



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL RECREATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2023, AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE, 102, SALT LAKE CITY UTAH.

Present: Sarah Bennett, Chair
Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair
Dennis Goreham
Kirk Nichols
John Knoblock
Hilary Lambert
Ian Hartley
Emily Salle
Patrick Nelson
Patrick Shea

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

OPENING

1. Chair Sarah Bennett will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Recreation Systems Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.

Co-Chair Barbara Cameron called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Recreation Systems Committee Meeting to order to 2:00 p.m. and welcomed those present. She noted that Chair Sarah Bennett would join the meeting shortly. Co-Chair Cameron asked the attendees to introduce themselves. Dennis Goreham reported that he is the Conservation Director for the Wasatch Mountain Club. Kirk Nichols is the President of the Evergreen Homeowners Association (“HOA”) and a professor at the University of Utah. John Knoblock serves as Chair of the CWC Stakeholders Council and was also on the Mount Olympus Community Council.

Emily Salle serves as the Trails Stewardship Director for the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. She was the Trail Crew Lead during the 2023 season. Ian Hartley is with the Mountain Trails Foundation. Patrick Nelson is with the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities – Watershed. Co-Chair Cameron clarified that Mr. Nelson is not an official member of the Recreation Systems Committee, but he is an important stakeholder in the area. Co-Chair Cameron explained that everyone was asked

1 to introduce themselves because this was the first meeting of the Recreation Systems Committee.
2 Members of CWC Staff were also present.

3 4 **REVIEW OF THE MOUNTAIN ACCORD CHARTER**

5 6 **1. Committee Members will Review the Mountain Accord Charter and Identify Key** 7 **Takeaways.**

8 9 **2. Committee Members will Discuss and Rank Potential Goals for the Committee to** 10 **Pursue.**

11
12 Co-Chair Cameron asked for Committee Member feedback about the Mountain Accord Charter.
13 Mr. Goreham thought the Mountain Accord document still held up well. There was nothing in the
14 document that he disagreed with after re-reading the language. That being said, certain things have
15 changed, so it would likely be appropriate to make some additions. Mr. Nichols believed the
16 Mountain Accord still made sense and was something that should be considered by the Committee.

17
18 The Committee discussed the recreation-focused portion of the Mountain Accord Charter. Co-Chair
19 Cameron reported that she and Chair Bennett discovered that mountain winter trails were not included
20 specifically. That was the reason the Consideration of Winter Recreation item was added to the
21 meeting agenda for discussion. Mr. Goreham commented that the recreation section that addresses
22 trails is fairly generic. It does not mention summer or winter trails specifically as it is general in
23 nature. Mr. Knoblock noted that the challenge for the Committee is to focus on the agreed-upon
24 actions in the Mountain Accord and think about what else should be addressed. He acknowledged
25 that there are some generalized statements in the agreed-upon actions of the Mountain Accord.
26 Adding more detail to those statements might be something to consider.

27
28 Some elements of the Mountain Accord address ski resorts and skiing. Item 3.6 of the document
29 mentions improving Silver Fork Canyon access. Mr. Knoblock believed something like that had been
30 added for backcountry skiing but could apply to summer use as well. Mr. Nichols was looking at the
31 Idealized Recreation System document and wondered if that was what the Committee was discussing.
32 Co-Chair Cameron confirmed that there was a desire to review that as well. Mr. Knoblock clarified
33 that the Mountain Accord Charter had intended outcomes and agreed-upon actions. The Idealized
34 Recreation System was a separate document.

35
36 Mr. Knoblock reported that he sent a document to Chair Bennett and CWC Staff. It listed the intended
37 outcomes and agreed-upon actions. Some applied more specifically to recreation:

- 38
39
- Prohibit ski area expansion beyond the map changes on the Forest Service land;
 - Support ski resort infrastructure improvements with the standard permitting process;
 - Improve Silver Fork Canyon access;
 - Create a private land acquisition program for environmental and recreation uses;
 - Improve cycling and pedestrian uses in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon;
 - Include bicycle paths and pedestrian ways up Parley's Canyon;
 - General Millcreek road cycling and pedestrian improvements;
 - Develop and implement a comprehensive trail and cycling plan; and
 - Study the environmental and social capacity of the Cottonwood Canyons for more recreation.
- 44
45
46
47

