



8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2024, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING. 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE, 330, SALT LAKE CITY UTAH.

Committee Members: Kelly Boardman, Chair
Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
Maura Hahnenberger
Spencer Shaver
John Knoblock
Tom Diegel
Meaghan McKasy
Brenden Catt
Adam Lenkowski
Dani Porier, CWC Youth Council

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

OPENING

1. Chair Kelly Boardman will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Environment Systems Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.

Chair Kelly Boardman called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Environment Systems Committee Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the July 9, 2024, Meeting.

MOTION: Kelly Boardman moved to APPROVE the July 9, 2024, Meeting Minutes. Dan Zalles seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

3. Chair Boardman will Welcome a New Committee Member.

Chair Boardman welcomed the new member of the Environment Systems Committee, Meaghan McKasy. Ms. McKasy stated that she is new to the Stakeholders Council. She is a Millcreek resident and Assistant Professor of Communication at Utah Valley University. She studies science and

1 environmental communication and is a quantitative survey researcher. Additionally, she loves to
2 recreate in the Central Wasatch. She looks forward to contributing to the Council and Committee.

3
4 **YOUTH COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

5
6 **1. The Committee will Engage with Members of the CWC Youth Council to Hear their**
7 **Concerns about the Central Wasatch and Gather Feedback on the Environmental**
8 **Dashboard.**
9

10 Dani Porier from the CWC Youth Council was present at the Environment Systems Committee
11 Meeting. She shared information about the Environmental Dashboard Education Committee and
12 noted that it has been difficult to coordinate schedules over the summer with Committee Members.

13
14 Ms. Porier discussed two potential projects the CWC Youth Council has considered. The first is to
15 make the Environmental Dashboard a more updated central resource where it is possible to find
16 information on various types of closures in the Wasatch. She explained that there have been
17 discussions about a more dynamic system. For example, the Environmental Dashboard could be used
18 to let people know when there is fuels mitigation happening. It could be used as a central resource
19 so people know what is happening before driving into an area. Providing regular updates about
20 closures in the Wasatch will also drive more visitors to the Environmental Dashboard. Another
21 potential project that has been discussed by the CWC Youth Council is the idea of adding winter trail
22 use data that the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has collected. She asked for Committee feedback.

23
24 Chair Boardman liked the idea of adding some real-time data to the Environmental Dashboard. She
25 agrees that this could attract regular visitors to the Environmental Dashboard. Discussions were had
26 about automation and how to move something like this forward. Ms. Porier explained that the CWC
27 Youth Council was thinking about starting it off with submissions. If an individual or organization
28 had notice about a closure, that could be added to a forum type of page. That will likely not be as
29 reliable as an automated process would be, but it is a useful place to start this effort.

30
31 Co-Chair Dan Zalles believes a notification system can be implemented. Chair Boardman noted that
32 she has not run into many closures in her experience. She asked what closures the CWC Youth
33 Council wants to highlight. Ms. Porier reported that the main ones relate to weed removal, seasonal
34 work, and fuels mitigation. The U.S. Forest Service has been doing a lot more work with fuels
35 removal and there is more planned for the future. Additionally, there are sometimes closures for
36 special events and road work. It would be beneficial to have current information about closures. John
37 Knoblock reported that there have been some rolling closures of the Big Water Trail and the Great
38 Western Trail. It is a good idea to reliably release information about these kinds of closures.

39
40 Brenden Catt believes the CWC Youth Council essentially wants to crowdsource data related to
41 closures. Ms. Porier confirmed this but clarified that the concept is still in the idea phase. Mr. Catt
42 expressed his support for what has been proposed so far but pointed out that crowdsourced data often
43 needs to be verified. He asked whether there have been discussions about verifying the data once it
44 is received. Ms. Porier denied this but suggested that to submit something to the Environmental
45 Dashboard, there must be a link to the closure notice. That might weed out inaccurate submissions.

