



8
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY,**
11 **JULY 9, 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 **Present:** Kelly Boardman, Chair
17 Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
18 Maura Hahnenberger
19 Adam Lenkowski
20 Jonny Vasic
21 Spencer Shaver
22 Brenden Catt
23 John Knoblock
24 Patrick Shea
25 John Adams
26

27 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
28

29 **OPENING**

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

33
34 Chair Kelly Boardman asked Co-Chair Dan Zalles to run the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”)
35 Stakeholders Council Environment Systems Committee Meeting. Co-Chair Zalles called the
36 Environment Systems Committee Meeting order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.
37

38 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that none of the CWC Youth Council Members were
39 able to attend the meeting. As a result, the CWC Youth Council discussion will occur at a later date.
40

41 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the June 11, 2024, Meeting.**

42
43 **MOTION:** Patrick Shea moved to APPROVE the June 11, 2024, Meeting Minutes. Adam
44 Lenkowski seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
45

1 **YOUTH COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

2

3 **1. The Committee will Engage with Members of the CWC Youth Council to Hear Their**

4 **Concerns about the Central Wasatch.**

5

6 No members of the CWC Youth Council were present, so the discussion was to take place at a later

7 date.

8

9 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD REVIEW**

10

11 **1. The Committee will Engage with Members of the CWC Youth Council to Gather**

12 **Feedback on the Environmental Dashboard.**

13

14 It was noted that no members of the CWC Youth Council were present at the meeting.

15

16 **2. The Committee will Choose a Data Set on the Environmental Dashboard to Review and**

17 **Develop a Set of Questions and Issues to Bring to Other CWC Groups.**

18

19 Co-Chair Zalles explained that the remainder of the Environment Systems Committee Meeting will

20 be focused on a review of one of the data sets on the Environmental Dashboard. The goal is to develop

21 a set of questions and issues that can be brought to other CWC subcommittees. Before that review,

22 Co-Chair Zalles reported that he drafted a survey that could be used to gather some preliminary data.

23 From there, it will be possible to do more focused questioning and obtain additional feedback about

24 the Environmental Dashboard. He offered to share the drafted survey language with the Committee.

25

26 Due to technical difficulties, it was determined that the drafted survey document will be shared at a

27 later time. Co-Chair Zalles explained that the idea is to determine priority topics and areas of interest.

28 There was a question on the survey about the user interface. For example, whether the terminology

29 and jargon are explained, whether the graphs and charts are clear and whether a notification system

30 would be beneficial. With the latter, it might be possible for users to select what notifications are

31 desired. The survey will also attempt to identify the background of the respondents. Understanding

32 who is using the Environmental Dashboard will be useful. The data can be examined before there is

33 an in-person discussion. The intention is to have more clarity about the users of the Environmental

34 Dashboard, what additional data is needed, and how the overall user experience is. Co-Chair Zalles

35 offered to send an email with the drafted survey document to the Committee following the meeting.

36

37 Patrick Shea thought the survey would be an excellent way to obtain information about who is using

38 the Environmental Dashboard. It might make sense to contact City, County, and State Planners and

39 ask them to review the Environmental Dashboard. The survey will provide information about users,

40 but it would also be valuable to hear directly from that particular group. Co-Chair Zalles reported

41 that there is a question included in the drafted survey that relates to this. The survey is designed to

42 be fairly straightforward and asks what the role of the respondent is, such as a government official,

43 representative, member of the public, and so on. The responses from each group can be identified.

44

45 Mr. Shea suggested that the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”) be asked to send the survey

46 out to their members. Ms. Nielsen liked the suggestion. Brenden Catt asked what software was used

47 to develop the survey. Co-Chair Zalles clarified that he created the questions in a Word document.

48 This is a draft version and the survey is not currently in an implementable format. Mr. Catt reported

1 that through Google Forms, there is an option to collaborate on surveys, so that might be something
2 to consider. Mr. Catt wanted to know whether the expectation was for the survey to be anonymous
3 or whether those surveyed would be given the opportunity to provide contact information. Co-Chair
4 Zalles believes it makes sense to assume anonymity and to allow for that. However, there could be
5 an option for respondents to include contact information if that is something they want to do.

6
7 Ms. Nielsen asked whether Committee Members have opinions about anonymity versus non-
8 anonymity. Mr. Shea believes that gathering as much information as possible is best. Allowing there
9 to be a choice for the respondent to leave information makes sense. Other Committee Members
10 agreed that it should be optional for respondents to include their contact information in the survey.
11 Discussions were had about how to finalize the survey and bring it to the Stakeholders Council. From
12 there, it can move forward to the CWC Board for consideration and possible approval.