1
2 Mr. Knoblock reported that the items were agreed-upon actions that impact the Recreation Systems
3 Committee. Co-Chair Cameron questioned whether there was one specific action that the Committee
4 wanted to prioritize. It was determined that the Committee would review the Idealized Recreation
5 System document before discussing potential items for Committee prioritization.
6

7 Mr. Nichols shared comments about the Idealized Recreation System Supporting Narrative document.
8 He read the document thoroughly ahead of the meeting and felt that a tremendous amount of work
9 needed to be done there. It might be best for the Committee to leave the document as it was, but then
10 create a new document that is appropriately updated. Mr. Nichols stressed the importance of
11 determining a direction for the Recreation Systems Committee. Chair Bennett noted that she and Co-
12 Chair Cameron had discussions prior to the meeting. There was a desire for the Committee to look
13 at the original Mountain Accord and determine whether any goals or action items needed to be
14 changed. She noted that not everything in the document is still applicable. Some of the main goals,
15 such as accessibility, variety of opportunities, and quality of the recreational experience were still
16 relevant. However, the land exchanges were no longer being pursued. There were also references to
17 acquiring lands for trail connections and acquiring properties to bolster access. Chair Bennett felt
18 that the Committee needed to add the possibility of easements to the existing language.
19

20 Chair Bennett read the following language, "Tightening restrictions on Federal land while allowing
21 for recreational uses." She considered it to be a problematic statement. That being said, there was a
22 lot of relevant language to consider, such as, "Improving and connecting the regional trail network,"
23 "Connect recreation destinations with trails," "Improving transit service," and "Directing future
24 recreation growth to the resorts." As for references to user fees, there was some movement with that.
25 Chair Bennett wanted to add language related to community trails. It was important to think about
26 the role of community trails in the plan as well as connections. Broadening water protections was
27 something more closely related to the environment but still overlaps with the recreation work. As for
28 winter recreation, that was something she felt the Committee should discuss.
29

30 Co-Chair Cameron thought a feasibility study for a year-round trail connecting Brighton to Cardiff
31 was an exciting concept because Rocky Mountain Power has been doing undergrounding of all the
32 electrical lines. As a result, the easement trail that goes all the way up the canyon will no longer be
33 used by them. It might be possible to reuse that easement as a trail. Chair Bennett asked for additional
34 Committee Member feedback about the Idealized Recreation System document.
35

36 Mr. Nichols noted that the One Wasatch and Transportation Connection referenced in the Idealized
37 Recreation System is no longer on the table. He questioned whether the Committee would change
38 the document or if it would remain as a historic document. There was still some uncertainty about
39 the path forward for the Recreation Systems Committee. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen,
40 explained that one of the reasons the Stakeholders Council committees were restructured was to more
41 closely resemble the Mountain Accord process. The intention was to revisit the Idealized System
42 reports, not to recreate or rewrite the Idealized System reports. The Committee Members could look
43 at what was included in the report and determine future priorities. As mentioned earlier in the
44 meeting, it would also be worthwhile to look at where some of the gaps might be. The reports were
45 fantastic historical documents based on consensus but 10 years old at this point, which meant there
46 might be some different needs now that should be considered by the Committee.
47

1 Mr. Nichols believed the idea was for the Committee to look at the Idealized Recreation System
2 document for relevant information, gaps, and ideas that were no longer relevant to the scope of work.
3 This was confirmed. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that something that came out of the Mountain Accord
4 specific to recreation was a regional bicycling plan. That was not something the CWC had focused
5 on yet and it could be a project for the Recreation Systems Committee to tackle. Mr. Knoblock shared
6 information about the Mountain Accord process and how the Idealized System reports were drafted.
7 Certain items from the Idealized System reports were added to the Mountain Accord where there was
8 consensus. He reiterated that the Mountain Accord was a consensus-based document and process.
9

