



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 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: Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
Brenden Catt
Meaghan McKasy
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.

In the absence of Chair Kelly Boardman, 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 September 10, 2024, Meeting.

MOTION: Brenden Catt moved to APPROVE the September 10, 2024, Meeting Minutes. There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY FEEDBACK

1. The Committee will Consider the Feedback from Stakeholders on the Environmental Dashboard Survey.

Co-Chair Zalles explained that the Environment Systems Committee will discuss the feedback received on the Environmental Dashboard Survey. Feedback was received from one person via email. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, reported that the feedback echoed a lot of what the Committee had discussed previously. For instance, there is a desire to see more commentary or interpretation of the data. That was the only feedback she received outside of the survey itself. Some

1 have made suggestions about the Environmental Dashboard Survey within the actual survey.

2
3 It was noted that Adam Lenkowski previously made a suggestion about frequency of use. Co-Chair
4 Zalles saw that email and responded. He informed Mr. Lenkowski that he thought it was a good idea
5 and that it was missing from the survey. Frequency of use relates to the frequency of visitation to the
6 Central Wasatch. The intention is to determine whether survey respondents have a different
7 experience with the Environmental Dashboard based on recreation levels. Co-Chair Zalles thought
8 it would be worthwhile to have that information and supported the addition of the survey question.

9
10 Co-Chair Zalles asked if it is possible to draft that question during the Environment Systems
11 Committee Meeting. Meaghan McKasy confirmed that it is possible to add that question in section
12 four. There is a general question area there, so it might make sense to include the question in that
13 location. She asked how Committee Members wanted to phrase the question. Co-Chair Zalles
14 suggested: “How frequently do you visit the Central Wasatch?” The choices could be once a year,
15 once a month, several times a month, weekly, and daily. Ms. Kilpack pointed out that the Central
16 Wasatch region is different than the Central Wasatch mountains. She asked how specific the
17 Committee wanted to be about the visitation location. The Committee might want to determine how
18 often a survey respondent visits one of the tri-canyons. Co-Chair Zalles noted that the CWC Board
19 includes people from Summit County, which is on the other side of the tri-canyons. There is a desire
20 to be inclusive, so it might make sense to include that area and cover the full CWC study area.

21
22 Ms. McKasy asked if there was a description of the CWC study area on the website. Executive
23 Director, Lindsey Nielsen confirmed this. She wondered if it would be possible to add a map of the
24 study area to the Environmental Dashboard Survey. Ms. McKasy confirmed that it is possible to add
25 an image to the survey. If there is a certain image there is a desire to use, she can include it.
26 Ms. McKasy shared her screen with the Environment Systems Committee. She pointed out a location
27 where a photograph could be added for context. The Committee discussed whether the question
28 should be multiple choice. Co-Chair Zalles believed it should be multiple choice and that there should
29 also be a “never” option. Other options could be once a year, several times a year, and so on.

30
31 Co-Chair Zalles believed the question and the options were straightforward and clear. Ms. McKasy
32 added an “other” option because it is always useful to provide that. Co-Chair Zalles suggested
33 different language for the question itself, which was: “Typically speaking, how frequently do you
34 visit the Central Wasatch?” Ms. McKasy showed Committee Members where the question would be
35 placed within the Environmental Dashboard Survey. It will be after the demographics and before the
36 questions about the level of engagement with the Environmental Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles
37 expressed support for the question that was added to the Environmental Dashboard Survey.

38
39 Co-Chair Zalles asked that the responses to the survey be shared. There was a question about how
40 often the Environmental Dashboard is visited, but some of the responses to that confused him. The
41 question is: “Have you engaged with the Environmental Dashboard available on the CWC website?”
42 Ms. McKasy explained that the question was edited, but the old data was not cleared. The original
43 question asked for a “yes” or “no” answer, but the new version of the question is worded slightly
44 differently. That is the reason for the discrepancy between some of the answer data received. It
45 is possible to clear out past responses when the Committee is ready to release the survey formally.

46
47 Discussions were had about the comments received from respondents so far. Co-Chair Zalles thought
48 the feedback was interesting. He asked that the Committee review the open-ended responses and

1 determine whether the responses have any implications for the design of the survey instrument. Many
2 of the responses are interesting, but he does not feel the answers suggest an issue with the survey.

3
4 There was a presentation at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting. The Environmental Dashboard
5 Survey was sent out and feedback was requested. Co-Chair Zalles noted that there was some
6 discussion about the survey at the meeting. Ms. McKasy clarified that the data collection process has
7 not officially begun. The data received so far will be cleared. The intention was to receive feedback
8 about the survey itself. The next step will be to focus on distribution. Co-Chair Zalles believes the
9 Environment Systems Committee is ready to finalize the survey. Ms. McKasy pointed out that
10 feedback has not been received from the CWC Board at this point, which will occur in the future.