13
14 Co-Chair Zalles noted that there is a Stakeholders Council Meeting scheduled for next week.
15 Theoretically, it is possible to finalize the survey draft ahead of that meeting. Edits and suggestions
16 can be made. If that process is too rushed, Co-Chair Zalles stated that it is also possible to finalize
17 the survey at the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting and then forward it to the
18 Stakeholders Council. Committee Members expressed concerns about the shorter timeline. Co-Chair
19 Zalles reported that the draft can be circulated and then discussions can take place at the next meeting.
20 Committee Members can agree on a final draft of the survey at the next Environment Systems
21 Committee Meeting and it will be presented to the Stakeholders Council at the September meeting.

22
23 Co-Chair Zalles asked to review the Environmental Dashboard. He referenced potential compatibility
24 issues on different browsers. Something the Committee might want to do is have a phone and iPad
25 available to ensure that the information can be navigated with ease on many different devices.

26
27 Ms. Nielsen reviewed what has been discussed by the Environment Systems Committee so far. There
28 was a suggestion made that there be a day when members of the public gather to review the
29 Environmental Dashboard in-person. Co-Chair Zalles confirmed this. Leading up to that in-person
30 gathering, there will be a survey conducted to have some data ahead of time. Co-Chair Zalles pointed
31 out that the survey will be electronic and can be administered to any number of people. After that, it
32 would be beneficial to have those face-to-face discussions about the Environmental Dashboard.

33
34 Ms. Nielsen suggested that a timeline be determined for what has been discussed. She reported that
35 there is a CWC Board Meeting scheduled in October and there is a Stakeholders Council Meeting
36 scheduled in September. Mr. Shea believes there will be better participation if an email is sent out
37 ahead of time. It could request a phone call or email conversation about the survey. One of the
38 perceptions he has is that there is not enough outside participation in these kinds of efforts. Co-Chair
39 Zalles believes it makes sense to couple that process with outreach to potential in-person participants.

40
41 Ms. Nielsen wanted to understand whether the Committee would handle outreach for the survey or if
42 that should be handled by CWC Staff. She explained that CWC Staff has a broad outreach system in
43 place. Co-Chair Zalles does not have a problem with CWC Staff handling the outreach portion.
44 Ms. Nielsen believes the contents of the survey are what the Committee should continue to focus on.

45
46 Adam Lenkowski suggested that the final question on the survey ask whether the respondent was
47 interested in learning more at a face-to-face meeting where the Environmental Dashboard will be
48 discussed in depth. If the answer is yes, then contact information can be provided. Discussions were

1 had about the most appropriate approach. Chair Boardman wanted to understand who the audience
2 for the survey would be. For example, if it would be only the CWC Board or if other users of the
3 Environmental Dashboard could also participate in the survey. Co-Chair Zalles believed it is
4 important for the CWC Board and Stakeholders Council to participate as well as other user groups.
5 He pointed out that there could be a link to the survey added directly to the Environmental Dashboard.
6

7 The Committee discussed the survey outreach. Co-Chair Zalles explained that it is possible for
8 anyone interested in taking the survey to do so. CWC Staff also has a broad contact list that can be
9 used to promote the survey. It was reiterated that there is no desire to limit who can take the survey.
10 Mr. Catt suggested prioritizing certain groups, whether that be the Stakeholders Council, CWC Board,
11 or policymakers. He believed it would be beneficial to have feedback that is specific to certain groups.
12 The survey may look different for the general public than it would for the Stakeholders Council, CWC
13 Board, or policymakers. Co-Chair Zalles noted that it may be possible for anyone to fill out the
14 survey. However, there can be certain groups targeted for those in-person discussions.
15

16 Ms. Nielsen reminded Committee Members that there is a Stakeholders Council Meeting scheduled
17 next week. The next meeting is scheduled to take place in September. The intention is to present the
18 survey to the Stakeholders Council in final form at the meeting in September. Co-Chair Zalles noted
19 that there are different steps involved in this process. The first is to make sure that Council Members
20 approve of the draft survey. The next step is for Council Members to fill out the survey. A follow-
21 up discussion can then take place with Council Members. The timeline was further discussed.
22

