

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) HYBRID STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD MONDAY, APRIL 24, 2023, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 2277 BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH.**

**Present:**  Will McCarvill, Chair

 Thomas McMurtry, Avenue Consultants

 Amber Broadaway, Solitude Mountain Resort

 Mike Doyle, Brighton Ski Resort

 Carl Fisher, Save Our Canyons

 Patrick Shea, Friends of Alta

 Joanna Wheelton, Cottonwood Canyons Foundation

 Serena Yau, Salt Lake Climbers Alliance

 John Knoblock, Mount Olympus Community Council, Trails Utah

 Sarah Bennett, Trails Utah

 Tom Diegel, Wasatch Backcountry Alliance

 Dennis Goreham, Wasatch Mountain Club

 Stuart Derman, Wasatch Mountain Arts

 Maura Hahnenberger, Salt Lake Community College

 Kurt Hegmann, Mill D Cabin Owners Association

 Del Draper, Cecret Lake Cabin Owners Association

 Michael Marker, Little Cottonwood Canyon Resident

 Paul Diegel, Salt Lake City Resident

 Kelly Boardman, Salt Lake City Resident

 Jennifer Eden, Salt Lake City Resident

 Roger Borgenicht, Utahns for Better Transportation

 Mike Christensen, Utah Rail Passengers Association

 Danny Richardson, Salt Lake City Resident

 Kirk Nichols, USFS Evergreen HOA, Professor of Outdoor Recreation, University of Utah

 Jan Striefel, League of Women Voters of Utah

**Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy

 Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration

**Opening**

1. **William McCarvill will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

Chair William McCarvill called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m. He reported that it was a hybrid meeting.

1. **The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholders Council DRAFT Minutes of Monday, February 27, 2023.**

**MOTION:** Patrick Shea moved to APPROVE the February 27, 2023, CWC Stakeholders Council Meeting Minutes. John Knoblock seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1. **Announcements:**
* **Short-Term Project Announcement.**

Executive Director of Policy, Lindsey Nielsen, shared information about short-term projects. She reported that the CWC opened a call for short-term project ideas in March 2023. It closed on April 1, 2023. The Short-Term Projects Committee, which included Mayor Nann Worel, Mayor Roger Bourke, and Mayor Michael Weichers, met in Park City on April 14, 2023. The Short-Term Projects Committee reviewed the proposals received for the fourth iteration of the Short-Term Projects Grant Program. Ms. Nielsen shared the recommendations from the Committee. Those recommendations were later presented to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and would be presented to the CWC Board on May 1, 2023. The recommendations were:

* Tri-Canyon Bathroom Maintenance and Cleaning (CWC) - $10,000;
* Trail Maintenance and Invasive Weed Control (Cottonwood Canyons Foundation) - $10,000;
* Wasatch Rock Fixed Anchor Maintenance (Salt Lake Climbers Alliance) - $5,000;
* Shuttle Program for Little Cottonwood Canyon (Wasatch Backcountry Alliance) - $12,500;
* Bonanza Flat Transit to Trail Shuttle (Utah Open Lands) - $12,500;
* Junior Ranger Activity Book (Friends of Alta) - $3,000;
* Wasatch Wilderness Stewardship and Education Project (Save Our Canyons) - $8,000; and
* Dumpster Days (Recycle Utah) - $6,500.

Patrick Shea wondered if the awardees would be asked to take photographs of the work. That would make it possible to add progress pictures or before and after photos to the CWC website. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. There were photographs from each year that were available to review. She reiterated that the recommendations from the Short-Term Projects Committee would move forward to the CWC Board for review and approval at the May 1, 2023, CWC Board Meeting.

* **Briefing on SHC Membership and Timeline.**

Chair McCarvill reported that there are openings on the Stakeholders Council. The deadline for applications was May 1, 2023. Stakeholders Council Members who know others who are interested in getting involved were asked to inform them of the deadline. The application as well as information about the Stakeholders Council was available on the CWC website. Once the application deadline passes there will be a meeting with Stakeholders Council leadership, CWC Staff, and Annalee Munsey, who will meet to review the applications. Recommendations will be made to the CWC Board. Mr. Shea suggested that the Stakeholders Council have a greater voice in the selection process. It was reiterated that Stakeholders Council leadership will be involved.