46
47 Co-Chair Zalles does not believe there should only be crowdsourced data submitted. He suggested
48 that the authorities who have scheduled the closures also participate in the notification system. There

1 could be additional crowdsourcing and verification, but he stressed the importance of cooperation
2 from those with authority to schedule the closures. Ms. Nielsen explained that the way the data works
3 currently is that there is automation of the data from where it originates. For soil data, which does
4 not need to be auto-updated, there are maintenance schedules so the GIS team at the University of
5 Utah can manually update that data. As for closures, if there is already a source and the Environmental
6 Dashboard can be connected to that source, then the closure data can be added. However, if the team
7 would need to manually add the data, that might result in additional costs. Alternatively, the closure
8 data could be the responsibility of a member of the CWC Youth Council or a CWC intern.

9
10 Chair Boardman noted that Sandy Wingert from the Division of Water Quality was listening in on
11 the Environment Systems Committee Meeting, but had to leave. Ms. Wingert left a comment in the
12 Zoom chat box. It stated that the Division of Water Quality collects data all over the Wasatch Front
13 and Wasatch Back. It is all in a database but is not auto-updated. She is willing to discuss that in
14 more detail and left her contact information for potential discussion after the meeting. Ms. Nielsen
15 clarified that there is water data already on the Environmental Dashboard, so the Division of Water
16 Quality data is likely already accessed in some way. However, she expressed her appreciation.

17
18 Ms. Porier reported that the Environmental Dashboard Education Committee Meeting will take place
19 this month. There should be some additional information to share after that meeting takes place.

20 21 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY WORK**

22 23 **1. The Committee will Finalize a Survey Regarding Options for Improving the** 24 **Environmental Dashboard to be Presented to the Stakeholders' Council.**

25
26 Chair Boardman reported that a suggestion was made previously to change the name of the
27 Environmental Dashboard to better represent the original intent. According to the Mountain Accord,
28 the Environmental Dashboard was intended to identify degraded conditions and monitor changes in
29 environmental conditions in the Wasatch for restoration and mitigation. The Human Element is one
30 of the areas there is a desire to expand. She shared information about the Visitor Use Study update.

31
32 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the Visitor Use Study reports were broken into
33 phases. The first phase was scoping and a review of what information was already out there. What
34 was released in October 2023 was the trails data and the final component of the various phases of the
35 study. Ms. Nielsen explained that what was released last week is a correction to the final report. The
36 visitation to third sites, or ski resorts, in the Central Wasatch, was corrected in the update. The
37 research protocol that was utilized was designed by the Forest Service. The research team at the
38 University of Utah needed to use that protocol because visitation to the public lands in the Central
39 Wasatch was the focus and this ensured that the Forest Service could utilize the data that was
40 collected. As for the correction, that was done to address a weighting issue that was unintentionally
41 made in the final report released in October. Visitation to third sites is now more accurately reflected.

42
43 Chair Boardman believes the Visitor Use Study can increase understanding of the study area and the
44 visitation levels. However, there was some information that was not included. For example, the
45 number of employees, people visiting the canyon for non-recreation uses, delivery trucks, and so on.
46 It would be nice to eventually add in those numbers because employees still contribute to visitation
47 levels. Co-Chair Zalles asked whether the revisions to the Visitor Use Study account for the traffic

1 to ski resorts outside of the ski season, such as events like Oktoberfest. Mr. Knoblock did not believe
2 so. Chair Boardman read from Page 12 of the newly released report, which stated the following:

- 3
4 • These visitation numbers are statistical estimates based on a product of overall forest visitation
5 within each canyon and the percentage of survey respondents who reported participating in
6 each activity. As such, they may differ slightly from visitation numbers collected by other
7 means (e.g. skier days based on RFID scans).

8
9 Mr. Knoblock shared additional information about the previous weighting issue. He noted that there
10 was an underestimate of some numbers. He read what the Mountain Accord stated in 3.15.5:

- 11
12 • It is recommended that either the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process or a
13 separate study analyze the capacity of the environmental resources (biological, flora, fauna,
14 watershed) in the Cottonwood Canyons to remain healthy under increasing recreational use.
15 The study should include an evaluation of the social capacity of recreation amenities such as
16 trails to handle increasing use while maintaining a range of recreational experiences.