23 The Environmental Dashboard was reviewed. Co-Chair Zalles asked to look at the Air Quality and
24 Climate section. Something he noticed about this section is that there is up-to-date information on
25 the webcam portion for Salt Lake Valley, Deer Valley, and Snowbird. He wondered whether those
26 locations are always shown there. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. Co-Chair Zalles noted that there is
27 also an Air Quality Index included on that page. What he does not see here is a graph that shows the
28 air quality data changes over time. Ms. Nielsen showed him where that graph can be found.
29

30 John Adams shared comments about the air quality section. In winter, traffic is an issue. It would be
31 interesting to see what the particulate matter looks like in the canyon or at the mouth of the canyon
32 where the vehicles back up. The winter-time particulate matter tends to be more in the valley, which
33 is one of the reasons that people want to spend time in the canyons. Another item to consider is the
34 ozone. Mr. Adams wished there was better data on ozone and particulate matter from the mouth of
35 the canyons and into the canyons. It was noted that the coverage of air quality sensors in the Wasatch
36 Mountains is sparse. The particulate sensors are \$200 to \$300 and an ozone analyzer can be anywhere
37 from \$5,000 to \$30,000. There is a lot that goes into these instruments. Ozone is a concern in the
38 summer. If there is any amount of wildfire smoke present, there will be high ozone days.
39

40 Mr. Adams believes there is a conception that the mountains can be used to get away from pollution,
41 but with ozone, that is not so much the case. Understanding where the pollution comes from and
42 when it spikes would be useful. He noted that it is interesting to watch particulate matter during the
43 Fourth of July celebrations. There is an understanding that sensors are expensive and not always
44 available, but he stressed the importance of having this kind of data on the Environmental Dashboard.
45

46 Mr. Shea wondered whether it would be possible to ask the Utah Department of Transportation
47 ("UDOT") to purchase a sensor halfway up the canyon or in a particular location. Mr. Adams was

1 not certain. He believes that air quality is a priority for the State. Since the canyons are an important
2 part of the economy, there needs to be a realization that the data should be extended into those areas.
3

4 Mr. Shea asked if the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation, Canyon Guard, and Friends of Alta could
5 potentially contribute to the costs of a sensor. Chair Boardman believed it was something worth
6 asking. It was noted that there is a company that has a mobile lab. Essentially, it is possible to pay
7 for the truck with sensors to drive around and provide reports. The CWC could potentially find
8 funding to have a report done in the middle of summer when the traffic levels are high and in the
9 middle of winter when the traffic levels are high. Mr. Shea reported that the University of Utah ran
10 a valley-wide experiment for five years, where a truck drove across the valley and did some
11 monitoring. Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) also put some of that equipment on several buses and
12 tracks.
13

14 Mr. Catt discussed the electric buses that were outfitted with air quality monitors. He is not sure
15 whether those buses make their way into the canyons, but UTA has been receptive in the past. It
16 might be worth looking into this further. Mr. Catt shared a comment about the air quality section of
17 the Environmental Dashboard. It considers air quality, weather, and climate independent of one
18 another, but there are certain weather and climate-related factors that impact air quality. That might
19 be something that could be included under the air quality section moving forward. Chair Boardman
20 appreciates the comments that have been shared so far. Looking at the Environmental Dashboard
21 with a critical eye means it is possible to identify what is missing and what can be added.
22

23 The air quality tab was reviewed. There is a question in that section that asks what factors affect air
24 quality. It was noted that the answer to that question could be fleshed out further to include high
25 temperatures in the summer and certain circumstances in the winter. Co-Chair Zalles stated that
26 during the in-person gathering, there will be an opportunity for participants to comment on the text
27 as well as the breadth of data and interface. Maura Hahnenberger left a comment in the Zoom chat
28 box. It was a link to a map and a comment to state that the map includes data from air quality
29 monitors. Committee Members acknowledged that monitoring is taking place outside the canyons.
30

31 Co-Chair Zalles likes the idea of focusing on sensors further into the canyons. This would allow there
32 to be some comparison data. Ms. Nielsen shared the boundary map that illustrates where the data is
33 drawn from. The brown line is the CWC Administrative Boundary and the green line is the
34 Environmental Dashboard Boundary. This can be found on the About page on the Environmental
35 Dashboard. That page includes the history, timeline, map, data resources, FAQ, acknowledgments,
36 and contact information. Committee Members reviewed the data resources information. Several
37 members of the Environment Systems Committee were unaware that this information was included
38 on the Environmental Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles suggested making the information more obvious
39 to a casual user of the Environmental Dashboard. The data resources tab could be added to the top.
40