* **Call for Additional ANNOUNCEMENTS from SHC Members.**

There were no additional announcements from Stakeholders Council Members.

**STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL COMMITTEE UPDATE**

1. **Millcreek Canyon Committee.**
	1. **The Stakeholders Council will Review and Voice Vote on a Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Recommendation.**

Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair, Tom Diegel, introduced himself to those present. The Millcreek Canyon Committee has six official members but there are many additional participants. Based on the level of participation, it was clear that there is a lot of interest in Millcreek Canyon. He shared information about the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant for Millcreek. The County and the U.S. Forest Service worked together on the application. Mr. Diegel explained that the County prepared a list of projects for the area and $20 million was awarded. The decision was made to focus on widening and straightening the road in the upper canyon. That project formally began 1 ½ years ago and an Open House was held along with a public comment period. 30% of the design was completed at the time of the last open house. Since then, there had been various meetings and discussions with County representatives. The Millcreek Canyon Committee tried to work with those involved to emphasize the importance of maintaining the intimate nature of the canyon. Based on the public comments, this is important to the community.

Mr. Diegel reminded those present that when the Millcreek Canyon Committee first started, it was called the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Committee. Eventually, the name was changed and the Committee became broader in nature. That being said, the shuttle was important to the future of the canyon. However, the FLAP grant did not address the shuttle. Theoretically, the road would be built to standards that would make it possible to have a shuttle, but there was nothing that specifically addressed a shuttle. In 2012, there was a study done by consultants for the County and it stated that Millcreek Canyon needed a shuttle. Despite this, the County and Forest Service had not pursued that further. He explained that there were different shuttle types and sizes that could be considered.

The Millcreek Canyon Committee was concerned that the shuttle was not the focus of the FLAP grant work. John Knoblock explained that the Committee was concerned that the road widening would result in additional vehicles rather than a shuttle. The idea for a shuttle was proposed in the Mountain Accord and the CWC was focused on implementing the Mountain Accord. Now that there are FLAP grant funds, the Millcreek Canyon Committee wants to make sure the shuttle is added. A letter for the U.S. Forest Service was drafted and there was a desire to obtain Stakeholders Council and CWC Board approval. It could then be sent to the Forest Service and even Salt Lake County. The letter encouraged the U.S. Forest Service to support the addition of a shuttle. There was a request for the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) work to start since the Salt Lake Ranger District stated that the road had to be brought to legal standards and NEPA was needed for a shuttle.

Mr. Knoblock clarified that there is a separate NEPA process for the road improvements. The Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) will do the road but someone else needed to do the NEPA for the shuttle. He acknowledged that the U.S. Forest Service was constrained financially and in terms of personnel. They might not have the resources to do the NEPA work. The County also indicated that there was support for a shuttle but there were no resources to do the NEPA work. Something needed to be finalized so the letter asked that the shuttle be prioritized and moved forward. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that references to mass transit were already included in the Forest Plan.

Not all of the Stakeholders Council Members present had the opportunity to read the draft letter that was sent out earlier that morning. Mr. Knoblock explained that the only difference between the previous draft and the version sent out that day was that initially the Forest Service was asked to conduct the NEPA study but he felt it did not make sense to ask them to do that since they felt unable to. CWC Staff offered to look into the NEPA process and attempt to move that forward. It might be possible for there to be partnerships or fundraisers. Mr. Knoblock stated that it was important for the shuttle NEPA process to move forward alongside the road NEPA process.

