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**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2023, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST, MILLCREEK, UTAH.**

**Present:**  John Knoblock, Chair

Carl Fisher, Co-Chair

Barbara Cameron

Linda Johnson

Amber Broadway

Kurt Hegmann

Ed Marshall

Tom Diegel

Caitlin Curry

Del Draper

Mike Christensen

Dave Fields

Morgan Mingle

Maura Hahnenberger

Kelly Boardman

Dennis Goreham

Dan Zalles

Sarah Bennett

Kirk Nichols

Rusty Vetter

Roger Borgenicht

Jennifer Eden

Ian Hartley

Hilary Lambert

Adam Lenkowski

Mike Marker

Nathan Rafferty

Danny Richardson

**Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director

Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Coordinator

**Opening**

1. **John Knoblock will Open the Stakeholders Council Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission.**

Chair John Knoblock called the Stakeholders Council Meeting to order at approximately 3:34 p.m. He noted that it was a hybrid meeting, with participants attending both in person and virtually. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, apologized for the technical difficulties.

1. **Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes from the July 31, 2023, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the July 31, 2023 Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1. **Announcements:**
   1. **Youth Council Call for Applications is Open Until September 28.**

Ms. Nielsen shared information about the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Youth Council. She informed the Stakeholders Council that the organization is creating a Youth Council for participants between the ages of 16 and 30. The call for applications will remain open until September 28, 2023. Ms. Nielsen explained that the Youth Council would essentially mirror what was done by the Stakeholders Council, however, the intention was to hear from younger voices. The application period had been open for the last three weeks and would close shortly. She asked Stakeholders Council Members to share the Youth Council information where possible. There was a desire to have a strong Youth Council with active participants. All of the application materials were on the CWC website.

* 1. **Visitor-Use Study Presentation for Final Data During October 2nd CWC Board Meeting.**

Ms. Nielsen reported that at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, she announced that the Visitor Use Study would be presented at the August 2023 CWC Board Meeting. However, the team at Utah State University (“USU”) ran into issues with the data. As a result, the presentation was pushed back to the October 2, 2023, CWC Board Meeting. After many years of work, the Visitor Use Study was coming to a close. It would be integrated into the Environmental Dashboard as a human element. She noted that the data would be fully accessible for everyone to see and use.

* 1. **New Staffing Introductions.**

Ms. Nielsen shared information about new staffing within the CWC. She was now serving as the Executive Director and was pleased to introduce two permanent members to the CWC Staff. Mia McNeil was appointed to serve as the Community Engagement Coordinator and Samantha Kilpack as the Director of Operations. Ms. Nielsen was excited to have both working within the organization.

* 1. **Next Scheduled Stakeholders Council Meeting is on November 27th and Thank You to Millcreek for Hosting.**

Co-Chair Carl Fisher reported that the next Stakeholders Council Meeting would be held on November 27, 2023. There would likely need to be another meeting location selected for the January meeting. Ms. Nielsen noted that the 2024 meeting schedule would be set at the November meeting.

**SYSTEMS COMMITTEES MEMBERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

1. **Summarize Self-Selection of Committees and Takeaways from Survey.**
2. **Chair Knoblock will Provide an Overview of the Survey and the New Committee Structure.**

Chair Knoblock reported that the Stakeholders Council would have a new structure. Currently, there were several subcommittees, but a decision had been made to create Systems Committees that were focused on the tenants of the Mountain Accord. There would be a hybrid type of system, where there would still be relevant subcommittees, such as the Millcreek Canyon Committee, but there would also be Systems Committees for Council Members. The proposed Systems Committees would focus on environment, transportation, recreation, and economy. Chair Knoblock explained that the purpose of the Systems Committees was to increase active participation and have more focused discussions.

During previous discussions, there were concerns that not all areas of focus would fit into the work of the four Systems Committees. That was the reason that there was a hybrid system proposed. It would allow subcommittees, like the Millcreek Canyon Committee, to continue to move forward. If there was another issue that did not fit into one of the four Systems Committees, an additional subcommittee could be created to address that need. Chair Knoblock reported that Council Members had filled out a survey related to participation and areas of interest. There was a draft created to outline Stakeholders Council Membership on the Systems Committees based on the survey results.

