



8
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY,**
11 **MAY 14, 2024, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND**
12 **VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES**
13 **LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING. 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE,**
14 **330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

15
16 **Committee Members:** Kelly Boardman, Chair
17 Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
18 Adam Lenkowski
19 Jonny Vasic
20 Maura Hahnenberger
21 Brenden Catt

22
23 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
24 Samantha Killpack, Director of Operations

25
26 **OPENING**

27
28 1. **Chair Kelly Boardman will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Environment**
29 **Systems Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

30
31 Chair Kelly Boardman called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
32 Environment Systems Committee Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

33
34 2. **Review and Approval of the Minutes from the April 9, 2024, Meeting.**

35
36 **MOTION:** Dan Zalles moved to APPROVE the April 9, 2024, Meeting Minutes. _____ seconded
37 the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

38
39 **MEETING SCHEDULE DISCUSSION**

40
41 1. **Committee Members will Discuss Changing the Committee’s Meeting Time to Best**
42 **Accommodate Members’ Schedules.**

43
44 Chair Boardman explained that the Environment Systems Committee Meeting is held monthly. The
45 Committee has been meeting on Tuesdays so far, but the times have shifted to accommodate different
46 Committee Members. Since the last adjustment to the meeting time, some Committee Members have
47 left and some new Committee Members have joined. She wanted to know if all of the current
48 Committee Members are supportive of the existing meeting time.

1
2 It was noted that a poll was previously sent out. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, explained
3 that the reason the poll was sent out was to determine whether there was a time that would
4 accommodate all Environment Systems Committee Members. Megan Nelson has a difficult time
5 attending the meetings when they are held at this time. The poll indicated that other times work for
6 most people, but there does not appear to be a time that will accommodate all members.
7

8 Chair Boardman asked whether any of the Committee Members present struggled with the current
9 time. Based on the feedback received, the current meeting time is agreeable to those present. Ms.
10 Kilpack noted that the issue can be raised again in the future if there is a desire to further discuss the
11 meeting time. It was determined that the meeting time would remain the same for the next meeting.
12

13 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD REVIEW AND DISCUSSION**

14 15 **1. Committee Members will Discuss How to Fill in Data Gaps in the Human Element** 16 **Section of the Environmental Dashboard.** 17

18 Chair Boardman explained that the intention is to continue the discussion about data gaps in the
19 Human Element of the Environmental Dashboard. One of the broad goals of the Environment
20 Systems Committee is to look at the deliverables of the Mountain Accord. That includes the
21 Environmental Dashboard. Committee Members found that the Human Element section could be
22 more robust. After the discussion at the last meeting with Pheobe McNealy from the University of
23 Utah DIGIT Lab, there is more clarity about what will and will not work in the Human Element.
24

25 Chair Boardman expressed a desire to discuss the Google document. There were some standout
26 suggestions made, such as the inclusion of metrics. She explained that metrics would clarify whether
27 something is healthy for the environment or if there needs to be closer examination of the issue. It
28 was noted that Adam Lenkowski previously suggested an interpretive map on the Environmental
29 Dashboard. Mr. Lenkowski stressed the importance of being able to see information in one place.
30 There is excellent data on the Environmental Dashboard, but it can be difficult to locate it all and
31 understand what is available. Co-Chair Dan Zalles believed the idea was to highlight key information.
32

33 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, shared the Story Map for the Central Wasatch National
34 Conservation and Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”) Act. With each of the tabs, the details become
35 more granular. The introduction page was reviewed for reference. She wondered whether something
36 like that was what Mr. Lenkowski was envisioning for the Environmental Dashboard. This was
37 confirmed. Mr. Lenkowski explained that the information needs to be more user-friendly.
38 Ms. Nielsen further reviewed the Story Map and discussed the different layers of information
39 available.
40

41 Discussions were had about the tabs shown and whether those were built upon one another.
42 Ms. Nielsen clarified that the map has individual layers and those are not dependent on one another.
43 Brenden Catt thought it would be helpful to be able to build on the layers so it was possible to see
44 trail use information and vegetation data at the same time. Ms. Nielsen wondered whether the
45 requests being made had already been added to the Google document of suggestions. Chair Boardman
46 was not certain and asked that the document be sent out to Committee Members again. Ms. Nielsen
47 thought Ms. McNealy and her team would be amenable to the suggestion for a more user-friendly
48 map.