Carl Fisher thought the letter was excellent and thanked everyone who worked on the draft. He wondered if there had been discussions with consultants about a NEPA cost estimate. It might strengthen the letter if potential costs and funding sources were identified. Mr. Knoblock agreed that funding would be needed but the scope of the NEPA had not been identified and consultants had not been contacted. At this stage, it made sense to move forward with the letter and start the process. There was discussion regarding the FHWA NEPA process. Mr. Knoblock believed the process had started but he was not sure how far along it was. Mr. Fisher reported that the 90% design was expected in the spring. Mr. Knoblock did not know what percent the NEPA would be at. There had been a public process about the design so far but not for NEPA. Mr. Shea felt that Millcreek needed to have an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). Mr. Knoblock pointed out that previously there had been discussion about whether there would be a categorical exclusion or not. Ultimately, it was determined that an environmental assessment would be done.

Chair McCarvill believed the purpose of the letter was to prioritize the shuttle. Certain issues needed to be addressed such as funding but the first step was for the CWC Board to agree that the shuttle needed to be prioritized. To move the item forward, the Stakeholders Council would need to recommend that the letter be forwarded to others in the organization for consideration. It seemed that there was support for a shuttle from the U.S. Forest Service but resources were an issue. As a result, it made sense for the CWC to state that the shuttle is a priority issue and look further into the process. He praised the Millcreek Canyon Committee for their hard work and dedication.

**MOTION:** Del Draper moved to APPROVE the shuttle letter and forward it to the CWC Board for review, action, and a discussion about NEPA funding sources. Tom Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

**MINI STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL RETREAT**

1. **Thomas McMurtry from Avenue Consultants will Conduct a Goal Setting Workshop.**

Thomas McMurtry from Avenue Consultants introduced himself to the Council. He was present to conduct a goal-setting workshop. An example scenario was shared with the Council and he noted that there are often multiple ways to look at a situation. People have different ideas that are valid and worth considering. Mr. McMurtry informed the Council that he is a Facilitator. He does a lot of transportation planning but also led dozens of vision and goal-setting workshops.

During the Mini Stakeholders Council Retreat, there would be goal-related discussions. Mr. McMurtry shared an agenda for the remainder of the meeting. It would start with background information on the CWC and there would be anonymous polling. After a short break, there would be discussion about goals and a goal exercise. All Council Members were given a worksheet and each table would work together to complete that. Afterward, the group would review the results of the exercise and polls. The Retreat would end with a Stakeholders Council discussion. Mr. McMurtry hoped that the Stakeholders Council Retreat would inspire and engage Council Members. The objective was to create specific goals and priorities for the Stakeholders Council.

Mr. McMurtry reported that for the anonymous polling, cell phones would be used to scan the QR Code. Those on the computer were given a website address to use. Council Members scanned the code and an example question was posed, which was: “What are three words to describe a puppy?” A word cloud was automatically generated based on the responses to that example question. He explained that words that were submitted more than once would be larger within the word cloud. Questions specific to the CWC and the Stakeholders Council would be posed during the exercise.

Background information was shared. Mr. McMurtry reported that the Mountain Accord identified four priorities, which were to protect the environment and natural resources, ensure high-quality recreation experiences, enhance regional transportation, and strengthen the regional economy. The CWC worked to implement the Mountain Accord. The CWC Board priorities were related to the stewardship of natural resources, preservation of quality recreational experiences, the establishment of an environmentally stable and sustainable transportation system, and contributing to a vibrant economy. It was important to remember those goals during the Stakeholders Council goal-setting workshop. As for the Stakeholders Council, it gathered information, conducted fact-finding, provided analysis, conducted feasibility studies, and otherwise collaborated with broader constituencies within the project area in order to make suggestions and recommendations to the CWC Board.

The CWC Board held a Retreat late last year and discussed the Stakeholders Council. There was a suggestion that the Stakeholders Council focus on areas where opposing sides could find agreement. Specifically, there was a desire to achieve small wins. The CWC Board mentioned that the Stakeholders Council should consider a wide spectrum of interests. This included both conservation and commercial interests. Additionally, the was a desire to have a smooth and productive working relationship between the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board.

