

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS**  
2 **COUNCIL MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2019 AT 3:00 P.M.,**  
3 **COMMUNITY ROOM, 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**  
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**  
5

6 **Present:** Chair Greg Summerhays, Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker, Troy Morgan, Kirk  
7 Nichols, Brian Hutchinson, Ed Marshall Will McCarvill, Jan Striefel, Carl  
8 Fisher, Paul Diegel, Matt Kirkegaard, Steve Issowits, Annalee Munsey,  
9 Sarah Bennett, Bill Malone, Michael Braun, Mike Marker, Dave Fields, Del  
10 Draper, Patrick Shea, John Knoblock, Don Despain, Mike Maughan, CWC  
11 Attorney Shane Topham, Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy  
12 Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Intern  
13 Carly Lansche  
14

15 **On the Phone:** Carolyn Wawra, Kurt Heggman, Megan Nelson  
16

17 **Alternates:** Tom Diegel (Scott Reichard), Barbara Cameron (Linda Johnson), Wayne  
18 Crawford (Pauline Crawford), Randy Doyle (Mike Doyle), Julia Geisler  
19 (Nate Furman)  
20

21 **Excused:** Nate Rafferty, Dan Knopp, Stetson West  
22

23 **A. OPENING**  
24

- 25 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**  
26 **Council (“SHC”).**  
27

28 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays called the  
29 meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.  
30

- 31 **ii. The SHC will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of Wednesday, July**  
32 **17, 2019.**  
33

34 **MOTION:** Mike Maughan moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, July 17, 2019. John  
35 Knoblock seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the SHC.  
36

37 **B. SALT LAKE COUNTY TRAILS MASTER PLAN – 3:05-3:25**  
38

- 39 **i. Martin Jensen and Angelo Calacino will Provide an Overview of the Salt Lake**  
40 **County Trails Master Plan and Project Process.**  
41

42 Paul Guis discussed Salt Lake County goals and reported that in 1993 the County prepared a Salt  
43 Lake County Regional Trails Master Plan. A great deal has happened since then and the plan  
44 should have been updated over the years. There is now an effort to coordinate with all of the cities  
45 in the County and help connect regional amenities and destinations and coordinate with the U.S.  
46 Forest Service and other agencies to bring visitors to the various locations and trails. They are

1 beginning the process with the help of Scott Peters from Environmental Planning Group (“EPG”).  
2 Mr. Guis reported that they are holding open houses, which have resulted in good discussion. They  
3 plan to update the plan by December of this year.  
4

5 In response to a question raised by Pat Shea, Mr. Guis stated that the trails will be categorized as  
6 there are numerous types of trails and users. Mr. Shea inquired about the type of enforcement that  
7 will be provided on the trails and if bicycles, pedestrians, and equestrian uses will be separated.  
8 Mr. Guis stated that there will be some enforcement. They will rely on local law enforcement to  
9 help monitor usage. Mr. Shea suggested that Salt Lake County jail inmates be used to provide  
10 labor, which would save a lot of money.  
11

12 Will McCarvill commented that Salt Lake, Summit, and Wasatch Counties want to make sure that  
13 the interconnections work and are appropriate. Mr. Guis stated that they have partnered with Davis  
14 and Utah Counties and will take the surrounding areas into account.  
15

16 Once the plan is completed in December, Sarah Bennett asked Mr. Guis if they foresee any future  
17 trail planning efforts such as outreach to various municipalities in the County. Mr. Guis confirmed  
18 that that is the goal.  
19

20 John Knoblock asked if in trying to get parcels purchased and move trail planning sections forward  
21 for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail if they would rely on municipalities for support. Mr. Guis  
22 confirmed that that would be the case and that there are several properties on their open space  
23 acquisition list.  
24

25 Pat Shea commented that when they closed City Creek Canyon, they were able to have the high  
26 schools in Salt Lake City adopt a portion of the trail. He asked if any thought had been given to  
27 approaching the high schools in Salt Lake County to provide assistance in designing and  
28 implementing the trails. Mr. Guis stated that they have not reached out to them but he liked the  
29 idea. He acknowledged that volunteers are a great source of help.  
30