41 Ms. Nielsen reported that there was a discussion with the development team, CWC Staff, and CWC
42 Board about the boundary map. From a scientific perspective, it did not make sense to chop up the
43 data based on the jurisdictional political boundaries. She explained that the boundaries were largely
44 based on water availability as close to the jurisdictional boundary as possible. Discussions were had
45 about the map shared by Ms. Hahnenberger. It has all of the air quality information in one location,
46 but most of the data on there is not in the environmental boundary shown on the Environmental
47 Dashboard map. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that if the Environment Systems Committee believes the

1 boundary for data should be larger than it is currently, that is something that can be brought to the
2 attention of the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board for discussion and consideration.
3

4 When it comes to particulate matter, it is not always possible to base the information on visuals.
5 Actual data needs to be examined to determine what is happening in the area. Mr. Lenkowski agreed
6 with the earlier statement made by Mr. Adams that the mouths of the canyons are important.
7 Currently, the map indicates that data is not being pulled from those areas. Ms. Hahnenberger was
8 asked how far the data should extend. She explained that one of the challenges with air quality data
9 is that there is not a lot of data outside of the valley, even though there are air quality impacts within
10 the canyons. As for increasing air quality sensors in the canyons, there might be funding and
11 resources for low-cost sensors. She noted that the EPA-grade sensors are more expensive. When it
12 comes to the potential expansion of the boundary shown, she would prefer to see it go all the way
13 down to the Jordan River or to the Great Salt Lake. Co-Chair Zalles noted that this could be
14 achievable. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that expanding to other areas would extend past the CWC study
15 area.
16

17 Mr. Shea asked about a truck that drove east to west and north to south at least once a week to test air
18 quality. He wanted to know if this would achieve particulate matter data. Ms. Hahnenberger
19 explained that once a week would not be overly useful. It is beneficial to have a continuous
20 monitoring instrument available. Co-Chair Zalles thought a truck gathering data would allow for a
21 snapshot of the data. There are some sensors associated with the TRAX line on the light rail cars.
22

23 John Knoblock wanted to know if there is a reason the CWC would be concerned about the PM 2.5
24 concentration in the valley relative to the mountains and foothills. Mr. Shea believes it is important
25 to understand the decrease in concentration from where it originated in Salt Lake County to where it
26 is essentially being deposited in the Central Wasatch area. Mr. Knoblock shared information about
27 PM 2.5 with those present. Co-Chair Zalles noted that if there is more PM 2.5 in the Central Wasatch,
28 it would be useful to know whether it is originating from sources that can potentially be controlled or
29 lessened. This is especially true if the amount poses any risks to wildlife and vegetation.
30

31 A question was raised about whether the Environmental Dashboard will be tied to the goal of moving
32 forward with the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act ("CWNCR").
33 Having a continued growth model in the Central Wasatch could continue to degrade the air quality.
34 It was noted that it might tie into the broader purpose of protection that is outlined in the CWNCR.
35 Co-Chair Zalles thought that was a good argument and it highlighted the need to examine this data.
36

37 Mr. Knoblock explained that he used to be a professional air quality expert at one point in his career.
38 He guessed that the air travel and transit travel for recreation to the mountains is less than 1% of the
39 total PM 2.5 generation. He does not believe it would be impactful relative to all of the other impacts.
40 Additional information about PM 2.5 was shared. Co-Chair Zalles believes it is important to hear
41 from users of the Environmental Dashboard whether PM 2.5 is something that should be prioritized.
42 Mr. Knoblock stated that what is currently in the Environmental Dashboard about PM 2.5 is useful in
43 terms of providing general information, but the odds of having an impact on PM 2.5 are very low. It
44 was reiterated that there are only three sensors in the canyons and there are thousands in the valley.
45

46 Mr. Knoblock feels it would be best to focus on water quality and mining waste remediation. He
47 pointed out that air pollution is a significant problem in the valley and many are working on that.
48 Ultimately, the impact the CWC would have on that issue would be negligible versus something like

1 water quality and E. coli contamination in the streams. Discussions were had about the impacts of
2 personal vehicles on air quality. Mr. Knoblock reported that mountain traffic is a small percentage
3 of the impact relative to all of the traffic on I-15 and the other roads throughout the valley.