Mr. McMurtry reported that a survey was distributed to Stakeholders Council Members a few months back. The results had been shared with him. An open-ended question was: “Why did you join the Stakeholders Council?” Based on the answers, there were three main reasons, which were to stay informed and provide input, to represent a group through advocacy and equity, and to make a positive impact. The survey also asked about expectations for 2023. He shared answers, which included identifying problems and opportunities in the Central Wasatch and helping to guide solutions. Additionally, some Council Members wanted to have a clear mission, vision, and purpose. There was also a desire for the Council to have a unified voice. Mr. McMurtry acknowledged that it was difficult to have a unified voice due to the broad range of interests, but there could be majority opinions and minority opinions. It was important to consider goals for the Council moving forward.

Information about the Central Wasatch was shared. Mr. McMurtry stressed the importance of the canyons to Salt Lake County and the State of Utah. In 2021, a survey was led by Envision Utah. Specifically for Salt Lake City and for the larger Salt Lake County, 90% of all water came from the canyons. It was clear that the work done by the CWC and the Stakeholders Council was important. A list of the Utah resident priorities was shared, which included water, transportation, economic development, and outdoor recreation. All of those priorities are related to the CWC work.

Mr. McMurtry explained that he looked for information about the canyons and impacts on the economy. He shared example data with the Council. It illustrated the impact on the economy that the canyons had. Last season, there were 5.8 million skier days in Utah. That directly contributed $2.3 billion to the economy. The work that was done in the canyons mattered to the ski resorts, visitors, and residents. The canyons were extremely important to the economy. As for transportation, he had pulled some transportation counts for reference. At the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon, there were count stations that made it possible to track the number of vehicles that passed through. Daily counts and weekly averages were shared with the Council. Mr. McMurtry reiterated that the canyons were meaningful to a lot of different people.

Anonymous polling took place. The first question posed to the Council was: “How important are the Wasatch Mountains to Salt Lake County and Utah as a whole?” The options ranged from not too important to very important. As Council Members voted, the anonymized results were shown on the screen. Mr. McMurtry reported that several questions would be asked about the Stakeholders Council specifically. One was related to what worked well within the organization. As the results came in, it was noted that a lot was working well within the Stakeholders Council. Some of the answers were CWC Staff, the kind of information received, civility, and passion. The next question related to what was not working as well for the Council. Some of the answers were meeting effectiveness, biases, consensus, lack of engagement, interaction with the CWC Board, and clarity of goals. Mr. McMurtry explained that the purpose of goal setting was to resolve some of the existing issues.

The next question related to the four CWC Board priorities that were previously identified. Mr. McMurtry wanted to better understand which of the four priorities was most important to Council Members. He asked that each Council Member vote for only one priority. It was noted that there was a balanced interest in all of the priorities, with the exception of the economy, which was not ranked as high. The next question was, “What are the strengths of the Stakeholders Council?” Some of the answers included education, leadership, passion, diversity, patience, investment, ethics, and a long-term dynamic vision. He noted that there were a lot of strengths to be proud of.

Another question was, “Who is the target audience for the Stakeholders Council?” Mr. McMurtry asked Council Members to think about what drove them to be a member and who else might be interested in the work that was being done. It could be the CWC Board, an elected official, or residents. Some of the responses were: everyone, people who interacted with the Central Wasatch, the Legislature, recreators, the Forest Service, and local government. Mr. McMurtry noted that the work was valuable to a lot of people. That was important for Council Members to remember.

There were two more anonymous polling questions. He asked Council Members to describe how they wanted the Stakeholders Council to look in the future. Some of the submissions were: effective, advisory, impactful, respected, valued by the CWC, and heard. Mr. McMurtry explained that he would be able to review the full responses afterward. He clarified that the responses would not be attributable to anyone specific. The last question was how to get the Stakeholders Council to function as desired. He asked specifically for action words to be shared. Some of the submissions were: input, communication, inclusivity, collaboration, funding, as well as vision, mission, and goal setting.

