



2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD RETREAT**
4 **HELD THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2022, AT 1:00 P.M. AT THE SILVER FORK LODGE**
5 **AND RESTAURANT IN BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON, 11332 SOUTH BIG**
6 **COTTONWOOD CANYON ROAD, BRIGHTON, UTAH.**

7
8 **Present:** Chris Robinson, Chair
9 Mayor Dan Knopp
10 Mayor Roger Bourke
11 Mayor Michael Weichers
12 Mayor Monica Zoltanski
13 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
14 Carlton Christensen
15 Annalee Munsey
16 Bekee Hotze
17 Laura Briefer
18 Will McCarvill
19 Barbara Cameron
20 Carl Fisher
21
22 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Executive Director of Policy
23 Blake Perez, CWC Executive Director of Administration
24

25 **OPENING**

26
27 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the Board Retreat and Welcome**
28 **Fellow Commissioners, Staff, and Members of the Public.**

29
30 Chair Chris Robinson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Retreat to order at
31 1:00 p.m. and welcomed those present. He thanked Mayor Dan Knopp for organizing the Retreat
32 location, which was the Silver Fork Lodge and Restaurant. The Retreat was hybrid, with both in-
33 person and online attendees. Bekee Hotze from the U.S. Forest Service was filling in for Dave
34 Whittekiend and Laura Briefer was filling in for Mayor Erin Mendenhall.
35

36 CWC Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez thanked everyone for attending the CWC
37 Board Retreat. Members of the public were present and able to join on Zoom. He noted that some
38 Stakeholders Council Members were at the meeting as well. The agenda was available on the Utah
39 Public Notice website for online attendees. This was the first in-person retreat since 2019.
40

41 Mr. Perez reviewed the CWC Board Retreat agenda. There would be a 2022 Strategic Plan Status
42 Update and a 2023 Story Boarding Workshop. Following the workshop, there would be a short break,

1 and then some dialogue between the CWC Board and Stakeholders Council leadership.

2
3 **2022 STRATEGIC PLAN STATUS UPDATE**

4
5 **1. Staff will Provide Strategic Plan Status Update.**

6
7 CWC Staff felt it was important to look back at the past year. During the previous Retreat, a decision
8 was made to organize a Situational Assessment. A request for proposal (“RFP”) had been released
9 and Common Ground Institute (“CGI”) responded to that RFP. CGI delivered a Situational
10 Assessment that the CWC Board approved in April 2022. Mr. Perez reported that the first part of the
11 Situational Assessment was the “Restatement and Recommitment of the Values and Principles of the
12 Mountain Accord.” Information related to the Mountain Accord was included in the packet as review
13 since it is a grounding document for the organization.

14
15 Mr. Perez shared additional information about the Situational Assessment. He explained that there
16 were several action items included in the document. Some of those items had been tabled. The CWC
17 initially discussed the possibility of “The Central Wasatch Compact.” However, the CWC Board
18 decided to table “The Central Wasatch Compact” and that item was still on hold. Mr. Perez reported
19 that another specific commitment and negotiated action item listed in the Situational Assessment
20 related to short-term projects. Short-term project work was ongoing and there was a desire to do more
21 in that area. The third section outlined the purpose of the organization. One of the action items was
22 for CWC Staff to develop an updated vision, mission, and purpose statement for the CWC. That had
23 not been completed yet. There was also a desire for the organization to provide a forum for multi-
24 jurisdictional discussions related to issues in the Central Wasatch. That work was ongoing.

25
26 Mr. Perez noted that the Situational Assessment referenced a desire to engage with multiple
27 jurisdictions, such as the State of Utah, Salt Lake County, and the Forest Service. That action item
28 was listed as completed and ongoing. He reported that the CGI report also included a statement from
29 the perspective of the consultant. According to CGI, the CWC was succeeding and accomplishing
30 its designated purpose by providing the forum it was designed to achieve.

31
32 The governance structure had been a significant topic of discussion. The Situational Assessment
33 stated that the CWC should actively seek to improve involvement from the State of Utah, Salt Lake
34 County, the Forest Service, and potentially other key government entities. The CWC should also
35 recruit and appoint State Government formal relationships. Mr. Perez explained that CWC Staff
36 developed a State Agency Matrix and had started engaging with different State agencies about the
37 level of participation there was interest in. That dialogue was ongoing. At the current time, there
38 was not one particular entity that had shown a lot of interest, but the dialogue was important.

39
40 Ex-Officio Member, Carlton Christensen noted that Salt Lake County had pulled out of the CWC.
41 He wondered to what degree that dialogue had continued. Mr. Perez reported that Salt Lake County
42 hired a new Staff Member, Jason Wolf, who is the Canyons Program Manager. This position was
43 created recently, so there would be continued discussions with the County. The CWC had also spoken
44 to the County about the Millcreek Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) Grant and Big
45 Cottonwood Canyon. He believed the organization was in a position to move forward with the County
46 more so now that there was a Canyons Program Manager in place. The CWC wanted the County to
47 be involved and engaged, even if Salt Lake County was no longer on the CWC Board.