Ms. Nielsen explained that the motivating force behind the survey was to see how Council Members felt about the Mountain Accord document and to see where Council Members wanted to focus their efforts when it came to the Systems Committees. She thanked everyone who took the time to complete the survey. Ms. Nielsen apologized again for the technical difficulties in presenting the information.

Chair Knoblock explained that the main goal of the CWC is to implement the Mountain Accord. The intention was to have a balance between economic concerns, environmental concerns, transportation concerns, and recreational concerns. It was important for the Stakeholders Council to continue to push items forward in a balanced way that took the Mountain Accord into account. He hoped the Systems Committees would discuss those specific areas of focus. Chair Knoblock read the 2023 Stakeholders Council Membership Draft document information, which was as follows:

* Millcreek Canyon Committee:
  + Mike Christensen;
  + Tom Diegel;
  + Del Draper;
  + Maura Hahnenberger;
  + John Knoblock;
  + Ed Marshall;
  + Rusty Vetter.
* Transportation Systems Committee:
  + Roger Borgenicht;
  + Mike Christensen;
  + Linda Johnson;
  + Michael Marker;
  + Danny Richardson;
  + Patrick Shea.
* Economy Systems Committee:
  + Amber Broadaway;
  + Mike Doyle;
  + Dave Fields;
  + Ed Marshall;
  + Nathan Rafferty.
* Environment Systems Committee:
  + Kelly Boardman;
  + Caitlin Curry;
  + Carl Fisher;
  + Maura Hanenberger;
  + Kurt Hegmann;
  + Adam Lenkowski;
  + Megan Nelson;
  + Rusty Vetter;
  + Dan Zalles;
  + Jennifer Eden.
* Recreation Systems Committee:
  + Sarah Bennett;
  + Barbara Cameron;
  + Stuart Derman;
  + Tom Diegel;
  + Dennis Goreham;
  + Ian Hartley;
  + John Knoblock;
  + Hilary Lambert;
  + Morgan Mingle;
  + Kirk Nichols;
  + Joanna Wheelton;
  + Serena Yau.

There was discussion about the draft list that was presented. Amber Broadaway previously stated that she would be fine serving on the Economy Systems Committee as long as at least one person is representing the ski resorts on the Transportation Systems Committee. Ms. Broadaway agreed to go wherever she would be the most useful but she was not certain that she would be able to participate on two Systems Committees. Chair Knoblock noted that even partial participation on the two committees would be appreciated. Co-Chair Fisher explained that the Systems Committees will allow for more focused discussion on specific issues. That being said, all of the highlights from the discussions would come back to the full Stakeholders Council for review and possible action.

Co-Chair Fisher explained that all of the Systems Committee meetings will be publicly noticed and recorded. It would be possible for Stakeholders Council Members to attend meetings that they are not formal members of. It would also be possible to listen to recordings of those meetings. Chair Knoblock noted that the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meetings were conducted via Zoom, which worked well because it made it possible for people to fit the meeting into their schedule.

Ms. Nielsen informed those present that the draft list of Systems Committee appointments could change based on preferences and discussion. That list was simply a rough starting point based on the results of the survey. Co-Chair Fisher confirmed that the list could be changed to ensure that everyone is on a Systems Committee that they want to be on. In the future, it will also be possible to move to a different Systems Committee if desired. It was possible to serve on additional Systems Committees as well. He explained that meeting schedules and agendas will be set ahead of time.

Chair Knoblock asked about the draft of the Mountain Accord Scorecard. He explained that the scorecard outlines how the organization is doing in terms of implementing the Mountain Accord. He hoped that would be presented to the CWC Board because he felt it should be one of the guiding documents for each of the Systems Committees. Ms. Nielsen explained that it was the foundation of the work that the CWC Board did during the 2022 CWC Board Retreat. CWC Staff will add the scorecard to the CWC website in the next week or two so it can be reviewed.

