



9
10 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) HYBRID**
11 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING HELD, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 2022, AT**
12 **3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY**
13 **VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL**
14 **COUNCIL OFFICES.**

15
16 **Present:** Will McCarvill, Chair
17 Barbara Cameron, Co-Chair
18 Amber Broadway
19 Dave Fields
20 Brian Hutchinson
21 Carl Fisher
22 Jennifer Eden (not yet confirmed)
23 Don Despain
24 Ed Marshall
25 Jan Striefel
26 John Knoblock
27 Kirk Nichols
28 Kurt Hegmann
29 Michael Marker
30 Sarah Bennett
31 Tom Diegel
32 Pat Shea
33 Danny Richardson (not yet confirmed)
34 Alex Porpora
35 Mike Christensen
36 Kelly Boardman
37 Maura Hahnenberger
38 Dennis Goreham
39 Serena Yau (not yet confirmed)
40
41 **Staff:** Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
42 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
43 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
44 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
45
46 **Others:** Christian Johnson

1 Cindy Cross
2 Rosie Hernandez
3 Steve Van Maren
4 Sandy Wingert
5

6 Environmental Dashboard University of Utah Developers:
7 Dr. Phoebe McNeally
8 Mary Pendergast
9 Susan Bush
10

11 **Opening**

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

14
15
16 Chair William McCarvill called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He reported that the Central
17 Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Meeting was a hybrid meeting.
18

19 **2. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Stakeholder Council DRAFT Minutes of Wednesday, February 23, 2022.**

20
21
22 **MOTION:** Pat Shea moved to APPROVE the February 23, 2022 Stakeholders Council Meeting
23 Minutes. Michael Marker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
24

25 **3. William McCarvill will Introduce New Stakeholders Council Members and Ask for a One-Minute Introduction from Each.**

26
27
28 Chair McCarvill reported that there are four openings on the Stakeholders Council due to
29 resignations. Stakeholders Council leadership and CWC Staff reviewed all applications.
30 Ultimately, four recommendations were made and those names would be forwarded to the CWC
31 Board for consideration at the May 2, 2022, CWC Board Meeting. Chair McCarvill explained that
32 the four recommendations were as follows:
33

- 34 • Joanna Wheelton;
- 35 • Serena Yau;
- 36 • Jennifer Eden; and
- 37 • Danny Richardson.

38
39 Chair McCarvill asked that each of the recommended Stakeholders Council Members introduce
40 themselves. Ms. Wheelton was not present at the meeting. Ms. Yau reported that she represents
41 the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance. She has served on the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance Policy
42 Committee since December 2021. Ms. Yau has done environmental compliance work since 2005,
43 working mostly with air compliance under the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act. She moved to
44 Salt Lake City in 2019, enjoys climbing, and looked forward to working with the Council.
45

1 Ms. Eden reported that she is a resident of Millcreek and owns a cabin in Lambs Canyon. She is
2 a teacher is a Geology and Environmental Science teacher at Westminster College with a focus on
3 air quality. Ms. Eden had concerns with the proposed mine and looked forward to participating
4 on the Stakeholders Council.

5
6 Mr. Richardson was originally from North Carolina but graduated from Utah State University in
7 Recreation Management and has worked at Snowbird for eight years. Additionally, he has served
8 as President of Ski Utah for five years. He was most recently at Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”).
9 He is a skier and hiker and hoped to be an asset to the Council.

10 11 **Committee and Committee Leadership**

12 13 **1. William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Lead the Stakeholders Council in** 14 **Discussion Around Committees and Committee Leadership.**

- 15
16 **a. Confirm Committees and Membership.**
17 **b. Confirm Committee Chairs and Co-Chairs.**
18

19 Chair McCarvill reported that the Stakeholders Council has three subcommittees. The
20 subcommittees needed to be reapproved each year based on the Rules and Procedures. He
21 explained that the intention is to approve the current subcommittees, which would be extended for
22 another year, as well as leadership and membership. Chair McCarvill noted that this process was
23 slightly delayed and should have been done in January 2022. In the future, the process will take
24 place each year in January. He noted that subcommittee membership is not fixed. If someone
25 wants to join a subcommittee, that Council Member would need to reach out to the Chair of that
26 Committee. The Chair would propose the addition and it would be voted on at a subsequent
27 meeting. While the process is somewhat tedious, all Committee Members need to be approved.
28 Only Stakeholders Council Members are eligible to vote.

