



8 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
9 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY,**  
10 **OCTOBER 25, 2023, AT 2:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON**  
11 **AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS CWC OFFICES**  
12 **LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE, 102, SALT LAKE CITY UTAH.**

13  
14 **Committee Members:** Kelly Boardman, Chair  
15 Dan Zalles, Co-Chair  
16 Caitlin Curry  
17 Adam Lenkowski  
18 Maura Hahnenberger  
19 Carl Fisher  
20 Rusty Vetter  
21 John Knoblock  
22 Pat Shea

23  
24 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
25 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

26  
27 **OPENING**

28  
29 1. **Chair Kelly Boardman will Open the Meeting as Chair of the Environment Systems**  
30 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

31  
32 Chair Kelly Boardman called the Environment Systems Committee Meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.  
33 She explained that this was the first-ever Stakeholders Council Environment Systems Committee  
34 Meeting. The intention was to support the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”). The CWC was  
35 tasked with implementing the Mountain Accord and the Stakeholders Council supported that  
36 objective. Chair Boardman wanted to be clear about the role of the Environment Systems Committee.  
37 She explained that the Committee can gather information, conduct fact-finding, provide analysis,  
38 conduct feasibility studies, and collaborate with broader constituents within the project area. The  
39 Environment Systems Committee could make suggestions and recommendations to the Council.

40  
41 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, prepared an action planning tool. The tool made it  
42 possible to focus on the actions and deliverables that came out of each discussion topic. Ideally,  
43 someone would be assigned as responsible for that item and there would be a completion date listed.

44  
45 Chair Boardman asked that the Committee Members present introduce themselves. Dan Zalles  
46 reported that he is retired but worked as an Environmental Science educator for many years. He has  
47 done research for grants and participated in many other projects. Since his retirement, he has worked

1 with the League of Women Voters and is the leader of the national committee on forests and wildfires.  
2 Chair Boardman informed those present that he serves as Co-Chair of the Committee.

3  
4 Adam Lenkowski introduced himself and reported that he studied Meteorology in school and was  
5 interested in ambient air quality monitoring as well as snow science. Carl Fisher is the Executive  
6 Director of Save Our Canyons, which is a non-profit working to protect the Wasatch. He had degrees  
7 in Geography and Environmental Science from the University of Utah. Caitlin Curry served as a  
8 Volunteer Chapter Leader for Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, specifically in the Vice-Chair role.  
9 She has experience with state and national policy around public lands, public waters, wildlife, and  
10 hunting rights. She looked forward to bringing that perspective to discussions. Professionally, she  
11 worked as an Accountant and Finance Director in the non-profit sector.

12  
13 Rusty Vetter came to Salt Lake City approximately 17 years ago. He spent his time working for the  
14 Department of Public Utilities and represented the department during the Mountain Accord process.  
15 The environmental component was an important part of his work. Mr. Vetter retired just over one  
16 year ago and became a member of the Stakeholders Council. As of two weeks ago, he had started  
17 working for the Department of Public Utilities as a Consultant. He let CWC Staff know that he would  
18 likely need to resign from the Council. That being said, he would likely be a regular visitor to the  
19 meetings that the Environment Systems Committee has in the future.

20  
21 Chair Boardman introduced herself and reported that her background is in Urban Studies and  
22 Planning. She has done some water quality work in the past, went to the University of Utah and  
23 worked on some projects there, and worked for several years as an Environmental Consultant on the  
24 Watershed Management Plans for several watersheds in the State of Utah. Chair Boardman retired  
25 in the early 2000s and has since spent time working in the ski industry.

26  
27 Maura Hahnenberger works as an Associate Professor of Geosciences at Salt Lake Community  
28 College and does research in dust transport, mainly off of dry lake beds, which looks at air quality  
29 impacts. Ms. Hahnenberger loves the mountains and the environment and teaches classes about  
30 climate change and mountain weather. Chair Boardman hoped there would be a good level of  
31 collaboration on the Environment Systems Committee as the work moved forward.