1
2 Chair Boardman reported that Maura Hahnenberger initially suggested defining metrics. She asked
3 her to speak more to what was envisioned there. Ms. Hahnenberger explained that she loves the
4 Environmental Dashboard because there is a lot of excellent data there. While there is a lot of
5 information available, there is no indication of whether the environmental goals are being met. She
6 acknowledged that implementation of that can be complex if there is not already an existing metric.
7 While this is something she feels the Environment Systems Committee should pursue, it might not be
8 possible to include metrics in everything available on the Environmental Dashboard.
9

10 Co-Chair Zalles noted that there could be some kind of metric to indicate whether conditions are
11 improving, staying the same, or getting worse. It would be nice to add something like that to the
12 Environmental Dashboard moving forward. The status at the time that the Mountain Accord was
13 written could act as a baseline. Chair Boardman believed what was being expressed by Committee
14 Members was a desire to clearly see what is degraded and what is improving. She reported that John
15 Knoblock previously suggested having degraded conditions data available on there as well. Other
16 metrics could be water quality and air quality. Ms. Nielsen shared some of the information that is
17 already available on the Environmental Dashboard. Chair Boardman noted that the existing data
18 could be presented on the home page with a map to explain whether streams are healthy, whether
19 water flow is sufficient, and so on. Looking at it on a weekly or monthly basis can add clarity to the
20 conditions.
21

22 Ms. Hahnenberger agreed that the interpretation of the data is not necessarily there. For someone
23 who understands the data and understands what it means, it is possible to make a determination.
24 However, for someone who does not necessarily know how to interpret the data, that can be more
25 difficult. Ms. Nielsen loved the suggestions that have been shared so far. She asked Committee
26 Members which data sets there is a desire to see on the home page of the Environmental Dashboard.
27 There is a lot of data available and it is important to determine what is most essential to highlight.
28

29 Ms. Nielsen provided background information on the Environmental Dashboard. She reported that
30 the idea came about during the Mountain Accord process. When it was originally contemplated, this
31 was designed to be a one-time static paper report. Over time, it became an online dynamic resource.
32 Originally, there was a suggestion to provide commentary on the functioning health of the
33 environmental elements. It was later decided by the CWC Board to move away from political
34 commentary or making comments about the health of the study area. Instead, the desire was to
35 provide data to the public so conclusions could be drawn independently. That being said if the
36 Environment Systems Committee wanted to return to the original idea, which was to make
37 commentary on water quality, air quality, soil health, and the flora and fauna, that can be presented.
38

39 Co-Chair Zalles asked for an example of something that would be viewed as political when it came
40 to the data. Ms. Nielsen explained that making assertions about the functioning health of anything
41 environmental can be considered political these days. She pointed out that air quality index
42 information is on the Environmental Dashboard and that data is managed by a third party. In the
43 absence of a quality index for other elements, like water or soil, the CWC would be the ones to make
44 that decision if there was a desire to add something similar to the Environmental Dashboard. She is
45 not certain the CWC is qualified to make those kinds of decisions or commentary. Additionally, she
46 does not know that the CWC Board would be supportive of adding that kind of commentary.
47

1 Co-Chair Zalles noted that stating, “water quality has become bad,” would be a political statement,
2 whereas “water quality is decreasing,” would not be political, since decreasing is merely an
3 observation of the data. Ms. Nielsen believed it is possible to add more context to the Environmental
4 Dashboard. For instance, when there is increased water supply shown, clarifying that it was the result
5 of different weather conditions. Context and history can be added to the Environmental Dashboard
6 when appropriate. Ms. Hahnenberger agreed that it is not appropriate for the CWC to make new
7 metrics, as that involves a lot of research and study. However, for some of the data that is on the
8 Environmental Dashboard, there are already metrics or comparisons that can be used.

9
10 Ms. Hahnenberger explained that using some of the existing metrics might be a good path forward.
11 Ms. Nielsen liked the suggestion. If the Environment Systems Committee wants to gather the metrics
12 that already exist and add them to the Google document, that can be presented to the University of
13 Utah team in the future. Chair Boardman noted that this is a broad suggestion for the Environmental
14 Dashboard, but a more specific area there is a desire to focus on is the Human Element. There have
15 been previous discussions about inviting Dr. Jordan Smith and others involved in the Environmental
16 Dashboard to build out that element. It is important to consider what the uses are and the impacts.