1 There was a strategy for engaging partner agencies, which included regular communications with
2 partners in the Central Wasatch Mountains. CWC Staff felt that work was completed and ongoing.
3 CWC Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen, overviewed the communication strategy. There
4 were robust digital communication platforms, such as the CWC website, newsletter, and social media
5 accounts. Additionally, press releases were sent out and press conferences were held, when
6 appropriate. There were also visits to the Editorial Boards when appropriate. Whenever there were
7 notable updates, she reached out to communications staff at each of the member jurisdictions.

8
9 Mr. Perez discussed the structure of the CWC Board. The recommendation from CGI, which was
10 later approved by the CWC Board, was to continue with the CWC structure that was created by the
11 Interlocal Agreement. The CWC was composed of only elected officials. There was non-elected ex-
12 officio representation as well. In the bylaws, the organization was allowed four ex-officio members.
13 There were currently three ex-officio members. Mr. Perez overviewed the scope and discretion. He
14 explained that this portion of the Situational Assessment clarified the roles of CWC Staff. For
15 instance, CWC Staff could analyze issues, formulate recommendations, and help to build consensus
16 around issues related to the Central Wasatch Mountains. That work was completed and ongoing.
17 CWC Staff continued to weigh in and provide information that could build consensus.

18
19 The Situational Assessment also included information about voting. This included majority voting,
20 weighted voting, and consensus support. In 2022, the CWC Board voted on a mechanism to shift to
21 a majority vote but the default standard was still a consensus agreement. That was adopted in April
22 2022. As for the frequency of meetings, there is now a bi-monthly meeting schedule for CWC Board
23 Meetings. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee meets monthly. The CWC was on track in terms
24 of the meetings. CWC Staff recommended keeping the bi-monthly schedule for 2023. There was a
25 memo related to the meeting schedule that would need to be approved at the December 2022 CWC
26 Board Meeting. The intention was to have meetings in January, March, May, June, August, October,
27 and December. Ms. Nielsen clarified that meetings were scheduled in both May and June because of
28 the budget. It was also noted that the Legislative and Land Tenure Committee and the Transportation
29 Committee had restarted. Those meetings were held as needed.

30
31 Mr. Perez shared information about engagement with external entities. This involved CWC Staff and
32 members of the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee speaking to member jurisdiction City Councils
33 to share updates about the organization. A lot of positive feedback had been received from the
34 Councils, especially as it related to the Visitor Use Study and Environmental Dashboard. Many were
35 excited to see the sixth element added to the Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Perez noted that the
36 Situational Assessment referenced formal presentations from the Forest Service, Utah Department of
37 Transportation (“UDOT”), and other entities relevant to ongoing work. Early in the year, there was
38 a presentation from Mr. Whittekiend from the Forest Service. There had also been presentations from
39 UDOT at the last several meetings. CWC Staff was open to suggestions about other agencies that
40 CWC Board Members wanted to hear from at future meetings.

41
42 The Situational Assessment included a suggestion that CWC Board Members participate on other
43 relevant Boards or Commissions. Mr. Perez explained that there had not been much movement with
44 that particular suggestion and it was still to be completed. There was also a suggestion to partner
45 with Stakeholders Council Members for 501(c)(3) fundraising. It was an option and there had been
46 some discussions, but that item was currently on hold. At present, there was no need to proceed that
47 way. Carl Fisher noted that the CWC had looked at possibly starting a 501(c)(3), but there were a lot

1 of 501(c)(3) partners already associated with the organization. Save Our Canyons or another
2 501(c)(3) could potentially partner with the CWC and assist in the fundraising efforts.

3
4 Mr. Perez noted that there was a suggestion to develop a plan to pursue various funding opportunities.
5 That work was ongoing. The Situational Assessment also suggested that the CWC continue to seek
6 external funding to support short-term projects and other initiatives. That work was ongoing as well.
7 As for the member contributions, that had been a topic of discussion over the last year. Mayor Jeff
8 Silvestrini explained that from the beginning of the organization, there had been conversations about
9 what each member's contribution should be. There was no methodology in place at the current time,
10 but he felt that it was necessary to move forward. While there was not a lot of time to explore the
11 issue at the CWC Board Retreat, it was something that needed to be addressed. CWC Staff prepared
12 a memo that proposed some models for consideration. One of the options was to take the formulaic
13 approach of the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”). This considered a variety of factors,
14 including population, sales tax, and real property valuation. Mayor Silvestrini believed it was
15 necessary to have clear membership contribution amounts in place. This would add to the stability
16 of the organization and eliminate variations from year to year.

17
18 Mayor Silvestrini believed it would make sense for CWC Staff to speak to each of the member
19 jurisdictions privately about contributions. He stressed the importance of determining a model for
20 member contributions. This needed to be done before March 2023 so the budget could be built
21 accordingly. He asked CWC Staff to reach out to CWC Board Members about the concepts outlined
22 in the memo. Mr. Perez overviewed the timeline for that work. The memo would be shared with the
23 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee in the next week or so. There would be discussions with CWC
24 Board Members after that point and a decision would be made at the beginning of March 2023.

