

# Outdoor Adventure Commission Minutes

April 16, 2024

**Meeting Location:** DNR - Soldier Hollow Conference Room

## Department of Natural Resources

Division of Outdoor Recreation

1594 W. North Temple, Suite 100

Salt Lake City, UT 84116

### Virtual Meeting Information:

Outdoor Adventure Commission - April Meeting

Tuesday, April 16 · 2:00 – 4:00pm

Time zone: America/Denver

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/pjr-egwu-oye>

Or dial: (US) +1 662-351-3797 PIN: 951 350 876#

More phone numbers: <https://tel.meet/pjr-egwu-oye?pin=8397193137986>

Outdoor Adventure Commission YouTube Playlist

<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLWixD5-tnhxrwAb0osnucRKxne2LX0gQW>

## Attendees

**Virtual:** Laura Ault, Brandy Grace, Jerry Taylor, Eric Isom, Kelly Goonan, Celina Sinclair. Michelle McCocnkie, Brooke Smith, Christa Hinton, Jeff Hartley, Kirk Cullimore

**In-Person:** Rep. Jeff Stenquist, Shane Stround, Chase Pili, Patrick Morrison, Jason Curry, Pitt Grewe, Tara McKee, Caroline Weiler, Emily Meadows, Jared Anderson, Maureen Casper, Jorge Vasquez

## Agenda

### 1. Welcome

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Call meeting to order

### 2. Minute Approval

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Motion to approve the motion from January

Second motion from Josh Van Jura

Unanimous approval

### 3. Advise OAC on R650-414 - Nonresident OHV Decals and Fees

Chase Pili: Our administrative ruling for non-residents needed to be moved over from Utah State Parks to our division. This is one of the last rules that needs to be moved from State Parks to our Division. There will be no substantial changes this will only clean up the language regarding the display of non-resident decals on OHVs. This will be in accordance with our in-state decal displays. The residency of the OHV is required by the rule to be the home state of the primary placement on the machine. If it mainly sits in Utah it is the primary residency of that machine so that it will be registered in Utah. This further clarifies the change to our OHV users properly and appropriately.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: For those that may not understand how that works, would you please explain what that means for residents versus non-residents?

Chase Pili: Yes and Shane may join me to help as well. If the OHV mainly has its primary placement here in Utah even though it may have an out of state registration or potential under a business because it mainly sits in Utah just like other motor vehicles in Utah, it should be registered as an in-state resident machine versus a non-resident user decal. Especially when the resident has a Utah driver's license. If the machine were to remain in Montana or Wyoming then it is truly there then that would be applicable for the potential of being registered out of state under the definition of the rules that we have clarified.

Shane Stroud: This really comes from a section of the motor vehicle act that says if an OHV or vehicle has its home station here in Utah it is a resident for registration. The way this comes up is sometimes an individual will register their machine to an out of state business and that person that owns the OHV is in another state but the vehicle is used primarily and almost exclusively here in Utah. This means it is subject to the registration requirements here.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: You generally figure that out by noticing that they've got an in state drivers license and the OHV is registered out of state

Chase Pili: Yeah. coming from a law enforcement ranger's or the perspective of our County's deputies, they may ask that question, "why is coming from another state when you have an in-state residency?" That doesn't necessarily mean that its not allowed to be a non-resident allowed registration its if the motor-vehicle or OHV is mainly here in Utah then it should be registered here in Utah versus another state. So we'll just ask additional questions, really reasonable, not adding too much time. Those are the types of questions that are added if we do see some suspicion of evading state registration.

Shane Stroud: Essentially the biggest change to this rule is that the individual that owns it will have to provide a statement that the home station of this vehicle is somewhere other than Utah. This will make sure that the registrations are in compliance with the law. I don't know if any of you were able to look over the reviewed rule that was provided to you, we did make one additional change, and that just clarifies the sticker should be displayed in the same way that Chase said. That wasn't included in the rule that was provided to you, that was the only change.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Any other questions or items for this commission? This is not an action time it is just advisory, correct?

