



AMERICAN FORK CANYON VISION

Steering Committee Agenda: June 29; 8:00-10:00 am

Cedar Hills Community Center

10640 N Clubhouse Drive

1. Welcome
2. Project updates & schedule (contact cards)
3. LSD personnel change; project budget & funding discussions (see attmt 1+2)
4. Draft Charter
5. Proposed Mayors/Commissioners Luncheon
6. Discuss Vision Structure
7. Steering Committee Member Involvement Statements (see attmt 3)
8. Next steps and adjourn at 10:00 am



Attachment 1: AFCV Budget Update

Dear Steering Committee Members,

Several challenges affecting the project's budget have emerged over the past month or so. Mountain Accord's (MA) proposed land exchange, federal land designation, and the history of mountain-transit-related ideas in upper American Fork Canyon have generated significant confusion and controversy in Utah County among the American Fork Canyon user-base and the project Steering Committee. As you know, some of MA's proposed land exchange parcels are located in Utah County in the upper reaches of American Fork Canyon.

These issues have added significant controversy and costly challenges, including a dedicated social media opposition group, which quickly gained a following of over 3,200. The American Fork Canyon Vision (AFCV) Project is now dealing with outcomes of the MA process reactively rather than proactively.

Problem - Budget impacts to the original \$80,000 contract

We have spent over 50% of that budget, which is now not tracking with deliverables. Interacting with this social media group and managing its demands and requests responsibly has become a task demanding nearly full-time PR attention. The complex relationships between MA and AFCV must be coordinated, explained, and managed continuously. This is a challenge which did not exist prior to the Cottonwood Canyon Taskforce and Federal Designation Taskforce negotiation outcomes. Those outcomes occurred after we went under contract with the AFCV process.

The AFCV was designed with a moderate public involvement (PI) and public relations (PR) component, and was intended to spend its most significant time and energy in policy and plan development tasks. The added burden of dealing with the project's expanded PI/PR scope requires us to pause and consider a way forward given an unexpected change in scope.

Solutions - Three options

1. **Stop Work and Re-Strategize.** We could halt work and continue the intercept survey that is planned through January of 2016. This would allow us to "reset" public expectations about the project. The approach is to terminate the Visioning contract and re-strategize with the Steering Committee on a new and different approach. The risks are that we may lose the public attention that we have gained through our outreach, meetings, and efforts completed to date. However, the product of those efforts can be easily packaged to support any new approach that is developed.
2. **Reduce Scope of Phase 1; add Phase 2 Later.** We could reallocate the remaining budget to a smaller scope. A full written Vision wouldn't be completed, but the current budget and timeframe would be maintained. This approach would refocus the remaining budget toward a thorough public collaboration to develop a Vision "study plan" that would set a more specific scope of what the Vision should study and address. The policy development, process democracy, and implementation framework tasks would be completed in a Phase 2 effort.



3. **Retain original scope, expand public involvement, and increase budget.** Maintaining the original, full scope of the Vision project, given the controversy and interest that now exists, would require additional budget. Under this option, we continue with full Vision development but add resources for PR, additional meetings, and more consultants present at all meetings and events. We won't fully understand the budget impact until we hit the next meetings and understand what's happening with conflict dynamics. A first step to making this option work would be obtaining the \$30K that has been requested of Mountain Accord. See Attachment 2.

Paraphrased Perspective Carl Fisher, Executive Director of Save our Canyons:

The differences between SLCo & Mountain Accord, and UTCO & AFCVision. Some 80 studies have been done on the other side of the ridge (SLCo). A number of focused visioning documents were prepared. Even additional studies where necessary (Wasatch Canyons Transportation Study for example). Still at that point, after decades of study and planning, it's arguable whether the "community" was ready for Mountain Accord. However, I believe that diligence, patience, and improving our understanding of the systems that make up the Central Wasatch, was time well spent. Others might argue differently.

I think it is safe to say that Utah County is perhaps a decade or more, behind the visioning, planning and implementation of something for the American Fork Canyon Alpine Loop. I don't think it is impossible to do it faster than a decade, but I think that we certainly need to dedicate more than a year or two and why not start now. I want to reaffirm (for better or worse) that Save Our Canyons is committed to partnering with you all to help construct a vision that protects what is so important about this region to so many, both in and outside of Utah County.



Attachment 2: MA Funding Request

Mountain Accord
Attn: Laynee Jones
Program Manager

June 5, 2015

RE: Funding Assistance Request

Hi Laynee,

As discussed over the past couple weeks, the American Fork Canyon Vision (AFCV) Project, which is currently funded primarily by the Utah State legislature and Snowbird, would like to ask Mountain Accord (MA) for funding assistance. The rational nexus for the request is that MA's land exchange, federal land designation, and mountain-transit-related concepts have generated significant confusion and controversy in Utah County among the American Fork Canyon user-base and the project Steering Committee.

As you know, some of MA's proposed land exchange parcels are located in Utah County in the upper reaches of American Fork Canyon. Utah County elected officials, who were not invited to participate in Mountain Accord's Phase one process, are now dealing with outcomes of the MA process reactively rather than proactively. Key relationships between MA and AFCV must be coordinated, explained, and managed continuously, a challenge which did not exist prior to the Cottonwood Canyon Taskforce and Federal Designation Taskforce negotiation outcomes.

The AFCV was designed with a moderate public involvement and public relations component, but now has significant and costly challenges. This includes a social media group that has gained a following of over 2,400, and that is demanding nearly full-time PR attention.

To help support the added PI/PR challenges and pressures to the AFCV project, funding assistance in the amount of **\$30,000** is requested. We appreciate your consideration of this request. Please contact me anytime with questions.

Regards,

Shawn J. Seager

Shawn Seager
Regional Planning Director
Mountainland Association of Governments
(801) 824-1066
sseager@mountainland.org



Attachment 3: AFC Member Statements

American Fork Canyon Vision Sample Member Statement

[The Forest Service] is a member of American Fork Canyon Vision Steering Committee. We joined the committee because we are concerned about [heavy canyon use and the potential challenges that come along with it, including managing natural resources and canyon congestion/public safety in the face of a population doubling by 2040.] We became involved in the AFCV process when [approached in January 2014 by the Utah County Council of Governments with a proposal for the development of connectivity to Snowbird via American Fork Canyon.] Our key interests in the project are to [address natural and social resource concerns, while reconciling conflicting interests in order to make decisions that provide the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run.] We would like to see the AFC Vision document provide [clear public direction for enhancing and guiding uses, activities, and investments on NFS lands in American Fork Canyon.]

*The highlighted areas would be customized by each steering member.