31 Sarah Bennett commented that there are various ways to maintain trails and establishing them  
32 initially is hard work. Increasingly, they are using professional trail operators and developers. She  
33 stated that she relies heavily on the Professional Trail Builders Association in terms of design and  
34 construction. Trails come in different varieties and the intent is to create a pleasant experience and  
35 provide trails that are specific with respect to the type of use. Volunteers are valuable but require  
36 a certain level of training. She also stressed the importance of professional trail design and  
37 construction. In the process, they are trying to bring some of the management agencies in to  
38 determine what is required to maintain specialty trails.  
39

40 Carl Fisher expressed appreciation to the County and stated that part of his organization’s  
41 consideration was whether the Wasatch Mountains can accommodate the increase in population.  
42

43 Dr. Kelly Bricker looked forward to the planning process and asked if there will be data associated  
44 with the trails. Mr. Guis stated that they are in the process of preparing a GIS for most of Salt  
45 Lake County and are far from what she described.  
46

1 **C. TRAILS UTAH – 3:25-3:35**

2  
3 **i. Sarah Bennett and John Knoblock will Present on Trails Utah Projects and**  
4 **Partnerships.**

5  
6 Sarah Bennett appreciated the work done by Salt Lake County to promote additional trails  
7 development. She explained that they have been able to leverage funding and cooperation, which  
8 has been beneficial. She described how Trails Utah started and reported that they received their  
9 501(c)(3) designation in May of 2013. The initiative was to create an organization from her  
10 experience developing a Trails Master Plan for Emigration Canyon. Ms. Bennett stated that she  
11 resides in Emigration Canyon and saw a need for management and design of the trails there. She  
12 approached the County who helped provide funding for the Trails Master Plan effort. Three public  
13 hearings were held with the Salt Lake County Council where a great deal of public input was  
14 received.

15  
16 Ms. Bennett stated that it took three years to develop the Trails Master Plan and in 2007, the County  
17 Council voted to approve it. Years passed with no progress. There was opposition and then the  
18 economic downturn in 2008. One of the issues was the patchwork of different types of land  
19 management agencies and goals of the various agencies. Ms. Bennett was motivated to establish  
20 an organization that could work to bring together various land management agencies along with  
21 local government entities to create trails plans.

22  
23 The former Deputy Director of the Mountain Trails Foundation suggested they form another local  
24 trails organization that was very specific in terms of the geographic area. The goal of the  
25 organization was to serve as a catalyst for stakeholder development and create funding  
26 partnerships. They also hope to provide planning, funding, construction, and management advice  
27 to various entities. They raise funds, write grants, and leverage monies through various  
28 partnerships. Increasingly they also hope to provide more education and communication  
29 pertaining to trails. Ms. Bennett remarked that trails help keep people fit and open space is an  
30 essential part of the trails. The two go hand in hand. She commented that there must be more  
31 political will to allow private property to come into the public trust. She considered that to be the  
32 ultimate challenge.

33  
34 John Knoblock reviewed the list of achievements and stated that Salt Lake County has been very  
35 helpful in terms of funding. Various projects were described including some that were completed  
36 in partnership with the Utah Conservation Corps. They were also preparing to begin a project in  
37 the next few weeks in Millcreek Canyon and working with high school mountain bike race teams.

38  
39 Ms. Bennett explained that as part of the various projects, they were working with a variety of  
40 partners. Their intent is to serve as an umbrella organization for local grassroots organizations.  
41 They welcomed feedback from the SHC.

42  
43 Pat Shea asked if anyone was looking at a Master Trails System from Spanish Fork to Brigham  
44 City. It seemed to him that there was very little coordination. Ms. Bennett stated that one of the  
45 goals of their organization is the Great Western Trail. Portions of it exist but not in continuity.

1 One of their main goals is to provide something that is contiguous through the regional landscape.  
2 She pointed out that multi-day adventures on the trail are becoming increasingly popular.