#### **4. Swearing in New Commissioner - Oath of Office**

Carly Lansche: There has been a travel conflict so we will be swearing her in at the next meeting, it is Natalie Randall.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: She will be a great addition.

#### **5. 2024 Legislative Session Review, Chair Rep. Stenquist**

We are going to review a couple of items, we had some good pieces of legislation, in my opinion, that I passed. HB 236 - One that passed having to do with counties having issues to fund search and rescue, we've heard that SAR is hard to

fund from our rural counties for those counties by basically expanding the tax that was previously limited to medical expenses can now be used for visitor management. So that is a step in that direction but there is still work that can be done. Another bill is HB 85, which is a definition of e-bikes. It started out as a simple request from the division of rec saying that people are bolting on rotating crank arms to electric motorcycles and I also heard from the national organization called people for bikes and they suggested a much more comprehensive definition, so I incorporated their ideas into the bill. We were able to pass that, its been getting national attention. I attended a conference in Tucson to talk about that. I was a little star-struck talking to big movers and shakers in the bike industry.

Jason Curry: HB 90 redefines outdoor recreation infrastructure to expand the utilization of resources to include things like planning and analysis.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: And that is particularly important to this commission. When we went through that round of project proposals we had proposals that were technically not eligibvle because it wasn't allowed in the statute. We made some clarifications to this so that we can allocate uses the outdoor restricted account to things like planning and NEPA and technology. So those kinds of things can be considered for prioritization by the Commission. Another significant development from this legislative session is that this commission is that there was a new understanding after speaking with the appropriations Chair and to the people at the LFA to understand and clarify the process that we come up for a project list to the legislature. The answer that I got from the Appropriations Committee and the LFA is that in the future they are not expecting our prioritization to go to the legislature, this commission will be able to have the final word on being able to approve the funding for these projects. We get to be the final word on what gets funded. So that is a good thing and this also means that the timing of this means that we will have another round of projects to be presented and prioritization.

Josh Van Jura: Does that remove some of the constraints of doing multiple awards throughout the year as well?

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: This commission basically has the discretion to decide what projects get funded and maybe we fund part of it this round and then next round we could write some additional funding that's completely up to this commission. Any questions from anyone on the Commission about this process?

Jason Curry: It is good news.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: It is much more streamlined and then it helps with the concerns of us providing a prioritization list that gets completely changed. We don't need to worry about that as much.

Pitt Grewe: Would that be written into the big bills for funding?

Jason Curry: Its on-going funding, it's already appropriated.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Yes, it is just like the grants but with a lot more clarification. With a lot more flexibility than grants.

Jason Curry: What about HB 88?

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Yeah, HB 88 basically just clarifies that private property owners or counties or other municipal land owners are allowing for public recreation uses. It adds rock climbing to the definition of activities that they are indemnified for.

Carly Lansche: Would it make sense if we sent out our legislative summary that the Division put together to all of the Commissioners?

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: That would be great. Certainly some others worth mentioning. There were some discussions with Representative Snyder and other related to conflicts between Wildlife Management Areas and recreators. We didn't

come to a resolution but we certainly discussed how we can work better together and coordinate in an appropriate way to maybe allow some recreation uses instead of putting a theoretical fence around the WMA's. I hear a lot about the areas in Pleasant Grove and Orem.

Jason Curry: The venn diagram has diverged quite a bit, it used to be that they didn't have to worry about it. Most of the activities that were taking place on a WMA were engaging by people with fishing licenses, etc. Now people come to these areas for camping or riding or just to shoot, so yeah its an on-going discussion. There's validity to their concerns. We want to make sure that we're involved in that conversation. I would also add HB 469 which was a bill that will consolidate all DNR law enforcement, right now there are four agencies within the Department of Natural Resources that have law enforcement. That is wildlife, parks, us, and forestry fire and state lands. This bill created a division of law enforcement that takes effect on January 1st in 2025. There will be no more rangers working for the division but they will still carry out our mission. Not a whole lot will change on the ground but they will have a different chain of command and a lot more consistency in standards.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: So it will be a lot more consistency standards for them as law enforcement agency instead of servicing other divisions like State parks and ours?