11
12 Co-Chair Zalles asked if the CWC Board has discussed the Environmental Dashboard Survey at this
13 point. Ms. McKasy reported that it was briefly mentioned at the CWC Board Meeting, but there has
14 not been a formal request made to the CWC Board for their feedback. Co-Chair Zalles believes the
15 next milestone is to ask the CWC Board for feedback on the survey and the drafted questions.
16 Ms. Nielsen reported that there is an Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting soon. The
17 Environmental Dashboard Survey can be presented to the Committee at that time by Stakeholders
18 Council leadership. If the Committee is clear about what there is a desire to receive from the CWC
19 Board, then Stakeholders Council leadership can communicate that. She suggested that the
20 Environment Systems Committee write some questions there is a desire to have answered. The
21 questions can start at the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee level and then move to the CWC Board.

22
23 Co-Chair Zalles wondered how to best present the Environmental Dashboard Survey to the
24 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee and then the CWC Board. He is not entirely sure how to proceed,
25 because he can see the pros and cons associated with different strategies. The first strategy would be
26 to receive all of the feedback at the CWC Board Meeting. The benefit is that there would be a focused
27 discussion, but the downside is that there may not be enough time to discuss the survey in depth. The
28 alternative is to work on this through email. There are pros and cons associated with that approach
29 as well. Ms. Nielsen suggested that the Environment Systems Committee draft three questions. When
30 the Meeting Materials Packet is prepared ahead of the CWC Board Meeting, the survey and the
31 questions can be included. Those materials can be highlighted in the email to the CWC Board. Board
32 Members will be asked to do some prep work ahead of the meeting and the survey presentation.

33
34 Ms. McKasy showed Committee Members what the survey looked like with images added.
35 Ms. Kilpack asked whether both maps should be included. The first was the CWC study area and the
36 second was related to the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act
37 (“CWNCRA”). Ms. Nielsen explained that the first one is technically correct, but the second one is
38 more colorful and aesthetically pleasing. Committee Members chose the most appropriate image.
39 Co-Chair Zalles stressed the importance of clarity about the image shown. Survey respondents need
40 to immediately be able to understand what it is they are looking at. Instead of writing “see the map
41 below,” he suggested that there be additional clarity there. It could state that the line shown represents
42 the CWC study area. Ms. McKasy proposed the following language: “The dark black line shown in
43 the map below identifies the boundaries.” It was stated that the map itself could be further clarified.

44
45 A question was asked about the difference between the CWC study area and the Environmental
46 Dashboard boundary. Ms. Nielsen reported that the map on the Environmental Dashboard is different
47 from the CWC jurisdictional boundary map and the proposed CWNCRA map. The data on the
48 Environmental Dashboard comes from a different map, which uses water units. It is essentially where

1 the water is coming from, as environmental elements are not constrained by political boundaries.

2
3 Since the Environment Systems Committee is seeking feedback on the Environmental Dashboard,
4 Brenden Catt wondered whether the Environmental Dashboard map should be used. Ms. Nielsen
5 confirmed that the Environmental Dashboard map can be used if that is desired by the Committee.
6 Mr. Catt clarified that he is not advocating for one map over the other, but he is trying to better
7 understand the boundaries and the different map options that are available. The Committee further
8 reviewed the different maps. Ms. Kilpack suggested zooming in further to show the canyon roads.
9 There could then be an explanation in the survey about what the map is representing. Co-Chair Zalles
10 believed the area the Environmental Dashboard has data for should be shown on the map used.

11
12 While CWC Staff works to finalize the map that will be included in the Environmental Dashboard
13 Survey, it was suggested that the Environment Systems Committee discuss the questions that will be
14 posed to the CWC Board. Ms. McKasy believes it would be beneficial to receive the most feedback
15 about Sections 5 and 6, which are specific to the Environmental Dashboard itself. Co-Chair Zalles
16 noted that for the demographic section, the Committee could ask whether the questions are
17 sufficiently inclusive of all of the information that is desired. Ms. McKasy noted that this could be
18 mentioned during the meeting presentation. Asking questions about some of the other sections might
19 be best in terms of feedback. Co-Chair Zalles thought a question could be whether there are any
20 concerns about the technical design of the survey. For instance, the way the questions are worded
21 and the length of the survey. Another question could relate to the actual content of the survey and
22 whether or not the Environmental Dashboard Survey covers all of the content that is desired.