3  
4 **D. DISCUSSION OF AN SHC TRAILS SUBCOMMITTEE – 3:35-3:45**

5  
6 **i. Stakeholders Sarah Bennett and John Knoblock will Lead a Discussion**  
7 **Exploring the Potential Creation of an SHC Trails Subcommittee.**  
8

9 Ms. Bennett reported that she has had a lot of discussions recently with land managers and others  
10 about what a trails subcommittee group might do. There are currently not enough plans in place  
11 to put an implementation effort together. In about one year it was expected that they will be to the  
12 point that a subcommittee from the SHC could coordinate efforts between entities.  
13

14 Mr. Knoblock stated that during the Mountain Accord there was a trail subcommittee. Trails plans  
15 were prepared by volunteers that provided a picture of interconnectivity. It was not, however,  
16 implemented. The CWC's goal is to implement Mountain Accord.  
17

18 Ms. Bennett stressed the importance of obtaining a detailed inventory of existing trails in the  
19 Central Wasatch. There are a plethora of user-created trails and regional trails. She stated that  
20 trails are a land management tool and suggested that GIS professionals be hired who can gather  
21 data and help complete the work.  
22

23 Don Despain asked if it would be helpful to have trail professionals provide advice. Ms. Bennett  
24 indicated that they could certainly arrange for a presentation to be made on the basics.  
25

26 Carl Fisher questioned why they are taking a trails approach rather than a land approach and asked  
27 how this differs from the previous trails plan. Mr. Knoblock stated that a trails plan was put  
28 together but was not run through the watershed managers or the Forest Service. Ms. Bennett stated  
29 that they want to provide a quality recreational experience and ensure that that resource is being  
30 taken care of. She reiterated that trails are a land management tool and that trails are popular.  
31 Recently studies have shown that residents want trails and will continue to use them.  
32

33 Carl Fisher asked why they do not engage with Salt Lake County rather than create a  
34 subcommittee. Mr. Knoblock stated that the Salt Lake County Plan includes just the major  
35 regional trails.  
36

37 Will McCarvill commented that there is a lack of education and culture. One element of the plan  
38 must be how to convince people in the Salt Lake Valley that trails are a resource that needs to be  
39 cared for. Ms. Bennett remarked that signage is an important part of every project and an effort  
40 has to be made to educate users. For that reason, it is critical that trailheads be secure and feature  
41 appropriate signage. She identified management tools that can be used to ensure the future of the  
42 Wasatch Mountains.  
43

1 **E. CREATION OF A VISITOR CAPACITY SUBCOMMITTEE– 3:45-3:55**

2  
3 **i. SHC Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker will Lead a Discussion and Action on the**  
4 **Creation of a Visitor Capacity Subcommittee.**  
5

6 Vice-Chair Dr. Kelly Bricker distributed a handout and stated that the proposed Visitor Capacity  
7 Subcommittee would be a subcommittee of the SHC. The intent is to form the committee and  
8 officially recognize it. She proposed a date and time for the next meeting. Those joining the  
9 subcommittee were invited to review the information provided and be ready to give feedback on  
10 the purpose of the group.  
11

12 **MOTION:** Dr. Kelly Bricker moved to form a subcommittee to address visitor use capacity. Will  
13 McCarvill seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the SHC.  
14

15 It was proposed that meetings be held on the fourth Wednesday of each month at 4:00 p.m. Those  
16 interested in participating included their names on a list that was circulated.  
17

18 **F. MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE – 3:55-4:05**

19  
20 **i. Subcommittee Lead Brian Hutchinson will Provide an Update on Progress the**  
21 **Subcommittee Made in July and August.**  
22

23 Brian Hutchinson reported that the subcommittee was recently organized with a target date of  
24 January 1, 2020 to begin a pilot shuttle program. The County Mayor’s Office, the Forest Service,  
25 and the CWC were involved. A study was referenced that addressed the impacts on Millcreek  
26 Canyon. A five-year planning process was proposed that is focused on infrastructure. There is  
27 very little money or resources but shared concern about the unintended impacts on the trails and  
28 the canyon as a result of a shuttle. One of their goals was to not increase the impacts on the canyon.  
29

30 Two meetings were held where concern was expressed with respect to preserving the quality of  
31 the canyon and recognizing the different user groups and the importance of having a public process  
32 to identify the various issues that exist in the canyon. It was suggested that data be obtained from  
33 UTA with four locations identified in the canyon. Another consideration was the impact on air  
34 quality as well as the quality of the canyons.  
35