Jason Curry: Yes, they will still check for licenses and OHV violations and vessel inspections and pretty much everything that needs to get done up to this point. Make a little bit of changes within the State Parks, so nobody with a gun and badge will clean the restrooms at state parks.

Online: Eric Isom "Chair Stenquist, may the legislative list Carly referenced be shared with all participating on this call?"

Carly Lansche: Yes, it will be part of the public record.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Any other comments or questions?

Brandy Grace: Not a question but an update to continue the conversation about counties looking into TRT dollars and their concern with a lack of funding for emergency management and medical response. I have been made aware that this was made an interim study item but prior to that UAC had also reached out to Kem C Gardner Policy Institute to see if they could provide some resources to help us dive into that issue and come up with some of that actual data. I'm not sure if they've reached out to you, Jason, but I have recommended that someone from this Commission be part of those conversations so that it is a more collaborative approach with opinions from all stakeholders. So that is just an update that that's something the counties are working on.

Jason Curry: Awesome, thank you, Brandy.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: If there are no other comments we will move on to our next item with Patrick.

## **6. Outdoor Recreation Initiative (ORI) Updates**

- a. Review awarded projects
- b. 2024 ORI Program Update
  - i. Review regional recreation councils + structure
  - ii. Discuss draft ranking committees and charter

Patrick Morrison: Thank you to the Chair and for all of your work during the session. The first thing we can do is review our awarded projects and give you all a few updates on this. Everyone is so excited. Looking down this list there just a few ones that I want to bring attention to, first is the \$182 thousand for NEPA for Guacamole Mesa. The Zion Regional Collaborative is not a 501(c)3 and they cannot hold this funding. Since the mission of the ORI is to help with project management, this will be a great opportunity for us to leverage some of our efficiencies and showcase us as project

managers to help with that. This one in particular will allow us to help support this NEPA as a project manager. The expectation is that we aren't going to pursue the infrastructure improvements because that is a pretty small pricetag for what will probably need to get done but I am really looking forward to us serving as the project manager and probably working with a local engineering firm to get that project done. The next one is Duck Creek is another that we came in at lower than was requested. We had conversations with Cody and the Ranger District and they said that they are comfortable with that amount. The general update is that once we relayed that we were waiting for legislative approval and now we know we can move forward, essentially I just created an application through our grant portal so that these applicants can submit their formalized scopes, work budgets, and timelines and the things that we want to have before we put organizations in contract. Thank you to Maureen Casper, our amazing contract analyst, and Shane Stourd for their assistance. We are starting to send out the contracts very soon.

Another one I want to talk about is the Colorado River Pathway project. We came in at \$2.5 million out of their original \$5 million request, that was with the hope that UDOT would see this and then prioritize the ranking. I don't want to speak for Josh or Stephanie, but it has appeared on their prioritized list at 39. This project has been approved for \$10 million, contingent on UDOT Commission's approval. We just spoke with Stephanie who leads up the Utah Trails Network and she said that the project cost is \$12.5 million. So it looks like that very expensive and difficult section of trail will finally be constructed. And just some commentary on the process, I'm excited to learn how we can explore the flexibility that we have with this project. In this case, UDOT will operate as the project manager for this section. So I'm sure I'll get to talk to Shane about the legal process of exchanging funds with UDOT. I like these opportunities to clarify what we do and how we do it. So thank you to our UDOT colleagues for making this possible and coming in at a higher amount.

Carly Lansche: As a note of commentary, some of our staff attended the Canyon Country Partnership meeting down in Moab a couple of weeks ago, the emotion within that room was palpable and they wanted to pass on their thanks to this Commission.

Jeff Hartley (online): Question regarding less generally once we're done talking about this individually,

Patrick Morrison: Great.

