



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

Committee Members: Kelly Boardman, Chair
Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
Meaghan McKasy
Jonny Vasic
Brenden Catt
Adam Lenkowski
Maura Hahnenberger
Spencer Shaver

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.

Chair Kelly Boardman 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 August 13, 2024, Meeting.

MOTION: Dan Zalles moved to APPROVE the August 13, 2024, Meeting Minutes. Spencer Shaver seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY

1. The Committee will Consider the Feedback from Stakeholders on the Environmental Dashboard Survey and Finalize the Survey for Distribution.

Chair Boardman shared information about the Environmental Dashboard survey. The survey has already been distributed to the Stakeholders Council for feedback. She asked for details about the feedback received so far. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, noted that she has received

1 feedback from Mike Marker via email, who felt the Environmental Dashboard should be more
2 interpretive and should provide more analysis on the actual health of the resource. Chair Boardman
3 noted that there is some difficulty reconciling the initial purpose of the Environmental Dashboard, as
4 stated in the Mountain Accord, with political correctness about the way information is presented.

5
6 Chair Boardman reminded Committee Members that the Mountain Accord envisioned the
7 Environmental Dashboard as something that looks at deteriorated conditions. She wondered how to
8 present the information in a way that meets the objective without being biased. Executive Director,
9 Lindsey Nielsen, pointed out that commentary on the functioning health of the resource can be
10 subjective. However, there are some ways based on science, such as the presence of certain indicator
11 species. That data is objective rather than subjective. She shared the history of the Environmental
12 Dashboard. The CWC Board wanted something slightly different than what was originally written
13 into the Mountain Accord. The current version of the Environmental Dashboard came out of direction
14 from the CWC Board. If there is a desire to see commentary included in the Environmental
15 Dashboard, a formal request needs to be forwarded to the CWC Board from the Stakeholders Council.
16 In the event, the CWC Board chose to accommodate a request to have more commentary data on the
17 Environmental Dashboard, that would involve approaching the team at the University of Utah.

18
19 Co-Chair Dan Zalles shared comments about the interpretation of data. He presented an example
20 scenario where a substance in the water was increasing. The Environmental Dashboard does not
21 necessarily need to state whether the trend is good or bad, but it could state that the substance in the
22 water has increased. In the data dictionary, it could explain that the chemical is considered toxic for
23 drinking. It is possible to share information and allow the visitors to determine what the data means.

24
25 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Environmental Dashboard shows the fluctuation in the existence of E.
26 coli. Based on the comments shared, she believes there is a desire to see some sort of narrative. Co-
27 Chair Zalles believed a narrative would be useful when it comes to the interpretation of the data. For
28 example, a narrative could state that the graph shows there is an increase in E. coli between 2000 and
29 2020. Ms. Nielsen asked if the Committee wanted to see more explanation, which was confirmed.

30
31 Chair Boardman noted that based on the feedback received so far, it seems that many want to see
32 some qualitative element added to the Environmental Dashboard. She asked for additional feedback
33 about the Environmental Dashboard survey from those present. For example, if there is something
34 missing from the survey or if there are questions that are unnecessary. Meaghan McKasy pointed out
35 that feedback was received from a CWC Youth Council Member, who noticed an issue with one of
36 the questions. It was stated that the issue was fixed before it was sent out further.

37
38 Ms. Kilpack reported that an email was received from John Knoblock about the Environmental
39 Dashboard. In that email, he suggested moving vehicle counts from the Air Quality section to the
40 Human Element. There was also some additional email discussion. Chair Boardman explained that
41 she cut and pasted the suggestion into the existing document to make sure the idea was not
42 overlooked.

43
44 There was discussion about whether or not the Environmental Dashboard survey would be
45 anonymous. Chair Boardman stated that the survey will be anonymous, but there will be an option
46 to leave contact information. Ms. Kilpack confirmed this and explained that at the end of the survey,
47 it states that those interested in being contacted or identified can leave their name and email address
48 at the bottom. Ms. Kilpack reported that seven survey responses have been received so far and three

1 of those responses included contact information. The other four surveys were submitted
2 anonymously.

3
4 Ms. McKasy pointed out that it is possible to rephrase the final question. Currently, it asks survey
5 respondents to leave their contact information if there is an agreement to follow up. She explained
6 that it is possible to rephrase that to state that those open to being contacted can leave their email
7 address. The language can be tweaked slightly to emphasize that leaving personal information is
8 optional.