25
26 Mr. Perez reported that most of the Stakeholders Council engagement had been completed. As part
27 of the Strategic Plan implementation, a budget was provided to the Stakeholders Council for
28 leadership training and clarification about the role of the Council. Some of that would be discussed
29 later on in the CWC Board Retreat. The Stakeholders Council developed a work plan, strategy, and
30 sub-committees in April 2022. The Co-Chairs of the Stakeholders Council started to attend the
31 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meetings as Ex-Officio Members as well. There was also a
32 standing agenda item on the CWC Board Meeting for Stakeholders Council updates.

33
34 Final thoughts related to the Situational Assessment and Strategic Plan were shared. Mr. Perez
35 overviewed a list that outlined the outstanding items that had not been completed. Some items were
36 on hold and others were underway. Ex-Officio Christensen wondered which items on the list were
37 viewed as priorities. Mr. Perez explained that he did not want to influence any decision-making. All
38 of the items on the list were worthwhile and had merit. Priorities would be discussed next.

39 40 **2023 STORYBOARDING WORKSHOP**

41 42 **1. Commissioners, Stakeholders Council Chairs, and Staff will Participate in a Story** 43 **Boarding Process to Help Develop Goals and Prioritize Them.**

44
45 Mr. Perez reported that those present would participate in a Story Boarding Workshop. The purpose
46 of the exercise was to hear from all CWC Board Members and gather new ideas, project priorities,
47 and policy direction. It was also a way to reflect on previous work and group themes together.
48 Everyone would vote on the ideas and the immediate and future goals would be prioritized at the end

1 of the exercise. A digital version would be presented to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and
2 the full CWC Board. The outcomes would help dictate the portfolio of work, budget, and the Strategic
3 Plan. Mr. Perez explained that he had learned a bit about storyboarding at the ULCT Conference a
4 few weeks ago. It was a straightforward, simple, and effective way to obtain vital information.

5
6 After speaking with Chair Robinson, it was determined that CWC Board Members and Ex-Officio
7 Members would participate in the exercise. In addition, CWC Staff would participate as well as the
8 Co-Chairs of the Stakeholders Council. Ms. Hotze clarified that the Forest Service could not
9 participate in the exercise. The organization could only provide comments on the management of the
10 Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. As a result, she would not provide direction during the
11 workshop. Mr. Perez reported that he had spoken to CWC Legal Counsel, Shane Topham beforehand.
12 He had no concerns about Ex-Officio Members participating in the Story Boarding Workshop.
13 Ms. Hotze reiterated that she would not participate in the Story Boarding Workshop.

14
15 Mr. Perez overviewed the Story Boarding Workshop process. Five questions would be posed and
16 each participant would have a total of 10 index cards. As many or as few cards could be used for
17 each of the questions. For instance, someone could write multiple answers for one question and only
18 one for another. Participants would spend 15 minutes answering the questions. Virtual participants
19 would email Mr. Perez their answers. After that, participants would be broken up into groups of two
20 and the cards would be gathered. There could be 20 to 30 index cards per question. The teams of
21 two would categorize those cards by theme or topic. Once the cards were categorized, the voting
22 process would begin. Everyone would be given seven stickers. Those stickers represented individual
23 votes. Participants would place their votes on the index cards they felt best represented the priorities
24 for the CWC in 2023. After voting, there would be recategorization, prioritization, and discussion.
25 In the end, there would be some clear themes as well as a prioritized action list. That action list would
26 be presented to the CWC Board at the December 2022 meeting.

27
28 Mr. Perez overviewed the questions that participants would answer in the Story Boarding Workshop:

- 29
30
- What are the CWC's highest priorities this year?
 - What are the CWC's highest priorities in the next three to five years?
 - What would you like to see the CWC accomplish?
 - If the CWC were to receive additional ongoing funding, what should the money be used for?
 - What do you think the Stakeholders Council should work on this year?
- 31
32
33
34
35

36 Participants spent approximately 15 minutes writing down their answers. Virtual participants
37 submitted their answers to CWC Staff via email. Mr. Perez collected the index cards and the teams
38 categorized the cards. He asked each group to briefly explain the topics and themes for each question.

39
40 For the first question, one theme was the completion of the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action
41 Plan ("MAP"). Another card stated that the CWC needed to become relevant again. Other answers
42 had to do with the stabilization of membership contributions, addressing growth in the canyons,
43 engaging other organizations and other parts of the community, and the Federal Legislation. For the
44 second question, one notable theme was a framework for transportation. Other suggestions had to do
45 with the Big Cottonwood Canyon MAP and moving the work of the Environmental Dashboard
46 forward. There was also a question about how the Visitor Use Study data would be integrated.
47 Additionally, there was a desire to focus on inter-government relations and further establish the
48 effectiveness of the CWC. Federal Legislation was also listed for this question.