Co-Chair Fisher noted that some adjustments had been made to the draft membership list, which included moving Kurt Hegmann to the Transportation Systems Committee. He wondered if any other modifications were requested. It was noted that Morgan Mingle had asked to be moved to the Economy Systems Committee. Tom Diegel wanted to participate in the Transportation Systems Committee. It was reiterated that Ms. Broadaway also wanted to be part of the Transportation Systems Committee. There were no additional changes requested to be made to the draft document.

1. **Committee Membership and Leadership Vote.**
2. **Co-Chair Fisher will Review Stakeholders Council Survey Responses and Assign Committee Membership.**

**MOTION:** Mike Christensen moved to APPROVE the Systems Committee Structure, as discussed. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

1. **Nomination and Election of Committee Leadership.**
2. **Stakeholders will Nominate and Vote for a Chair and Co-Chair for Each of the Four Systems.**

Co-Chair Fisher reported that the next matter to discuss pertained to the Systems Committee leadership. It was noted that Tom Diegel is the current Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and Del Draper is the Co-Chair. Both were willing to continue in those positions. Mr. Diegel explained that there are two-year terms. In the spring, it would be possible to rediscuss the matter.

**MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to APPROVE the Millcreek Canyon Committee Leadership, with Tom Diegel as Chair and Del Draper as Co-Chair. John Knoblock seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

There was discussion regarding the Economy Systems Committee. Co-Chair Fisher asked for possibilities for a Chair and Co-Chair. Dave Fields and Morgan Mingle were nominated.

**MOTION:** \_\_\_\_\_\_ moved to APPROVE the Economy Systems Committee Leadership, with Dave Fields as Chair and Morgan Mingle as Co-Chair. Ed Marshall seconded the motion.

The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

There was discussion regarding the Environment Systems Committee. Co-Chair Fisher asked about possibilities for a Chair and Co-Chair. Kelly Boardman offered as did Dan Zalles.

**MOTION:** Dennis Goreham moved to APPROVE the Environment Systems Committee Leadership, with Kelly Boardman as Chair and Dan Zalles as Co-Chair. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

There was discussion regarding the Recreation Systems Committee. Co-Chair Fisher asked for possibilities for a Chair and Co-Chair. Sarah Bennett offered as did Barbara Cameron.

**MOTION:** Maura Hahnenberger moved to APPROVE the Recreation Systems Committee Leadership, with Sarah Bennett as Chair and Barbara Cameron as Co-Chair. \_\_\_\_\_ seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

There was discussion regarding the Transportation Systems Committee. Co-Chair Fisher asked about possibilities for a Chair and Co-Chair. Mike Christensen offered as did Amber Broadaway.

**MOTION:** Del Draper moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Leadership, with Mike Christensen as Chair and Amber Broadaway as Co-Chair. Linda Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

Co-Chair Fisher believed that in addition to the Systems Committee Meetings, there should be a leadership check-in occasionally with the Systems Committee Chairs and Co-Chairs. He believed a 30-minute call once a month or so would make the most sense. There would be discussions in the future with those who had been selected for the different Systems Committee leadership roles.

Rusty Vetter had a question related to voting. It was his view that the different Systems and committees would provide recommendations to the Stakeholders Council. If a Council Member wanted to participate in a Systems Committee that they were not officially part of, he thought that was fine, and he also thought it was acceptable for that Council Member to vote. However, he wondered if others felt the same. Co-Chair Fisher explained that the Systems Committees will not necessarily vote but will forward an opinion to the Stakeholders Council. Committees will advance recommendations that will then be considered further by the Stakeholders Council and voted on. Members of the public could also engage during Systems Committee discussions.