Josh Van Jura: I just wanted to add specifically the Utah Trail Network made a recommendation for this project on the prioritized list but ultimately, this will go to our Transportation Commission and they will make the final decision. I just always have to throw that caveat out there. It will be made official in May.

Patrick Morrison: I think Calf Creek they are already wrapping up their work because they received a UORG grant for a smaller amount. They're very excited, I had a long call with their staff. The last project I want to call attention to is the Puffer Lake property. They originally requested \$7 million and they wanted to do property acquisition. I've been working with Commissioner Pearson on this project, she can't be here today, but this is one where the \$3.5 million while very generous and awesome, they are having trouble moving forward with their property acquisition. I think \$5 million is what they really need, you can see they have their own cash match of \$1 million. She is really hoping there is an opportunity to get that additional \$500k so that they can make that \$5 million mark. So that is one of the partials that perhaps we can talk about. Other than that, the rest seem to be going pretty well. Meeks Mesa was one that was awarded, it is a very important project to Wayne County and Torrey. We voted to award it out of the following year's fiscal appropriation. We are still working to get them under contract. As Representative Stenquist has said, with the new freedom of how we can approve these funds this allows us the flexibility to be able to get these projects under contract immediately in these types of situations if funds are available. This is pretty much all there is in terms of a review. The three most important ones are the Colorado River Pathway and UDOT's potential commitment, the Guacamole Mesa

and the project management from the Division, and the \$500k funding shortfall for the Puffer Lake land acquisition project. I don't want to speak too much for Commissioner Pearson but I know that the Forest Service is looking to purchase that property as well. With that, Jeff, if you want to chime in.

Jeff Hartley: I wanted to go back to the Guacamole Mesa line item. I was contacted by Washington County, they were concerned that the organization that applied for that project has concerns that it isn't a very well-structured organization. They expressed concern and interest in taking over and helping run that project and at least host the funds for it but they don't want it to work against them because they have higher priorities that they want to ask for. They don't want it to count against their equitable distribution by county or by region. Do we need a process in which to vet these organizations that come to us to make sure that they are a real organization? Do we need to have a structure in place?

Tara McKee: Are they a 501(c)3?

Patrick Morrison: No, thank you for that Jeff. So I've been in discussion with Washington County, specifically with Leslie Fonger and Emily Friedman who is the hired facilitator with the ZRC. There are a lot of cities and counties that are participating in this process. We are not going to use a standard contract, as we would with others, right now we are working through an MOU so that we will have those listed parties, in a contractual sense, we will have those listed parties. Such as Virgin or La Verkin, I think that will give them the opportunity to support it or not. Also, this will help give this shape to a list of legitimate institutes which is a lot of different organizations if that helps answer that question. I guess for the second question, which is formalizing it.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Going forward, we talk about an application process that would make sure that they are well organized and structured before we award the money.

Patrick Morrison: I will plan to present the status and progression as to where the Outdoor Recreation Initiative is going but certainly the following year's system will continue to be more robust.

Kelly Goonan: I am a little familiar with the ZRC and I like Patrick's recommendation to have an MOU approach. My understanding is that they are technically not a non-profit because it does present challenges and opportunities when they can be a convener for a number of different groups. My recommendation would be that whatever the commission decides is the best approach is that we have that really clearly spelled out in a grant application process because I would push back a little bit in saying that the ZRC is not a legitimate organization, they've just been structured differently in a very intentional process and decision on their part. I support the MOU and I also support making the application process as clear and as transparent as possible if there are concerns among the Commission related to awarding funds to projects like this in the future. Thank you.

Patrick Morrison: Thank you, Kelly. I've attended a few ZRC meetings and there really is a wide array of stakeholders from that community in the greater Washington County area. To one of your concerns about this being held against Washington County with the point that this may be held against them in the future, I can just say that that won't be the case, and hopefully I can make that clear in this upcoming presentation.