1
2 For the third question, one suggestion was a mechanism that would allow the CWC to serve as a hub
3 for multi-jurisdictional projects and take a clear position on issues. Other suggestions included
4 continuing the vision of the organization, setting the organization up for success, and becoming more
5 respected in the community. Additionally, there were suggestions related to the passage of the Central
6 Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”), transportation solutions,
7 and widespread watershed projects. There was also a suggestion to expand the CWC to include
8 Draper. For the fourth question, there were suggestions to use hypothetical funding for public
9 engagement, specific short-term projects, and operational needs. For the fifth question, there were
10 suggestions about short-term projects, more Stakeholders Council outreach, increased familiarity
11 between the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board, and additional education and funding for the
12 Environmental Dashboard. In addition, there was a suggestion to explore different ways to obtain
13 private lands from willing sellers and put those lands into conservation easements. There was also a
14 desire for the Council to address the ongoing drought issues in the State and to communicate to others
15 about the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).

16
17 Mr. Perez thanked everyone for their participation. The next part of the Story Boarding Workshop
18 was voting. He asked those present to use their stickers to vote on priority items. After the voting
19 was complete, the intention was to group the priority items according to categories. For instance, the
20 Big Cottonwood Canyon MAP was referenced a lot. There were also a lot of references to the
21 Environmental Dashboard, short-term projects, and Legislation. Mayor Dan Knopp believed that the
22 short-term projects would fit in well with the Stakeholders Council work because it would be possible
23 for Council Members to investigate projects and share recommendations. It was noted that phasing
24 and strategic planning seemed to be a priority as well as expansive and inclusive study areas.

25
26 After the voting was complete, Laura Briefer noted that some index cards had more stickers on them
27 than others. However, there were a lot of important comments. She did not want the suggestions to
28 be ignored. Public engagement was very important and she saw that repeated throughout. Though
29 there may not be clusters of stickers on one particular card, it was a common theme. Mr. Perez
30 explained that those items would be listed under one category. Everything would be broken down by
31 votes, but all other suggestions would also be included on the list. Ms. Briefer felt the cards related
32 to inclusivity were important. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that all comments would be included in the
33 report that would be shared with the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and CWC Board. In
34 addition to reporting all of the ideas shared during the retreat, there would also be a ranked list.

35
36 The CWC priorities for the year were discussed. Mr. Perez read one of the cards aloud, which was:
37 “Develop a strategic plan for the first steps of funding.” Mayor Monica Zoltanski explained that the
38 suggestion had to do with phasing. For instance, determining what a phased approach meant. The
39 CWC was in the best position to come up with recommendations for where the State should fund
40 reservation systems, tolling, and buses. The card was tied to a phased approach for transportation.

41
42 Other priorities included stabilizing funding for member jurisdictions and “finding a meaningful role
43 to be engaged in during the ongoing debates, discussions, decisions, and actions regarding the Federal
44 Legislation and transportation solutions, which are considered to be interrelated.” Chair Robinson
45 believed there were two unknowns including what would happen with transportation and what would
46 happen with the Federal Legislation. The success of transportation and Federal Legislation were
47 interrelated. The CWC had shared a consensus opinion about transportation with UDOT. On the
48 other side of things, the organization was trying to put forth Legislation. At the current time, the

1 transportation discussions were ahead of the Federal Legislation discussions. Ms. Briefer noted that
2 there would be a Record of Decision (“ROD”) released shortly. If there was a ROD released, but no
3 focus on Federal Legislation, that would create a troubling imbalance. Chair Robinson explained that
4 the CWC needed a sponsor to take on the CWNCRA and assist in moving it forward.

5
6 Mr. Fisher noted that transportation and conservation strategies had been separated. He wondered
7 why this happened and whether that separation was appropriate. Transportation was a tool that could
8 manage visitation and achieve a conservation vision. Since those were not integrated, it created
9 issues. Chair Robinson did not believe transportation and conservation should be separate. While
10 they were not separate at the signing of the Mountain Accord, a separation had occurred since. Ms.
11 Briefer pointed out that a transportation proposal was on the table for Little Cottonwood Canyon,
12 which was an economic development proposal. This was another pillar of the Mountain Accord.
13 That meant economic development and transportation were moving forward, but there was no sense
14 of success with the conservation side of things. She was concerned about the imbalance.

15
16 Mr. Perez discussed the CWC priorities for the next three to five years. Some of the priorities seemed
17 to be the Big Cottonwood Canyon MAP, an app for the Environmental Dashboard, Legislation and
18 maintaining relationships and collaboration with entities, such as the Forest Service, County, UDOT,
19 Salt Lake County Public Utilities, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”),
20 and the Unified Police Department (“UPD”). Barbara Cameron felt it was an honor to have Forest
21 Service participate in the organization. She appreciated those contributions and encouraged
22 additional contributions. For example, there could be more of a connection between UPD and UFA.
23 Those entities could be integrated into the CWC discussions and work.

