

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2021, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM WITH NO ANCHOR LOCATION.**

**Present:** Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Co-Chair Jan Striefel, Jess Kirby, Doug Fry, Joanna Sheeton, Kirk Nichols, Megan Nelson, Nathan Rafferty, Ned Hacker, Pat Shea, Paul Diegel, Sarah Bennett, Troy Morgan, Del Draper, Abi Holt, Holly Lopez, Carolyn Warwa, Annalee Munsey, Dennis Goreham, Randy Doyle, Don Despain, Ed Marshall, Catuscarlito, Gay Lynn Benson, John Knoblock, Carl Fisher, Mike Marker, Deborah Case, Wayne Wickizer, Barbara Cameron, Brian Hutchinson, Carolyn’s iPhone, Helen Peters, Nate Furman, Steve Van Maren, Michael Braun, Mike Maughan, Tamara Prue

**CWC Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker (via telephone), Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson

1. **OPENING**
2. **Dr. Kelly Bricker will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council (“SHC”).**

Stakeholders Council Chair, Dr. Kelly Bricker called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. **Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Read the Determination Letter Referencing Electronic Meetings as Per the Legislative Requirements.**

Chair Bricker read the following statement:

Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-207‑4, the Mountain Accord Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) hereby determined that conducting Council Meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents substantial risks to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Salt Lake County Health Department have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to a new strain of Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). Due to the state of emergency caused by this global pandemic, we find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the location. According to the information of State Epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an accelerated phase which has the potential to overwhelm the State’s health care system.

1. **The Stakeholders Council Will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, January 20, 2021.**

Ed Marshall noted that in the Millcreek Canyon Committee section, in the second and fourth paragraphs, the speaker was Brian Hutchinson and not Mike Marker.

**MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, January 20, 2021, as amended. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the consent of the Committee. Carl Fisher and Brian Hutchinson abstained from the vote.

1. **RULES AND PROCEDURES: Brought Forward from January 20, 2021.**
2. **Stakeholders will Consider for Approval Recommendations on Changes to Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures – Reference “Committees”: Redlined and Clean Copies Attached. These Requests for Changes Come from within the Current Committee Leadership of Stakeholders Council Committees.**

Chair Bricker reported that proposed changes to the Rules and Procedures were brought forward at the previous Stakeholders Council Meeting. It was decided at that time that the Stakeholders needed more time to look over the recommendations. Chair Bricker noted that members of the Stakeholders Council requested the updates to ensure that the Rules and Procedures were relevant and accurate. Both a redline version and a final version were included in the packet.

Barbara Cameron noted that there were some blank sections. For instance, on Page 3 of the document, the following examples could be found:

* Each Committee will be established for a period not to exceed \_\_\_\_.
* All Committees shall meet at least one per \_\_\_\_.

Deputy Director, Blake Perez discussed the first example. He noted that the Committees were reestablished during the Stakeholders Council Meeting in January. The Committees were put together to achieve a purpose and not necessarily to meet a timeframe. There may be flexibility with the purpose and duration of each of the Committees. He suggested that the sentence be reworded. Mr. Perez liked the idea of revisiting the Committees on an annual basis.

The second example was discussed. Mr. Perez did not believe the Stakeholders Council would want to set specific rules on meetings because some Committees need to meet quarterly while others need to meet every other month. Co-Chair Jan Striefel suggested that the language state that Committees should meet at least once per year. Chair Bricker felt that made sense, especially if the Committees are reviewed on an annual basis.

Ms. Cameron also made note of language related to a quorum, which stated:

* Subcommittees may consist of members of the Council or others approved by the Council’s majority vote. Each subcommittee shall include less than a quorum of the entire Council.

Mr. Perez clarified that the above language was crossed out. John Knoblock commented that on the same page, there was language stating:

* The Committee Chair shall appoint a person to act as Secretary for the Committee.

Mr. Knoblock felt that point was not needed, since Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson fills that role. Ms. Mickelson noted that CWC Staff is always available to the Stakeholders Council.