4
5 Chair Boardman explained that the reason the Environment Systems Committee is auditing the
6 Environmental Dashboard is to identify what data is currently available and what is relevant to the
7 decision-makers. That is what the survey proposed by Co-Chair Zalles has to do with. The
8 discussions had by the Committee are useful in terms of tackling the following questions:
9

- 10 • Is it relevant?
- 11 • Is it helpful?
- 12 • How can we make it better?

13
14 Mr. Knoblock stated that he is thinking about what issues the CWC can influence. He wants to focus
15 on areas where the data will make a difference. It is possible to make a difference in areas such as
16 vegetation, water, mining waste contamination, and so on. Making a difference in air quality is less
17 likely. He noted that the reason the Forest Service did not support the land exchanges was because
18 there was no desire to deal with land that potentially had mining waste contamination.

19
20 Ms. Nielsen further reviewed information on the Environmental Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles
21 suggested that additional information be included so there is more context provided. He believes the
22 question is to what extent the Environmental Dashboard provides adequate information in order for
23 users to draw conclusions. Providing raw information does not necessarily do much unless someone
24 is qualified to make conclusions. There are likely some examples where context can be provided.

25
26 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Mountain Accord mentioned monitoring impaired conditions in the
27 Central Wasatch. Ms. Nielsen explained that between the time the Mountain Accord process ended
28 and the CWC was formed, the contract for building the Environmental Dashboard was brought from
29 Colorado to the University of Utah. At that time, there was a reassessment of what was originally
30 envisioned. During the Mountain Accord, the proposal was a static paper report card. However, that
31 is not what the CWC Board decided to move forward with. The Environmental Dashboard is now an
32 online dynamic tool. If users of the Environmental Dashboard have decided that the original proposal
33 from the Mountain Accord is more in line with what is desired, that can be introduced to the
34 Stakeholders Council and then the CWC Board. That being said, it would be a significant request.
35 Mr. Knoblock noted that the idea is to make the Environmental Dashboard more useful over time.

36
37 **OTHER ITEMS**

38
39 Mr. Knoblock referenced the Wyssen Towers on Mount Superior and the UDOT categorical
40 exclusion. Mr. Lenkowski reported that he sent out an email prior to that announcement. It doesn't
41 seem like anything can be done about this. Mr. Knoblock noted that Spencer Shaver from Save Our
42 Canyons put out a call to action to those involved in the organizations. People are clearly thinking
43 about this matter and are looking into action. Mr. Knoblock felt it was curious that this was only
44 noticed through UDOT and not through the Forest Service project site. He offered to send a link to
45 CWC Staff and Committee Members for the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest website. This is
46 where the projects that include National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") reviews are listed.

1 Mr. Shaver confirmed that he did some follow-up with the Project Managers from UDOT. There was
2 some environmental review done by UDOT. An email was sent out about this matter recently. He
3 offered to forward that to anyone interested. The intention is to hold UDOT accountable and see
4 more extensive environmental reviews on future projects. Mr. Shaver stated that a cursory
5 environmental review was conducted and the conclusion was that the project would have no
6 significant public controversy. That is not something that he agrees with based on what he has heard.
7 Mr. Knoblock expressed concerns that this conclusion was reached given the public outcry about
8 visual impacts in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Additional discussions were had about the project.
9

10 Mr. Knoblock asked whether the CWC Board heard about the towers. Ms. Nielsen reported that the
11 CWC was not informed and there was no communication from UDOT to the CWC Board or CWC
12 Staff. However, she spoke to Mayor Roger Bourke and the Town of Alta is in favor of these towers.
13

14 Co-Chair Zalles reviewed some next steps for the Environment Systems Committee. Based on the
15 earlier discussion, it was determined that he will email the draft survey document to Committee
16 Members. Committee Members can review the document before a final draft is approved at the next
17 Environment Systems Committee Meeting in August. It will then be presented to the Stakeholders
18 Council ahead of the next meeting in September. The results will be shared with the Stakeholders
19 Council at the meeting in September and a discussion will take place. At that time, the Council will
20 provide feedback on the survey instrument itself. After that, it will be appropriate to move the survey
21 questions forward to the CWC Board for consideration and possible distribution.
22

23 Chair Boardman reported that the agenda items related to the CWC Youth Council will be added to
24 the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting agenda, as there is a desire to hear from Council
25 Members. Ms. Nielsen reported that the next meeting is scheduled to take place on August 13, 2024.
26

27 **CLOSING**
28

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

31 **MOTION:** Dan Zalles moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting. There
32 was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
33

34 The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.
35

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, July 9, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: _____