24
25 Another priority was read aloud, which was: “Explore the creation and feasibility of a mechanism
26 through which the CWC may serve as the hub for multi-jurisdictional projects in the Central
27 Wasatch.” That item received three votes. Ms. Nielsen explained that she had written that card. This
28 was not a new idea, but in the past, there had been discussions about the CWC becoming a hub through
29 which multi-jurisdictional work was done. As an example, funding could be put toward a single
30 project. She wondered whether it would be possible to pull the funding and ideas into a central place.
31 It would make a lot of sense for the CWC to play that role. Mayor Knopp expressed support. Mayor
32 Silvestrini was also supportive of the concept but noted that one of the obstacles was the fact that it
33 may be difficult for other entities to agree that the CWC should be the hub.

34
35 Mr. Perez read the following suggestion: “Becoming a well-respected and supported (financially and
36 politically) organization to help plan and guide the use and conservation of the Central Wasatch.”
37 Chair Robinson explained that he struggled with making sure the CWC was relevant. The
38 organization needed to be sought out and be known for making a difference. Mr. Perez noted that
39 there was a lot of support for short-term projects expressed through the voting.

40
41 As for the Stakeholders Council question, there were a lot of different suggestions. Mr. Perez read
42 language that stated, “The Stakeholders Council is where opposing sides can find agreement in
43 improving the canyons and there can be small wins.” Ex-Officio Christensen explained that often,
44 the larger and more complicated issues were addressed, but in his experience, it was also worthwhile
45 to focus on smaller issues where there was a consensus. There were likely smaller issues that
46 Stakeholders and Board Members could come together on. That could be a focus of the Stakeholders
47 Council so there was a greater sense of accomplishment. For instance, short-term projects.

1 Another suggestion stated, “Evaluate how we can become relevant to the whole spectrum of
2 Stakeholder interests, from conservation to commercial. Spread and amplify messages beyond east
3 Salt Lake County.” Mayor Zoltanski noted that there was a shared interest in protecting the Central
4 Wasatch. Tying in State-wide interests, rather than only focusing on those who lived near the canyons
5 or the elected officials adjacent to the canyons, would be beneficial. Broadening the reach would be
6 worthwhile as there would be a more educated, empowered, and invested community. There was a
7 wide spectrum of Stakeholders Council Members and even more that could be considered. Mr. Fisher
8 believed there was a general feeling that the Stakeholders Council was not being utilized to its fullest
9 potential. Ms. Briefer liked that there was diversity of perspectives and values associated with the
10 Stakeholders Council. She stressed the importance of inclusion. Chair Robinson praised the current
11 Stakeholders Council leadership. Ms. Briefer echoed those sentiments.
12

13 Mr. Perez explained that he would take all of the submissions and organize the themes and priorities.
14 By the end of the CWC Board Retreat, the categorized and prioritized list would be complete. It
15 would be cleaned up after the retreat and a digital version would be shared with the
16 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and CWC Board to approve in December 2022. He thanked
17 those present for participating in the Story Boarding Workshop. It had been helpful and there was
18 now some good direction and a lot of good ideas. Once the broad ideas were finalized, the
19 Committees would start to do work to achieve the desired outcomes. For instance, the Legislative
20 and Land Tenure Committee would develop a strategy related to Federal Legislation and the
21 Transportation Committee would look into funding for the Big Cottonwood Canyon MAP. The work
22 would be done at the Committee level. He noted that there would now be a short break.
23

24 **BREAK**

25
26 CWC Board Retreat participants took a 10-minute break.
27

28 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

29
30 1. **Stakeholders Advisory Council Chair and Co-Chair, William McCarvill and Barbara**
31 **Cameron will Provide an Overview of the Work and Accomplishments of the**
32 **Stakeholders Council During 2022.**
33

34 2. **Commissioners and Stakeholders Council Co-Chairs will Discuss, Set Priorities, and**
35 **Assign Topics and Goals for the Council.**
36

37 Stakeholders Council leadership, William McCarvill, and Ms. Cameron were present to share
38 information about the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Perez noted that Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron
39 had done an excellent job over the last year and a half leading the Council. The Co-Chairs had built
40 a strong foundation. It was an exciting time for the organization and the Stakeholders Council.
41

42 Ms. Cameron shared information about the Stakeholders Council. She reported that the Council had
43 been able to see several projects move forward, such as the Environmental Dashboard and the Visitor
44 Use Study. Both projects had exciting futures. There were seven new members on the Stakeholders
45 Council. Additionally, Stakeholders Council leadership now met more often with the CWC Board.
46

47 There were two active Stakeholders Council sub-committees, which included the Trails Committee
48 and the Millcreek Canyon Committee. The Trails Committee had been discussing the Forest Service

1 Trails Master Plan. The Trails Committee also discussed the Watershed Management Plan. The
2 Chair of that Committee was John Knoblock. The Millcreek Canyon Committee was a lively liaison
3 between the County and the public as the FLAP grant progressed. Stakeholders Council leadership
4 was proud of their outreach. There were a lot of members that participated and there were also a lot
5 of interested members of the general public. Anyone could participate in the sub-committee meetings.
6 Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Tom Diegel, handled intense meetings with diplomacy.