## 32 33 **WASATCH WILDFIRE CRISIS LANDSCAPE PROJECT**

### 34 35 **2. Committee Members will Discuss the Wasatch Wildfire Crisis Landscape Project.**

36  
37 Co-Chair Zalles shared information about the Wasatch Wildfire Crisis Landscape Project. He found  
38 that this was an emergency project under the Federal Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. There was a  
39 section in that about environmental analyses. It stated that the Secretary can determine that an  
40 environmental assessment could occur, which suggested that the Secretary could also determine that  
41 an environmental analysis does not need to occur. Given that this was considered an emergency  
42 project, he wondered if that meant there had not been an Environmental Impact Report made available  
43 to the public. Environmental Impact Reports are beneficial because the reports provide transparency  
44 about the details of the project. For instance, why cutting would be done in one location but would  
45 not be done in another location. It was worthwhile to have that information.

46  
47 The reason this matter caught the attention of Co-Chair Zalles was because he looked at the Central  
48 Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area (“CWNCR”) and noticed that the White Pine

1 Watershed Protection Area specifically states that there will not be any commercial timber there. He  
2 wondered why that was mentioned and about the history of the area. He was under the impression  
3 that no commercial logging was taking place anywhere in the Central Wasatch. Co-Chair Zalles  
4 thought the topic might be beneficial for Committee Members to discuss further.  
5

6 Mr. Fisher referenced the legislation in the White Pine Special Management Area. There are  
7 essentially five different management units, which include wilderness areas, the Conservation  
8 Recreation Area, as well as the White Pine Special Management Area. With each one, he believed  
9 there would be a prohibition on commercial timber harvest. It was spelled out in that Special  
10 Management Area but each of the units has a slightly different management prescription. Something  
11 that Save Our Canyons was founded on was the establishment of the Lone Peak Wilderness Area.  
12 There was a desire for White Pine to be part of the Lone Peak Wilderness Area, but it was carved out  
13 at the last minute. Save Our Canyons wanted that area to become wilderness but there were some  
14 issues with that because of those who service the dam and the helicopter skiing that takes place in  
15 White Pine. He explained that a special management area had been created for White Pine for those  
16 reasons.  
17

18 Currently, there is a Forest Plan that governs the areas. The U.S. Forest Service could change some  
19 of the provisions whenever the Land Management Plan is brought for revision. Mr. Fisher explained  
20 that a lot of people desired to have a higher level of protection. As it pertains to wildfires, there was  
21 a directive for adaptive management. That was particularly aimed toward climate change and  
22 managing those values in a way that might not be consistent with the Wilderness Act because it has  
23 such a high standard for preservation. However, he noted that it would allow tools that might not be  
24 as heavy-handed as commercial timber harvest and ski area expansion.  
25

26 Co-Chair Zalles asked Mr. Fisher about his other question, which had to do with an Environmental  
27 Impact Assessment. He visited the project website and was unable to find any of that information.  
28 Mr. Fisher would try to find the information for the Committee. He did not think an environmental  
29 analysis had been done but National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) work had been done. It  
30 might have been done as a categorical exclusion, with a less robust public engagement process than  
31 other projects. He reiterated that he would look into whether there was an assessment.  
32

33 Co-Chair Zalles believed the details were important because it is challenging to determine the Active  
34 Management Plan. It was a complicated matter as the age of trees, species of trees, the separation  
35 between trees, and other matters need to be considered. The environmental assessments outlined the  
36 rationale for the different decisions made. He felt that would be worthwhile to review.  
37

### 38 **PARLEY’S CANYON MINE EXPANSION**

#### 39 **3. Committee Members will Discuss the Parley’s Canyon Mine Expansion.**

40 Chair Boardman wondered what could be done in relation to the Parley’s Canyon mine expansion.  
41 Mr. Fisher reported that Salt Lake County has an ordinance that prohibits that use, so there was  
42 litigation taking place regarding the land use. The last thing he heard was that the schedule for  
43 litigation would go into 2025, assuming that there are no delays in resolving that dispute. The parties  
44 involved in that litigation are Salt Lake County and Tree Farm, LCC. Tree Farm, LLC owns the land.  
45 The operators of the gravel pit on the opposite side of the freeway might also be involved as there  
46  
47

1 were some instances of shared property ownership. Mr. Fisher offered to share the information that  
2 he had seen so far with Committee Members, which included the court filings.