29
30 Co-Chair Barbara Cameron shared information related to the Millcreek Canyon Committee. She
31 reported that Tom Diegel serves as Chair with Del Draper as Vice-Chair. Voting Committee
32 Members included:

- 33
34
 - Paul Diegel;
 - 35 • Maura Hahnenberger;
 - 36 • Brian Hutchinson;
 - 37 • John Knoblock;
 - 38 • Ed Marshall;
 - 39 • Mike Christensen; and
 - 40 • Alex Porpora.

41
42 Non-Voting Members included:

- 43
44
 - Polly Hart;
 - 45 • James Hicks;
 - 46 • Hilary Jacobs;

- 1 • Christian Johnson;
- 2 • Kent Parker;
- 3 • Jason Schnaitter;
- 4 • Melanie Topham; and
- 5 • Russell Vetter.

6

7 Ex-Officio Members included:

8

- 9 • Rita Lund (City of Millcreek);
- 10 • Helen Peters (Salt Lake County Regional Development);
- 11 • Bekee Hotze (U.S. Forest Service);
- 12 • Zinnia Wilson (U.S. Forest Service); and
- 13 • Patrick Nelson (Salt Lake City Watershed).

14

15 **MOTION:** Pat Shea moved to APPROVE the Millcreek Canyon Committee and Committee
16 Membership for 2022. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

17

18 Co-Chair Cameron discussed the Trails Committee. She reported that John Knoblock serves as
19 Chair with Sarah Bennett as Vice-Chair. Voting Committee Members included:

20

- 21 • Pat Shea;
- 22 • Dennis Goreham; and
- 23 • Barbara Cameron.

24

25 Ex-Officio Members included:

26

- 27 • Patrick Nelson (Salt Lake City Watershed);
- 28 • Zinnia Wilson (U.S. Forest Service); and
- 29 • Walt Gilmore (Salt Lake County).

30

31 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to APPROVE the Trails Committee and Committee
32 Membership for 2022. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

33

34 Co-Chair Cameron shared information related to the Preservation Committee. She reported that
35 Carl Fisher serves as Chair with Megan Nelson as Vice-Chair. Voting Committee Members
36 included:

37

- 38 • Jan Striefel;
- 39 • Michael Braun;
- 40 • Dennis Goreham;
- 41 • Barbara Cameron;
- 42 • Brian Hutchinson; and
- 43 • Sarah Bennett.

44

1 Mr. Fisher noted that the Preservation Committee had not met in some time because the Committee
2 was waiting for guidance from the CWC Board. Many of the CWC Board Meetings stressed the
3 importance of protection and preservation. However, additional support and meaningful guidance
4 were needed from CWC Board Members moving forward.

5
6 **MOTION:** Will McCarvill moved to APPROVE the Preservation Committee and Committee
7 Membership for 2022. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8
9 **Beta Environmental Dashboard Presentation and Public Comment Session**

10
11 **1. Dr. Phoebe McNeally will Present the Beta Environmental Dashboard to**
12 **Stakeholders, Subsequently Followed by a Period for Stakeholders and Members of**
13 **the Public to Ask Questions and Provide Official Comment.**

14
15 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen commented that it was an exciting day for the
16 organization as the beta version of the Environmental Dashboard had been released earlier that
17 morning. All of the Stakeholders Council should have received that information. During the
18 Stakeholders Council Meeting, the University of Utah Project Team would walk through the beta
19 version of the Environmental Dashboard with those present. Ms. Nielsen reported that a two-week
20 public comment period had begun. There were various ways to submit feedback and all of the
21 information was listed on the CWC website. The current Stakeholders Council Meeting would be
22 used to gather feedback and answer questions about the beta version.