Mr. Hutchinson suggested that all Committees be required to meet twice per year. Annalee Munsey considered the once per year minimum to be appropriate and felt that it should be left to the Chair of each Committee to determine what type of schedule is needed. Chair Bricker noted that some Committees may need to wait on certain things to happen before meeting.

Mr. Perez overviewed the changes made to the Rules and Procedures document:

* Item #2: Purpose and Duration was changed to state:
	+ The focus and purpose of each Committee shall be specified by the Chair with the Council’s consent. Each Committee will be reviewed on an annual basis for consent from the Council.
* Item #4 (C) related to Duties of the Secretary of the Committee was eliminated; and
* Item #5 specified that all Committee shall meet at least once per year.

**MOTION:** Annalee Munsey moved to approve the Stakeholders Council Rules and Procedures document, as updated. Jan Striefel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

1. **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP DISCUSSION**
2. **Chair Dr. Bricker will Lead Discussion and Review the Decision Tree for the Stakeholders Council Regarding the Process and Time Frame of Appointing New Members of the Stakeholders Council.**

Mr. Perez explained that approximately half of the terms of the current Stakeholders Council Member were expiring. The initial terms were for two years while the new terms would be for four. He reported that there are six open seats due to resignations, moves and Council Members who went on to become CWC Board Members. The CWC would advertise for applications throughout May 2021. At the end of the month, the applications would be compiled and a small Selection Committee, consisting of Dr. Bricker, Jan Striefel, CWC Commissioner Max Doileny will make recommendations to the CWC Executive Committee. The new Stakeholders Council Members would then be approved by the CWC Board at the July 2021 meeting.

Mr. Hutchinson noticed that there were omissions on the decision tree. For instance, it did not include all of the Committee Assignments. Mr. Perez clarified that the focus was currently on reappointments and open seats. However, CWC Staff would work to fill out the Committee Assignments section as well.

1. **MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE UPDATE**
2. **Paul Diegel, Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee will Provide an Update on the Work of the Committee to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Paul Diegel reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had been tracking the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. It is a $12 million grant for transportation improvements in Millcreek. The tentative plan included issues that would need to be worked out. However, once it reaches time for local input, Mr. Diegel believed there would be an opportunity for the Millcreek Canyon Committee to get involved. He expected the FLAP grant to be awarded in the near future. While it was not a certainty, Mr. Diegel felt it was highly likely that the FLAP grant will be awarded to Millcreek. Mr. Diegel added that the Millcreek Canyon Committee was also trying to determine how individual members could be more involved in the U.S. Forest Service Stakeholders Groups.

Mr. Hutchinson commented that the scope of the FLAP grant application and the actual designs of the various projects had largely unfolded with little response to Millcreek Canyon Committee input. The FLAP grant was initially proposed to support infrastructure for a shuttle but it now looked more like a paving project. Mr. Hutchinson did not believe the Millcreek Canyon Committee should wait to speak out until the FLAP grant funds are awarded. He felt that a roadway widening would change the character of the canyon. Mr. Hutchinson asked the Committee to consider withdrawing their letter of support as the current scope does not resemble what the Committee previously supported one year ago.

Mr. Diegel explained that the FLAP grant is entirely run by the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) who will establish the scope and handle the work. The actual proposed scope of work was only released to the Millcreek Canyon Committee a little over one month ago. There were some elements that the Committee liked and some that they did not. Mr. Diegel was not in favor of withdrawing the letter of support. If the FLAP grant was awarded, there would be opportunities to weigh in on the scope of work. The Millcreek Canyon Committee requested a meeting with Salt Lake County to determine their position.

Mr. Marshall did not believe the letter of support should be withdrawn. The FLAP grant was requested in good faith by the County and the Forest Service. He noted that the amount was $12 million and they had hoped that would be enough to widen Millcreek Road enough to include a five-foot bicycle path all the way up the canyon. However, as the process began, they determined that they would need three times that amount. As a result, the project was limited to the upper portion of the canyon. The road from Elbow Fork up to the top of the canyon was narrow and there were no shoulders above the winter gate. They believed that area needed the most improvement and should be addressed first.