7
8 Ms. Cameron discussed the Stakeholders Council Survey. The survey was created by Stakeholders
9 Council leadership to understand the input that Stakeholders wanted to have. There were a lot of
10 positive responses to the survey. The results found that a lot of Council Members believed the
11 meetings were too short or it was too difficult to contribute to the discussion. There were some strong
12 voices on the Council and that made it challenging for everyone to participate. Ms. Cameron praised
13 CWC Staff for their hard work as their efforts benefited the Stakeholders Council.

14
15 The Stakeholders Council wanted to be helpful to the CWC Board. Ms. Cameron explained that there
16 was excitement about the new meeting schedule, as it would likely strengthen communication
17 between the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. The Stakeholders Council would meet bi-
18 monthly rather than quarterly and the months would alternate with the CWC Board. Mr. Perez
19 explained that the Stakeholders Council Meetings would be three weeks before the CWC Board
20 Meetings. This would ensure that items from the Stakeholders Council would be in front of the CWC
21 Board in a timely manner. It would also allow the CWC Board to send items to the Council.

22
23 Ms. Cameron referenced the Stakeholders Annual Report. Ms. Hotze asked to share comments about
24 the report as all of the language needed to be accurate. She stated that the Forest Service had a
25 National Visitor Use Monitoring Survey that was currently underway. It compared the forest to other
26 forests. The National Visitor Use Monitoring Survey included social aspects as well. For instance,
27 cleanliness and whether users were enjoying themselves. It was a qualitative assessment. Ms. Hotze
28 reported that the CWC gave additional money so that a subset in the tri-canyon area could be done.
29 She discussed trail counters and explained that the counters tracked the number of users on a trail.
30 That information would be used to augment the National Visitor Use Monitor Survey data.
31 Additionally, she clarified that neither she nor Zinnia Wilson were Ex-Officio Members of the Trails
32 Committee or Millcreek Canyon Committee. Forest Service representatives had attended certain sub-
33 committee meetings when asked to provide specialized expertise.

34
35 Discussions were had about the Forest Service National Visitor Use Monitoring Survey.
36 Ms. Cameron believed it would be worthwhile to add the visitor data to the Environmental Dashboard.
37 Ms. Nielsen clarified that the sixth element of the Environmental Dashboard would have that kind of
38 information. The hope was that the work for that element would start in 2023. The sixth element,
39 also referred to as the human element, would incorporate data gathered through the Visitor Use Study
40 into the Environmental Dashboard so it would be accessible to everyone.

41
42 Mr. McCarvill reported that the CWC Situational Analysis was conducted by CGI in the spring.
43 Question nine of the analysis asked about satisfaction with the Stakeholders Council. The results
44 tended to be not-so-satisfied. He explained that some Council Members found the meetings to be
45 “contentious, unproductive, with mistreatment of fellow Council Members or presenters.” There was
46 also a question about the role of the Stakeholders Council in creating its agenda and priorities versus
47 receiving direction from the CWC. Mr. McCarvill believed both were needed.

1 There were two issues that the Stakeholders Council leadership worked to address in 2022. That
2 work would continue into 2023. The first issue was the functioning of the Stakeholders Council as a
3 safe place for presentation and discussion. The second issue had to do with how the Stakeholders
4 Council identified issues and acted upon those issues. Those priorities would continue to be the focus.
5 Mr. McCarvill explained that the Stakeholders Council had a diverse set of interests. Members felt
6 strongly about those interests. Sometimes, Council Members were forceful and quieter voices were
7 not heard. It was the responsibility of Stakeholders Council leadership to manage meetings
8 appropriately. He pointed out that the Trails Committee and Millcreek Canyon Committee were both
9 running well. The Committee Members were attentive, kind, and collaborative.

10
11 Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron wanted to continue to work on the Stakeholders Council function.
12 Over the last several months, the operations had improved as there was more identification of issues
13 and more action related to those issues. Council Members were volunteers and participated as
14 interested and as time permitted. Some were more engaged and some were less engaged. Recently,
15 it seemed that Council Members were more willing to bring items to the Council for consideration.
16 At the next Stakeholders Council Meeting, there would be a discussion related to items brought
17 forward by individual members. This included County funding and the Little Cottonwood Canyon
18 EIS. The last several months had been encouraging in terms of Stakeholders Council progress.

19
20 It was noted that the Transportation Committee and Legislative and Land Tenure Committee were
21 both active. However, the Stakeholders Council did not feel that their involvement was desired.
22 Those issues were extremely important, but there had been no effort to inform the Council about those
23 issues. Council Members could sit in on those meetings as members of the public, but not in a more
24 formal position. As a result, the Stakeholders Council felt left out of those discussions. Mr. McCarvill
25 liked the idea of the new CWC Board and Stakeholders Council meeting scheduled for 2023. It would
26 make it possible to hear things from the CWC Board or prepare things for the CWC Board. This
27 would allow for more engagement between the groups and would improve the connection.