36 As part of the meeting, they held breakout groups and created lists of the various users. Once the  
37 user groups were identified, they began identifying potential conflicts. One of the hopes for the  
38 shuttle system was to manage the delivery of visitors. It was a collaborative effort and those  
39 interested were invited to attend the next meeting, which was scheduled for the first Monday in  
40 September at 3:00 p.m. at Millcreek City Hall.  
41

42 Ed Marshall reported that differences in perspectives and objectives have arisen among the  
43 members of the subcommittee. Some members want to focus on, arrest, and solve problems that  
44 exist in Millcreek Canyon. They do not want to focus on problems that do not exist or that are  
45 minor. They recognize that solutions in the canyon will benefit the valley. On the opposite side  
46 of the issue, the chairman is focused on solving problems in the valley including restrictions on

1 Millcreek Canyon in order to solve problems relating to traffic congestion, air pollution, water  
2 pollution, and noise pollution. Mr. Marshall pointed out that these problems do not exist in  
3 Millcreek Canyon. Trying to solve them where they least exist will have a marginal impact on  
4 solving the problems in the valley even if they are able to make a marginal improvement in the air  
5 quality. He did not feel this was a study that should be pursued.

6  
7 Chair Summerhays pointed out that there can be no more than 17 people on a subcommittee of the  
8 SHC.

9  
10 **G. SHORT-TERM TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS – 4:05-4:25**

11  
12 **i. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide an Overview and Lead a**  
13 **Discussion of Proposed Short-Term Transportation Solutions for the**  
14 **Cottonwood Canyons.**

15  
16 Executive Director Ralph Becker reported on transportation challenges, particularly in the  
17 Cottonwood Canyons. He presented an update on information that will be put out and invited  
18 comments from the Council. Mayor Wilson of Salt Lake County serves on the CWC Board and  
19 has been focused on what can be done to provide immediate relief to the unacceptable traffic  
20 congestion conditions. A Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement  
21 (“LLCEIS”) is underway as well as the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Action Plan  
22 (“CCTAP”). Both are looking at road improvements, parking, transit, policy issues such as tolls,  
23 and medium and longer-term decision making relative to transportation in the canyons. The intent  
24 was for the improvements to be of benefit long-term.

25  
26 Mr. Becker asked for feedback on what can be done this season to reduce the problems that exist.  
27 It was brought to the attention of the CWC Board that one of the major challenges is motorists  
28 who travel up the canyons without proper tires. Rental cars do not have snow tires and the rental  
29 companies will not provide them unless they are forced to. Others are visiting from out of town  
30 and do not recognize the need for snow tires. Enforcement is an issue since it is nearly impossible  
31 based on the number of people traveling up the canyons and can actually slow down traffic.  
32 Various options were being considered.

33  
34 In terms of transportation, the focus is on transit improvements. UTA and others have spent a lot  
35 of time researching what can be done to improve the service in the canyon in terms of the number  
36 of busses and how to move them more quickly. UTA, UDOT, and the UPD have spent time  
37 analyzing the situation and considering possible solutions. In terms of the number of busses, there  
38 is a two-year lag time in purchasing new ones and getting them on the road.

39  
40 Enforcement issues were addressed, who is to provide it, and how to improve towing when it is  
41 needed. It was noted that when law enforcement pulls over a vehicle, the problem is exacerbated  
42 because there is not a place to pull over. The possibility of a valet service was discussed that would  
43 involve putting chains on vehicles that need them on their way up the canyon and removing them  
44 upon their return. There was discussion about how to implement such a service.