Mr. Draper asked about quorum requirements for the Systems Committee. Membership had been set, but he wondered if Stakeholders Council Members not on that particular Systems Committee could count towards meeting the quorum. Ms. Nielsen stated that the technical reading of the Rules and Procedures document states that members of committees needed to be officially approved during a larger Stakeholders Council Meeting. Stakeholders Council Members who want to join additional Systems Committees could make a request. That could be voted on at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. The Chair or Co-Chair of that specific Systems Committee could make the request during the Open Comment period of the Council Meeting. This was only needed for Stakeholders Council Members and not members of the public. She explained that members of the public cannot vote.

Chair Knoblock questioned whether each Systems Committee needs to have a quorum to proceed with the meeting. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. According to the Rules and Procedures document, a quorum is half of the Committee Members, plus one. The appointments made to the Systems Committees constituted the full Committee. A quorum would be half of that membership, plus one. Now that there are Chairs and Co-Chairs for each of the Systems Committees, CWC Staff would reach out to leadership following the current Stakeholders Council Meeting. There would be coordination with calendars and meeting schedules to select appropriate meeting times and dates. Mr. Zalles was having difficulty hearing portions of the meeting. He asked Chair Knoblock to repeat some of the information that was shared. Chair Knoblock noted that the goal was for each of the Systems Committees to meet every other month. Those meetings would occur during months that the full Stakeholders Council did not meet. However, he acknowledged that those details still needed to be finalized. He pointed out that adjustments could be made depending on how things went.

**COMMITTEE UPDATES**

1. **Millcreek Canyon Committee Update.**
2. **Committee Chair Tom Diegel will Provide an Overview of Recent Millcreek Canyon Committee Activities.**

Mr. Diegel reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee met recently. There had been discussions about the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant project. The Committee had been trying to understand what the plans were. There was a desire to confirm that the consultants, County, U.S. Forest Service, and Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) were working towards the desires of the public. There was a public comment period and open house held in June. Mr. Diegel had done a Government Records Access and Management Act (“GRAMA”) request for comments and many of them stressed the importance of maintaining the intimate nature of the canyon. However, the design was to widen the road, improve some sightlines, and put in some infrastructure for a shuttle. There was a desire to better understand the proposal.

At the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, information was shared about a Feasibility Proposal for shuttle service in Millcreek Canyon. Ms. Nielsen shared information about that proposal. The FLAP grant illustrated the need to look seriously into the implementation of a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. The Forest Service approached the CWC at the beginning of the summer to see whether some background research could be done. For instance, potential funding sources, estimated costs, and possible parking areas. CWC Staff did the research and delivered it to the CWC Board for review. From there, it went on to the Forest Service for review. The Forest Service determined that the shuttle was not feasible from their perspective due to the lack of parking. As a result, there was no additional work being done with the CWC at the moment for a potential shuttle service.

Mr. Diegel pointed out that there might be some other opportunities for parking areas. One was the frontage road to the west of the freeway and another option was on the east side of the freeway. The Millcreek Canyon Committee was moving forward to determine whether those areas might be feasible for shuttle parking. An email had been sent to Mayor Jeff Silvestrini in Millcreek. Mr. Diegel noted that there are currently less than 400 parking spots in the entire canyon. If there were 150 parking spots at the mouth of the canyon, that would be more than enough to start with.

Mr. Diegel stated that there had been a lot of excellent participation on the Millcreek Canyon Committee. If there were other Stakeholders Council Members interested in joining, he asked that they reach out. There was a desire to hear different perspectives.

1. **Co-Chair Fisher will Give an Update Concerning Stakeholders’ Recommendation Letter to the Board Concerning UDOT’s LCC EIS and UDOT’s Subsequent Email Response.**
2. **With Discussion and Possible Action from the Stakeholders Council.**
3. **UDOT’s Response Email is Included in the Attachments.**

Co-Chair Fisher reported that last month, a letter from the Stakeholders Council was formalized. It related to the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). He presented the letter to the CWC Board at the CWC Board Meeting in August. At that meeting, UDOT presented the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS and there was a request that UDOT respond to the Stakeholders Council letter. EIS Project Manager, Josh Van Jura, sent an email response to the letter that was included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It was suggested that there be a discussion about the response.

