



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  
48

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2024, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS CWC OFFICES, LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE, 102, SALT LAKE CITY UTAH.**

**Committee Members:** Dan Zalles, Co-Chair  
Kirk Nichols  
Maura Hahnenberger  
Adam Lenkowski  
Catilin Curry  
Patrick Shea  
John Knoblock

**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.**

Co-Chair Dan Zalles 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 January 9, 2024, Meeting.**

The Environment Systems Committee Members briefly reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the meeting held on January 9, 2024. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, explained that the expectation is that the Meeting Minutes will be independently reviewed by Committee Members ahead of the meeting.

**MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to APPROVE the Minutes from the January 9, 2024, Environment Systems Committee Meeting. Maura Hahnenberger seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

**ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD IMPROVEMENTS DISCUSSION**

**1. Committee Members will Discuss Potential Changes to the Environmental Dashboard.**

1  
2 **2. The Committee will Draft a Memo Summarizing the Proposed Changes for the**  
3 **Stakeholders' Council.**  
4

5 Co-Chair Zalles reported that at the last Environment Systems Committee Meeting, there was a  
6 discussion about addressing gaps in the Environmental Dashboard. A Google document was created  
7 and the Committee Members were encouraged to contribute suggestions. Co-Chair Zalles noted that  
8 there were contributions from John Knoblock, Kelly Boardman, and Grace Tyler, which can be seen  
9 on the Google document. He asked the Committee Members to comment on the needs assessment  
10 contributions. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, noted that the link to the Google document  
11 is in the Zoom chat box and those present could take a few minutes to review the contributions.  
12

13 Mr. Knoblock noted that the original idea behind the Environmental Dashboard was to have a way to  
14 document and track the impaired conditions in the Central Wasatch. There is a lot of information in  
15 the Environmental Dashboard but it is not easy to look at it and see the key indicators. He believed  
16 the Environmental Dashboard should clearly outline the key environmental indicators for the Central  
17 Wasatch, as that will make it possible to track the conditions. Some example indicators are  
18 contaminated mining soils, forest health, and fire risks. Without tracking these types of indicators,  
19 he fears that the Environmental Dashboard will not guide decision-making, as initially envisioned.  
20

21 Caitlin Curry acknowledged that there is a lot of information in the Environmental Dashboard, but  
22 agreed with the comments shared by Mr. Knoblock. There needs to be a way to track certain items.  
23 She referenced the wildlife section and suggested that there be a comparison added that looks at the  
24 management objectives. Mr. Knoblock reported that Laura Briefer and Patrick Nelson from Salt Lake  
25 City Public Utilities are willing to look at what could be highlighted to best measure forest health.  
26

27 Co-Chair Zalles wondered how the Environment Systems Committee could take action to improve  
28 the Environmental Dashboard. He wanted to better understand the process moving forward.  
29 Ms. Nielsen first shared background information about the Environmental Dashboard. When it was  
30 first envisioned under the Mountain Accord, the idea was to create a one-time static paper report that  
31 resembled a report card. However, the technology changed significantly in that time and there was a  
32 shift away from the paper report. The Environmental Dashboard was now available online. As  
33 directed by the CWC Board, there is no commentary on the functioning health of the different  
34 environmental elements. The CWC Board opted to provide open access to the data in perpetuity for  
35 anyone interested. She did not anticipate that the CWC Board decision will change. That being said,  
36 there are items that can potentially be highlighted. For example, there are species where the existence  
37 or non-existence indicates whether an ecosystem is functioning or not functioning well. It is possible  
38 to point those out on the dashboard, but she does not believe there will be support for a report card.  
39

40 Kirk Nichols reported that indicator species indicate whether an ecosystem is functioning well. He  
41 suggested that the indicator species be highlighted in the Environmental Dashboard. Ms. Nielsen  
42 noted that the footer of each page on the Environmental Dashboard has a comment card. Normally,  
43 if there are a few suggestions for potential changes or additions, that is the most appropriate way to  
44 let the developers know. Since the Environment Systems Committee has compiled several comments  
45 on the Google document, it makes sense for her to forward those to the developer. Ms. Nielsen  
46 explained that she has regular conversations with the developers and can be the person to share the  
47 comments. The team will review them and can determine whether additions or changes are needed.  
48