Chair Bricker commented that it seemed that there would be opportunities to define the scope and the impacts moving forward. Carl Fisher noted that Save Our Canyons had heard concerns from a number of different organizations about the impacts of road widening. Mr. Diegel stated that the FLAP grant was for transportation-related improvements. The Millcreek Canyon Committee would need to determine how the proposals will impact the transportation corridor. Mr. Hutchinson reiterated his position that action needed to be taken immediately. Mr. Knoblock discussed transit options, such as smaller shuttle buses, and noted that there was still an opportunity to work toward transit solutions with the FLAP grant funds.

Chair Bricker suggested that the Millcreek Canyon Committee take a proactive stance. The Millcreek Canyon Committee could work with the Preservation Committee to discuss possible recommendations related to the FLAP grant funds.

1. **TRAILS COMMITTEE UPDATE**
2. **John Knoblock, Chair of the Trails Committee, will Provide an Update on the Committee Work Completed to Date. Minutes of the Committee are Posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

Chair of the Trails Committee, Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee prepared a list of Committee goals and objectives. The Committee was also focused on supporting Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation and the Forest Service with their Trails Master Plan process. Mr. Knoblock noted that the Forest Service had been working on a trails inventory. It would also focus on user-created trails and determine which were appropriate and which should be eliminated.

Additionally, the Trails Committee was working to prepare a list of family-friendly hikes in the Central Wasatch. This would allow users to spread out on different trails. The Committee was also focused on assisting the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation Adopt a Trail program and had discussed supporting the trails included in the Forest Service Forest Plan: the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and the Great Western Trail. There had also been discussions with Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen about the creation of a trail project spreadsheet to share on the CWC website.

Mr. Knoblock reported that the Trails Committee discussed ongoing short-term projects. For instance, the two new bridges connected to the Desolation Trail reroute and the Utah Conservation Corps and who was hired to handle the Desolation Trail maintenance project. Additional volunteers would assist the Utah Conservation Corps with labor and supplies.

Ms. Cameron asked about the timeline for short-term projects. Ms. Nielsen reported that the call for short-term project ideas had closed. The project finalists were invited to build out their initial submissions with a more robust timeline and work plan. The Short-Term Projects Committee would deliberate over the project ideas on April 27, 2021, at 8:00 a.m.

1. **VISITOR MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE UPDATE**

 **a. Annalee Munsey and Will McCarvill, Chair and Co-Chair of the Visitor Management Committee, will Provide Updated Information. Information on the Contracting of Utah State University to Complete Phase 1 of the Visitor Use Study is Available on the Utah Public Notice Website and the Central Wasatch Commission Website.**

Chair of the Visitor Management Committee, Ms. Munsey reported that the CWC approved an agreement with Utah State University for Phase One of the Visitor Use Study. She overviewed the timeline. Before the end of May 2021, the Utah State University team would do a literature review, interview key stakeholders, handle data compilation, and conduct some reviews and reporting. The team was also looking at legislation and conducting a policy review. Ms. Munsey noted that the CWC Board wanted the team to expedite the work and was not sure if that would impact the timeline. The goal was to have an interactive webinar on June 1, 2021, before the team continued to do more scoping and assessing of information.

Mr. Perez noted that there were discussions with Utah State University about expediting Phases One and Two of the Visitor Use Study. The Selection Committee agreed to stay on as a Working Group to receive key milestone updates from Utah State University. Updates could be shared with the Stakeholders Council through either the consultant team or the Working Group.

1. **PRESERVATION COMMITTEE**
2. **Carl Fisher and Megan Nelson, Chair and Co-Chair of the Preservation Committee will Provide an Update on the Committee Meeting and Direction.**

Preservation Committee Chair, Carl Fisher, reported that the Preservation Committee had not yet met. The Preservation Committee was created at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting and was ratified at the March CWC Board Meeting. Mr. Fisher and Megan Nelson had since discussed the Committee. The objective was to take an all lands and systems approach to protecting and preserving the natural resources of the Central Wasatch mountains. The Preservation Committee meetings would be between 60 and 90-minutes long, with one-fourth of the time dedicated to a presentation on current conditions, efforts, and policies. The remainder of the meeting time would be spent working to forward the goals of the Committee.