28
29 The Council still lacked answers to questions that were posed at the last CWC Board Retreat:

- 30
31
- What does the CWC Board expect of the Stakeholders Council?
 - What is the Stakeholders Council doing right? What is the Stakeholders Council not doing?
 - What actions would be of value to the CWC Board?
- 32
33
34

35 Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron were excited about 2023. The last few months had created
36 opportunities for Stakeholders Council Members to participate more. Additionally, the new meeting
37 schedule would mesh the Council more fully with the CWC Board. Mr. McCarvill agreed with an
38 idea presented earlier in the retreat. Having a lot of smaller successes would build momentum. Mayor
39 Zoltanski thanked Mr. McCarvill and Ms. Cameron for their hard work and dedication. She believed
40 the Stakeholders Council was an important part of the mission of the CWC. The Council made it
41 possible to achieve meaningful deliverables. Mayor Silvestrini asked whether short-term projects
42 resonated with the Stakeholders Council. That was an area where there was demonstrable progress.
43 Mr. McCarvill confirmed this. Council Members could submit project ideas for consideration.

44
45 Ms. Nielsen shared information about short-term projects. She explained that CWC Staff would start
46 to draft the call for project ideas in January and February. There would be meetings with resource
47 managers during that time as well. In March, the call for project ideas would open. There would be
48 one month to submit short-term projects. The projects needed to be implemented that year.

1 Ms. Hotze asked whether it would be possible to start the process in the summer so the Forest Service
2 could analyze the projects in winter and implement them the next summer. This would ensure there
3 was additional time for due diligence. She wanted to make sure everything was analyzed properly.
4 It was difficult to review the projects in such a short amount of time. Ms. Nielsen stated that this
5 could be taken into consideration. Mayor Knopp suggested that there be a lighter schedule for the
6 next round of short-term projects. After that point, the schedule could shift, as desired by Ms. Hotze.

7
8 Ms. Briefer wondered whether there could be a rolling set of projects. One of the criteria for
9 implementation could be appropriate agency review. Ms. Nielsen explained that one of the existing
10 criteria was that the project procures a letter of support from the landowner or resource manager.
11 Mr. McCarvill asked that applicants be informed of the application process, especially if a project
12 was added to a queue of sorts. It was important for volunteers to know that they were heard and
13 appreciated. Discussions were had about the schedule moving forward. Mr. Fisher liked the idea of
14 short-term projects, but sometimes, he felt some of the projects did not forward the CWC's direction
15 and policies. It would be nice to have a list of priorities and an integrated checklist. Ms. Hotze felt
16 there were wonderful short-term project submissions, but it was a matter of timing and proper
17 analysis.

18
19 Mr. Perez pointed out that there had not been a short-term project application specifically from the
20 Stakeholders Council. There had been applications from members of the Stakeholders Council for
21 their individual organizations. As a result, the Stakeholders Council and short-term projects had not
22 been fully meshed. Funded short-term projects were seen as successes for the specific organizations
23 rather than seen as a shared success among the Stakeholders Council. More could be done there to
24 promote the idea of success on a Council level. Mayor Silvestrini wondered whether it would be
25 beneficial to have a recommendation from the Stakeholders Council moving forward. For instance,
26 there could be a list of short-term project prioritizations so there was a greater sense of ownership.
27 Alternatively, a project could score higher if there was Stakeholders Council consensus support.
28 Mayor Knopp suggested that the Stakeholders Council vet the short-term projects to start. Mayor
29 Silvestrini explained that there was a Short-Term Projects Committee that determined how the money
30 would be distributed. The Committee prioritized the projects and shared recommendations.

31
32 Ms. Nielsen reported that there was a benefit to the funding schedule. The disbursement of short-
33 term project funding happened near the end of the fiscal year. This meant that if there was unspent
34 funding somewhere else in the budget, that money could be added to the short-term project's funding
35 if desired by the CWC Board. This allowed additional project requests to be fulfilled.

36
37 Ms. Briefer asked if the Forest Service program of work was done on an annual basis. Ms. Hotze
38 explained that there were many different strategies. On a national level, there was a three-to-five-
39 year strategy. The program of work was tied to that strategy. The Forest Service had a program of
40 work that was not necessarily tied to a year, but there were certain priority projects across all of the
41 forests. Ms. Hotze explained that each district also had a separate program of work.

42
43 Chair Robinson appreciated the short-term project discussions but noted that it was important to
44 answer the outstanding questions related to the Stakeholders Council. Mayor Knopp wondered
45 whether it would be best to discuss the matter further at a CWC Board Meeting since several CWC
46 Board Members were not present. Ms. Nielsen clarified that Ex-Officio Christensen, Mayor
47 Zoltanski, and Mayor Roger Bourke were still online. Chair Robinson agreed with the earlier
48 comment from Ex-Officio Christensen that small areas of consensus would build trust. It was

1 important to continue to do that. He referenced an earlier comment from Mr. McCarvill about the
2 Stakeholders Council feeling left out of the Transportation Committee and Legislative and Land
3 Tenure Committee. He wondered whether Stakeholders Council representatives should be added.
4