10 Mr. Nichols thought one way to start the review of the Idealized Recreation System document was to
11 cross out sections that were no longer relevant. That would make it clear what to focus on. One
12 Wasatch was no longer being proposed and neither was the Transportation Connection, so that
13 language could be crossed out. The Committee could focus on what remained once those removals
14 were done. Ms. Salle asked about the achievements since the document had been drafted. She wanted
15 to better understand what actions had been taken. Some deliverables that had been achieved were:
16

- 17 • Create a government body to carry out what was laid out in the Mountain Accord (CWC);
- 18 • Facilitate long-term and short-term special projects (CWC and Short-Term Project Grants);
- 19 • Environmental Dashboard.
- 20

21 The other action items mentioned in the Mountain Accord were works in progress with the exception
22 of the land exchanges, which had fully been removed from the scope of the CWC work. Three of the
23 action items had been fully achieved, one had been deemed not feasible, and the rest were in progress
24 or yet to be addressed. Patrick Shea wondered why the land exchanges had been fully removed.
25 There were over 2,500 acres in Salt Lake County alone of remnant lands. It seemed to him that those
26 exchanges could still be made as long as they involve governmental entities. Ms. Nielsen reported
27 that the land exchanges were removed from the most recent version of the Central Wasatch National
28 Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”). Those were removed from the 2020 version
29 of the bill after many hours of meetings with the interested parties, including the U.S. Forest Service
30 and the ski resorts. Ultimately, it was determined that the dollar-for-dollar land exchanges that the
31 bill dictated were not feasible because the land proposed to be traded into public ownership to the
32 Forest Service was much less valuable in terms of dollar value than the land that would be traded into
33 private ownership to the ski resorts. The other reason was that the Forest Service determined the land
34 to be well past the point of environmental degradation due to historic mining activities.
35

36 Mr. Knoblock noted that Mr. Shea had raised an interesting point. There were two references to land
37 acquisition and land exchanges in the Mountain Accord. One related to the ski area and Forest Service
38 land exchanges. The other was: “Develop a program for acquisition of private lands with
39 environmental and recreation values.” There might be opportunities for different land exchanges.
40 Mr. Shea reported that in Park City, there were a lot of remnant mining claims that either BLM or the
41 Forest Service had, and those were exchanged out to private owners who wanted to develop but could
42 not. He felt it would be worth the CWC revisiting the land exchange issue. Mr. Shea offered to speak
43 to BLM and the Forest Service about some of the possibilities. Ms. Nielsen clarified that the land
44 exchanges, as referred to in the context of the CWNCRA, were the only land exchanges that had been
45 determined to be not feasible. The other part of the Mountain Accord that the CWC had not focused
46 on yet related to private land acquisition. That was still on the table and could be a future focus.
47

1 Chair Bennett noted that smaller parcels could assist with additional recreation access. It might be
2 worthwhile for the Recreation Systems Committee to create some sort of inventory of lands in the
3 study area. Certain parcels could provide that necessary recreation access. Mr. Knoblock discussed
4 recreation and the pieces of the Mountain Accord that had moved forward. The Forest Service, with
5 funding from the County, was working on the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. Since the Mountain
6 Accord was written, a bicycle lane has been added in the lower half of Millcreek Canyon to the winter
7 gate. There was hope that the bicycle lane could be extended to the top of the canyon as well. In Big
8 Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon, both of the canyons had been milled and
9 overlaid to renew the surfaces. Additionally, when the Utah Department of Transportation
10 (“UDOT”) restriped the road, the lanes were shifted over a foot so there was a one-foot shoulder on
11 the downhill lane and three feet of shoulder on the uphill lane. In Little Cottonwood Canyon, for the
12 most part, the lane was actually four feet wide. As a result, road bicycling in those canyons has
13 improved.

14
15 Co-Chair Cameron asked about the water treatment plant at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon.
16 The latest she had heard was that the work would start in 2026, but the road overlay would occur in
17 2024. Mr. Nelson reported that the plan was delayed. One of the big projects that would come first
18 was a pipeline connecting the intake at Big Cottonwood Canyon to the plant at the mouth of Little
19 Cottonwood Canyon. He was not certain what the schedule for the rebuild was estimated to look like.