Jason Curry: While you're bringing that up, I want to recognize Patrick and his work. This has been an in-depth and also quite concise process. You can tell by the past couple of conversations he's really worked well with each of these applications to understand their nuances.

Patrick Morrison: Big shoutout to Carly and Rep. Jeff Stenquist. What we're going to present today is to review the ORI, the bill language, and where things are currently.

I will try to be efficient right now, today I will present what this will look like this upcoming year and what this may look like in the following years. Thank you to Rep. Stenquist for letting me dream big with this. This is to review the bill language, it gives us a lot of freedom through the outdoor adventure restricted account, with the allowances from HB 90 this allows us to do a lot of the things we want to do. There are private and public sources of funding, right now we are working with public sources. Everything that this program is right now is a living process, I've had some conversations with Commissioner Grace, and we've been able to have some great talks. I would happily sit down with any of you to talk more about this. The mission is "The Outdoor Recreation Initiative (ORI) aspires to be a national model for effective, collaborative, and sustainable management of outdoor recreation infrastructure. By leveraging municipal, state, federal, and private resources, the ORI seeks to create a legacy of well-preserved public recreation opportunities, offering a multitude of recreational experiences that strengthen local communities and foster a deep connection between people and the great outdoors"

This will be the vehicle to help deliver the strategic plan. We heard the Governor speak about how this will not be just a document that will sit on the table, it will be our guide into the future. What we will be talking about soon is the regional recreation councils. The building and supporting collaborative processes aligns with what we are doing with the regional recreation councils. There has been a lot of preparation that we are doing and we are really excited to launch these councils. Next month we want to send out our roster invitations and kick-off meetings set, this is so you can see what our timeline is. Our timeline is flexible but this is what we are hoping this year's schedule will look like. After the effectiveness of these dollars shows, I assume that these will become quite popular. There is a lot of excitement building for this process. These councils will be discussing these projects and ranking them similar to the Watershed Restoration Initiatives. Rather than all of you hearing long presentations for each project, we hope that it will be the Chairs or representatives from these councils that will represent the projects they've identified. In turn, the OAC will be in charge of the final rankings and final approvals. Year after year there will be a lot of details that we will figure out as we develop the process, such as equity and how we're dispersing these funds as a Commission, and how it best serves the strategic plan. These are the regions. I spoke with every AOG throughout the state to make tweaks to this and get to this place. When we think about the state there are so many ways that we can break it up. These aren't exactly the AOG regions, there are only 5 and not 7 because we want to considerate of staffing needs. We brought Utah County into the Wasatch Front Region. When I spoke with MAG and WFRC they were supportive of this. Morgan County moved into the northern Region because they shared a bit more of a recreation experience to the Wasatch back and those counties. We have Commissioner Taylor on, when we talked about keeping 5 county together they were really excited. We also made sure that San Juan and Grand Counties were in the same region as well. So far we are pretty excited about these, the relationships are in place, the people know each other.,

Pitt Grewe: Can I ask a question? I fully support this, I like this division. How do we make sure that the user groups are represented well in each of these groups? It would be very easy in each of these groups for a specific user group to dominate the conversations. There will be motorized in some and non-motorized and fishing access and climbing and mountain biking, that whole list of what outdoor recreation is, are all represented through all of this. How do we get equal representation of these user groups for all outdoor recreation?

Patrick Morrison: That is the \$19 million dollar question. Of course I've thought about that. I cannot express enough that if there is vagueness that is by design. Our staff will have a big role in making sure that we have that representation. That is also a great next segway into our next slide.