17
18 The Executive Summary from Dr. Jordan Smith states that visitors are satisfied with the number of
19 people seen in the canyons. Visitors expect to see a lot of other people when they visit somewhere
20 like Donut Falls, but there are always other places to find solitude. Dr. Smith recommended that there
21 be loop trails around the high alpine lakes to prevent degradation of the shoreline and riparian areas.
22 Several Stakeholders Council Members have expressed a desire to see data on some of the specific
23 uses in the canyons, as that data can be used for grant funding, restoration, and other improvements.
24 That being said, that objective is not the direct takeaway that was included in the Mountain Accord.
25 As for what the Mountain Accord says about the Environmental Dashboard, it states the following:

- 26
27 • The Environmental Dashboard is the basis for the development of a landscape-level
28 restoration and mitigation plan that addresses watershed protection, contaminated
29 soils/historic mining activities, lands with invasive weeds, impaired streams, roadside
30 mitigation/stabilization, safe passage for wildlife, and other areas of the environment that are
31 in a degraded condition.

32
33 Mr. Knoblock stressed the importance of re-reading the Mountain Accord to remember what the
34 desired results actually were. Ms. Nielsen appreciated the information shared. That being said, she
35 informed those present that different decisions have been made on purpose by the CWC Board. The
36 original idea behind the Environmental Dashboard was to create a report card. That is no longer the
37 intention, due to decisions that were later made by the CWC Board. While it is useful to look back
38 at the Mountain Accord document, it is also important to keep in mind that certain things have
39 changed over time. Chair Boardman wondered whether the Environment Systems Committee should
40 address the original intent of the Environmental Dashboard or accept it has since changed.

41
42 Co-Chair Zalles pointed out that the Mountain Accord was concerned with degraded conditions. It
43 is possible to ask whether increased traffic is an example of a degraded condition, but the connection
44 between degradation and traffic leaves some room for interpretation. Ms. Nielsen explained that if
45 the Environment Systems Committee and Stakeholders Council want to see more pointed
46 commentary on the Environmental Dashboard, what would be appropriate is making a presentation
47 or request to the CWC Board. The Committee could draft a letter and have it approved at the
48 Stakeholders Council level. From there, it could move forward to the CWC Board for consideration.

1
2 Chair Boardman reported that Co-Chair Zalles created a survey regarding options for improving the
3 Environmental Dashboard and then Mr. Catt added the draft to Google Docs. Mr. Catt noted that the
4 Committee needs to consider how the intent of the Environmental Dashboard may have evolved since
5 the Mountain Accord was executed. It would be useful to understand how the CWC Board perceives
6 those changes as well. He asked whether the changes occurred formally or informally. Ms. Nielsen
7 clarified that it was not done through formal resolution, but informal decisions were made.

8
9 Mr. Knoblock pointed out that if those matters were discussed during CWC Board Meetings, it would
10 be possible to locate those Meeting Minutes. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. She informed those present
11 that all of the Meeting Minutes and recordings are accessible on the CWC website. Mr. Catt asked if
12 there is a way to narrow down that search. Ms. Nielsen offered to look into this and share information.

13
14 Tom Diegel noted that the original question posed by Chair Boardman had to do with the name of the
15 Environmental Dashboard. The overall goal of the Environmental Dashboard is for it to be used as a
16 resource. It seems it might be possible to rename it to something like the Wasatch Resource, so it
17 feels a little bit more accessible to users. It is important to think about what the Environmental
18 Dashboard is intended to do when considering a potential change to the name. Chair Boardman
19 appreciated his comments and liked the name suggested. The question is whether this is an
20 Environmental Dashboard or a comprehensive tool for people to see what is happening in the
21 Wasatch. She wonders if there is a way to present the data more holistically and comprehensively.
22 It might be possible to present the Environmental Dashboard in a more user-friendly manner as well.