20
21 Chair Bennett wondered whether there were any Committee Member comments on what had been
22 accomplished so far and the focus of the work moving forward. Mr. Nelson thought the fact that the
23 CWC existed and people continued to convene was a meaningful achievement. From the signing of
24 the Mountain Accord to the establishment of the CWC, a lot has been done to move forward important
25 work. Ms. Nielsen reminded those present that the CWC was unique as there was nothing else like
26 it in the country. The purpose of the CWC was to think about different issues facing the study area
27 but also to talk about those issues. There was power in convening and sharing ideas.

28
29 Chair Bennett noted that the Recreation Systems Committee would not be asked to recreate an
30 Idealized Recreation System document, but it was possible to create a list of items that were still
31 relevant. The Committee could then set goals to work towards as the Committee work continued.

32 33 **CONSIDERATION OF WINTER RECREATION**

34 35 **1. Committee Members will Discuss Winter Recreation Interests within the Committee** 36 **and Potential Goals and Topics for Consideration.**

37
38 Chair Bennett believed it was important to further discuss access points and the quality of experiences.
39 Winter recreation was something that she felt should be considered. She will be meeting with the
40 Wasatch Backcountry Alliance next week. The Wasatch Backcountry Alliance wanted to share some
41 of their ideas and concerns about the more dispersed style of recreation throughout the canyons. Mr.
42 Goreham noted that the Idealized Recreation System document talked about promoting recreation in
43 areas that could accommodate the use and protecting difficult-to-access and pristine areas. The
44 Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, Save Our Canyons, the Wasatch Mountain Club, and many others
45 still agreed with that approach. There could be different zones suitable for different types of
46 recreation.
47

1 Chair Bennett stressed the importance of providing visitors with a 45-minute to 1-hour experience
2 and being able to provide that sustainably. Some thought could be put into how to make closer access
3 points more desirable so there could be shorter, more succinct experiences. Mr. Goreham believed
4 that could be addressed through an inventory. Co-Chair Cameron asked whether the Wasatch
5 Backcountry Alliance had an inventory already. Chair Bennett offered to ask them about that and
6 speak to them about some of their access concerns. Mr. Goreham pointed out that there was a lot of
7 overlap between the work of the different Systems Committees. There would need to be a fair amount
8 of coordination during the Systems Committee processes. Ms. Nielsen explained that the four
9 Systems Committees were interconnected. One could not exist without the other. There would be
10 overlapping issues from time to time. It would be possible to have members of the Recreation
11 Systems Committee attend another Systems Committee Meeting whenever that was necessary.
12

13 Chair Bennett asked for additional comments about winter recreation. Mr. Hartley reported that the
14 Mountain Trails Foundation had a program provided in part by the CWC called Transit to Trails. It
15 was a shuttle system that provided transportation between the Bonanza Park neighborhood and
16 Empire Pass. The area was accessed using a private road. It was effective in terms of dispersed
17 recreation, honoring the spaces, and providing access. He shared a link with information about the
18 program in the Zoom chat box. Transit to Trails was a good example of the way recreation served
19 transportation and vice versa. It had also been a success story for the community. Chair Bennett
20 asked how long the Transit to Trails program ran. Mr. Hartley reported that it ran until the end of the
21 month. Part of the limited window had to do with access to the private road that was used.
22

23 Mr. Nichols believed that a good place to start was with the Forest Plan. There were a lot of maps
24 included in that document as well as definitions of what could happen on those lands. It was a
25 wonderful place for Committee Members to learn more. He pointed out that it was important not to
26 propose plans or create plans that would be impossible for the Forest Service to accept. Mr. Knoblock
27 asked that a link to the Forest Plan be shared with Committee Members. Ms. Nielsen believed the
28 comment made by Mr. Nichols was necessary to keep in mind. Anything that was proposed needed
29 to be considered within the confines of the CWC scope of work. Since the Recreation Systems
30 Committee would mostly look at Forest Service lands, the desires of the Forest Service also needed
31 to be considered. Mr. Knoblock explained that a challenge with the Central Wasatch was that there
32 was a mixture of private and public lands. The original Mountain Accord boundary was half a mile
33 to the north of I-80. However, when the CWC was formed, the Mountain Accord boundary was
34 drawn slightly differently. Discussions were had about trails, trail connectivity, and access in the area.
35 Chair Bennett noted that Parley's Canyon included a major transportation route between the front and
36 the back. There were opportunities to access recreation from that corridor, but there were some
37 limitations there given the boundary map the organization had to work with.
38