9
10 Jonny Vasic shared a comment about survey language that referenced a private citizen. It would
11 likely be more inclusive to reference a private resident instead. There was support for that adjustment.
12 There was additional discussion about the final question language. Ms. McKasy reported that it
13 currently asks respondents to leave their contact information if there is agreement to follow up.
14 Instead of that, the language could state: "If you are open to being contacted by the CWC, please
15 leave your contact information." Co-Chair Zalles noted that respondents might wonder why the CWC
16 is considering contacting survey respondents. Some explanation might need to be added. He wanted
17 to better understand why the organization would be interested in contacting someone not affiliated
18 with the CWC. If there is not a solid answer, then it might be best to remove that question entirely.

19
20 It was noted that the original purpose of the contact information question was to reach out and further
21 understand the substance of the feedback received through the survey. The suggestion was made to
22 have the language state: "If you are open to being contacted by the CWC regarding improving
23 publicly available resources, please leave your name and email address below." Co-Chair Zalles
24 shared an additional amendment to the language to read: "If you are open to being contacted by the
25 CWC with requests for more feedback from you, please leave your name and email address below."
26 Chair Boardman explained that one reason for collecting the information was to have a better idea of
27 the audience, who is utilizing the Environmental Dashboard, and why the resource is being selected.

28
29 A question was asked about whether contact information could be used to add respondents to the
30 CWC mailing list. Ms. Nielsen explained that she would prefer respondents to opt into the mailing
31 list on their own. She does not want to add anyone to the CWC mailing list without their express
32 consent. Co-Chair Zalles shared another suggestion for the language: "If you are open to being
33 contacted by the CWC for more feedback, please leave your name and email address." There was
34 support for that. Ms. Kilpack pointed out that it is possible to add a link to the CWC website so those
35 interested can sign up for the mailing list after the Environmental Dashboard survey is completed.

36
37 Ms. Nielsen asked for details about the Environmental Dashboard survey distribution. She noted that
38 it can be sent out through the CWC newsletter, but if that is the approach taken, it may be redundant
39 to add a link to the CWC website to join the mailing list. Ms. Kilpack explained that the outreach
40 channels have not been fully discussed outside of sending them out to the Stakeholders Council and
41 CWC Board. It is also possible to mention it in the CWC newsletter and on the CWC website. Chair
42 Boardman wondered whether there is something in place to prevent an individual from responding to
43 the survey more than once. Ms. Nielsen reported that Google Forms makes it possible to place limits.

44
45 Information about the outreach channels was shared. Ms. Nielsen informed those present that there
46 are CWC social media accounts as well as the In The Wasatch podcast. Additionally, there is the
47 CWC newsletter and website. She reported that there is also communication with the jurisdictional
48 communication managers. The organization has a wide reach. Mr. Vasic believed the individual

1 groups that members are associated with might be willing to send out the survey as well. He pointed
2 out that someone who has not spent a lot of time on the Environmental Dashboard will likely have
3 different survey responses than someone who has used the Environmental Dashboard more often.

4
5 Ms. Kilpack asked if there is a desire to add more specificity to the question about how often someone
6 has used the Environmental Dashboard. It was noted that the options could include: more than once,
7 more than three times, and so on. The intention is to determine whether someone is a frequent user
8 of the Environmental Dashboard or not. Ms. McKasy stated that there could be a question related to
9 the level of engagement. Co-Chair Zalles suggested that the options include: Yes (Very Briefly), Yes
10 (Briefly), Yes (Often), and Yes (Extensively). Ms. McKasy understands wanting to know the
11 difference between those who have used the Environmental Dashboard briefly versus often, but
12 beyond that, it might not be necessary to break down the use level as much. It was next suggested
13 that the question related to Environmental Dashboard use include the following choices: No, Yes
14 (First Time), and Yes (Prior to Taking The Survey). The Committee further clarified the options.

15
16 Ms. Kilpack shared the edited version of the Environmental Dashboard survey with the Committee.

17
18 **2. The Committee will Discuss How to Best Organize the Feedback on the Environmental**
19 **Dashboard Gathered Through the Survey, as well as the Committee's Own Suggestions,**
20 **for Presentation to the Central Wasatch Commission and the DIGIT Lab.**

21
22 Chair Boardman explained that the Environment Systems Committee will now discuss how to
23 organize the information received from the survey. Co-Chair Zalles noted that once the results are
24 received, the Committee can start to break down the data. For instance, the Committee can look at
25 the different answers received and compare those answers to the level of Environmental Dashboard
26 use. The data can also be broken down to determine whether there are differences based on the user
27 group, such as private residents, CWC Board Members, and Stakeholders Council Members.