23
24 Chair Boardman likes the idea of a map on the front page of the Environmental Dashboard as well as
25 comparison maps to show what the conditions were like in the past. Mr. Knoblock wondered whether
26 the proposal is a GIS map where visitors can click on different areas to see the data. He reiterated
27 that the Environmental Dashboard was originally intended to monitor environmental conditions. He
28 likes the idea of something visual being included but stressed the importance of focusing on what the
29 Environmental Dashboard is meant to do. Additional discussions were had about a potential map.

30
31 The Committee further discussed the name of the Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Knoblock thought
32 a more inclusive name would be the Environmental and Current Conditions Dashboard. Co-Chair
33 Zalles believes there is a desire to increase visitation to the Environmental Dashboard. He agrees
34 with Mr. Knoblock that it is important to protect the Wasatch from degradation. If additional attention
35 to the Environmental Dashboard will result in additional protection, that is something to keep in mind.

36
37 Chair Boardman clarified that she is not suggesting that the organization move away from the
38 information currently included on the Environmental Dashboard. It is necessary to embrace the
39 original intent, but also understand how the intention has evolved over time. When looking at the
40 survey, she asked Committee Members to think about whether data is being presented in a way that
41 helps to make decisions related to sustainability and conservation. She wants thought to be put into
42 how the data included on the Environmental Dashboard will actually be used.

43
44 Committee Members contemplated a map on the main landing page of the Environmental Dashboard.
45 Ms. Nielsen asked what data there is an interest in seeing on a map like that. Suggestions were made
46 to include some of the bigger datasets that are available, as those could be useful to highlight. Ms.
47 Nielsen shared the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”)
48 story map that digitally displays what is proposed in the legislation. She envisions something similar

1 for the Environmental Dashboard based on some of the comments shared by Committee Members.
2 The landing page could show the geographic focus area of the Environmental Dashboard with
3 significant datasets on the landing page. It will be possible to click on the tabs for more details.
4

5 Ms. McKasy had a question about the survey. It appears that it is intended to be internal. She wanted
6 to understand if the Environmental Dashboard survey will be taken by those involved in the CWC or
7 if it will also be sent out to others. Co-Chair Zalles explained that the idea was to design the survey
8 to be flexible enough that it could be administered to anyone. At first, it was suggested that it be
9 administered to the Stakeholders Council, then the CWC Board, and then anyone else interested.
10

11 Chair Boardman reminded Committee Members that Mr. Catt put the survey into Google Docs and
12 sent it to all Committee Members. It is a survey for users of the Environmental Dashboard. Co-Chair
13 Zalles asked if there are any comments about the survey that has been drafted. A question was asked
14 to determine if there will be one version of the survey or if there will be one geared towards the CWC
15 Board, Stakeholders Council, CWC Youth Council, and so on. Co-Chair Zalles believes the benefit
16 of a standardized survey is that the results can be compared. For example, it is possible to look at
17 what CWC Board Members think compared to the Stakeholders Council. The standardization allows
18 for comparison and contrast to take place. Ms. McKasy asked about Google Docs. When she creates
19 surveys, she uses Qualtrics. Co-Chair Zalles explained that Google Docs makes it possible to review
20 the questions and make comments. Ultimately, that is not how it will be administered.
21

22 Co-Chair Zalles read the following introduction from the CWC Environmental Dashboard Survey:
23

- 24 • This survey was developed by the Environment Systems Committee of the CWC to obtain
25 feedback from users of the Environmental Dashboard. The Environmental Dashboard was an
26 action item in the Mountain Accord and acts as a tool for the public, land managers,
27 policymakers, and technical users. The feedback you provide is important to inform the
28 Environment Systems Committee's efforts to improve the Environmental Dashboard. While
29 your response is expected to remain anonymous, the Environment Systems Committee invites
30 you to submit your contact information should the Committee seek additional information
31 regarding your response. Thank you for devoting your time to completing the survey.
32