Mr. Fisher noted that the Preservation Committee would expect to work on or provide feedback on a number of different projects. That could include the Environmental Dashboard, reviewing data already in existence, as well as looking at background information on past, present, and future efforts to implement protective policies for the Central Wasatch. The Preservation Committee could also take on some of the workload from the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee when appropriate. Mr. Fisher asked that anyone interested in joining the Preservation Committee reach out to a member of CWC Staff. The first meeting was scheduled to take place on April 29, 2021.

Ms. Nielsen suggested that any interested Stakeholders Council Members with a known interest in joining the Preservation Committee state their name into the record. The list was as follows:

* Chair – Carl Fisher
* Co-Chair – Megan Nelson
* Dr. Kelly Bricker
* Pat Shea
* Jan Striefel
* Sarah Bennett
* Michael Braun
* Barbara Cameron

Ms. Nielsen added that the Preservation Committee Meeting would be open to the public. Anyone from the public was welcome to attend. Mr. Fisher encouraged anyone interested to participate.

1. **CWC STAFF INFORMATION**
2. **Staff will Provide Information on Other Areas of CWC Work.**

Ms. Nielsen reported that the Environmental Dashboard was on track to be up and running by the end of the year. She asked that any Council Members with questions or concerns reach out to her for additional information.

Mr. Perez noted that the CWC’s Tentative Budget for fiscal year 2021-2022 would be discussed at the May 2021 CWC Board Meeting. There would be a 30-day public comment period and the budget was expected to be approved at the June 2021 CWC Board Meeting.

Mr. Perez discussed the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”). He reported that there was a Commissioner’s Summit in March and additional discussions during the April 2021 CWC Board Meeting. The goal was to reach a consensus recommendation that would be forwarded to the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). However, consensus had not been met. CWC staff had met individually with CWC Board Members to walk through the evaluation matrix. Mr. Perez stressed the importance of making a recommendation before the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) is released in June 2021.

1. **OPEN DISCUSSION**

Pat Shea shared a recommendation in the Zoom chat box related to the MTS. He read it out loud to the members of the Stakeholders Council:

* Recommendation of the CWC Stakeholders Council, adopted April 21, 2021:
	+ Whereas there have been innumerable studies made addressing the transportation problem in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon and;
	+ Whereas none of these studies have resulted in any significant improvement to ease the transportation problem in the east canyons and;
	+ Whereas the Stakeholders Council believes it is time to suggest an alternative, less expensive solution for the next 5-10 years, during which time, new technologies might develop a better transportation solution and;
	+ Whereas the Stakeholders Council believes enhanced bus service with several geographically distributed pick up and drop off points is such a solution;
	+ Therefore, the Stakeholders Council of the CWC endorses an enhanced bus service with several geographically dispersed pick up and drop off locations along the Wasatch Front. This endorsement may be rebutted by the CWC if and when, by an objective standard, a better, more environmentally sustainable solution can be determined, proposed, and adopted.

Mr. Hutchinson seconded the recommendation. Chair Bricker opened up the recommendation for comments and discussion. Michael Braun wondered if the recommendation indicated that the Stakeholders Council would not agree with whatever recommendation the CWC made. Mr. Shea noted that the CWC had not come up with a recommendation. He felt that the suggestion for an interim solution that lasted 5 to 10 years would be a better way of approaching the transportation situation. Mr. Braun asked about the recommendation for a cog rail system. Mr. Shea clarified that the recommendation for the cog rail system had come from CWC staff and not the CWC Board. He noted that the CWC staff recommendation had not been well received.

Nathan Rafferty asked if the suggestion was to adopt the enhanced bus alternative that was included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Mr. Shea explained that it would be a different configuration. There had been discussions with Ex-Officio Member Carlton Christensen and some of the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) planners. Mr. Shea reported that there was a map that showed five or six key locations that could serve as drop-off and pick-up locations on a non-stop basis to Snowbird or Alta. He believed it was important to remove vehicles from the road and discussed paid parking and tolling. Mr. Rafferty asked about the cost estimate. Mr. Shea did not have an exact number but strongly recommended that the snowsheds not be included.