Carly Lansche: You may remember from our previous meeting that we suggested a next meeting in May and just keep that in the back of your mind as we talk about this, particularly with the passing of HB 90 passing and the opportunity to use some of these resources for planning, particularly with the Outdoor Recreation Planning Assistance program and

embellish it with resources as an arm within the ORI. That is kind of one thing that we can talk about is the planning nexus and the technical assistance support and then the other is how do we grow into more of a project manager type of role such as the Guacamole Mesa project. There are several projects throughout the state that have arisen and really need support and project management. One of those is the High Desert Trail that has become a legislative priority over the last couple of years, it goes through 7 different counties and it really needs that birds-eye-view support working through so many different jurisdictions. Another example is the North Wash Boat ramp, which has drawn national attention from the guiding and outfitting community where there is a sore need for one project manager because its very inter jurisdictional. With this we wanted to foster a discussion today and get input from the Commissioners here in regard to the idea of a, "sixth region," which I'm not sure we love that verbiage for it but basically it would allo DOR, not necessarily from the regional recreation councils, but more so looking from that statewide perspective to then come to OAC with projects like the north wash boat ramp where we can come to the commission and say we need funding for preliminary engineering, etc. This is new terrain for us. Is this our role?

Rep. Jeff Stenquist - You've had the opportunity to introduce this idea. In my mind, pretty simply, it is just that there may be projects that because of their regional significance or other characteristics, instead of being proposed by the regional councils it is brought to this commission from the division of outdoor recreation saying there is a need and its interjurisdictional between the councils and the commission can consider those projects at the same time as the regional councils. I think it really is as simple as that. I certainly think that makes a lot of sense. Do the other commissinoers have any other thoughts or comments on that approach?

Carly Lansche: In tandem to talk about the ORPA projects, I think technical assistance with one staff can only get you so far. So to be able to come here with a request and scope to filter through projects and asks that come our way that would allow for us to come to you all for approval. So this is sort of a two-pronged approach.

Tara McKee: Does it make sense to discuss the project in Bicknell and how they are sort of stalled?

Carly Lansche: I think one of the things too is that the planning process has been so new to the division, our grants are a well oiled machine, so we're working to best meet the needs of the communities we are working with. So getting from planning to building a project there is still a big gap, so that is why HB 90 was successful this year is because it has been called out and spoken to. For instance, in Bicknell, we've helped them vision a list of projects that they can do with public input and all of these things. But right now they still aren't quite eligible for our grants. They have to do through NEPA steps and preliminary engineering work, so it has been quite frustrating for that community because we are able to support them but we can't help them close that gap. So this could be the mechanism to help them close that gap from planning and visioning to getting it done, scoping it out, and having those additional resources. We are learning a little bit as we go.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist - It sounds like the role of the Division of recreation is to provide that help and support and resources to help them get recreation projects done. I think it falls squarely within the scope and mission of the division and the Commission.

Josh Van Jura- I guess I would suppose an alternate theory, and I am perfectly fine with this, but some of the processes that we've gone through. We would take our potential list of initiatives and take them through what would be in this case the regional recreation council to see if the communities support these projects. It is just another slightly different process.

Carly Lansche: Can I piggy back on that? I'm so glad you brought that up. One of the things that we've been thinking about long-term is doing some strategic planning for each of these regions that Patrick is working with to conduct a needs assessment so we can figure out what are those priorities? Where can we focus these resources and does this

make sense? Simultaneously we can make our recreation asset database a little more robust so that we can make that a resource for all of the various needs that will be applicable for transportation planning and land-use scenario planning. So that is sort of the long-term planning that Patrick and I have been trying to think through. I'm curious to hear if folks think that this could dovetail into what you're hoping to see out of this program.

Patrick Morrison: I would say with each of these councils, we have our statewide strategic plan, but as we work with each of these regions, it will be important to develop these strategic plans with their local flavor. I think how we develop these local plans to find their purpose and direction will be how we can get some of these infrastructure projects through these councils.

Jason Curry: So I see it has going both directions through that chain, from the councils to the councils, and it probably won't be a surprise to anyone. It will just be that capacity of assistance.

Josh Van Jura: It can stay fluid right as the organization and structure of processes mature it doesn't have to stay the same.