Mr. McMurtry would review all of the responses and share some commonalities later on in the Mini Stakeholders Council Retreat. The Council took a short break before continuing.

The next section of the Mini Stakeholders Council Retreat was dedicated to the goal-setting process. Mr. McMurtry shared some example goals from workshops that he had led in the past. For instance, at Utah Valley University, there were discussions related to transportation around campus. The goals that were created included:

* Improving regular mobility;
* Enhancing transit service;
* Expanding active transportation access; and
* Improving safety.

Additional example goals were shared with the Council for reference. In Cedar City, four goals were created as follows:

* Enhance safety for everyone;
* Plan efficient access to destinations;
* Create multi-modal roadways; and
* Work together to create feasible solutions.

Mr. McMurtry believed the Stakeholders Council would want to draft at least four goals as well. He asked the Council Members to consider the example goals shared and to think about the types of goals that would make the most sense for the Stakeholders Council moving forward.

Mr. McMurtry explained that goals are typically brief but poignant and follow a theme. He asked that the Council Members brainstorm a handful of goals with the people sitting at the same table. The Council Members should consider the word cloud charts and some of the discussions that had taken place. He informed the Council that goals should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-based. If there is a goal that is a bit more difficult to define, that was okay as well, but he challenged Council Members to think about clear and concise goals that could be considered by the full Council. Each Council Member had been given a worksheet. He asked that one be returned per table. Mr. McMurtry instructed each group to talk about the types of goals that the Stakeholders Council should set. For instance, things that the Council wanted to accomplish next year, in the next few years, and in the future.

Mr. Diegel asked how many people should be in each group. Mr. McMurtry believed it would be best to have three to four people per group. Some tables combined to make that happen. He explained that after the brainstorming session, the proposed goals would be shared and discussed. The discussions could move quickly or take a little bit longer. It depended on the individual group. Mr. McMurtry pointed out that there was space on the worksheet to elaborate on the goal. If a group creates a goal and wants to flesh out the specifics or reference ways to measure success, that could be written down. He noted that while the Council Members were brainstorming goals, he would review the responses from the anonymous polling and make note of some of the common themes.

There was discussion about the types of goals Council Members should brainstorm. The Council Members wanted to understand whether the goals should be related to the functionality of the Stakeholders Council or Stakeholders Council work. Mr. McMurtry clarified that the goals should be specific to the Council as a body. An example goal was for the Stakeholders Council to drive action in the canyons, which could be done through actionable deliverables from targeted committees. Mr. Knoblock believed the intention was to create actionable goals for the Stakeholders Council. This was confirmed. Council Members spent time in small groups brainstorming possible goals. Ms. Nielsen reported that information had been added to the Zoom chat box for online participants.

After the brainstorming session, Mr. McMurtry thanked Council Members for participating in the exercise. He asked to hear the suggestions from each group and noted that the papers would be collected afterward. Mr. Diegel shared goals from his group. The first one was to have a clear communication process with the CWC. The group felt that had been one of the shortcomings, as Stakeholders Council Members were not familiar with CWC Board Members. There was not a lot of communication towards them or from them. To change that, the Stakeholders Council could develop a relationship with CWC Board Members and create a clear communication process, such as formal meetings between the Council and the Board. There had also been discussions about activist groups in the broader community that were not represented in the organization. One possible goal was to create an inventory of the various activist groups throughout the valley and increase involvement.

Another suggestion from the group was to return to the diverse collaboration that was key in the Mountain Accord process. Mr. McMurtry asked what was intended by the phrase “diverse collaboration.” It was clarified that there were many people with many different interests within the organization. There was a desire to define the different interests and find areas of commonality. There was a sense that key stakeholders had stopped engaging. As a result, there needed to be engagement and an acknowledgment of the different interests of the individual stakeholders.

The second group shared goal suggestions. One was to revisit the Mountain Accord and determine how it could be more effective. Mr. McMurtry asked why there was a desire to revisit the Mountain Accord. Mr. Fisher explained that the intention was to collaborate and create common ground. It was a foundational document and it should be revisited regularly. Mr. Knoblock wondered whether a scorecard or report card about the implementation of Mountain Accord items would be appropriate. Another goal was to receive more direction from the CWC Board and to prioritize the Legislation.