1 There was discussion about the issue of snow removal and how it can be improved.  
2 Communication was also identified as a key component. Many do not know where to go to find  
3 information road conditions, potential wait times, and possible alternatives. UDOT has hired  
4 someone full-time to work intensively to combine all of the information in an app or  
5 communications tool. The hope was to implement something this year. Other pilot programs that  
6 have been implemented to help with the flow of traffic at congestion points were identified.  
7

8 Pat Shea wanted to see practical solutions put something in place immediately. He stressed the  
9 need for a toll in the canyons and make it an irresistible choice to use busses rather than continuing  
10 to allow people to drive up in cars. Mr. Becker stated that tolling work is being done as part of the  
11 LLCEIS and the CCTAP. It is a more intensive study than has ever been conducted in the area  
12 and focuses only on the canyons. They are utilizing local and national expertise. The study is  
13 scheduled to be completed in November and will feed into the decision-making on transportation  
14 solutions.  
15

16 Mr. Shea asked what the study will reveal that is not already known. Mr. Becker stated that once  
17 complete, the SHC should review and comment on the study. A great amount of attention and  
18 focus was on local solutions.  
19

20 Brian Hutchinson commented that while not stated, it is assumed that the problem is the delivery  
21 of visitors to the ski resorts in the winter. For the 90 to 95 percent of the residents in the valley  
22 who are not going skiing, they are concerned about car exhaust, safety, and money spent on  
23 resolving the problem. He suggested they identify the air quality impacts and incorporate it into  
24 the effort. Mr. Becker stated that what gets done will be the result of everyone's input and the  
25 analysis.  
26

27 In response to a question raised by Del Draper, Mr. Becker explained that there is currently a  
28 policy in place that establishes a requirement for snow tires or chains in the canyons from  
29 November 1 through April. The rules are in place and were presented to the CWC Board at their  
30 last meeting.  
31

32 Dave Fields appreciated the effort in the short-term and was of the opinion that without pursuing  
33 it they are in effect doing nothing. He agreed that tolling may be part of the solution. He reported  
34 that two weeks ago there was a microburst that left 12 feet of rock deposited on the road. He  
35 pointed out that the road could have been lost entirely. He considered it to be a staggering display  
36 of the power of mother nature.  
37

38 Lydia Johnson stated that the summer road conditions are not as bad as the winter because people  
39 do not slide off. The roads are still very crowded, there is not enough parking, and no bus service.  
40 She considered the current condition to be unacceptable. She commented on the UDOT rules for  
41 winter driving, which are four-wheel or all-wheel drive vehicles with all-season or snow tires.  
42 Snow tires or chains are required on two-wheel-drive vehicles. She stressed the need for busses.  
43 Mr. Becker agreed and recognized that it is a four-season issue.  
44

45 Pat Shea responded to Mr. Fields comment and stated that the WPA built ridgelines across the  
46 south side of the Mount Timpanogos in the 1930s similar to what is found in Austria and

1 Switzerland. He was concerned that as a group they will become so compartmentalized in their  
2 individual areas of specialization that they will not look at the whole picture. Mr. Becker stated  
3 that those involved in the study have been looking at the full range of issues.  
4

5 Kirk Nichols asked if a study is underway dealing with the latent demand. Mr. Becker stated that  
6 there has been but it has not been extensive. They are looking at existing use, demands, and  
7 projections going forward, and the demand and capacity for transportation.  
8

## 9 **H. CWC STAFF REPORT – 4:25-4:35**

### 10 **i. CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker will Provide a Brief Overview of the** 11 **Work CWC Staff Accomplished or Made Progress with During July and** 12 **August.** 13 14

15 Mr. Becker reported that staff continued to work on a variety of issues including the transportation  
16 work discussed, the federal legislation, and the environmental dashboard. He noted that they are  
17 on schedule. The preliminary work on the environmental dashboard is expected by the end of the  
18 year. They will then move forward and create an interactive tool.  
19

20 With regard to the federal legislation, a new fourth draft was up for review with a deadline of  
21 September 19. It includes four different documents consisting of the bill, a six-page guide to the  
22 bill, an area map, and the land exchanges. The six-page document describes the changes made to  
23 the bill, which are primarily technical changes. The bill has been undergoing a congressional  
24 drafting service review. Based on major public lands legislation passed this year, the formatting,  
25 organization, and standard provisions of public lands bills have changed. As a result, people have  
26 looked at the bill and brought it into conformance with the current congressional standards. This  
27 includes reorganization of the bill, moving sections around, and changing how they describe the  
28 National Conservation and Recreation Area on the map. Many issues have accumulated since  
29 work began on the bill. At the next SHC meeting, there will be a breakout discussion to help  
30 collect comments and make sure they receive input directly. There will also be an opportunity for  
31 public comment at the September 9 CWC Board meeting. A public meeting on the Wasatch Back  
32 will be held on September 17.  
33