33 Co-Chair Zalles reviewed some of the questions included in the survey. The first question asked
34 about the respondent's interest in the Central Wasatch. After further consideration, Co-Chair Zalles
35 did not believe the question should start with, "If you are a member of the CWC Stakeholders
36 Council..." Since this will not only be administered to the Stakeholders Council, it makes sense to
37 remove that language. There was support from other Committee Members to remove that language.
38

39 The next question proposed for the survey was reviewed. Co-Chair Zalles read the draft language:
40

- 41 • Which of the following best characterizes your life situation?
 - 42 ○ Student;
 - 43 ○ Working;
 - 44 ○ Fully retired;
 - 45 ○ Partially retired;
 - 46 ○ Other.
- 47

1 Ms. McKasy pointed out that a student might also be working. Chair Boardman suggested that
2 language be added to state that respondents check all that apply. The next question was as follows:

- 3
- 4 • Which of the following aspects of the Wasatch are you most interested? (Select all that apply.)
- 5

6 Chair Boardman asked whether a ranking could be done instead of selecting all applicable options
7 that are listed. Ms. McKasy suggested that respondents rank their interests on a scale of one to five
8 instead. Co-Chair Zalles and Chair Boardman were supportive of the idea. The next questions were:

- 9
- 10 • Have you accessed the Environmental Dashboard available on the CWC website?
- 11 • If you have accessed it, which of the following questions most accurately describes why you
12 were drawn to the Environmental Dashboard? (Select all that apply.)
 - 13 ○ What has changed over time in the Central Wasatch?
 - 14 ○ How does the Central Wasatch compare to other areas in Utah?
 - 15 ○ How does the Central Wasatch compare to other mountainous regions in the United
16 States?
 - 17 ○ How close are we to meeting the goals expressed in the Mountain Accord?
 - 18 ○ How successful have certain Central Wasatch policies and practices been since their
19 implementation?
 - 20

21 Adam Lenkowski suggested that the question be refined to state, “Have you previously accessed the
22 Environmental Dashboard?” or “Have you accessed the Environmental Dashboard before taking this
23 survey?” Chair Boardman suggested that another option be added for the question about being drawn
24 to the Environmental Dashboard. The original intent of the Environmental Dashboard in the
25 Mountain Accord was to identify environmentally degraded areas. The question could be: “Are there
26 environmentally degraded areas in the Wasatch and has remediation occurred?” Co-Chair Zalles
27 suggested the following wording: “What (if any) conditions have degraded in the Wasatch?”
28

29 Chair Boardman wondered whether the introductory language for the survey should ask people to
30 visit the Environmental Dashboard before answering the survey. Ms. McKasy believes it is valuable
31 to have people explore the Environmental Dashboard. However, the motivation for accessing the
32 Environmental Dashboard will then shift and the questions posed above will not be needed. Chair
33 Boardman noted that the question could be changed to: “What information do you feel the
34 Environmental Dashboard is providing?” Ms. McKasy explained that it comes down to what
35 information the Environment Systems Committee wants to learn from the survey responses.
36

37 Additional discussions were had about how to best present the questions and whether respondents
38 should be asked to review the Environmental Dashboard before taking the survey. Mr. Lenkowski
39 noted that the current Environmental Dashboard is complex, as there are a lot of tabs and a wealth of
40 information. He believed the intention is to send out the survey to the Stakeholders Council prior to
41 the next meeting. Co-Chair Zalles suggested that there not be a request for respondents to look at the
42 Environmental Dashboard. It might be best to simply move the survey forward to the Council.
43

44 Co-Chair Zalles reported that the Environmental Dashboard datasets are grouped into the following:

- 45
- 46 • Air Quality and Climate;
- 47 • Geology and Soils;
- 48 • Vegetation Communities;

- 1 • Water;
- 2 • Wildlife;
- 3 • Human Element.