Pitt Grewe: I like that idea of having information flowing back and forth. How do we ensure that transparency? How do we facilitate that they get the feedback from the communities that they are representing? What is the reality of having a higher ranking or rating as the head of each of these recreation councils? I like what Commissioner Van Jura was saying. That is going to be the person who makes sure we are hitting all of these responsibilities. Does that look like an appointed volunteer or something so that it looks regional and doesn't get sucked into the portion of the region?

Patrick Morrison: Absolutely, that is the discussion I'm having with our AOGs. That is what I'm hoping the AOGs can help ensure that we're looking regionally. We will need charters to outline the chairs, vice chairs, and what all of that looks like. We will need to have staffing support of course as well.

Pitt Grewe: I don't think that is the role of the Division to be communicating with everybody in the state of what's happening. That is too big of a lift but there should be the organizations that are on the group whether or not they have the opportunity to work with these councils or the commission to be like, "hey, here is what is being proposed, go out and activate in a civil way." That is the structure we need to be able to

Carly Lansche: That could be the potential avenue of the needs assessments where we can have public open houses and public surveys and comments and things like that so the transparency will build over time.

Pitt Grewe: I don't want the user groups to come to us in a year or two and say, "holy cow" how did these trails get built?

Patrick Morrison: So that is the OAC regions. Are there any questions before we go on? We will go over the construction of the proposed rosters. We are considering things like how do we make sure these groups don't get too bloated, what organizations should be included? There are a lot of considerations that is going into this. This is the ground work for beginning the long-term planning. This is not an exhaustive list, this is just to give an idea of the many partners that may be involved in these councils. I want to bring your attention to the ranking committees, there is a strong preference for locally-led processes. I want to make sure that when these are getting ranked that the locals really have that say, so I'm trying to figure out where the federal partners fit into these councils. They are a crucial partner and I want to make sure that these projects are locally led. We had a commissioner from Kane county say that they had no idea that these projects from our prior round of scoring were being suggested in her county. This is a fix for that where these councils can help bring these projects up and coordinate between different partners. I like the idea of having elected officials in these councils because then there is an outlet for the general public to communicate with someone who is representing them. I just want to make sure that the regions are being taken care of and that they are not just looking at one city or county. So this is what I'm working through and I'd love to hear any thoughts or comments to make sure there is an

opportunity that these are successful when looking at these projects on a regional level. One other point is I am still trying to figure out how to incorporate tribal leadership. I applied to present at the tribal leadership committee but I have not heard back yet and I will try again, but I do want to figure out what is the role of the tribes in this process, and other groups as well such as adaptive recreation or PLPCO. This is not an exhaustive list. So this is one example of what a roster can look like.

Pitt Grewe: What is the reality of having a higher ranking or people with more responsibilities leading these councils? Can we pay a part-time person or something like that in each of these areas? Do we have an official appointment to put some weight and responsibility on the chair or the person to oversee and make sure that this is regional?

Patrick Morrison: And as I've thought about it, in my discussions with AOGS, that is a discussion that I'm having with them, we are going to be requesting that their staff will hopefully help lead out on because they are thinking regionally. And we will have charters, and chairs and vice-chairs, and systems to ensure success. We will have more staffing as well. We've been working with USU and they are putting in a lot of work into helping us. They set aside some time for focus groups to help outline the needs and different arrangements. Casey Trout is doing her thesis on the Watershed Restoration Initiative and she is helping us draw some insights from this process to help inform suggestions for how the ORI can develop. They have suggested different models in how the ORI may operate in the future. Here is how the project approval will work through. The general councils and the ranking will be very involved in developing recommended lists to share with the OAC. Instead of 18 presentations over several months, you will have essentially 5 presentations will be longer and perhaps by each council Chair. You all have a very important role in this process for final approval. It's ambitious and I'm excited about it. We now have great flexibility to figure out how the money works, we are no longer tied to the same timeline, which is to wait for every General Session for approval, so that brings opportunities with that and thinking about a statewide region for things that we can identify as emergencies. There is a lot of flexibility to help achieve the vision of the strategic plan. It is ambitious and I'm very excited about it. I want to say thank you to everyone who has helped me with their insights to help shape this program. The invitation to talk more about this with me anytime is always open to our Commissioners. That is it for my presentation.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Patrick, this is fantastic and it's really exciting to see how you've taken the ball and run with it. Thanks so much. Any other questions or comments? I want anyone on the Commission to weigh in.