Mr. Hegmann did not believe UDOT was interested in answering the questions posed in the initial letter from the Stakeholders Council. He felt it was the responsibility of the CWC to call out UDOT on the non-answers that were received. Mr. Zalles wondered if there was anything that could still be done at this point. Chair Knoblock pointed out that the CWC Board purposely decided not to submit an opinion on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Instead, the pillars document was created. He suspected that if the Stakeholders Council tried to move something forward to the CWC Board, there would not be further action taken. As a result, he did not see what else the Stakeholders Council could do. That being said, individuals could pursue the matter further with UDOT. He reminded the Council that the Stakeholders Council could only pass things onto the CWC Board.

Ms. Johnson asked if the CWC Board Members had received the UDOT letter. This was confirmed. She felt it was important to find out whether the CWC Board wanted the Stakeholders Council to pursue the matter further. It might also be worthwhile for the Transportation Systems Committee to discuss the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Co-Chair Fisher noted that when he presented the initial letter to the CWC Board, there was a desire to understand what success would look like for the phased approach. That was a request from Mayor Monica Zoltanski and was an actionable item the Transportation Systems Committee could discuss and share recommendations on.

Based on the letter received from UDOT, Co-Chair Fisher did not believe UDOT was interested in engaging with anyone outside of a legal challenge. If UDOT was unwilling to engage with anyone on phasing or any other aspect of the Little Cottonwood Canyon work, he was concerned about the process moving forward. He thought the CWC Board might need to challenge the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS if there was a true desire to engage with UDOT. Ms. Johnson asked that the Transportation Systems Committee discuss the matter further and share a recommendation. Co-Chair Fisher pointed out that there were limitations due to the deadline of the UDOT response period.

Chair Knoblock suggested that the Transportation Systems Committee invite Mr. Van Jura to attend a meeting. There could be a discussion about how the organization could assist with the Phase 1 implementation. Additionally, there could be a brainstorming session about how to solve problems. Mr. Diegel noted that the CWC was established to execute the Mountain Accord. The CWC Board, with the exception of the Ex Officio Members, is comprised of elected officials. Not responding to the UDOT email did not necessarily make sense as he felt the dialogue needed to continue.

Mr. Hegmann reported that at the Big Cottonwood Community Council Meeting, he asked about phasing. According to Mr. Van Jura, it is technically possible to skip right to the gondola. It was important to remember that the numbers listed are not necessarily sequential. Whatever is funded is what will be built. If the Legislature wanted the gondola to be built, that could be done first.

Chair Knoblock wondered if the CWC Board would discuss the UDOT response email at the CWC Board Meeting in October. Ms. Nielsen reported that she would speak to Chair Robinson to determine whether it would be included on the meeting agenda or not. It was a potential discussion item. She pointed out that Stakeholders Council leadership would make a presentation at the CWC Board Meeting. It would be possible to mention the response email during that presentation. There was also a Public Comment period at the end of each CWC Board Meeting. Any individuals who wanted to make a comment and share personal opinions could do so at that time.

There was discussion about the role of the Stakeholders Council and how the Council interacts with the CWC Board. It was noted that the letter from the Stakeholders Council was well received by several CWC Board Members, which implied that there was a desire to have additional discussion. Co-Chair Fisher offered to speak about the UDOT response email at the next CWC Board Meeting. There could be a discussion about next steps. The Stakeholders Council communicated with the CWC Board through those meeting updates as well as through recommendations. If there was a strong desire for the UDOT letter to be on the CWC Board Meeting agenda, a motion could be made and the Stakeholders Council could forward a specific recommendation. That would make it clear that the Council felt it was important for the response letter to be discussed by the full CWC Board. Otherwise, it would be part of the Stakeholders Council leadership update.

