Meeting Notes
Environment System Group Meeting #2
April 1, 2014

This meeting included:

- Presentation and discussion on the Existing Conditions report
- Presentation and discussion on draft information on Future Trendlines
- Member survey on goals for the future.

Existing Conditions Report Summary and Discussion

The definitions of the project area and study area were reviewed. The Existing Conditions for the Environment System Group were presented. The presentation for this meeting will be posted on the Mountain Accord website [http://mountainaccord.com]. Four categories have been identified to describe the "Environment System." These are: 1) water, 2) air, 3) ecosystems, and 4) land.

There was a group discussion regarding the information and whether any categories of environment were missing?
- Granite Community. We need wildfire as another category. *Wildfire is discussed under ecosystems and stressors (climate change).*
- Water:
    - Supply: Concerns with how "surplus" water supply is defined.
        - Water providers plan for dry years (not average). Picture is unclear as currently painted.
        - Dewatering of Little Cottonwood Creek is an issue (e.g., surplus does not consider in-stream flow).
        - Surface water supply is constrained by contract (Service Area #3 and Cottonwood Canyons). Discussion should be included in existing conditions.
    - We should set-up water subcommittee to get the right context, data for these items.
    - Missing Safe Drinking Water Act compliance component in the report. Driven by federal regulations.
    - Watershed:
        - Provo River Water Council and/or Weber River Watershed should have data on Wasatch Back.
        - Missing watershed assessment. Watershed Condition Framework (source: USFS)
    - Summary conclusions are off (i.e. H2O supply/demand). Fix the draft before posting it.

- Ecosystems
  - Disagreement with statement that wetlands are stable. Group members have observed small-scale impacts causing a cumulative impact over time. Wetlands as a whole may not be steady.
  - Some members did not agree with statement that that habitat in the mountains is "functional". Quantitative vs. qualitative assessment. Question: how was this translated into a qualitative assessment? *Ecosystem mtg. group looked at reports, experts and managers consulted (such as USFS), professional judgment. Departure was important--how it has changed from historic conditions. LANDFIRE data provides departure from historic conditions on a landscape scale. LANDFIRE is not a good tool to assess wetlands and riparian systems.*
  - Concerns with how map displays habitat by vegetative type/community rather than the physical habitats of species. Suggestion to change title from "Habitat" to "Vegetative Cover".
  - Habitat fragmentation has not been evaluated yet.
  - Add bullet for "stream system dewatering" to the ecological stressors slide.
  - Role of insects (bark beetles, ips, gypsy moth)
  - Habitat, communities, fragmentation needs to be incorporated before we can make any decisions moving forward.
  -
- Land
  - Land Protection Map. Prefer the term "land management schemes" rather than "land protection." This includes a combination of zoning, regs, and statutory requirements.
  - Should not include urban developed land. Private land.
  - Concerned with the % represented in PC for conservation easements. (e.g. Deer Valley Resort: combined conservation/deed restricted).
  - Need to clean up shape files (SLC 995 acres open space vs. 6300 ac.). Parks, open space, golf courses. How do we define—consistency.
  - *Question: Does this lead to a metric? A. Clayton: Good area to focus on as part of an outcome. We should spend time here to get it right.*
  - FCOZ—suitability component. This bleeds over into other groups—(econ: can land be developed?)
  - Maps: suggest covering all areas on one map—multiple layers.
  - Pie chart map gives the appearance that 50% of the county is protected.
  - Opinion: Protection is a good word. Not all of the county(ies) have protection or management.
  - Change terminology on the pie chart: "open space/management"
  - Suggest renaming this report "DRAFT" for publishing to the web.
  - *Aside: (J. Heilman) Keep in mind we are moving towards a recommendation to the Executive Committee and we can't be comprehensive in this report. Consider: What are the key things in the existing environment we should consider and plan for in the future?*
  - Park City soils map needs labels (roads, etc.).
  - There are contaminated soils outside of Park City. CERCLA site parallel to US-40 but outside of project area. Do we keep this slide (A. Clayton)? Park City team can revise the slide (A. Ober).
- Stressors

- o Stressors are not appropriately defined (land use). Not all residentially zoned acres are developable. *Parking Lot. Doesn't paint a perfect picture because we can't capture it. If you have a comment or strong sense for this information, send it to Andrea Clayton (A.Ober).*
  - o Move climate change up rather than have at the end of the document.
  - o Discuss fire trends in LCC

Poll, Results and Discussion:

The members of the System Group were not polled on their level of concurrence with the Existing Conditions report. Changes will be made, the document revised and distributed, and polling will take place at the beginning of the next Environment SG meeting.

Future Trendlines Summary and Discussion:

Details of the environment future conditions are included in the PowerPoint presentation. Highlights include: population growth, land use/development, transportation, and climate change.

- Some don't agree with the representation of development on Parley's Canyon.
- Snowbird units—are the units approved in master development plan included? Maybe this slide (Canyon Land Use) is misleading.
- Role of Wasatch Canyons Tomorrow? Map showing residentially zoned acres an projected residential units may not paint an accurate picture of development potential (does not take into account suitability)
- Climate change—should this move to Economy?
- Message observations where there is no data
  - o What is the message you want to tell other systems?

Which of these changes/trends would be the most critical for the future of this system? Why? Are there other, more important TRENDS to understand? What existing data have we missed?