23
24 The Environmental Dashboard was originally conceived under the Mountain Accord. Ms. Nielsen
25 stated that the initial concept was an environmental report card that addressed various
26 environmental elements in the Central Wasatch. Since 2015, there had been many changes. For
27 instance, the report card scope had shifted and the Environmental Dashboard was now intended to
28 present all available data in an accessible way. The project team had also changed. There was
29 originally a consulting group from Fort Collins, Colorado, but the work was ultimately performed
30 by the University of Utah Project Team. Ms. Nielsen explained that the technology had changed
31 as well. When it was originally scoped, this was intended to be a paper report that was static.
32 However, it was now online, fully accessible, dynamic, and able to be updated.

33
34 Ms. Nielsen introduced Dr. Phoebe McNeally, the Director of the DIGIT Lab at the University of
35 Utah, and Dr. Jim Ehleringer, Director of the Ehleringer Lab at the University of Utah.
36 Dr. McNeally asked if the Stakeholders Council Members had watched the informational video
37 already. Many of the Council Members had watched it but some had not. Ms. Nielsen shared the
38 informational video. It provided an introduction and referred to the Environmental Dashboard as
39 a living document. The Environmental Dashboard could be used to inform decisions and educate
40 the public. The document consisted of tables, figures, maps, and images and could work on both
41 computers and mobile devices. There were five elements associated with the Environmental
42 Dashboard, which included the following:

- 43
44
 - Air Quality and Climate;
 - 45 • Geology and Soils;
 - 46 • Vegetation Communities;

- Water; and
- Wildlife.

The informational video overviewed the Vegetation Communities element. It looked at the tabs within the element and explained how to use the Environmental Dashboard. Historical information was shared related to reforestation. The informational video also showed that it was possible to look at air quality measurements for different locations. In addition, there was data related to vehicle emissions. The Environmental Dashboard was able to provide information on a month-by-month basis, show how vehicular travel had changed, and show the average number of vehicles per year. There was a lot to explore within the Environmental Dashboard.

Dr. McNeally thanked Dr. Ehleringer for preparing the educational video. She felt it provided a good overview and introduction to the website. Other University of Utah team members included:

- Mary Pendergast;
- Susan Bush;
- Melissa Warner;
- Eric Goodwin; and
- Bailey Costello.

It had been a team effort to move the Environmental Dashboard forward. Dr. McNeally pulled up the Environmental Dashboard website and walked the Council Members through the various components. She stated that it is a living website that is under development. There had been meetings with CWC Board Members about the beta version of the Environmental Dashboard and feedback was received. That feedback would be incorporated into the website as well as feedback from Stakeholders Council Members and the public.

The main page of the website contained icons for the five elements. Dr. McNeally clicked on Air Quality and Climate to further illustrate how to use the Environmental Dashboard. The landing page had three webcams representing three different areas of the Central Wasatch including Salt Lake Valley, Deer Valley, and Snowbird webcams. She explained that the webcams are near real-time. Below the webcams, it lists the air quality from nearby sensors. Dr. McNeally reported that the boxes are color-coded according to the air quality index so that visitors have a visual comparison between the webcam footage and the actual air quality. This was done to explain that when it is smoggy out, it is not necessarily smoggy in terms of the air quality.

Dr. McNeally reported that the Air Quality and Climate section also provided background information as well as information about vehicle emissions. She noted that the Environmental Dashboard linked to existing data sources when possible. This section of the website also looked at greenhouse gases, and carbon dioxide and included various maps with data readings. There was also historic data available. Dr. McNeally stated that the Environmental Dashboard included information related to weather and climate. That included the current meteorological conditions.

Climate was broken down into the long-term averages for temperature and precipitation. Dr. McNeally explained that it used the SNOpack TELentry (“SNOTEL”) sites and was a reliable source of data. The SNOTEL sites that fall within the Central Wasatch area included:

- Brighton;
- Mill D North;
- Parleys Summit;
- Parleys Upper;
- Snowbird; and
- Thaynes Canyon.

It was possible to select specific years to look at trends. Accumulated precipitation information was also available. She noted that this was accumulated from the start of the water year, which was October 1. Individual storms were graphed to show how they contributed to the water year. It was possible to select individual sites and choose different time periods to receive more specific information.

