Meeting Notes
Recreation System Group
Meeting #5
July 23, 2014

This meeting included:

- A message from Executive Board Member Andy Beerman
- Vision and Goals: Polling Results
- Metrics: Discussion
- Mapping Exercise on Idealized Systems
- Metrics Polling

Executive Board Message

- Some groups are drawing items that are "owned" by other groups and that is exciting.
- Dream big; don't put limits in this phase.
- Cost has been an issue in other groups. Don't be limited by cost. The intrinsic value of the Wasatch is priceless.
- Executive Committee has put a lot of trust in you.
- Timing. Executive Committee has established a priority to meet the deadline. We have the right people, at the right time. We may not have all the answers, however we can make the best decisions with the information available. We think we have what we need now.

Vision and Goals Polling Results

Michael Barille presented a summary of the Vision and Goals polling which occurred since the last System Group meeting.

Vision Polling: 30 Participated

1) Concur (65%)
2) Concur with minor point of contention (20%)
3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (12%)
4) Dissent (0%)
5) Waive or Abstain (3%)

Comments from members that dissented or that disagreed with outcome but consent to move forward:

Consultant team incorporated terms of "solitude and naturalness" which were voiced as issues of concern in meeting #4. Based upon poll, some concerns still exist with sustainability. It is good to recognize this as we move through the process; incorporate these ideas into the mapping exercises. High, med, low use needs to be addressed, not just high use.

Goals Polling: 30 Participated
1) Concur (65%)
2) Concur with minor point of contention (23%)
3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (6%)
4) Dissent (3%)
5) Waive or Abstain (3%)

Metrics Discussion and Polling

Reid Persing introduced the metrics and reviewed them in the in the context of the mapping exercise. *[Note: members were polled on the metrics <u>after</u> the group mapping exercise.]*

Comments:

- *Goal 1 and 2 are similar and the metrics can be interchangeable. Suggest refining the first 4 metrics so they can be applied to the first 2 goals.* It is better to have these separated to preserve the individual metric. We can address this fluidly. Also note metrics do not have to be associated with specific goals.
- Paralysis on how to quantify High, Med, Low use. We need a working definition of each. Maybe we could cite an example. High use is relative based upon the activity. High use at a resort vs. high use on a hiking trail. Consider the design elements. High use node vs. high use trailhead. Some of this is also in the score sheet.
- *Does the use node change on a seasonal basis (e.g. May-Oct for hiking) vs. ski resorts for skiing. In other words, how do we define the "high use" node?* This can be reflected in the mapping and the scoring.
- Missing: the ability of the goals to address growth (capacity, population). Can we/should we rate how well we will do in the future? Adding high use nodes. Sustainability.
- *Is there a way to quantify enforcement?* Yes--in the Policy and Governance Goal.

Metric Polling 23 Participated
1) Concur (43%)
2) Concur with minor point of contention (48%)
3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (9%)
4) Dissent (0%)
5) Waive or Abstain (0%)

Comments from members that dissented or that disagreed with outcome but consent to move forward: None.

Mapping Exercise on Idealized Systems

Group broke into 5 small groups and were asked to focus on a section of the project area. While focusing on this section, the small groups began to draw broad design features (e.g., high use nodes) and more specific design features (e.g., campgrounds) to better understand how the metrics will be used to measure an Idealized Recreation System.

Action Items

- None.