There was discussion regarding a potential motion. Co-Chair Fisher suggested asking the CWC Board to explore challenging the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. The Stakeholders Council letter clearly outlined five deficiencies and UDOT essentially stated that in order to speak to them about those deficiencies, there needed to be a legal challenge. Some Council Members were uncertain that the CWC Board would be willing to pursue a legal challenge to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Others felt the legal challenge was appropriate, given the response from UDOT. There was additional discussion regarding how to move forward and what to recommend to the CWC Board.

**MOTION:** Maura Hahnenberger moved to REQUEST that the Chair of the CWC Board add the Stakeholders Council letter and the UDOT response to that letter to the CWC Board Meeting agenda and consider a meaningful response, up to and including potential legal action, to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS by the December 10, 2023, deadline. \_\_\_\_\_ seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: John Knoblock-Nay; Carl Fisher-Aye; Sarah Bennett-Nay; Roger Borgenicht-Aye; Amber Broadaway-Nay; Barbara Cameron-Nay; Mike Christensen-Aye; Caitlin Curry-Aye; Tom Diegel-Aye; Del Draper-Aye; Jennifer Eden-Aye; Dave Fields-Nay; Dennis Goreham-Aye; Ian Hartley-Aye; Maura Hahnenberger-Aye; Kurt Hegmann-Aye; Linda Johnson-Nay; Hilary Lambert-Aye; Adam Lenkowski-Aye; Mike Marker-Aye; Ed Marshall-Aye; Morgan Mingle-Nay; Kirk Nichols-Aye; Nathan Rafferty-Nay; Danny Richardson-Aye; Rusty Vetter-Aye; Dan Zalles-Aye. The motion passed 19-to-8.

**WASATCH WIDLFIRE CRISIS LANDSCAPE PRESENTATION**

1. **Deputy District Ranger, Scott Frost, will Provide an Overview of the Wasatch Wildfire Crisis Landscape Program with Discussion from Stakeholders.**

Deputy District Ranger, Scott Frost, was present to share information about the Wasatch Wildfire Crisis Landscape Program. Mr. Frost reported that he was hired in May to assist the District Ranger. The Wildfire Crisis Strategy (“WCS”) focused on shifting from reactive to proactive management. He explained that this was a 10-year program that would identify priority areas, especially as it pertained to communities and urban areas that were considered high-risk. He shared a map to illustrate some of the high-risk fire shed areas. In addition to the 10-year program, money had been invested into the upfront costs of a more proactive approach. For instance, increasing the number of treatments that were done and focusing on a maintenance plan. Ms. Johnson wondered if enough funding had been provided to do this work. Mr. Frost stated that upfront investment was there, but there were questions as to where the money would come from moving forward. That being said, there was a lot of momentum as well as partners who could assist with the program work.

Mr. Frost shared a milestone timeline with the Council and explained that from 2000 onward, a lot of work had been done to be proactive instead of reactive. The biggest pieces of Legislation came in 2014 during the Obama Administration. The national strategy focused on collaboration and pooling resources. Mr. Frost reported that there was a history of fire suppression dating back to the early 1900s. It was important to remove what was not useful and make sure that what remained was healthy and vibrant. He shared additional items on the milestone timeline and talked about the associated risks. There were a lot of parallel efforts to reduce risks.

The Shared Stewardship Priority Map was reviewed. Mr. Frost explained that a composite score was used to determine the risk to water, infrastructure, and people. Co-Chair Fisher reported that Parleys Creek is one of the most significant contributors to the Salt Lake City watershed. It had a higher score because if a fire took that offline, there would be a much larger impact on the water supply. Mr. Frost explained that there were resources out there that made it possible to understand the risks.

WCS started in 2022. The Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest was designated as a priority area that received additional funding at the beginning of the current year. Mr. Frost shared some example images of what proactive work looked like. He noted that aspen was a wonderful natural fuel break. It is resistant to fire because it holds so much moisture. The intention was to reduce the amount of fuels in general and try to promote species like aspen, which were more fire resistant and fire resilient. A crew would come through, cut small trees, and create piles, and after one year of those piles sitting there, the piles would be burned. That was one method of fuel suppression. Mr. Frost shared an example image from Stansbury, where there would be mastication of junipers. Additional example images were shared to illustrate treatment after rainfall or snowfall. There was a lower risk when treatment was done in those circumstances. There was a lot of different work that could be done.