Kirk Nichols asked if the recommendation was outside the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Mr. Shea confirmed that the recommendation was independent from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS with the hope that it might influence UDOT to either amend the EIS or one of the alternatives to include more dispersed pick-up and drop-off areas. Mr. Hutchinson believed the recommendation from Mr. Shea would address computer-related issues. He suggested that the recommendation be Phase One of the transportation solution.

Ms. Cameron wondered if the recommendation shared by Mr. Shea included tolling. Mr. Shea felt that tolling would likely be included in the second phase. Mr. Hutchinson believed that tolling and paid parking would need to be included in the first phase. Discussions were had about the necessity of a phased approach to transportation.

Mike Maughan asked about the level of detail included in the recommendation. He noted that it seemed to be very high level. He wondered how the Stakeholders Council could approve something without the details to understand the difference between the current recommendation and the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS enhanced bus alternative. Mr. Shea did not believe the Stakeholders Council was the place where that level of detail could be generated. However, the CWC Board, CWC staff, and interested participants from the Stakeholders Council would be able to determine the details. Mr. Braun felt that UTA already had geographically distributed pick-up and drop-off locations. Mr. Shea did not believe that there were enough dispersed locations.

Mr. Perez shared a map with the Stakeholders Council Members in the Zoom chatbox. It included eight different regional bus hubs with a 15-minute service frequency to each of the Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts. He also shared the associated costs. Mr. Perez reported that under that scenario, approximately 470 buses would be needed to deliver the service effectively. UTA currently has 400 buses.

Mr. Knoblock believed the recommendation needed more fleshing out. He asked if it was appropriate for the Stakeholders Council to vote on something that was not on the meeting agenda. Mr. Shea reported that a recommendation could be made at any time during a meeting. Chair Bricker noted that Council Members may need additional time to consider the recommendation. Mr. Fisher felt that the recommendation from Mr. Shea was timely. He liked it because it showed conviction from the Stakeholders Council and felt it might encourage the CWC to put energy and resources behind an in-depth analysis on bus systems and enhanced regional transit.

Mr. Marshall noted that CWC staff and the Commission invested several years into evaluating different long-term alternatives. Even if the Stakeholders Council preferred the bus alternative, the recommendation would tell the CWC that the Council did not believe in any of the other alternatives. He felt that the recommendation would need to include a whereas clause stating:

* The Stakeholders Council believes that buses are the appropriate alternative.

Mr. Marshall also expressed concerns related to some of the language in the recommendation. For instance, the line that said, “This endorsement may be rebutted by the CWC…” He felt that may overstep the position of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Marshall reminded Council Members that the Stakeholders Council is an advisory body. Mr. Marker felt that the recommendation made by Mr. Shea was consistent with the charter. The Stakeholders Council existed to advise the CWC. If members of the Stakeholders Council felt that there were other transportation alternatives to consider, and if was the right and responsibility of the Stakeholders Council to make them known.

Mr. Maughan reported that Alta Ski Area has been trying to increase bus ridership for over 30 years. He commented that it was disheartening that Alta Ski Area provided free bus ridership for over 10,000 people and less than 500 took advantage of it. He noted that less than 3% of the total canyon visitors chose to ride the bus. Mr. Maughan believed it was more difficult to make a bus solution work for families with children and a lot of equipment and mentioned incentives geared toward single-occupancy vehicles. He also expressed concerns that certain measures to incentivize users to move onto public transportation would have more of an impact on lower-income residents. Discussions were had about parking at ski resorts.

Mr. Rafferty stated that it was difficult for him to support a recommendation that was not included on the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda. He felt it was premature to ask Council Members to vote on the recommendation. Mr. Shea suggested that there be a two-week period where Stakeholders Council Members could study and amend the recommendation. Mr. Perez wanted to hear more from the Stakeholders Council about what they envisioned. He noted that the next two weeks would be extremely busy for CWC staff.