28
29 Ms. McKasy confirmed that since scale questions were added, it is possible to look at certain
30 differences. Once the survey results are received, she will be able to look into the data further. Co-
31 Chair Zalles explained that it might be possible to examine the different ways audiences respond to
32 certain questions. Chair Boardman asked that the Committee take time to review the survey
33 questions. It was noted that the CWC Youth Council should be added as an option on the survey.

34
35 The Environment Systems Committee continued to review the survey questions. It was stated that
36 there can be age range options included on the survey. Chair Boardman asked what would result in
37 the best information. She pointed out that it might be interesting to see what younger respondents
38 think versus those who have lived in the Central Wasatch for decades. Ms. Nielsen thought it made
39 sense to include various age ranges for respondents to select from. For example, providing options
40 for respondents who are under 18, 18 to 24, and so on. Ms. McKasy noted that after age 24, it makes
41 sense to have 10-year age ranges. Additionally, there can be a 65 and older option. It was clarified
42 that none of the questions on the Environmental Dashboard survey are required questions. Ms.
43 McKasy suggested that the first survey question be required due to the question block filter.

44
45 Co-Chair Zalles made note of the repetition in some of the questions. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that
46 repetition in the survey might be beneficial. Adam Lenkowski stated that it would be interesting to
47 see the breakdown in respondent ages and how the answers differ. There was discussions about which
48 questions should be mandatory. Some minor adjustments were made to add "Select All That Apply"

1 to some of the survey questions. Co-Chair Zalles suggested that one of the questions be edited to
2 state: “Which of the following purposes would characterize your motivation for visiting the
3 Environmental Dashboard?” That small adjustment to the language will cover more respondents.
4 Ms. McKasy pointed out that those viewing that particular question will have visited the
5 Environmental Dashboard already. Changing the question to be more theoretical will alter the data.

6
7 Chair Boardman believes the intention of the Environmental Dashboard survey is to look at the results
8 and consider them in future discussions. The Committee wants to know if the Environmental
9 Dashboard is providing the data and resources desired by those who are currently using or are
10 interested in using the Environmental Dashboard. Ms. Nielsen believed that since this is the goal of
11 the Committee, survey respondents should be asked what they would do on the Environmental
12 Dashboard rather than what they have already done. As a result, broader language might be best.

13
14 There as discussion about whether to add an “Other” option to some of the questions. Co-Chair Zalles
15 expressed concerns about survey respondents who have only looked at the Environmental Dashboard
16 briefly before they fill out the survey. He wondered whether a respondent was able to pause the
17 survey, further review the Environmental Dashboard, and then come back to finish the survey. Ms.
18 Nielsen believes the respondent would need to start the survey over in that scenario. Ms. Kilpack
19 noted that with Google Forms, the survey progress is saved if the individual is signed into Google.

20
21 Ms. McKasy asked if anyone had viewed the survey on their phone. Chair Boardman confirmed that
22 she has and saw no format issues. The Committee continued to review the survey questions. It was
23 clarified that notifications would be through email whereas announcements would be shared on the
24 Environmental Dashboard itself. Ms. Kilpack believed the language could be clarified further. Co-
25 Chair Zalles suggested a specific reference be made to notifications via email or text.

26
27 Ms. Kilpack pointed out a reference to “vegetation communities” and a later reference to “animals
28 and plants.” She wondered whether the difference between the two was clear enough. Co-Chair
29 Zalles explained that those are statements related to what is on the Environmental Dashboard already.
30 Ms. McKasy reported that after all surveys have been completed, it will be possible for the Committee
31 to look at consistent themes that emerge from the data. Chair Boardman reminded those present that
32 Ms. McKasy has offered to help sort through the data once the survey responses are received.

33
34 **3. The Committee will Discuss Dividing the Topics from the Environmental Dashboard**
35 **Among Subject Matter Experts on the Committee for Detailed Review and Feedback on**
36 **the Quality, Quantity, and Presentation of the Data.**
37

38 Chair Boardman referenced a Google Document that was created previously. It includes Committee
39 Member feedback about the Environmental Dashboard. There is a desire to build on the document
40 and share additional comments. She encouraged Committee Members to continue to contribute.
41 Chair Boardman asked if there are any members of the Environment Systems Committee willing to
42 focus on one of the areas on the Environmental Dashboard. The idea is to review a specific section
43 and look at it closely. Some feedback can then be provided to the full Committee at a future meeting.