Dr. McNeally overviewed the Geology and Soils portion of the Environmental Dashboard. This was broken down into geology, soil type and characteristics, soil disturbance, and hazards. In the geology section, the geology of the Central Wasatch was explored and there was a link to the Utah Geological Survey (“UGS”). A lot of information from UGS was included on the website. She reported that there was also information about faults and folds as well as transition zones. There were mapping components to use as well.

The Soil Type and Characteristics section contained information regarding how soil is formed and classified. This would provide information for a variety of different users. As for the soil disturbance section, there was information on the three different types consisting of physical, biological, and chemical. Dr. McNeally noted that there was data about mines on the Environmental Dashboard. Mines create soil disturbance and there was a historic view of mining activity. The hazards section included information about earthquakes, avalanches, landslides, and flooding. She noted that the avalanche information was linked to the Utah Avalanche Center. The Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) slide paths were also shown. For flooding, there was data from Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) to show the flood areas. Dr. McNeally reported that there were limited flood areas in the Environmental Dashboard Study Area.

The Vegetation Communities section was reviewed. Dr. McNeally made note of the disturbances tab and stated that it had been expanded to include current fire conditions as well as historic fire conditions and watershed history. Under the current fire conditions, there was a link to the Forest Service map of conditions. That map was updated daily. The historic fire conditions data was also provided by the Forest Service. The data set had been refined to show the area north of Utah Lake to Ogden. Dr. McNeally explained that this was because south of Utah Lake, there were large fires, which skewed the numbers. The inclusion of that data would make it appear that the Wasatch Front was regularly burning, which was not the case. Dr. Ehleringer had been able to obtain information related to the history of the watershed. As a result, the Environmental Dashboard included a timeline of the watershed, which dated back to 1847.

Dr. McNeally overviewed the Water portion of the Environmental Dashboard. She reported that water was separated into current water conditions, water supply and stores, water demand, and

1 water quality. For current water conditions, there was a link to SNOTEL sites, where it was
2 possible to see accumulated precipitation. Water supply and stores looked at streamflow, soil
3 moisture, snow, groundwater, and reservoir storage. It was possible to filter the information by
4 year, by month, or by site to see the different trends. Dr. McNeally reported that the groundwater
5 data was spotty and there are gaps where data is not available. She also noted that there is not
6 much data available for water demand. However, there was information about evapotranspiration,
7 which was mapped and graphed based on four different categories including Alpine, High
8 Mountain, Mountain, and Upland.

9
10 Dr. McNeally stated that graphs from Kevin Eubank and KSL Weather would be linked. This
11 would show how the Wasatch Front was doing for outdoor water use compared to the 10-year
12 average. The data would be live on May 15, 2022, and would be updated. There was permission
13 to link and show the graphs, but there was no permission to use the data. The water quality section
14 looked at E. coli, macroinvertebrates, and stream chemistry. For E. coli, the smaller the dots on
15 the map, the lower the reading was. She noted that there was information about annual readings,
16 the latest samples, and the number of samples taken. For macroinvertebrates, this looked at the
17 biological health of the streams. The biological condition gradient was also shown. Higher values
18 indicated extreme changes and lower numbers were preferable. There were lower numbers in the
19 canyons and higher numbers in the valley. Stream chemistry was broken down into pH, dissolved
20 oxygen, temperature, and conductivity. It was possible to see information based on the year.

21
22 The Wildlife portion of the Environmental Dashboard was reviewed. Dr. McNeally reported that
23 it was separated into animals (mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles, fish, butterflies, and snails)
24 and plants (flowering plants, trees, and shrubs). For animals, there were habitat maps and field
25 guides from the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. It was possible to obtain specific
26 information about each of the animals on the Environmental Dashboard. There was also a map to
27 show where species of concern were present. For plants, the flowering plants section was
28 separated further by the flower color. Dr. McNeally pointed out that the Environmental Dashboard
29 did not have an exhaustive list of plants. There were just over 100 listed, which were the types
30 that visitors were most likely to see when visiting the Central Wasatch.