39 Mr. Knoblock talked about potential improvements to the condition of the Great Western Trail
40 between Lambs Canyon and Big Mountain Pass. That could have increased the importance of
41 accessing whatever trail development took place on the 910 parcel. He reported that the 910 parcel
42 was on the east side of the Wasatch Crest north of I-80. Mr. Hartley explained that details about that
43 were starting to come out. It could be an important keystone property. Chair Bennett noted that the
44 parcel would contain a section of the Great Western Trail. That was significant because it was one
45 of two trails that had been identified by the Forest Service to receive special consideration for
46 implementation.
47

1 Chair Bennett wondered whether it was possible to reference access points and connections outside
2 of the CWC boundaries. Ms. Nielsen explained that anything the Committee wanted to work on
3 should take place within the CWC boundaries. Mr. Goreham asked about a scenario where a trail
4 was mostly in the CWC boundary area, but there was an access point a mile out. Ms. Nielsen
5 confirmed that the access point could be considered in the discussions, but the intention was to focus
6 on the CWC area. The Environmental Dashboard included data that extended past the jurisdictional
7 boundaries of the CWC because water and air quality went beyond jurisdictional boundaries. If the
8 Committee wanted to develop a plan for maintenance of a specific trail and made a request to the
9 CWC Board for funding of that maintenance, the proposal would be limited to the CWC boundaries.

10 **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE PURPOSE AND GOALS**

11 **1. Committee Members will Discuss Their Vision, Purpose, and Goals for the Committee.**

12
13 Chair Bennett explained that the first Recreation Systems Committee Meeting intended to have a
14 high-level conversation about the Mountain Accord, winter recreation, and the vision for the
15 Committee moving forward. Committee Members could identify what there was a desire to
16 accomplish at a Committee level. She noted that Committee Members could look at the Mountain
17 Accord document and select items to move forward with. That could be done individually and the
18 selections could be compared and discussed at the next Recreation Systems Committee Meeting.

19
20 Co-Chair Cameron wanted to see the Committee focus on signage to promote stewardship, but that
21 might be a better idea for a short-term project rather than an area of Committee focus. Ms. Nielsen
22 reported that there had been discussions about a potential short-term project proposal from the
23 Stakeholders Council as a whole. However, there were questions about the implementation. Mr.
24 Goreham pointed out that there were a lot of different signs needed and it would be challenging to
25 determine where to locate them with whatever money was potentially awarded. Chair Bennett
26 believed a professional communications person could be hired to create an appropriate sign plan. Mr.
27 Knoblock reported that part of the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan was dedicated to signage. Chair
28 Bennett suggested that the Committee make a list where trails were desired. From there, it would be
29 possible to have discussions with the Forest Service and find someone to assist with the development
30 of a signage plan with appropriate branding. Ms. Nielsen liked the ideas that had been shared so far.
31 The research and planning were well within the scope of the Committee. Ultimately, she believed
32 that any proposal for grant funding should come from an individual organization.

33
34 Discussions were had about the Short-Term Projects Grant Program. Chair Bennett believed the
35 requests could be for amounts under \$10,000. Ms. Nielsen clarified that there had not been
36 discussions about the details for the upcoming grant program season yet, but those would take place
37 shortly. In the first year of the program, the maximum request amount was \$20,000, but the maximum
38 amount could vary from year to year based on the amount of funding that was available. This year,
39 there was nearly \$100,000 that could be distributed to short-term project requests. Chair Bennett
40 asked about a comprehensive cycling plan. A professional could be hired to work on a Feasibility
41 Study, but that would be more expensive and would likely be outside of the scope of the grant
42 program.