3  
4 Mr. Fisher reported that the matter went through the Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining. There was  
5 conditional authorization received to operate the mine. The Air Quality Permit process concluded in  
6 the summer. The CWC passed a Resolution last month on the mine. Executive Director, Lindsey  
7 Nielsen, confirmed that a Resolution was passed and was communicated. Mr. Fisher shared  
8 additional information about the mine expansion. He noted that there had been a water dispute, but  
9 he believed that the case had been dismissed and the position of the city on the water was upheld by  
10 the court. It essentially affirmed that there was no water. That was important because the mitigation  
11 for dust was water. Mr. Vetter reported that across I-80, there is a small water source. An agreement  
12 was entered into with the city to use that water. That agreement was approaching expiration and Salt  
13 Lake City gave notice that it would expire. A lawsuit was filed. It was ultimately recognized that  
14 there was no case, so the case was dismissed, and the lease expired. He believed the idea was now to  
15 truck water in because Salt Lake City had made it clear that no Salt Lake City water would be used  
16 through a direct pipe. The proposal for trucking could lead to other challenges.

17  
18 Mr. Fisher noted that there was uncertainty about what the decision would be from the Utah Division  
19 of Air Quality but there could be a challenge to the decision. In terms of trucking in water, Save Our  
20 Canyons was concerned about the pollution. The organization felt that the source of pollution needs  
21 to accompany the permit. Millions of gallons of water per year would need to be trucked in to mitigate  
22 the impacts of the use on the site. A stream alteration was denied previously and some right-of-way  
23 issues with the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") needed to be considered. There were  
24 several issues associated with the project at the moment.

25  
26 There was discussion about the type of materials that will be mined. Co-Chair Zalles believed it was  
27 limestone. He wondered if other sites could be used as alternatives if there was a need to mine  
28 limestone. Mr. Fisher pointed out that limestone is fairly common. The concerns mainly had to do  
29 with the use being so close to an urbanized population. Limestone is not rare in Utah and there are  
30 other locations where it can be found. Co-Chair Zalles wondered if the intention was to utilize the  
31 materials from the mine in the area. He wanted to better understand how the products from the quarry  
32 would be used. Mr. Fisher had seen it suggested that the materials would be used locally. One of the  
33 arguments made was that trucks would not need to drive as far to deliver the materials to the final  
34 destination. However, he pointed out that there would be a lot of additional miles driven if trucks  
35 needed to be used to deliver water to mitigate the dust.

36  
37 The Committee discussed actionable items. Mr. Fisher believed this matter would be discussed at the  
38 Legislature. There was a failed attempt during the last session to effectively remove the ability of  
39 local governments to deal with gravel operations from a zoning perspective. An attempt to erode the  
40 Salt Lake County ordinance that prohibited the use was something that might be seen in the future.  
41 As far as the monitoring and mitigation of fugitive dust in the region, there was a lot more that could  
42 be done from a policy standpoint. The standard was that it should not exceed 20% opacity. The only  
43 way opacity was measured as far as the state standards were concerned was that a certified person  
44 needed to see the dust violation. He felt there had been an effort not to provide the Utah Division of  
45 Air Quality the tools needed to act as a regulatory entity in the State of Utah. It was noted that dust  
46 coming off of mining operations was not generally monitored in Utah. There were no direct air  
47 quality monitors, but there were general monitors that were in populated locations. Those monitors  
48 would pick up some of that dust but would also include dust from a variety of different sources.

1  
2 Mr. Fisher reported that a Researcher at the University of Utah had reached out to Save Our Canyons.  
3 He had been monitoring dust emissions in Parley’s Canyon as part of his research. Mr. Fisher noted  
4 that one of the disputes related to the air quality permit was that an average wind speed of nine miles  
5 per hour was used, but the average wind speed of the researcher was significantly higher than that.  
6 The fugitive dust rule did not kick in until 12 or 15 MPH. There were some discrepancies with the  
7 air quality permit but there were also some issues outside of the air quality. That area of Parley’s  
8 Canyon was a massive elk and moose migration corridor. It was the area of the canyon where the  
9 interstate had been shut down for the last several years to allow moose and elk to safely traverse the  
10 interstate. Increased activity there could be disruptive to the wildlife populations.

