

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

**Present:**  Chris Robinson, Chair

 Mayor Dan Knopp

 Mayor Roger Bourke

 Mayor Michael Weichers

 Mayor Monica Zoltanski

 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini

 Carlton Christensen

 Annalee Munsey

 Bekee Hotze

 Laura Briefer

 Will McCarvill

 Barbara Cameron

 Carl Fisher

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

 Blake Perez, CWC Executive Director of Administration

**OPENING**

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

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

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

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

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

**2022 STRATEGIC PLAN STATUS UPDATE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Situational Assessment included a suggestion that CWC Board Members participate on other relevant Boards or Commissions. Mr. Perez explained that there had not been much movement with that particular suggestion and it was still to be completed. There was also a suggestion to partner with Stakeholders Council Members for 501(c)(3) fundraising. It was an option and there had been some discussions, but that item was currently on hold. At present, there was no need to proceed that way. Carl Fisher noted that the CWC had looked at possibly starting a 501(c)(3), but there were a lot of 501(c)(3) partners already associated with the organization. Save Our Canyons or another 501(c)(3) could potentially partner with the CWC and assist in the fundraising efforts.

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

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

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

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

**2023 STORYBOARDING WORKSHOP**

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

Mr. Perez reported that those present would participate in a Story Boarding Workshop. The purpose of the exercise was to hear from all CWC Board Members and gather new ideas, project priorities, and policy direction. It was also a way to reflect on previous work and group themes together. Everyone would vote on the ideas and the immediate and future goals would be prioritized at the end of the exercise. A digital version would be presented to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and the full CWC Board. The outcomes would help dictate the portfolio of work, budget, and the Strategic Plan. Mr. Perez explained that he had learned a bit about storyboarding at the ULCT Conference a few weeks ago. It was a straightforward, simple, and effective way to obtain vital information.

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

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

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

* 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?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other priorities included stabilizing funding for member jurisdictions and “finding a meaningful role to be engaged in during the ongoing debates, discussions, decisions, and actions regarding the Federal Legislation and transportation solutions, which are considered to be interrelated.” Chair Robinson believed there were two unknowns including what would happen with transportation and what would happen with the Federal Legislation. The success of transportation and Federal Legislation were interrelated. The CWC had shared a consensus opinion about transportation with UDOT. On the other side of things, the organization was trying to put forth Legislation. At the current time, the transportation discussions were ahead of the Federal Legislation discussions. Ms. Briefer noted that there would be a Record of Decision (“ROD”) released shortly. If there was a ROD released, but no focus on Federal Legislation, that would create a troubling imbalance. Chair Robinson explained that the CWC needed a sponsor to take on the CWNCRA and assist in moving it forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**BREAK**

CWC Board Retreat participants took a 10-minute break.

**STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

1. **Stakeholders Advisory Council Chair and Co-Chair, William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Provide an Overview of the Work and Accomplishments of the Stakeholders Council During 2022.**
2. **Commissioners and Stakeholders Council Co-Chairs will Discuss, Set Priorities, and Assign Topics and Goals for the Council.**

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

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

There were two active Stakeholders Council sub-committees, which included the Trails Committee and the Millcreek Canyon Committee. The Trails Committee had been discussing the Forest Service Trails Master Plan. The Trails Committee also discussed the Watershed Management Plan. The Chair of that Committee was John Knoblock. The Millcreek Canyon Committee was a lively liaison between the County and the public as the FLAP grant progressed. Stakeholders Council leadership was proud of their outreach. There were a lot of members that participated and there were also a lot of interested members of the general public. Anyone could participate in the sub-committee meetings. Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Tom Diegel, handled intense meetings with diplomacy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* 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?

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

Ms. Nielsen shared information about short-term projects. She explained that CWC Staff would start to draft the call for project ideas in January and February. There would be meetings with resource managers during that time as well. In March, the call for project ideas would open. There would be one month to submit short-term projects. The projects needed to be implemented that year. Ms. Hotze asked whether it would be possible to start the process in the summer so the Forest Service could analyze the projects in winter and implement them the next summer. This would ensure there was additional time for due diligence. She wanted to make sure everything was analyzed properly. It was difficult to review the projects in such a short amount of time. Ms. Nielsen stated that this could be taken into consideration. Mayor Knopp suggested that there be a lighter schedule for the next round of short-term projects. After that point, the schedule could shift, as desired by Ms. Hotze.

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

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

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

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

Chair Robinson appreciated the short-term project discussions but noted that it was important to answer the outstanding questions related to the Stakeholders Council. Mayor Knopp wondered whether it would be best to discuss the matter further at a CWC Board Meeting since several CWC Board Members were not present. Ms. Nielsen clarified that Ex-Officio Christensen, Mayor Zoltanski, and Mayor Roger Bourke were still online. Chair Robinson agreed with the earlier comment from Ex-Officio Christensen that small areas of consensus would build trust. It was important to continue to do that. He referenced an earlier comment from Mr. McCarvill about the Stakeholders Council feeling left out of the Transportation Committee and Legislative and Land Tenure Committee. He wondered whether Stakeholders Council representatives should be added.

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

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

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

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

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

**RECAP**

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

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

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

**ADJOURN BOARD RETREAT**

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

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