Kelly Goonan: I really like that model and I appreciate the work that Patrick and the division team has put into that.

Jason Curry: I want this to maintain that local communities can maintain that autonomy and pursue their own destinies when it comes to outdoor recreation and achieve that balance between that autonomy and making sure that we're not pigeonholing into one region. It is set up well to help us achieve that balance.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: I'm very curious to see as the interest and participation as the word gets out how this plays out.

Jason Curry: We will be getting the word out at UAC and other opportunities. We will likely discuss it with the League at some point.

Josh Van Jura: I'm sure there will be a lot of interest in this round versus other rounds.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Especially as we have involvement from the general public and different user groups, when people get very interested in these groups we might be drawing on the participation from people outside of these regions as well. There is nothing that we are doing necessarily to prevent that but I could see that happening as well. I don't know necessarily if that would be a bad thing.

Patrick Morrison: Admittedly, I've spent so much time thinking about this but I haven't necessarily thought about this exact circumstance before but yeah I could see that being very important to somebody who travels to an area a lot.

Pitt Grewe: Or where there isn't that representation of that group in the area, like climbing areas in Utah. The Salt Lake Climbers Alliance cares a lot about what is happening in Maple Canyon but there isn't necessarily anyone in that region. Or like motorized recreation in Emery county. Like they need more motorized representation there when the majority of those users are coming from other parts of the state. The user group representation is important to be very broad. But we don't want the voices and decisions in Salt Lake City to drive what is happening in rural Utah that will backfire really fast. There is a fine balance.

Patrick Morrison: There will be a balance with general public and participation and transparency.

Pitt Grewe: Everyone wants their own playground, so it won't be hard to find opinions.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Are there any other comments?

Jason Curry: I'd like to make a move that we consider the extra \$500k for the Puffer Lake project.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Which project was it that you were saying didn't need their total awarded amount?

Patrick Morrison: That was Duck Creek.

Jason Curry: We do have funding appropriated if that wasn't possible.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: So the idea was to make a motion to reallocate some of the money that isn't going to be utilized there to move it to Puffer Lake project?

Patrick Morrison: We just gave them a partial based on what was requested.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: So the motion is to basically reallocate an additional \$500k from the restricted account to the Puffer Lake property acquisition?

Jerry Taylor: Mister Chair I will second that.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Okay so we have a motion and a second. Do we have any discussion on the motion?

Josh Van Jura: We do have additional funding that would work to cover this expense?

Jason Curry: Yes. I can speak to my motion, as Patrick mentioned, I think there is key interest on this land. The forest service has been wanting to acquire it but the answer that we've heard there is that they don't need any more federally managed recreation lands. I feel like Beaver County has proven themselves with the management of the Millsite and I think they are in a good position to do the same here.

Pitt Grewe: But \$500k doesn't get them to their total project cost does it? They still need \$5 million, right?

Jerry Taylor: I believe they have a million of their own dollars, right?

Jason Curry: Yes, so they have a million of their own and its a \$7 million total and we already allocated \$3.5 million but the project is listed for \$5 million.

Pitt Grewe: The land is listed for \$5 million so the \$7 million would be the total project cost.

Patrick Morrison: I don't want to speak for Commissioner Pearson but it sounds like \$5 million is what would be needed to acquire the land.

Tara McKee: I had the very same comment, where does that get them? I knew they were stalled and that was a very frustrating part for Beaver county.

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: Any other comments on that motion? I will place that motion for a vote. All in favor please

Unanimous approval.

**7. Public Comment (2 mins per person)**

Rep. Jeff Stenquist: The last item is public comment. Seeing none I will go ahead and close the

**Motion to adjourn from Director Curry**

Unanimous approval.