4
5 Mr. Lenkowski reported that the traffic information is currently under Air Quality and Climate. It
6 was suggested that road traffic be mentioned in parenthesis so respondents know where certain data
7 is located. Co-Chair Zalles read another proposed question for the survey, which was as follows:

- 8
9 • The following are possible changes to the Environmental Dashboard interface. Rank them on
10 how important you think they are from one (most important) to six (least important):
 - 11 ○ More explanation of each term, label, or acronym presented;
 - 12 ○ More explanation of how to interpret each chart or graph;
 - 13 ○ A main page of the most important data;
 - 14 ○ An optional notification system that would send you a text message or email when
15 new values are added to a particular variable;
 - 16 ○ An optional notification system that would send you a text message or email, but only
17 when a brand new dataset is introduced;
 - 18 ○ A regularly updated “What’s New” section on the main page that announces new
19 values or new datasets;
 - 20 ○ More frequently collected data values. For example, if possible, making annual data
21 monthly or monthly data weekly, or weekly data daily;
 - 22 ○ Are there other changes that you would like to see?

23
24 Chair Boardman suggested that instead of the option related to interpretations of each chart or graph
25 that there be more visual portrayals of the data. Alternatively, there could be an option for more
26 interpretation of the data. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that when surveys are written, it is important to be
27 very careful about the words chosen. She wondered whether there is a desire to ask about
28 interpretation or commentary. Co-Chair Zalles believes a lot depends on the specific type of data.

29
30 Ms. McKasy pointed out that since there is so much text proposed for this Environmental Dashboard
31 survey, it might be difficult for respondents to answer on their phones. Many people take surveys on
32 their phones these days. The longer the labels are, the harder it will be for someone on their phone to
33 complete the survey. The more succinct some of the labels can be, the better. Discussions were had
34 about the best format for clarity. Chair Boardman noted that Ms. McKasy seems to have a lot of
35 experience in writing surveys and considering the audience. She wondered whether it would be
36 possible to sit down with Co-Chair Zalles and review the questions with that information in mind.
37 Ms. McKasy confirmed that she is willing to schedule a time and discuss the survey further.

38
39 Mr. Lenkowski wondered whether the last question needed to be ranked. He pointed out that there
40 are a lot of questions listed there and it might ask too much of the respondents. Co-Chair Zalles
41 agreed that changing that to a yes or no option would make the process easier. He read additional
42 language:

- 43
44 • What other topic areas or datasets (if any) should be included in the Environmental
45 Dashboard?
- 46 • If you would like to see additional changes to the Environmental Dashboard not described
47 elsewhere in the survey, please provide a description of those desired changes below.

- 1 • The CWC is committed to continuously improving its publicly available resources. Please
2 leave your contact information if the CWC can follow up with you regarding the feedback
3 you provided in this survey.
4

5 Mr. Lenkowski suggested adding to the final statement above and noting that those interested in
6 learning more about the CWC can also leave their contact information. He pointed out that this will
7 be useful once the survey is distributed beyond those already involved in the organization.
8

9 Chair Boardman asked whether it is appropriate for Co-Chair Zalles and Ms. McKasy to work on the
10 survey outside of the meeting and redistribute it to the Environment Systems Committee. Committee
11 Members could then share comments via email. She also wanted to know if there needs to be an
12 official vote to forward the finished survey to the Stakeholders Council. Director of Operations,
13 Samantha Kilpack, expressed support for collaboration between Co-Chair Zalles and Ms. McKasy.
14 It is possible to work via email between meetings. However, if there is a desire to bring something
15 to a vote and move it forward to the Stakeholders Council, that would need to be done during a
16 meeting with a quorum. She pointed out that the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting is
17 scheduled before the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Discussions were had about the next steps.
18

19 **OTHER ITEMS**

20
21 There were no additional items.
22

23 **CLOSING**

24 25 1. **Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment Systems Committee** 26 **Meeting.**

27
28 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting.
29 Dan Zalles seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
30

31 The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Environment Systems Committee Meeting held on*
3 *Tuesday, August 13, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____