44
45 Co-Chair Zalles asked if there is anything on the Environmental Dashboard currently to designate
46 where the private lands are and where the public lands are. Ms. Nielsen wondered whether there was
47 a desire to see a map that included that information. That was confirmed. The Environmental
48 Dashboard was shared with those present. Ms. Nielsen offered to look for the location of that data.

1
2 Chair Boardman stated that she has been thinking about the Human Element build-out. There has
3 been discussion at several other Systems Committees about this as well. The Human Element section
4 of the Environmental Dashboard is an area that represents all four of the systems identified in the
5 Mountain Accord process: environment, transportation, economy, and recreation. The Human
6 Element makes it possible to illustrate how all of the different systems work together. Chair
7 Boardman pointed out that there is a Visitor Use Study. However, the study does not provide an
8 accurate representation of the total users in the Central Wasatch or the associated impacts.
9

10 Ms. Nielsen informed the Committee that the parcel map of ownership is not included on the
11 Environmental Dashboard. This is something that could be added to illustrate where the public lands
12 and private lands are located. As for any requests for additional information, formal requests can be
13 forwarded to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. Chair Boardman does not see a way to
14 accurately represent the Human Element without understanding who is visiting the study area.
15

16 The Committee discussed the timeline moving forward. Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a
17 Stakeholders Council Meeting on September 18, 2024. That agenda has not been posted yet, so it is
18 possible to add this item to the meeting agenda if there is a desire to make a presentation. There is a
19 CWC Board Meeting scheduled for October 7, 2024. If there is not enough time between the two
20 meetings, the next chance to address the CWC Board about the survey would be in December. Chair
21 Boardman asked if it would make sense to present the Environmental Dashboard survey to the
22 Stakeholders Council at the next meeting and have discussions at that time. This was confirmed.
23

24 Co-Chair Zalles believes there is enough time between the next Stakeholders Council Meeting and
25 the CWC Board Meeting to look at the survey results. It might be possible for Stakeholders Council
26 leadership to report some of the survey data to the CWC Board in October. Ms. Nielsen confirmed
27 that the discussion item will be added to the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda on September 18,
28 2024. Environment Systems Committee leadership will make a presentation. During the
29 Stakeholders Council updates, which are normally shared during the CWC Board Meeting,
30 information about the survey can be presented. CWC Board Members will be encouraged to take the
31 survey. Between October 7, 2024, CWC Board Meeting and the CWC Board Meeting scheduled in
32 December, public outreach will occur and the survey data will be compiled. At the CWC Board
33 Meeting in December, time can be allotted for Chair Boardman to review the survey data.
34

35 Ms. McKasy suggested that time be allotted in order to make changes to the survey based on feedback
36 from the CWC Board. The CWC Board may want to review the survey again before it is sent out to
37 the public. Possible revisions should be factored into the timeline as well. Ms. McKasy asked about
38 plans for sharing the survey with members of the public. Ms. Nielsen reviewed the various outreach
39 opportunities. She noted that it is also possible for Stakeholders Council Members to share the survey
40 with their networks. She suggested that at the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting, the
41 Committee spend time further developing a preferred outreach plan. It was noted that after the survey
42 is presented to the Stakeholders Council, there will likely be a lot more responses from members. It
43 is unlikely that the survey will be shared with members of the public until feedback is received from
44 the Council and Board. There was additional discussions about the timeline for survey distribution.
45

46 Chair Boardman reported that she will present the survey and outline the purpose of the survey at the
47 Stakeholders Council Meeting next week. Council Members will be encouraged to fill out the survey
48 and a deadline will be provided. Ms. McKasy can then look at Council Member feedback and present

1 some preliminary information at the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting. The timeline
2 can be further discussed and refined at that time. There can also be a discussion about outreach.

3
4 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

5
6 **1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the October 8, 2024, Meeting Agenda.**

7
8 It was reiterated that the next meeting agenda will include time for a discussion about the survey
9 outreach. Chair Boardman reiterated her request that members of the Environment Systems
10 Committee look through a section of the Environmental Dashboard and provide detailed feedback.
11 That is something that can be added to the next meeting agenda if there are willing participants.

12
13 **OTHER ITEMS**

14
15 There were no additional discussions.

16
17 **CLOSING**

18
19 **1. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment Systems Committee**
20 **Meeting.**

21
22 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting.
23 Dan Zalles seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

24
25 The meeting adjourned at 4:30 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 on*
3 *Tuesday, September 10, 2024.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____