The next group explained that a similar goal had been drafted about communication between the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. Another goal recognized that there may be some misalignment between businesses and other stakeholders, so the intention was to “define happy.” The metrics were the measurement of transportation times, parking revenue, and incorporating modeling into the business goals. Mr. McMurtry understood that there were concerns about capacity. Understanding how to strike a balance between the various desires was important.

Mr. Draper shared goals from the next group. One was to be more impactful within the CWC, which could be done by submitting more fully developed proposals to the CWC Board. It would be possible to develop proposals more fully, so by the time they reached the CWC Board, the action steps would be clear to CWC Board Members. By the time a proposal reached the CWC Board, the group felt it should be actionable rather than theoretical. Mr. McMurtry liked the variety of suggestions.

While the Stakeholders Council Members were brainstorming goals, Mr. McMurtry had been using the anonymous poll data to create some draft goals as well. He explained that there were five clear themes based on the submissions. It was clarified that these goals did not need to be adopted by the Stakeholders Council but were examples based on the information received. The goals included:

* Working together as a diverse group to protect the canyons for everyone;
* Align the interests of passionate members to create meaningful contributions;
* Provide and collect input to inform decision-makers;
* Help entities implement effective improvements; and
* To provide value and influence to the decisions made in the Wasatch.

Mr. McMurtry clarified that the goals he shared were based on the words that were submitted during the anonymous poll portion of the Mini Stakeholders Council Retreat. Those were examples and were not necessarily more important than the other goals that had been brainstormed by Council Member groups. He explained that a final document would be compiled with the various goals. Mr. McMurtry asked Council Members to participate in another anonymous poll and choose three of the five draft goals he presented that stood out as priorities. He explained that the words used in the suggested goals were based on language submitted by Council Members. The draft goals listed were actionable and active. Based on the submissions received, it was clear that the Stakeholders Council Members had a desire to take action, be useful, and make a difference in the Central Wasatch.

The input from the Stakeholders Council would be reviewed after the meeting and some final recommendations would be created. The recommendations would be sent to CWC Staff for review and would then be shared with the Stakeholders Council at a future meeting. There could be a final discussion about the goals at that time and the Council could make decisions about the next steps. Mr. Perez clarified that Mr. McMurtry would provide a report to CWC Staff. It would be brought back at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. At that time, the potential budget would be discussed as well. There would be Stakeholders Council Member feedback on the report and the budget ahead of the June 2023 CWC Board Meeting. It was important for the Council to review the report beforehand.

Information was shared about committees. Mr. McMurtry explained that a lot of times, goals were accomplished through committee work. There was an opportunity to think about the existing committees and discuss whether other committees might need to be formed. There were currently three Stakeholders Council subcommittees: Millcreek Canyon Committee, Preservation Committee, and Trails Committee. The CWC had several other subcommittees as well. Mr. Knoblock noted that Stakeholders Council Members could attend the CWC subcommittee meetings as individuals, but he was not certain that it was possible to participate on a more official basis, as a Council Member.

Mr. McMurtry posed a question about the Stakeholders Council subcommittees. He wondered whether Council Members believed every member of the Stakeholders Council should serve on a subcommittee. The question was asked through an anonymous poll. Chair McCarvill felt it was important for all members to serve on a subcommittee. The subcommittees were extremely effective and did a lot of excellent work. He believed it was important for all members to be involved. Mr. Fisher also voted yes. He pointed out that ideas were generated when the full Stakeholders Council met, but there was not a lot of time for the actual work to be done. Committees did the work and he felt it made sense for all Stakeholders Council Members to share the workload. Mr. Diegel voted yes on the poll as well and explained that committees were more actionable in nature. In addition, working on committees created a sense of comradery and added to the cohesion of the Council.