34 The expectation is that they will take all of the comments, summarize them, and bring forward a  
35 recommendation and the next version of the bill to the CWC Board at its October meeting.  
36

## 37 **I. OPEN DISCUSSION**

38  
39 It seemed to John Knoblock that one of the most significant things in looking at the bill was that  
40 they no longer have a boundary and instead have bits and pieces of the Central Wasatch National  
41 Conservation Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”) which does not include the wilderness or ski areas  
42 or the private property. As a result, it looks very scattered. He asked for information on why the  
43 ski areas, wilderness areas, and Alta were not included.  
44

45 Mr. Becker responded that that is probably the biggest change in the bill without it being  
46 considered a substantive change. With regard to the boundaries, they received comments about

1 private lands that are shown inside the boundary of the CWNCRA. They had explicitly written  
2 into the bill that private lands are not part of the CWNCRA, which can be confusing. As a result,  
3 they followed the Forest Service boundary. In that area, however, it is beyond where the forest  
4 lands end. A determination was made to take all of the Forest Service land that is not wilderness  
5 and designate it as a National Conservation Recreation Area (“NCRA”). Nothing has changed  
6 other than the removal of the boundary with two exceptions. The first is that there was an overlap.  
7

8 In the October version of the bill that was adopted in November, the Town of Alta including Alta  
9 Ski Lifts, were removed from the CWNCRA. In speaking with the other ski areas, there was  
10 discussion about doing the same for all of the ski areas. A decision was made that within the ski  
11 area skiing permit boundaries, that it be shown as National Forest Lands. Another minor change  
12 was a change to the name of White Pine from a Special Management Area to a Watershed  
13 Protection Area.  
14

15 Nate Furman asked who was sponsoring the bill and what the timeline is. Mr. Becker responded  
16 that there is not yet a named sponsor. Staff has been working closely with Congressman Curtis  
17 and his staff.  
18

19 Carl Fisher remarked that something that is lost with the outline or boundary is that there is a lot  
20 of land inside of the Wasatch. The hope is that if the land is acquired that it would become part of  
21 the NCRA designation. He felt that losing that boundary could perhaps not be protected. Mr.  
22 Becker stated that the bill specifies that if there is land added to the area, that it becomes part of  
23 the CWNCRA.  
24

25 Kurt Nichols commented that an unintended consequence is that when Brighton is moved outside  
26 of the boundary there are a number of recreational residences that the Forest Services leases that  
27 are in that boundary. The result is that there are recreational residences are outside the boundary  
28 and two that are inside. They operate under their own special permits. He was concerned that  
29 they have accidentally created something different in these areas. Mr. Becker was aware of those  
30 situations and stated that there is something similar in Millcreek as well. He explained that the  
31 permit conditions and policy direction for those cabin areas will dictate what happens there.  
32

33 Michael Braun asked if there is a currently legal requirement to conduct a capacity study on the  
34 LLCEIS, CCTAP, and the NCRA. Mr. Becker was not aware of one. Dr. Bricker stated that there  
35 are wilderness areas and a capacity component by enabling legislation. Mr. Becker explained that  
36 national parks have very strict limits on how many people can go in certain areas. Dr. Bricker  
37 stated that they are required to follow their management plan.  
38

39 Pat Shea asked that the democratic members of the house or their staff that are working with  
40 Congressman Curtis and asking him to carry this legislation in the present congress be identified.  
41 Mr. Becker stated that staff has worked with both Democrats and Republicans on the bill. They  
42 met with both the committee staff in the House and Senate on both sides of the aisle.  
43

1 **J. ADJOURNMENT**

2

3 **MOTION:** [REDACTED] moved to adjourn. [REDACTED] seconded the motion. The motion passed  
4 with the unanimous consent of the Council.

5

6 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately  
7 4:55 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held Wednesday, August 21, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_