5 As for the broader question about what the CWC Board wanted the Stakeholders Council to do, Chair
6 Robinson wanted the CWC Board to have well-defined objectives and for the Council to be part of
7 that process. There could be bottom-up issues presented to the CWC Board as well. Those present
8 discussed the membership of the Committees. Mayor Knopp was supportive of adding Stakeholders
9 Council representatives to the Transportation Committee. Alternatively, the Transportation
10 Committee could present work to the Stakeholders Council and share updates as appropriate.
11

12 Mr. Fisher noted that he was the Chair of the Preservation Committee, but the Committee had not
13 met, because no direction had been received about how to move forward. The Preservation
14 Committee wanted to understand what was valuable to the CWC Board. There were a lot of different
15 personalities on the Stakeholders Council, but the sub-committees allowed quieter members to open
16 up more. He was not sure that adding Stakeholders to a Committee with elected officials would be
17 as beneficial. However, providing clear direction to sub-committee Chairs would be productive. In
18 the absence of direction, the Council and the sub-committees would only be able to share scattered
19 recommendations. Mr. Fisher reiterated the need for additional clarity and direction.
20

21 Chair Robinson believed the Stakeholders Council sub-committees and the CWC committees needed
22 to be examined further. Mayor Silvestrini felt that the Commission Committees would benefit from
23 some Stakeholders Council input. He did not believe there was anything in the Interlocal Agreement
24 that would prevent a Stakeholders Council Member from being appointed to something like the
25 Transportation Committee or Legislative and Land Tenure Committee. This could bridge the divide
26 between the CWC Board and the Stakeholders Council. It would also improve communication. Chair
27 Robinson wondered whether it would be best for the Committees to be expanded and for the
28 Stakeholders Council to select the appropriate representatives. The representatives could then share
29 updates at regular Stakeholders Council Meetings. This would keep everyone informed. Chair
30 Robinson noted that there could also be representation from commercial interests.
31

32 It was suggested that members of the CWC Board attend a future Stakeholders Council Meeting to
33 better understand the dynamics of the group. Mr. McCarvill liked that idea. It would allow Board
34 Members to observe the Council and would also show Council Members that the CWC Board cared.
35 It was important for the Council to feel valued. He wanted to make sure everyone on the Stakeholders
36 Council felt useful and important. Everyone wanted to make a positive difference in the canyons.
37 Chair Robinson explained that he was normally unable to attend Stakeholders Council Meetings
38 because they were scheduled on Wednesdays. He could attend on another day. Mr. McCarvill did
39 not believe it would be an issue to shift the date by a day or so. Mr. Fisher believed that a Stakeholders
40 Council Retreat would be incredibly valuable as well. There was support for that idea.
41

42 Those present reviewed some of the Stakeholders Council ideas from the Story Boarding Workshop
43 exercise. Mr. McCarvill asked for time to sit down with Ms. Cameron and review the list. Each of
44 the issues and suggestions could be discussed and shared with the Council. Ms. Briefer noted that
45 based on comments from Stakeholders Council leadership, there was some disconnect to address.
46 She wondered whether it would be possible for a professional facilitator to work with the Council and
47 establish some strategic collaboration. Mr. McCarvill was supportive of that. There could be one
48 designated meeting per year with a professional facilitator. That could smooth out some of the issues.

1
2 **RECAP**
3

4 Chair Robinson asked those present to share parting comments and questions. Ms. Briefer believed
5 the CWC Retreat was an effective way to document and organize thoughts. She looked forward to
6 what would happen next. She noted that the Stakeholders were extremely important. It was necessary
7 to take care of that facet of the organization. Ex-Officio Member, Annalee Munsey felt it was possible
8 to find solutions. She was hopeful about the future. Ms. Nielsen thanked everyone for dedicating a
9 portion of their day to the CWC and for their participation in the retreat. She had a lot of direction to
10 work with. It would be possible for CWC Staff to build out a draft of the Strategic Plan for 2023.
11 There was also a lot that the Stakeholders Council could focus on in the year ahead.
12

13 Ms. Cameron hoped that everyone felt the CWC was an important organization. Mr. Fisher
14 appreciated the hard work that went into making sure the Wasatch Mountains were a priority. A lot
15 of thought and care went into the discussions. Ms. Hotze thanked the CWC for allowing her to
16 participate in the retreat. Mayor Silvestrini believed the CWC was a valuable organization. He felt
17 that significant progress was made during the CWC Board Retreat, especially as it related to the
18 Stakeholders Council. Mr. McCarvill expressed his appreciation to CWC Staff and the CWC Board.
19 Mr. Perez thanked everyone for their participation. Though there were some questions still to be
20 answered, he felt there was a lot of support from the CWC Board and Stakeholders Council.
21

22 Chair Robinson thanked Mr. Perez and Ms. Nielsen for their dedication. He knew that a lot of work
23 had been put into the organization of the CWC Board Retreat. The Story Boarding Workshop exercise
24 was engaging. He thanked everyone who had attended and participated in the CWC Board Retreat.
25

26 **ADJOURN BOARD RETREAT**
27

28 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC Board Retreat.**
29

30 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Retreat adjourned at approximately 5:00 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Retreat held Friday, November 10, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____