17
18 Chair Boardman noted that at the last Environment Systems Committee Meeting, there was a detailed
19 discussion about the number of vehicles entering the canyons at different times of year. There are
20 ways to take the existing data and do more with it. Co-Chair Zalles suggested looking at the accident
21 data for the canyons. Ms. Nielsen thought that was a really interesting suggestion and noted that it
22 could be added to the Human Element. She liked the idea of a safety-related component. Once the
23 proposals are finalized and fully conceptualized, these ideas can be presented to the CWC Board.

24
25 Chair Boardman asked for additional suggestions. Mr. Catt noted that at the last meeting, there was
26 a discussion about more passive uses. He thought that raised questions about the types of uses taking
27 place. When he was in Big Cottonwood Canyon this past weekend, he saw many people having a
28 meal outside of their vehicle. The human impact from that might be different than an individual
29 hiking, mountain biking, or rock climbing. The type of use is something to be considered in the data.

30
31 Chair Boardman pointed out that the data can be useful when looking at the Utah Department of
32 Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”)
33 phased approach. Ms. Nielsen asked Mr. Catt for more examples of passive uses. She liked the idea
34 of looking at use data but wanted some specificity about what there is a desire to see reflected in the
35 Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Catt explained that the uses he was referencing include picnicking at
36 a trailhead, pulling out a chair and drawing, taking photographs, birdwatching, and so on. Ms. Nielsen
37 shared information about the Visitor Use Study. The final report that was released in 2023 roughly
38 broke out use and activity in Little Cottonwood Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, and Millcreek
39 Canyon. She shared Page 8 of that report for the reference of those present. Mr. Catt thought it would
40 be beneficial to represent that information outside of the report and make it more interactive.

41
42 Ms. Nielsen suggested that all Committee Members read the final report from the Visitor Use Study
43 ahead of the next meeting. Any desires for clarifications can be expressed at that time. It is available
44 on the CWC website, but she offered to send out the document to Committee Members as well as the
45 Google document. Additional discussions were had about the information in the final report. Ms.
46 Nielsen noted that there is a lot of information in the report that could be added to the Human Element
47 in order to build that out further. She reiterated her support for the safety component proposed.

1 The vehicle emissions section of the Environmental Dashboard was shared. Ms. Nielsen explained
2 that the data shown was likely available and easy to amass into one place. If there is a desire to reflect
3 other sources of emissions in the canyons, that is a suggestion that can be added to the Google
4 document. There can be a discussion with the University of Utah team about that possibility.
5 Discussions were had about the vehicle emissions section and the information shown. Ms. Nielsen
6 noted that it is difficult to delineate where the emission is coming from. For instance, whether it is
7 from a vehicle or a fireplace. Mr. Lenkowski noted that the vehicle data is an interesting data set.
8 Chair Boardman thought it would be wonderful to visually see the number of vehicles in each of the
9 canyons over the last few decades. The information could be presented differently than it is currently.

10
11 Ms. Nielsen believed Committee Members wanted to conduct an audit of what is on the
12 Environmental Dashboard. It is possible to make notes and request changes and additions. That is
13 what the Committee started to do with the Google document, but that process can continue. Chair
14 Boardman asked about scheduling the Human Impacts Workshop. Ms. Nielsen reported that the goal
15 of the workshop is to express what there is a desire to see in the Human Element and determine how
16 to make that happen. The CWC is planning to host a Central Wasatch Symposium, which will be a
17 two-day conference-style event where there will be different breakout workshops. During the Central
18 Wasatch Symposium planning process, CWC Staff considered hosting a Human Impacts Workshop.
19 The symposium is scheduled to take place in January 2025. If that is not soon enough, there can be
20 a separate workshop hosted to discuss the Human Element. Committee Members thought summer
21 was a better time to host the workshop, as there was not a desire to wait until the new year for
22 discussions.