11  
12 Co-Chair Zalles believed those advocating for the mine had an uphill climb. It sounded like the water  
13 issue could seriously impact the project unless the legislature decided to take away rights from  
14 municipalities. It seemed there were some critical problems with what had been proposed. Mr. Fisher  
15 did not believe there would be much of an uphill battle, given the regulatory framework in the State  
16 of Utah. Ms. Curry asked if the current litigation was limited to only the larger parcel south of I-80.  
17 Several parcels are owned, so she wondered if this process was intended to set precedence for the  
18 other parcels. Mr. Fisher believed the litigation had to do with the parcel and likely not the entirety  
19 of their land holdings. He offered to double-check that. He also offered to share the complaint and  
20 the County response with Committee Members, as those items were public.

21  
22 Chair Boardman asked about an action item related to this issue. Mr. Fisher noted that Mayor  
23 Silvestrini, Mayor Mendenhall, and Laura Briefer were all focused on this matter. The Stakeholders  
24 Council could forward a recommendation to the CWC Board or provide some additional information  
25 for analysis in the future. However, he was not sure what there was to do at the current time.

26  
27 Co-Chair Zalles thought the lack of data on air quality was something that could be explored further.  
28 Additionally, there needs to be more clarity about the proposal to truck in water. There were  
29 limestone sites that have water nearby that might be more appropriate alternatives. It might be  
30 worthwhile to focus on the education component. Mr. Fisher noted that background information and  
31 research could be provided to the CWC Board. However, he pointed out that when legislation was  
32 moving at the capital, there only needed to be 24 hours’ notice before a bill was heard. Getting the  
33 Stakeholders Council to meet, make a recommendation, forward that to the CWC Board, and have  
34 the CWC Board weigh in within that kind of timeframe was not possible. That being said, it would  
35 be possible to forward information to the CWC Board for consideration as it becomes available.

## 36 37 **WASATCH AS POSSIBLE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA**

### 38 39 **4. Committee Members will Discuss the Wasatch as a Possible National Conservation Area.**

40  
41 Chair Boardman reported that the idea of the Wasatch as a possible National Conservation Area was  
42 one of the pillars of the Mountain Accord. She reviewed what was available on the CWC website  
43 and was still confused about why the bill never made it out of committee. It sounded like a lot of  
44 work went into the CWNCRA and then stopped. She asked for additional background information.

45  
46 Ms. Nielsen discussed the CWNCRA and stated that the bill that is currently on the CWC website is  
47 the seventh iteration of the CWNCRA. In 2016, it was introduced by the then-congressman, Jason  
48 Chaffetz, to the Natural Resources Committee. Committee Members were wary of an unwritten

1 compromise that the bill relied on for the many interest groups that were involved in the early version  
2 of the bill. In the original iteration, the bill included land exchanges between the Cottonwood Canyon  
3 ski resorts and the Forest Service. It also included wilderness offsets to accommodate the  
4 continuation of the multi-use quality of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Ms. Nielsen reported that the  
5 land exchanges were not in the latest version of the CWCNRA, and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail  
6 was taken care of outside of the CWCNRA in the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Advancement Act.

7  
8 A lot has changed since the beginning of the CWCNRA process. In 2021, the CWC Board elected to  
9 place the forward movement of the legislation on the backburner given the hesitancy from the federal  
10 delegation and the lack of official sign-off from the governor. The intention was to allow the state to  
11 figure out transportation issues in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Ms. Nielsen explained that there were  
12 still difficulties with the CWC finding a path forward. There needed to be sponsorship and then an  
13 introduction. However, the organization still had a desire to move the CWCNRA forward.

14  
15 During the last discussion about the CWCNRA, there were no major issues with the bill. Some major  
16 changes had been made before then, which included the removal of the land exchanges and the  
17 removal of the realignment of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The bill focused on the designation of  
18 the National Conservation Recreation Area for the study area that included Little Cottonwood  
19 Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Millcreek, and Parleys Corridor. That designation was the major  
20 hallmark of the bill and that still stood. Additional wilderness designations and additions to existing  
21 wilderness would still be part of the bill. She was available to answer Committee Member questions.