- Population growth isn't just the # of users, but their use (recreational) of the mountains.
- We could be inducing more recreational or managed use (these are distinct).
- Connection to our food supply relative to the farming areas. Wasatch Back has "significant" agriculture; connected to restaurants.
- Ecosystem conversion. Evolving habitats, species.
- Time span of ecosystem movements (to higher elevations). There might not be enough time for the conversion to occur relative to the rate of climate change. Loss of native habitat at higher elevations.
- Snowmaking should be included in this discussion (climate change, water supply, elevation grades).
- Fire: discuss impacts to water quality
- Climate change is not just on the ecosystem. Ecosystems change outside of climate change influences.
- We should be sensitive to the latest scientific reports (IPCC).
- Warming water bodies. Impacts to water temp and associated costs to treat (if possible). More difficult to treat warmer water.

- Air Quality: less snow in winter, decreased albedo, less inversion. This impacts the snowpack. Prism dataset (Natureserve).
- "If you build it they will come" mentality and how it relates to land use relationships and induced demand, especially on the Wasatch Back.
- Water quality/quantity. Deforestation and development affects runoff and aquifer recharge.
- How does this work overlap with Envision Utah/Wasatch 2040. *Similar/same data.*
- Public health trends, disease/outbreaks. (air/water)
- Land cost/management effort. Maintenance of parks, ski areas, open space, trails. *Hard to quantify. If you have data, send it to us (A. Clayton)*
- Trendline of availability of funding to preserve lands. *Hard to quantify; large swaths of land are harder to come by. We are open to data/ideas if folks have some on this.(A. Ober)*
- *The trendlines are frightening realistic. We have done a good job. There are incompatibilities with population growth between envr. and econ.*

Survey

For the Central Wasatch, what should be the key GOALS for an ideal future system?

- maintain current balance (rec/open space)
  - resiliency in environment systems (climate)
  - traffic/ air quality with growth
  - protecting what we have
  - preserve water, experiences, habitat
  - environment is equal to economy (taken a back seat to econ)
  - transportation
  - preserve wetlands
  - water quality/quantity
  - funding for preservation of land,
  - maintaining ecosystem health (benefit people, plants, animals)
  - ecosystem function
  - optimism
  - improve current conditions
  - funding tied to preservation
  - protect ecosystem, climate change, models
  - get representation through decisions making (post Mountain Accord)
  - sustainability in all four system areas
- open process
- ecosystem function
- improve current conditions
- preserve environment. resources/balancing other resources
- look at all system groups through the environmental lens
- air quality
- prepare for impacts of future generations
- minimize impacts of population growth
- stewardship of forest--education
- strive for balance of uses/resources
- preserve biodiversity
- ecosystem integrity, sustainable programs, community support
- protect watershed/open space
- adaptable landscape
- scientific understanding of data to make informed decisions
- improve water quality
- conservation for economic value rather than conservation for conservation sake

Decisions

Revise Existing Conditions report for group review. Move forward to fully characterize Future Trendlines.

Action Items

No.	Action Item	Responsible	Note
1	Modify report based on discussion prior to next meeting	Andrea Clayton	
2	Create table of requests from environmental system group – bring to next meeting (how addressed)	Andrea Clayton	
3	Water sub-committee working group	Stacey Arens	
4	Land sub-committee working group	Elisa Albury	
5	Ecosystem sub-committee working group	Reid Persing	
6	Provide information on future trendlines	System Group members	
7			
8			
9			

MOUNTAIN ACCORD

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Bob Archibald	Granite	B.ABLE@SBCGLOBAL.NET	801 232 6288
Jim Ehleringer	UU	jim.ehleringer@utah.edu	801 581-7623
Maura Olivos	Alta Ski Area	Molivos@alta.com	971.285.7582
Lisa Yoder	Summit County	lyoder@summitcounty.org	801-0 435-336-3128
Kim Carson	Summit Co.	kcarson@summitcounty.org	435-640-1035
Mary Pendergast	Wild Utah Project	mary@wildutahproject.org	801 328-3550
Jeremy Roberts	SLCoHD	jroberts@slco.org	385-468-3913
Brock LeBaron	UDAQ	blebaron@utah.gov	801-536-4006
Julie Kalar	Deer Valley	j.kalar@deervalley.com	435 645 6668
Brandon Weston	UDOT	brandonweston@utah.gov	
May Deloretto	UTA	mdeloretto@rideuta.com	801-741-8808
Mary Closser	Recycle Utah		
B. Cameron	BCCA	barbara.cameron@hotmail.com	
Dick Weber		dick.weber46@gmail.com	801-580-8603
Jeff Matthews	USFS	jmatthews@fs.fed.us	801-999-2161
John Urbanic	USACE	john.e.urbanic@usace.army.mil	801-295-8380
Liz Larsen	Hogle Zoo/Wild Anawlbh	llarsen@hoglezoo.org	801-584-1754
Matt Howard	Utah DWR	MATTHOWARD@UTAH.GOV	385-985-7526
Andy Beerman	PCMC	andy@parkcity.org	
Court Strong	Univ. Utah	Court.Strong@utah.edu	801 585-0049
Kirk Robinson	Western Wildlife Cons.	lynx@xmission.com	801-468-1535
Brian Suhadole	Park City Mt. Resort	brian@pcmr.com	435-647-5499
Claudia Wheeler	MWDSLS	wheeler@mwdsls.org	801-942-9651
Michael L. Wilson	"	wilson@mwdsls.org	801-942-9685
George Vargyas	Wasatch Backcountry All.	gvargyas@hotmail.com	
Dan Drumiler	SL County	ddrumiler@slco.org	385-468-6640
Jen Clancy	Friends of Alta	clancy@friendsofalta.org	
John Guldner	Town of Alta	jhg@townofalta.com	801-363-5105
Jesse Stewart	SLC	jesse.stewart@slcgov.com	801-483-6864
Eliot Seter		lop@ch.ot-setzer.ni.yoru.to	801-803-5418
Julie Peek Dahling	SLCO	jpeek-dahling@slco.org	385 468 881
G. Libecci	SLCSD	glibecci@yahoo.com	