Mr. Frost shared Utah’s Watershed Restoration Initiative website. He explained that it was possible to look through the information shared there. He reiterated that there was a lot of work being done to be proactive about protecting watersheds and communities. Mr. Frost presented the Central Wasatch WCS timeline. There was a clear plan to move forward with the work. Essentially, the work would move from north to south. Currently, the focus was Millcreek and that work would continue to move further south to Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon over time. Mr. Frost shared links to additional information and shared his contact information for those interested.

Mr. Draper noted that Rocky Mountain Power recently buried some power lines in Millcreek to reduce risks. He wondered whether Rocky Mountain Power had received money from the program for that work. Mr. Frost believed those funds had largely come from Rocky Mountain Power. Chair Knoblock referenced the work along Big Cottonwood Canyon Road, where a corridor was cleared parallel to the road. He wondered whether that was Rocky Mountain Power, UDOT, or the Forest Service. Mr. Frost believed that was the Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”). There was a lot involved in the work and risk reduction. In Big Cottonwood, there had been a lot of work done around Donut Falls and Spruces Campground. In Millcreek, there had been initial work at the Elbow Fork Trail.

Discussions were had about medium-term and long-term plans. Mr. Frost explained that the hope was to use prescribed fire as maintenance. He explained that once the large stuff was removed, it was cheaper and easier to come in on a five to seven-year frequency and cut down on small items. Mr. Draper asked about the Forest Service's relationship with UFA. Mr. Frost reported that the Forest Service indirectly partnered with them, but their primary focus was around cabins and roadways.

Mr. Zalles noted that Forest Service projects normally had environmental impact assessments done, where the details of the work were made clear to members of the public. He wondered whether the projects in the Central Wasatch had those environmental impact assessments. Additionally, he asked about infrared detection implementation. Mr. Frost explained that the Forest Service had to have an environmental review to take action. The Forest Service website contains information about the different projects. The intention was to be transparent and communicate as much as possible. As for the infrared detection implementation, he knew that was being done in California. In this area, drones were being deployed more often, but that was more in the context of fire. If there was going to be prescribed fire, the drones could scout territory and so on. Infrared was a capability of drones and could be used to monitor fires. Those are resources that had been made available to the organization.

Ms. Cameron wondered if high-pressure fire suppression was used. Mr. Frost confirmed this and shared information about the different ways water could be brought to certain locations. Mr. Diegel asked if there was anything the Stakeholders Council could do to assist with the fire-related work. Mr. Frost stated that advocacy was key as it would ensure residents better understood the proactive techniques. It would be worthwhile to coordinate public outreach and education.

Co-Chair Fisher encouraged Council Members to reach out to Mr. Frost with additional questions.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no comments.

**STAKEHOLDERS OPEN COMMENT**

Chair Knoblock reported that the Bonneville Shoreline Trail across Grandeur Peak will be completed. Last week, the Forest Service completed the section of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail between Ferguson Canyon to Big Cottonwood Canyon. Approximately one month ago, Salt Lake County finished the new boardwalk interconnect trail from Cardiff to Donut Falls Trail. Solitude had opened up new mountain bike trails and Brighton was a few weeks out from finishing their new 3.5-mile trail. He stated that there were a lot of trail projects moving forward in the area.

Ms. McNeil shared information about the Stakeholder Spotlight series featured on the CWC social media pages. It was a wonderful way for followers of the organization to learn more about who was on the Stakeholders Council and who served on the CWC Board. Those posts would continue to be shared once a week. She encouraged Council Members to follow the CWC social media pages.

**CLOSING**

1. **Chair Knoblock will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders' Council Meeting.**

**MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. \_\_\_\_\_ seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:34 p.m.
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