23
24 Mr. Lenkowski asked for additional information about the Central Wasatch Symposium. Ms. Nielsen
25 confirmed that it will be available for anyone interested in attending. She believed Committee
26 Members wanted the Human Impacts Workshop to happen ahead of the Central Wasatch Symposium,
27 which was confirmed. Co-Chair Zalles suggested that it take place in the fall instead. Chair
28 Boardman noted that she is away in September, so October was targeted as a possible time. Ms.
29 Nielsen reported that CWC Staff will create a rough outline and bring it to the next meeting. The
30 Human Impacts Workshop was an idea that came out of the Mountain Accord. The consensus from
31 the Environmental Dashboard Steering Committee at that time was to see the first version of the
32 Environmental Dashboard move forward. It was determined that the Human Element would be added
33 after the rest of the data was available. The goal of the workshop will be to define what there is a
34 desire to add and to determine the best way to make those additions happen.

35 **US FOREST SERVICE LANDS MAP**

36 **1. Co-Chair Zalles will Share with the Committee the Forest Service's Lands Map, which** 37 **Outlines Who Controls the Different Lands in the Central Wasatch.**

38
39 Co-Chair Zalles shared the U.S. Forest Service lands map that outlines who controls some of the
40 different lands in the Central Wasatch. There are different ways to zoom in on the data. It is possible
41 to roll over an area and receive metadata about that particular location. The metadata is entered by
42 people who have permission to enter it. This is a living tool that the Forest Service uses. Co-Chair
43 Zalles explained that some of the information is fairly straightforward while some are more complex.
44
45

46
47 Co-Chair Zalles pointed out the mineral rights option, where it is possible to find out where the
48 mineral rights are located. He reported that there is a legend on the map that can be used and there

1 are default layers that are selected. Co-Chair Zalles referenced the service ownership parcel data. He
2 explained that there are different categories listed there as well. However, there is some insider jargon
3 used, which means that not all of the information is clear to outsiders looking at the map. That being
4 said, this is an excellent tool to investigate and learn more about relevant areas of land.

5
6 The map was further reviewed. Co-Chair Zalles reported that it is possible to create bookmarks and
7 come back to certain sections. Chair Boardman asked that CWC Staff send out an email with the
8 Google document, the final report for the Visitor Use Study, and the link to the Forest Service lands
9 map. Ms. Nielsen asked whether Co-Chair Zalles wanted something like the Forest Service lands
10 map added to the Environmental Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles explained that he simply wanted to
11 alert Committee Members that this resource is available. It is a useful tool that can add clarity.

12
13 Co-Chair Zalles noted that the Forest Service lands map does not cover the BLM lands. He thought
14 it might be interesting to discuss remnant lands. His understanding of remnant lands is that they are
15 lands that no one wants. It would be worthwhile to have additional conversations about those.

16
17 Ms. Nielsen was impressed by the discussions had during the Environment Systems Committee
18 Meeting. A lot of ideas were shared and there is a clear path to move forward. Chair Boardman
19 explained that the general idea is to look at the main deliverables of the Mountain Accord and to
20 ensure that the Environmental Dashboard is useful for decision-making. As for the CWNCRA, based
21 on recent discussions, it seems the ski areas are most interested in ski area expansion, water for
22 snowmaking, and transportation. She stressed the idea of compromises that will benefit all involved.

23
24 Ms. Nielsen suggested that the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting agenda include a
25 section where the Committee can determine what items should be added to the next agenda.

26
27 Ahead of the next meeting, Committee Members will read the final report for the Visitor Use Study
28 and come back with thoughts, comments, questions, concerns, and ideas. Additionally, there is the
29 ongoing audit of the Environmental Dashboard, which is being tracked through the Google document.
30 Ms. Nielsen wondered whether it might be helpful to perform an audit of one or two pages at the next
31 meeting. She noted that the Committee also wanted to discuss what should be reflected on the home
32 page of the Environmental Dashboard. There is a lot of work that can be done during future meetings.

33 **OTHER ITEMS**

34
35
36 There were no other items discussed.

37 **CLOSING**

38 **1. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment Systems Committee** 39 **Meeting.**

40
41
42
43 **MOTION:** Dan Zalles moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting. Adam
44 Lenkowski seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

45
46 The meeting adjourned at 4:25 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 Tuesday,*
3 *May 14, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____