22  
23 Chair Boardman asked when the CWCNRA was last discussed with a congressional delegation.  
24 Ms. Nielsen reported that in 2020, there were serious conversations with John Curtis about sponsoring  
25 the bill, but the delegation was not excited about sponsoring bills when there was not a clear pathway  
26 to victory. As a result, there was some hesitation from Mr. Curtis. Co-Chair Zalles asked if there  
27 had been any designations of National Conservation Recreation Areas in the current Congress.  
28 Ms. Nielsen reported that there had been other National Conservation Recreation Areas in other  
29 places in the country. She was not sure whether there was anything in the current congress, but she  
30 did not believe so. Mr. Fisher explained that public lands bills in the last several years were done  
31 through large packages. For instance, the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Advancement Act was part of  
32 a package of public lands bills. He was not aware of anything that had moved ahead more recently.

33  
34 Mr. Fisher stated that the reason legislation had been put on hold was because of the UDOT Little  
35 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). UDOT authored a legal analysis of  
36 the legislation and asked whether the draft legislation would restrict new gondola construction, which  
37 the attorney confirmed. UDOT saw the language as a direct conflict with building a gondola, rather  
38 than advancing public transportation that served all users all year. Chair Boardman asked whether  
39 there was language written into the bill to state that the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”)  
40 could still be considered. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. There was always an option to include specific  
41 language in the bill that would allow for the inclusion of whatever was decided for transportation.  
42 There had been discussions with UDOT and that had been clearly communicated with them.

43  
44 Chair Boardman noted that there were 140 comments on the CWC website related to the CWCNRA  
45 and all of those were supportive. Mr. Fisher believed that the Environment Systems Committee could  
46 advance a Resolution to the Stakeholders Council requesting that the legislation be a priority of the  
47 CWC moving forward. It would advance a framework that would allow the transportation work to  
48 be done hand in hand with conservation. He noted that the current Forest Plan did not allow for transit

1 to happen at trailheads. If there was a desired future where visitors could take a bus to a hiking  
2 location, then the legislation was a necessity. It would advance a framework and create solutions that  
3 would protect the landscape. He reiterated that the Committee could forward a Resolution.  
4

5 Ms. Hahnenberger asked if there was a desire to add specificity. The Committee could ask that the  
6 CWNCRA be made a priority, but there could be specificity in terms of the desired actions. Co-Chair  
7 Zalles noted that there could be a mention of milestones. Mr. Fisher felt it was important that the  
8 CWC Board focus on making the legislation a reality. The bill needed to be positioned so it could be  
9 part of any moving package that would address some of the challenges within the Wasatch.  
10 Ms. Nielsen reported that there was a CWC Board Retreat scheduled in December 2023. At that time,  
11 Board Members would set priorities for 2024. If the Committee wanted to draft a letter, it would be  
12 possible to schedule a special meeting of the Environment Systems Committee. Committee Members  
13 could vote to approve that letter and advance it to the Stakeholders Council at that time. The  
14 Stakeholders Council could then discuss the matter at the Council Meeting at the end of November.  
15

16 There was support to work on a draft letter and hold a special meeting of the Committee. Mr. Fisher  
17 stated that he could start to work on the first draft of the letter and share that with Committee Members  
18 over the next week or so. Once circulated, the drafted language could be further refined.  
19

20 Ms. Curry explained that she had not had the opportunity to read the CWNCRA in full yet, but the  
21 idea sounded like something that the Environment Systems Committee would support. She suggested  
22 that the draft letter include support for the overall concept while still allowing there to be an  
23 opportunity to further wordsmith the bill if that was necessary. There was support for that approach.  
24

## 25 **WASATCH PROPERTY ACQUISITION**

### 26 27 **5. Committee Members will Discuss Potential Property Acquisition in the Wasatch for** 28 **Environmental Sustainment.** 29

30 Chair Boardman believed there had been discussions about potential property acquisition separate  
31 from the ski resort land exchanges. There had been trouble with that in terms of the value of the  
32 properties. For instance, instances when people wanted more for a property than it was worth.  
33 Mr. Fisher discussed land acquisition in the Wasatch. He explained that Salt Lake City had a  
34 dedicated fund for land acquisition, but there was not a lot of money set aside for land acquisition in  
35 general. There had been land acquisitions in the past, such as Bonanza Flat several years back. That  
36 was approximately 1,200 acres and it cost \$38 million. Park City had bonded for \$25 million of that  
37 and a coalition of organizations and governments found the remaining \$13 million needed.  
38