1 Co-Chair Zalles had asked how to embark upon a data collection project if there is a desire to do so.  
2 Ms. Nielsen explained that data collection has been done before by the CWC. She suggested that the  
3 Visitor Use Study Committee recordings and Meeting Minutes be reviewed. The CWC Visitor Use  
4 Study originated as a Stakeholders Council subcommittee. The CWC Board ultimately put \$300,000  
5 of funding toward that project. Data collection projects can be done and have been done by the  
6 organization in the past. Ms. Nielsen suggested pooling the expertise of the Environment Systems  
7 Committee for a data collection project and preparing a compelling proposal. That can be brought to  
8 the Stakeholders Council for approval and would then be presented to the CWC Board. Ultimately,  
9 the CWC Board will decide whether the proposed data collection project will be funded.

10  
11 Co-Chair Zalles felt the human impacts and degradation issues need to be highlighted in the  
12 Environmental Dashboard. Before asking for funding for additional data collection, it was likely best  
13 to do a feasibility analysis to determine what is optimal and what is possible to achieve. Ms. Nielsen  
14 believed that relates to the proposed Human Impacts Workshop and asked to discuss that matter.

## 15 **DISCUSSION OF “HUMAN IMPACTS” WORKSHOP**

### 16 **1. Committee Members will Discuss a Potential “Human Impacts” Workshop to** 17 **Understand Human Use Patterns in the Central Wasatch.**

18  
19  
20  
21 Ms. Nielsen reported that a Human Impacts Workshop was always intended to occur. The idea was  
22 to have the Environmental Dashboard up and running before the human impacts became a focus.  
23 Now, there is space in the plan of work to focus on a Human Impacts Workshop without  
24 overwhelming CWC Staff. She explained that a Human Impacts Workshop will bring together people  
25 from the original Steering Committee and experts in the field to discuss what should be included in  
26 the human element and what can feasibly be displayed. Mr. Nichols shared some potential data  
27 collection ideas, such as the total user days in each canyon, the total number of vehicles, and a  
28 concentration index. It is possible to determine high, medium, and low concentration areas. He  
29 thought it was worthwhile to then look at different user types in the different concentration zones.

30  
31 Patrick Shea stated that he has spoken to Jim Ehleringer and Paul Brooks and they recommended that  
32 there be more input on water in the Environmental Dashboard. Specifically, more information about  
33 the groundwater and the quality of water to understand the points of pollution that occur throughout  
34 the canyon. The Division of Water Quality could be enlisted to put in that kind of monitoring device.  
35 Ms. Nielsen noted that Mr. Ehleringer will be part of any Human Impacts Workshop scheduled.

36  
37 Co-Chair Zalles thought the Environment Systems Committee should prepare an agenda for the  
38 Human Impacts Workshop. At the beginning of the meeting, he suggested laying out the Committee  
39 assessment of needs on a conceptual level. The experts present could share opinions on the feasibility.  
40 Mr. Shea reported that the new Granite Library has a meeting room with a capacity for approximately  
41 100 people. He suggested looking into that as a location for the workshop as it is possible to make a  
42 reservation for that room ahead of time. Ms. Kilpack thanked him for sharing that information.

43  
44 Co-Chair Zalles noted that in his review of the Environmental Dashboard, the following data was not  
45 included: changes in traffic (month by month and year by year), numbers of buses and circulation  
46 (month by month and year by year), and Forest Service information (item by item budget totals year  
47 by year). Chair Boardman previously pointed out other gaps: robust winter use data, trail degradation  
48 and bushwhacking data, and an emergency preparedness plan for ski areas. Mr. Knoblock mentioned

1 the health of the watershed, contaminated soils and historic mining activities, invasive weeds, safe  
2 passage for wildlife, and areas of the environment that are in a degraded condition. There are a lot of  
3 human element issues that can be explored within the Environmental Dashboard moving forward.

