Committee not take on too much. He did not believe the CWC
39 could afford any failures.
40

41 Ms. Mickelson was waiting to see if the Sandy City membership contribution would come through
42 to move ahead with the Visitor Use Study. If everything falls into place and funds are available,
43 the RFP would occur in October. She noted that she would like to use Mayor Sondak as a resource
44 as they move forward with the project.
45

1 • **OTHER DISCUSSION ITEMS**

2
3 Chair Silvestrini wondered if there had been a change in Sandy City’s outlook. Mr. Perez reported
4 that he had spoken to Marci Houseman from the Sandy City Council after the budget was passed.
5 Ms. Houseman felt there needed to be a separation between the employee compensation package
6 and CWC funding. Mr. Perez noted that there were some savings and public utility funds of
7 approximately \$700,000. Ms. Houseman inquired with Director of Public Utilities, Tom Ward,
8 about how this would impact the taxpayers, if there was a possibility to provide the CWC funding,
9 and if he thought it would be worthwhile to do so. Mr. Ward responded to the entire Council
10 jumpstarting the conversation. Mr. Perez had heard that there would likely be a 6-to-1 or a
11 unanimous vote in one week.

12
13 Chair Silvestrini asked if the Mayor’s Office had changed their opinion on the issue of membership
14 contributions. He wondered if Sandy City Mayor, Kurt Bradburn, had any opposition to the issue.
15 Mr. Becker reported that the Mayor had never recommended the CWC Budget. The Council put
16 it in the budget they approved and the Mayor accepted it. Mr. Becker was unaware if anyone
17 associated with the CWC had had a direct conversation with Mayor Bradburn about the issue. Mr.
18 Becker reported that Sandy City’s Chief Administrative Officer, Matt Huish, had attended several
19 CWC sessions and was positive about the work done by the Commission. Mayor Sondak noted
20 that Mayor Bradburn had not expressed much interest in what the CWC was doing. Chair
21 Silvestrini believed Mayor Bradburn would hear the presentation on August 18, 2020, and he and
22 Commissioner Robinson could follow up.

23
24 Chair Silvestrini noted that a Policing Town Hall Meeting for Millcreek was held on Monday
25 evening. Mayor Sondak noted that he had a conversation with the police recently and found that
26 the police in the City of Alta had not fired a weapon in more than 30 years, had not tasered anyone
27 in 30 years, and had only occasionally made arrests with handcuffs. Chair Silvestrini reported that
28 he had gone through a Truth and Taxation Hearing to discuss the purpose of a tax increase, which
29 had been less than 3%, for funding for the United Police Department (“UPD”) contract. He noted
30 that 57% of residents were in favor of the tax increase as long as it went toward police. The
31 opposition had been divided between not wanting a tax increase and wanting to defund the police.
32 Chair Silvestrini noted that there were also residents who want to reallocate resources. Given the
33 comments made regarding the tax increase, Chair Silvestrini expected there would be a lot of
34 supportive comments for UPD. However, he noted that the department would have to be
35 reorganized since Taylorsville was leaving to form its own police department.

36
37 Chair Silvestrini opened up the discussion to public comment. There were no public comments.

38
39 • **ADJOURNMENT**

40
41 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:30 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Budget/Finance Committee Meeting held Thursday, August 13, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____