39 Mr. Fisher asked if the CWC had considered having a land acquisition fund. It would be nice to have  
40 funds available for that purpose, but he acknowledged that there were constraints to consider. He felt  
41 it would be beneficial to have available funds and to address some of the barriers around the  
42 acquisition of land. Entities like Friends of Alta, a land trust working with Utah Open Lands, might  
43 be able to provide some additional guidance. It might be worthwhile to invite those organizations, so  
44 it was possible to better understand the challenges associated with land acquisition.  
45

46 Co-Chair Zalles asked for additional information about the land trusts. Mr. Fisher reported that those  
47 land trusts were fairly successful organizations. Sometimes, one of the barriers was the issue of fair  
48 market value. John Knoblock reported that there were often willing sellers but there was not always

1 money to obtain the parcels for protection. He shared several examples of parcels that had sold  
2 recently. Mr. Knoblock felt it was critical to find out how to address the issue moving forward. It  
3 might be possible to obtain information about parcels for sale and then make a case to the state  
4 legislature. Mr. Fisher noted that before approaching the legislature for funding, it would be  
5 worthwhile to have a match for the funds. Additional information was shared about the land trusts.

6  
7 Ms. Nielsen reviewed information related to land acquisition. She explained that it was a specific  
8 deliverable outlined in the Mountain Accord for the CWC to investigate and carry through. The  
9 Millcreek Canyon Committee was actively aware of the properties that were for sale in that specific  
10 canyon. If the Environment Systems Committee was interested in looking further into land  
11 acquisitions, it would be beneficial to be aware of different properties and create a database. The  
12 parcels of land might move quickly at times, but often when parcels of land were priced at millions  
13 of dollars, there was a little bit more time to find the funding. A database would be helpful to better  
14 track land that was for sale from willing sellers in the study area. There were currently vacancies on  
15 the Stakeholders Council. It would be possible to invite leaders from the land trusts to join the  
16 Council. Some venues could be pursued as far as granting funds to the CWC for land acquisition or  
17 lobbying jurisdictions for funds for land acquisition. The CWC contributed a small amount of funding  
18 for the land acquisition that occurred at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon.

19  
20 Mr. Fisher was less interested in focusing on specific properties. He felt the Environment Systems  
21 Committee should work on a framework that helped to enable the realization of some of the land  
22 acquisitions. He felt that came down to having a pot of money that could be leveraged. This could  
23 include grants, fundraising efforts, or donations from member jurisdictions or the legislature. Co-  
24 Chair Zalles discussed a trust in California that was very successful. It had a long track record of  
25 buying and managing open land and turning it into trails and open space preserves. It might be worth  
26 looking into their success to determine how to bring some of those strategies to the Central Wasatch.

27  
28 It was noted that Utah Open Lands and other organizations were already focused on land acquisition  
29 work. The suggestion was made to reach out to those organizations to help address the existing  
30 barriers. Mr. Fisher thought that the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting should include  
31 a presentation from Utah Open Lands or Friends of Alta. It would be a good way to start the process.

## 32 **OTHER TOPICS**

### 33 **6. Committee Members will Identify Other Topics that May be of Interest to the** 34 **Committee.**

35  
36  
37  
38 Chair Boardman believed the Visitor Use Study would be a relevant discussion topic for the next  
39 Environment Systems Committee Meeting. She thought it was well done but was somewhat leery  
40 about the timing of the surveys conducted. It seemed like people were generally pleased with their  
41 experience and found that the crowds were not detrimental, but there were days in the mountains  
42 when the crowds were intense. She was curious about when the surveys were conducted. Mr. Fisher  
43 wondered what the desired outcome was. Chair Boardman believed suggestions could be made about  
44 data collection. For instance, it could be done during certain time frames for certain uses. Ms. Nielsen  
45 asked whether there was specific data Chair Boardman felt was missing from the Visitor Use Study.  
46 Chair Boardman believed there needed to be data on the week between Christmas and New Year's.  
47



1 Additional discussions were had about the Visitor Use Study. Mr. Fisher shared information about  
2 the National Visitor Use Monitoring Survey. It was possible to review past surveys back to 2007 to  
3 compare the differences. In 2015, Save Our Canyons did a Central Wasatch focused survey, because  
4 most of the surveys were done forest-wide. Chair Boardman thought the Visitor Use Study provided  
5 a lot of excellent information, but suggested that there be supplemental data added.