31
32 Dr. McNeally encouraged the Stakeholders Council Members to further explore the Environmental
33 Dashboard and provide feedback. The final version would be released to the public on June 6,
34 2022. It was important to implement any suggested changes before that time. Ms. Nielsen thanked
35 Dr. McNeally for her presentation. She noted that the remainder of the Stakeholders Council
36 Meeting would address outstanding Council Member questions.

37
38 Mr. Fisher commended the University of Utah team for their work. He felt the Environmental
39 Dashboard was a beneficial tool and there was a lot of data. He wondered whether there were data
40 sets the project team wanted to incorporate but were unable to. Dr. McNeally explained that there
41 were data gaps in the Environmental Dashboard. For instance, there was limited data on wildlife.
42 Ms. Pendergast believed more data would become available in the future. This would make the
43 Environmental Dashboard more robust as time goes on.

44
45 Ms. Bennett asked if the Environmental Dashboard was based at the University of Utah or if the
46 CWC owned the website. It was a fantastic product and it would be interesting to see the data

1 continue to expand over the next several years. Ms. Nielsen explained that the beta version of the
2 Environmental Dashboard was still based at the University of Utah. However, it was a CWC-
3 owned product. Once the final version was ready and all of the feedback was implemented, it
4 would move over to the CWC on June 6, 2022. Since this was an online tool, there could be
5 constant additions of data as CWC Staff and the project team at the University of Utah became
6 aware of that data. There would be ongoing maintenance for the site.

7
8 Tom Diegel was impressed with the beta version of the Environmental Dashboard. He wondered
9 who the target audience was and who was anticipated to use the website the most. Mr. Diegel also
10 wanted to know more about the public comment period. Ms. Nielsen explained that the beta
11 version was available to the public and feedback would be received and considered. The public
12 comment period would end on May 4, 2022. She believed there was a wide target audience, which
13 would include school-aged children, technical users, researchers, policymakers, and those who
14 recreate in the Central Wasatch. The wide reach meant that the data needed to be presented in a
15 way that was accessible to many different age groups. Ms. Nielsen reiterated that the final version
16 of the Environmental Dashboard would be available on June 6, 2022.

17
18 CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez reported that the work from the Visitor Use Study would be
19 incorporated into the Environmental Dashboard as a sixth element. That would be added to the
20 Environmental Dashboard in the future. Mr. Shea asked for additional details about ownership of
21 the Environmental Dashboard. He wondered if there was a residual royalty right for the University
22 of Utah. Dr. McNeally did not believe so. She stated that it was a full CWC product.

23
24 Mr. Shea wanted to know if funds generated from the Environmental Dashboard would go toward
25 the CWC or if those funds would go back to the University of Utah for further development.
26 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Environmental Dashboard was fully CWC funded and owned. There
27 was a tab on the beta version for contributions. That was an area where individuals could provide
28 tax-deductible contributions that would go directly toward the maintenance and ongoing support
29 of the Environmental Dashboard project. Those monies would be directly received by the CWC
30 and used for maintenance and additional builds. The data was free and open access and that would
31 continue to be the case. She explained that there would never be a cost to the public to access the
32 Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Shea asked when the Visitor Use Study would be complete.
33 Mr. Perez explained that it was anticipated to be done in December 2022. There would be a Special
34 Meeting of the Stakeholders Council in May 2022 where Dr. Jordan Smith from Utah State
35 University would provide updates on the Visitor Use Study work to date.

36
37 Co-Chair Cameron asked where questions related to the Environmental Dashboard could be
38 addressed in the future. Dr. McNeally stated that at the bottom of each page, there was a Contact
39 Us form or a form to Provide Data Recommendations. Those forms could be filled out or emails
40 could be submitted to Ms. Nielsen. Alternatively, comments and feedback could be submitted to
41 the CWC offices by mail. Ms. Nielsen added that comments and questions related to the
42 Environmental Dashboard would be accepted even after the public comment period ended.