4  
5 Additional suggestions were shared to address data gaps. For example: vehicle counts per canyon,  
6 acres of invasive weeds, number of mine sites in need of mitigation, water quality and quantity of the  
7 major streams, measuring proactive wildfire mitigation needs, and counts of overflowing trailhead  
8 parking lots. Mr. Knoblock noted that many of the suggestions he had shared came from Section 3.16  
9 – Environmental Monitoring, Adaptive Management, and Restoration in the Mountain Accord:

- 10  
11 • The Environmental Dashboard is the basis for development of a landscape-level restoration  
12 and mitigation plan that addresses watershed protection, contaminated soils/historic mining  
13 activities, lands with invasive weeds, impaired streams, roadside mitigation/stabilization, safe  
14 passage for wildlife, and other areas of the environment that are in a degraded condition.

15  
16 Mr. Shea believed something Salt Lake County Public Health would be interested in, as well as Salt  
17 Lake City Public Utilities, was something BLM, Forest Service, and national parks do on a regular  
18 basis in crowded camping areas, which is to see what human pathogens coming from excrement are  
19 found in the stream. That can identify areas of heavy use and misuse. Ms. Nielsen noted that water  
20 disturbances are already included in the Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Shea explained that the  
21 intention was to better understand how many people were failing to use the provided restrooms.

22  
23 Co-Chair Zalles believed the Environment Systems Committee should create a bullet point list of  
24 missing data. When the Human Impacts Workshop occurs, it will be possible to share that list with  
25 the attendees and explain that the items came from the Mountain Accord and the Committee needs  
26 assessment. Putting together the list is one action item for the Committee. Another action item is to  
27 organize the Human Impacts Workshop and schedule the event. Ms. Nielsen suggested that the  
28 Environment Systems Committee work on the bullet point list during the remaining meeting time.  
29 The next Environment Systems Committee Meeting can be used as a planning meeting for the  
30 workshop. The CWC can host the workshop as early as May but also later in the year if desired.

31  
32 Co-Chair Zalles asked what approvals are needed to move ahead with the Human Impacts Workshop.  
33 He wanted to know if there must be approval from the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. Ms.  
34 Nielsen stated that she could mention this matter to the Chair of the CWC Board during their next  
35 discussion, but she believed only CWC Staff approval is needed for the Human Impacts Workshop.

36  
37 It was determined that the remainder of the meeting will be spent brainstorming a list of bullet points.  
38 Ms. Kilpack offered to write out the list for the Committee. Co-Chair Zalles referenced the items  
39 mentioned in the Google document and asked that some of those suggestions be included. He noted  
40 that Chair Boardman had mentioned robust winter use data. Co-Chair Zalles believed the suggestion  
41 about an emergency preparedness plan should not be included in the list, though it is an interesting  
42 idea. The earlier suggestions from Mr. Knoblock were reviewed and added to the list. Co-Chair  
43 Zalles suggested a bullet point to reference degraded condition data. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that  
44 some data was included in the Environmental Dashboard already. It would be worthwhile to have a  
45 summary of the important data items already included in the Environmental Dashboard.

46  
47 Co-Chair Zalles asked that the human element information currently on the Environmental Dashboard  
48 be reviewed. Ms. Nielsen noted that the data collected through the trails component of the Visitor

1 Use Study included all the human elements. However, the intention is to build upon this. Mr.  
2 Knoblock asked about traffic count data, such as how many vehicles were in the canyons. If that was  
3 already in the air quality data, it should be included in the human element as well, as it was related.  
4

5 There was discussion about data that would be better listed under the human element of the  
6 Environmental Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles agreed that the traffic data should be included in the  
7 human element. Ms. Nielsen noted that it would be fairly easy to move that data to the section.  
8 Committee Members talked about some of the existing data included in the Environmental  
9 Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles suggested that more complicated data sets include an explanation to  
10 better illustrate what each individual data point represents. An example data set was reviewed.  
11