43
44 Mr. Knoblock reiterated that the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan would include information about
45 signage. He did not believe there needed to be a separate small project for signage, but there could
46 be additional discussions with Zinnia Wilson and Chelsea Phillippe with the Forest Service. It would
47
48

1 be possible to work within the existing Forest Service program. A draft version of the Tri-Canyon
2 Trails Master Plan would be released in the new year and the Committee could share comments at
3 that time. Mr. Goreham thought it would be powerful if the CWC sent in relevant comments and
4 suggestions related to signage. If the Recreation Systems Committee drafted comments, those would
5 need to be forwarded to the Stakeholders Council and then the CWC Board. Timing would be critical.

6
7 Chair Bennett believed there was support to develop a list related to signage. She asked whether there
8 were any other Committee ideas, such as a cycling plan. Mr. Knoblock suggested discussing the
9 purpose and goal of the Committee broadly before specific items were contemplated. One example
10 was to implement the recreational enhancements that were agreed to in the Mountain Accord. From
11 there, the generalized statements in the Mountain Accord could be broken down into more specific
12 projects or tasks. Chair Bennett stressed the importance of access to recreation. She clarified that
13 access could relate to transportation, small parcel acquisition, or an easement. There was also a
14 human element to consider with access. For example, there could be educational signage added.

15
16 Ms. Salle further referenced times when access was compromised by heavy traffic and congested
17 trailheads. Transit goals went hand in hand with recreation goals. Highlighting under 15-minute
18 headways and a transit plan that worked for year-round trailhead access would be beneficial. She
19 noted that it was important to consider winter access as well. Ms. Salle felt that stewardship and
20 education were aligned with access. Essential components of access included advocacy about how
21 to use trails correctly and what trail resources were. She hoped those elements would be contemplated
22 in all of the access-related conversations. Ms. Salle shared information about her professional
23 background and noted that she represented the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. Mr. Goreham
24 stressed the importance of education as that information enriched the overall trail experience.

25
26 Mr. Nelson noted that the Recreation Systems Committee would ultimately make recommendations
27 to the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. He hoped that the Committee would look at how
28 different partners could work together. Better communication and collaboration could make a notable
29 difference. He agreed with the comments that had been shared about connecting the transit to the
30 different trail plans. Mr. Nelson stressed the importance of finding funding for different projects.

31
32 Mr. Knoblock stated that in order to bring transit to trailheads, the Forest Service needed to do a
33 National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) analysis. NEPA was needed in order to create that
34 kind of change to the way Forest Service lands were accessed. There would need to be proper
35 restrooms, ADA compliance, and an analysis of the number of visitors that would be dropped off.

36
37 Ms. Salle referenced the Wasatch Transportation Academy through the University of Utah. While
38 community members were allowed to take part in the class, it was largely focused on those obtaining
39 their Master’s Degree in urban planning. She took the class last semester and the proposal her group
40 created was for a transit to trails system in the Cottonwood Canyons. It was in the preliminary stages
41 currently as the research had not received funding to continue to move forward. However, it had been
42 presented to Ms. Wilson and Ms. Phillippe at the Forest Service. It was something she could share
43 with Committee Members if there was interest in reviewing the proposal. Chair Bennett thought it
44 would be beneficial for Committee Members to review the proposal and discuss what was included.

45
46 Chair Bennett asked Committee Members to review the Mountain Accord before the next Recreation
47 Systems Committee and pull out the top three values. From there, it would be possible to determine
48 a clear set of values and goals for the Committee to focus on. There have been discussions so far

1 about access, signage, and transit. Those were three worthy goals for the Committee to pursue. She
2 reiterated her request that each Committee Member review the Mountain Accord document and come
3 back with some goals and values. The next meeting was scheduled to take place on January 11, 2024.
4 She asked that the different values and goals be forwarded to her by January 5, 2024. Chair Bennett
5 would organize the submissions received into a document and send that out to the Committee.

6
7 **CLOSING**
8

9 **1. Chair Bennett will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Recreation Systems Committee**
10 **Meeting.**
11

12 **MOTION:** Sarah Bennett moved to ADJOURN the Recreation Systems Committee Meeting.
13 Dennis Goreham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
14 Committee.
15

16 The meeting adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Recreation Systems Committee Meeting held Thursday,*
3 *December 14, 2023.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____