Dennis Goreham voted no on the poll. He explained that he was on two different subcommittees and a lot of good work happened there, but if someone did not want to be on one, it was unlikely that they would be useful during the meetings. Paul Diegel had also voted no because the Stakeholders Council subcommittees addressed specific areas of interest. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that in addition to the Stakeholders Council subcommittees, there were also CWC subcommittees. It might be possible to have Stakeholders Council representation on some of the existing CWC subcommittees.

Discussions were had about the other CWC subcommittees. Ms. Nielsen reported that there was the Transportation Committee, Land Tenure and Legislation Committee, Short-Term Projects Committee, and the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. Mr. Perez informed those present that those meetings were public and were noticed ahead of time. Stakeholders Council Members were welcome to attend. The CWC subcommittees were inclusive in terms of participation from attendees.

Additional anonymous polling was done. Mr. McMurtry reported that two-thirds of respondents felt there were other subcommittees they would like to participate in or create. Mr. Shea responded yes to the question because he felt there should be a Budget and Finance Committee to review the information. It was important to have transparency about where the money was coming from and where it was being allocated. Additionally, it was important to know who was making the decisions about the allocations. Mr. Fisher felt the subcommittee chairs or a small group of Stakeholders Council Members could act as an Executive Committee to assist Stakeholders Council leadership. Mr. McMurtry liked the suggestions that had been shared and explained that those would be captured.

In the previous Stakeholders Council survey, there was an open-ended question about the Stakeholders Council subcommittees that were needed. At that time, the responses included a Transportation Committee, Budget Advisory Committee, and an Executive Committee. The Council discussed additional subcommittee ideas, such as a Public Outreach Committee. Mr. Knoblock felt that a Lands Acquisition Committee was important to consider since it related to the Mountain Accord work. However, he was not certain that there was anyone focused on making that happen at the moment.

Mr. Tom Diegel noted that communication with the Forest Service had been inconsistent. It would be worthwhile to have a subcommittee that worked directly with the Forest Service if there was support from them. That subcommittee could look at wildfires and a variety of other issues. Mr. Knoblock reported that after the Mountain Accord, District Ranger Bekee Hotze started a Stakeholders Council for the Forest Service, where stakeholders met with Forest Service staff. The intention was to improve communication. Once the COVID-19 pandemic hit, the Forest Service Stakeholders Council fell apart due to a variety of issues, including staffing limitations. Mr. Paul Diegel explained that he had participated on the Forest Service Stakeholders Council for a short period of time. Quarterly, there would be a meeting, and the Forest Service would share a report. There was one-sided communication and it was less of a discussion between the two groups.

Mr. Paul Diegel pointed out that one of the four Working Groups from Mountain Accord was the Recreation Group. He felt there was room for a Recreation Committee within the organization. Ms. Nielsen noted that some comments had been submitted online. Jennifer Eden felt a Wildfire Committee would be a good idea as public outreach, education, and prevention were critical.

Mr. McMurtry asked how the Stakeholders Council would measure the success of a subcommittee. He explained that this could be done with reports, deliverables, a plan for action, meetings, and so on. It was important for members of the subcommittees to understand how the subcommittee would be successful. Some of the Council Member answers included: CWC Board action on a recommendation, implementation, and deliverables. Mr. McMurtry thanked everyone for their suggestions. It sounded like there was some interest in additional subcommittees and clear deliverables were essential. He reiterated that all of the submissions would be reviewed following the Stakeholders Council Meeting and a report would be generated with goal-related information.

Mr. McMurtry felt that a lot of good goals had been drafted during the goal-setting workshop. He hoped that everyone had found the Mini Stakeholders Council Retreat to be valuable and beneficial. All of the information would be compiled and shared with CWC Staff. There would be a Stakeholders Council Meeting next month to review the draft goals and subcommittee recommendations.

**OPEN COMMENTS**

There were no additional comments.

**ADJOURN MEETING**

1. **William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

**MOTION:** Dennis Goreham moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Paul Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.
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