12 Mr. Nichols asked to review the trail use data in the human element. An area where additional data  
13 is needed relates to where the trails are taking people and what is happening in those spaces. It is  
14 important to think about the conditions by area. Co-Chair Zalles wondered whether conditions by  
15 area meant looking at all of the trails in one particular area. Mr. Nichols explained that it is necessary  
16 to subdivide into areas that are most sensitive and areas that have the highest concentration of use.  
17 He offered to submit a list of specific indicators to look at and pointed out that vegetation loss and  
18 soil damage were not looked at when previous data was collected. Based on that feedback, Co-Chair  
19 Zalles asked that soil loss and vegetation loss be added to the bullet point list currently being drafted.  
20

21 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Forest Service will release the draft version of the Tri-Canyon Trails  
22 Master Plan in a few weeks. He believed the report would highlight high alpine lake degradation and  
23 possible solutions. Mr. Nichols was pleased to hear that and looked forward to the master plan.  
24

25 Ahead of the next meeting, Co-Chair Zalles suggested that the bullet point list be refined. He  
26 wondered whether a Committee Member was willing to take on that technical task and then share it  
27 with the Environment Systems Committee before the next meeting. It is possible to approve the list  
28 at the next meeting. From there, the Committee can plan for the Human Impacts Workshop. Ms.  
29 Kilpack noted that any interested Committee Members could choose to refine the bullet point list.  
30 Otherwise, she offered to streamline it and send out the link to the new Google document for review.  
31

32 Maura Hahnenberger explained that she brainstormed some data sets relevant to the human element  
33 that might already exist. That list of ideas was added to the existing Google document. Mr. Knoblock  
34 asked whether there have been discussions with the Forest Service about the data they use to monitor  
35 forest health. Ms. Nielsen denied this. She offered to reach out and ask the Forest Service but was  
36 not certain that an answer would be provided. Co-Chair Zalles noted that it might be possible to  
37 obtain that information by looking at their Environmental Impact reports for wildfire mitigation  
38 projects in Parleys Canyon and Millcreek Canyon. He believed the data used would be referenced in  
39 those reports as well as some information about how their conclusions were reached.  
40

41 The next Environment Systems Committee Meeting is scheduled for March 12, 2024, at 3:00 p.m.  
42 Ms. Kilpack asked Committee Members to fill out the housekeeping documents that were sent out  
43 recently. She offered to bring physical copies to the next Stakeholders Council Meeting as well. Ms.  
44 Nielsen explained that there is an audit each year and there is a requirement for the documents to be  
45 signed as part of that audit. She stressed the importance of submitting the signed documents.  
46

47 Co-Chair Zalles asked if there were any other items Committee Members would like to discuss. As  
48 for the task of obtaining private parcels, he believed a separate subcommittee needs to be developed.

1 At the next Stakeholders Council Meeting, he thought it would be appropriate to propose that a new  
2 subcommittee be formed to focus on private parcels. Ms. Nielsen thought it made more sense to have  
3 those types of discussions at the Environment Systems Committee instead. She did not want to spread  
4 out Stakeholders Council Members too thin. After the Human Impacts Workshop, that work can be  
5 the next area of focus. Whenever private parcels are on the agenda for discussion at the Environment  
6 Systems Committee level, she suggested inviting members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee.  
7 Those Committee Members have put a lot of time and effort into thinking about what the CWC can  
8 do in terms of land acquisition. Co-Chair Zalles thanked her for providing that guidance.  
9

10 Mr. Knoblock noted that he had posed a question to Ms. Nielsen earlier that day about the Central  
11 Wasatch National Recreation and Conservation Area Act (“CWNCRA”). He was informed that there  
12 is a page on the CWC website related to the CWNCRA with a lot of useful information about the  
13 origins, the current status, and what the CWNCRA could ultimately do. He wondered whether it was  
14 possible to specifically answer the question: “Why is the CWNCRA important?” It is necessary for  
15 others to clearly understand why it is important and why the organization wants this moved forward.  
16 Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the requested information can be added to the website for clarity.  
17

## 18 **CLOSING**

### 20 **1. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment Systems Committee** 21 **Meeting.**

23 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting.  
24 There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
25

26 The meeting adjourned at 4:22 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 *February 13, 2024.*  
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes  
7 T Forbes Group  
8 Minutes Secretary  
9

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