Dave Fields noted that UDOT was working on a transportation solution, the CWC Board was working on a transportation recommendation, and now it seemed that the Stakeholders Council was working on a separate recommendation. Mr. Shea explained that the role of the Stakeholders Council was to advise the CWC. He felt it was consistent with the role of the Stakeholders Council to pass along suggestions to the CWC Board.

The Council Members discussed an additional meeting of the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez reported that it would be difficult to accommodate schedules. Mr. Shea suggested that the recommendation be added to Google Docs and the members of the Stakeholders Council could make comments or observations. From there, a final document could be put together and circulated to Stakeholders Council Members. Members could express support or opposition.

Chair Bricker was excused from the remainder of the meeting. Co-Chair Striefel assumed the Chair.

Executive Director, Ralph Becker appreciated the interest and investment of time that the Stakeholders Council had taken. He noted that everything that was discussed previously by the Stakeholders Council had been brought forward to the Commission. Mr. Becker discussed the recommendation made by Mr. Shea. He did not believe the item was on the agenda as an action item. The Commission had a position that all action items needed to be noted for consideration. Council Members debated whether or not a vote on the recommendation would be appropriate.

Mr. Becker reported that certain comments made during the Stakeholders Council Meeting had been inaccurate, specifically as it relates to information about UTA. He noted that CWC Staff could ask UTA if they would be willing to visit with the Stakeholders Council to further review information. Additionally, all formally presented information could be found on the CWC website or the Utah Public Notice website. Mr. Becker suggested that the Stakeholders Council consider all information, as presented by the experts, prior to a vote.

Co-Chair Striefel discussed possible next steps. She commented that she and Chair Bricker could meet with CWC staff to determine the best approach. Mr. Shea reiterated his suggestion that the recommendation be added to Google Docs for members of the Stakeholders Council to comment on. A resolution could be put forward by Zoom or via email. Co-Chair Striefel liked the idea of putting the document on Google Docs for Stakeholders Council feedback.

Mr. Hutchinson believed there was a motion on the floor. He noted that Mr. Shea had read the original recommendation dated April 21, 2021. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion. Mr. Shea proposed an amendment to the recommendation. He asked that it also state:

* There will be a two-week period of time for the Stakeholders Council to review, comment, and amend the draft, after which there will be a meeting duly called for the Stakeholders Council to consider further actions on the recommendation.

It was noted that Mr. Shea did not make a motion on the recommendation. He brought up a topic of conversation about the recommendation. Discussions were had about whether there was a motion on the table. Mr. Becker commented that he would want to defer to CWC legal counsel. However, CWC staff had not had a chance to consult with CWC Attorney, Shane Topham about the recommendation because the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda did not include an action item. Mr. Becker discussed how to move forward. He stated that CWC staff would do everything possible to bring the matter back before the Stakeholders Council in a forum that follows all requirements of State law and CWC procedures.

Mr. Becker did not want to commit to a two-week timeframe but felt the item could be addressed within one month. Co-Chair Striefel agreed that it might take more than two weeks. She recommended that the item not be voted on during the current Stakeholders Council Meeting. Further discussions were had about how to appropriately move forward. Co-Chair Striefel referenced her previous suggestion that she and Chair Bricker meet with CWC Staff to determine a suitable approach and then report back to the Stakeholders Council.

There was discussion about whether a motion had been made. Co-Chair Striefel asked Mr. Shea if he would be willing to take back his motion. Mr. Shea felt that the best solution was to have individual Stakeholders Council members make comments on the recommendation, let CWC staff review the document, and then have additional discussion in two weeks.

Ms. Cameron asked that an amendment be made to the recommendation. She wanted information related to Big Cottonwood Canyon to be included and wondered if the motion could be postponed until that was done. Mr. Shea was in support of that. Mr. Braun seconded the motion. Discussions were had about whether there needed to be a vote. It was noted it was acceptable to place a motion in pending status for a future meeting. Co-Chair Striefel stated that there was no need to vote on the motion. Mr. Shea confirmed that it now had a pending status.

1. **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to adjourn. Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately 5:35 p.m.
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