6  
7 Mr. Knoblock noted that he had sent an email to Ms. Nielsen previously to outline his concerns about  
8 the Visitor Use Study. For example, he had concerns about the percentage of resort skiers versus  
9 visitors. In Little Cottonwood Canyon, it stated that there were 65,000 skiers for the year, but that  
10 represented one week over the holidays. There were some quantitative data issues with that. There  
11 was data available from Ski Utah and the ski resorts that could be utilized. Another concern that he  
12 had related to the number of mountain bikes in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood  
13 Canyon that were estimated. The number shown was a small fraction of the true number. He felt  
14 some numbers had been underestimated and some corrections needed to be made to the data.

15  
16 Ms. Nielsen thought the first meeting of the Environment Systems Committee went well. She  
17 encouraged Committee Members to think about whether the intention was for the Committee to be a  
18 forum to discuss the environmental issues and projects happening within the study area or if there  
19 was a desire to look at specific initiatives that were environmentally focused. Alternatively, it would  
20 be possible to react to issues that Committee Members saw arise. Ms. Nielsen also encouraged  
21 Committee Members to think about how the environmental issues discussed by the Environment  
22 Systems Committee fit into the CWC's scope of work and how the CWC might be able to take action.

## 23 24 **ARRANGEMENT OF MEETING SCHEDULE**

### 25 26 **7. Committee Members will Decide on a Regular Meeting Schedule for Future** 27 **Environment Systems Committee Meetings.**

28  
29 Chair Boardman reported that the idea was to hold an Environment Systems Committee Meeting  
30 every other month. The meetings would take place in the opposite month of the Stakeholders Council  
31 Meetings. That meant the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting would take place between  
32 Christmas and New Year's. It was possible to shift that date and hold the meeting the following week.

33  
34 Mr. Fisher noted that anything the Committee wanted to be done prior to the CWC Board Retreat  
35 would need to be forwarded before that date. Once there was a better understanding of the CWC  
36 Board priorities, it would be possible to discuss how to support the advancement of those priorities.  
37 He suggested that there be an Environment Systems Committee Meeting in the first weeks of January.  
38 It would be ideal to hold another meeting in November in order to move items forward to the CWC  
39 ahead of the CWC Board Retreat. Ms. Nielsen reported that the December CWC Board Meeting and  
40 the CWC Board Retreat had been merged. Both of those would take place on the same date, which  
41 was December 15, 2023. Anything the Stakeholders Council wanted the CWC Board to consider  
42 would need to be submitted at least a week before then. She reported that there was a Stakeholders  
43 Council Meeting scheduled to take place at the end of November. Whatever the Environment  
44 Systems Committee wanted to forward to the Stakeholders Council could be discussed at that time.

45  
46 Ms. Nielsen suggested that the Environment Systems Committee schedule a supplemental meeting to  
47 review the draft letter. During that meeting, Committee Members could vote to advance that letter  
48 and then present that at the Stakeholders Council Meeting. It could then be reviewed by the CWC

1 Board during the CWC Board Retreat on December 15, 2023. For subsequent Environment Systems  
2 Committee Meetings, she noted that Stakeholders Council leadership intended for there to be  
3 subcommittee meetings held in the months between scheduled Stakeholders Council Meetings. There  
4 was a Stakeholders Council Meeting planned for January 2024. Following the supplemental meeting  
5 of the Environment Systems Committee, the next meeting would then be in February.  
6

7 There was discussion about when to hold the supplemental meeting of the Environment Systems  
8 Committee. It was determined that the meeting would take place on November 13, 2023, at 2:00 p.m.  
9 Co-Chair Zalles suggested that the following Environment Systems Committee Meeting take place  
10 early in February. Meetings could take place every other month starting in February, but there might  
11 be some instances where an additional meeting in between would be necessary.  
12

### 13 **CLOSING**

#### 14 15 **8. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment Systems Committee** 16 **Meeting.** 17

18 **MOTION:** Chair Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting.  
19 Carl Fisher seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
20

21 The meeting adjourned at 3:36 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*  
3 *Wednesday, October 25, 2023.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_