43
44 Ms. Yau looked at the beta version of the Environmental Dashboard earlier in the week and saw a
45 comprehensive Frequently Asked Questions (“FAQ”) page with answers. However, when she
46 looked at it more recently, there did not appear to be a page for that. Dr. McNeally clarified that

1 the FAQ page had not been built out yet. She believed Ms. Yau had seen the FAQ page for the
2 Environmental Dashboard on the CWC website itself. A lot of that content would be moved over
3 to the Environmental Dashboard itself.

4
5 Ms. Yau asked if there was a communication plan. Ms. Nielsen reported that the outreach
6 campaign for the beta version would include a press release, a newsletter for the CWC mailing list,
7 and two public open houses. There had also been connections with jurisdictional communication
8 managers to make sure the information was pushed out across those communication channels.
9 When the final version of the Environmental Dashboard was ready in June 2022, there would be
10 presentations with different Community Councils and at the University of Utah.

11
12 Kurt Hegmann congratulated the Project Team on the Environmental Dashboard. He believed
13 with the Wildlife section of the site, it was important that the information not be misused.
14 Dr. McNeally was concerned about protecting wildlife. If he saw anything that could potentially
15 have a negative impact, she asked that he include that in his formal comments. Ms. Eden suggested
16 that an educational element be added to explain what visitors should do if they saw a certain type
17 of wildlife. The answer would be different depending on the species. Additionally, there could
18 be information about what to do if there was a wildfire and high smoke. Dr. McNeally thanked
19 her for the suggestions and noted that they would be considered.

20
21 Kirk Nichols remarked that it was exciting to see the beta version of the Environmental Dashboard.
22 He was pleased to hear that the Visitor Use Study results would be included in the Environmental
23 Dashboard. Mr. Nichols pointed out that the Unified Police Department (“UPD”) has a good count
24 of vehicles in the canyons already. He felt that data would be interesting to add next to the
25 emissions numbers for comparison. Mr. Nichols asked if there was remote sensing that could be
26 added to the vegetation and soil disturbance sections. Dr. McNeally explained that no new data
27 had been created for the Environmental Dashboard. Remote sensing techniques could be used to
28 determine the de-vegetation of an area, but no new data sets had been created. That type of
29 information could potentially be added in the future.

30
31 Mr. Christensen was very proud of the work that had been done. He hoped that UTA ridership
32 data could be integrated in the future. The data could be used to measure impacts in the canyons
33 as transportation changes were implemented. Dave Fields felt that the Environmental Dashboard
34 would be an excellent resource. He wondered if the snow water equivalent data would be updated
35 regularly. Dr. McNeally reported that it would be updated frequently. Some of the data on the
36 site has live feeds and other data would be updated quarterly. Mr. Fields also wanted to know
37 about ongoing funding. Ms. Nielsen explained that the ongoing funding would be done through
38 the CWC. The CWC is largely funded by member jurisdictions. CWC Executive Director, Ralph
39 Becker noted that the last appropriation from the Legislature included one-time funding to assist
40 with the Environmental Dashboard. Donations would also be accepted.

41
42 Amber Broadaway asked how the average Utah resident would hear about the Environmental
43 Dashboard. Ms. Nielsen discussed outreach and explained that there will be social media outreach,
44 digital communications, newsletters, meetings with various organizations, press releases, radio
45 spots when possible, and so on. Mr. Fisher asked about accessing the data resources directly.
46 Dr. McNeally explained that the project team was in the process of building out a data resources

1 page. That would be the exhaustive list of all the data resources that were being linked within the
2 Environmental Dashboard. There would also be hyperlinks in many of the sections.

3
4 **Open Comments**

5
6 Chair McCarvill reported that he and Co-Chair Cameron are both Ex-Officio Members of the
7 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. This was largely due to the input from the Stakeholders
8 Council. There had been a desire to have a more direct relationship with CWC Board Members.
9 The Ex-Officio status would make it easier for information to be shared between the Stakeholders
10 Council and the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. Chair McCarvill reported that the next
11 Stakeholders Council Meeting on May 18, 2022, would include updates on the Visitor Use Study.

12
13 **Adjourn Meeting.**

14
15 **1. William McCarvill will Adjourn the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders Council.**

16
17 **MOTION:** Dave Fields moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Amber
18 Broadway seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

19
20 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Hybrid Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, April 20, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____