23
24 Ms. McKasy noted that one question could be whether or not the questions are exhaustive or if there
25 are areas that are missing. Co-Chair Zalles thought the questions should be about the technical aspects
26 of the survey and the actual content of the survey. It might be ideal to pose only two questions to the
27 CWC Board. Mr. Catt thought the Committee would benefit from feedback about who the audience
28 of the survey might be. Co-Chair Zalles suggested this be a third question. Additional discussions
29 were had about the questions the Environment Systems Committee will ask the CWC Board. Co-
30 Chair Zalles shared some draft language for the CWC Board questions, which were as follows:

- 31
32
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving the design of the survey? (Example: formatting,
 - 33 length, wording, etc.)
 - 34 • Do you have any suggestions for the content covered in the survey?

35

36 Ms. Kilpack asked if the second question could be reworded to state the following:

- 37
38
 - Should any survey questions be added, removed, or modified?

39

40 Co-Chair Zalles believed that was implied in the previous version of the question. He noted that there
41 is a draft question about who the audience of the survey should be. The following was suggested:

- 42
43
 - Who would you like to see respond to this survey and what method of outreach could be used?

44

45 Spencer Shaver shared suggested language for the second question, which was as follows:

- 46
47
 - Are there additional topics that should be included in the survey to capture different types of
 - 48 feedback on the contents of the Environmental Dashboard? Should any survey questions be

1 added, removed, or modified to capture this feedback?

2
3 The Committee discussed the proposed language and shared potential modifications. Co-Chair Zalles
4 suggested that the language be streamlined slightly for additional clarity. Ms. Kilpack noted that it is
5 possible to eliminate the first portion of that question and leave the second portion. It could read:

- 6
7 • Should any survey questions be added, removed, or modified to capture additional
8 information?
9

10 Maura Hahnenberger believed the CWC Board needs to understand why the Environmental
11 Dashboard Survey is needed. When this is presented, the goals of the survey need to be
12 communicated to the CWC Board. Committee Members supported the information she shared in the
13 Zoom chat box. Co-Chair Zalles stated that the questions for the CWC Board are now drafted.

14
15 Ms. Nielsen suggested that Co-Chair Zalles meet with Chair Boardman and review the Environment
16 Systems Committee Meeting discussions that have taken place. From there, it is appropriate to email
17 Stakeholders Council leadership about the situation and explain that there is a desire for them to speak
18 to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee about the survey work. She noted that the next
19 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting is scheduled to take place on October 21, 2024. In
20 preparation for the December 2, 2024, CWC Board Meeting, CWC Staff will email the Environmental
21 Dashboard Survey and the Environment Systems Committee questions to the CWC Board. It was
22 determined that the Chair and Co-Chair will reach out to Stakeholders Council leadership.
23

24 Additional discussions were had about the map that will be included in the Environmental Dashboard
25 Survey. Ms. McKasy asked for some clarification about which map should be included. Co-Chair
26 Zalles thought the teal section shown should be the focus. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the teal section
27 can be the focus of the map that is included in the survey. The survey was previewed. For the
28 question, “Typically speaking, how frequently do you visit the Central Wasatch?” Ms. Kilpack
29 suggested that it be changed to state, “How often do you typically visit the Central Wasatch?” instead.
30

31 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY DISTRIBUTION**

32 33 **2. The Committee will Discuss Distribution of the Survey to Current and Potential Users** 34 **of the Environmental Dashboard.** 35

36 Co-Chair Zalles believes it is worthwhile for the Environment Systems Committee to discuss survey
37 distribution ahead of the presentation to the CWC Board. He suggested the CWC Youth Council,
38 Stakeholders Council, and CWC Board. Beyond that, most involved in the CWC represent different
39 groups and organizations, so there could be survey outreach there as well. As for organizations and
40 interest groups that are not affiliated with the CWC, that is something that can also be considered.
41 There can be discussions about casting a wider net and seeking responses from the general public.
42

43 Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC outreach is extensive. It is possible to utilize the existing outreach
44 plan for the Environmental Dashboard Survey. For example, there is a CWC newsletter that reaches
45 5,000 email inboxes, there can be a blog post on the CWC website, and the survey can be shared on
46 the CWC social media pages. It can also be shared with the jurisdictional communication managers.
47

48 Co-Chair Zalles asked about the rollout of the Environmental Dashboard Survey. Committee

Members did not have a preference for the rollout and thought the same end date for all of the different groups would be appropriate. Mr. Shaver noted that Save Our Canyons can distribute the survey via email as well. It was reiterated that there is no support for a staggered rollout of the survey.

NEXT MEETING AGENDA

1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the November 12, 2024, Meeting Agenda.

A. Presentation from Cottonwood Canyons Foundation on their Plant Stewardship Program.

At the next Environment Systems Committee Meeting, there will be feedback from the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee to consider. During that meeting, the Committee can work on a draft email that will be sent out to survey respondents. For example, text that will introduce the survey. Though the Environment Systems Committee has largely been focused on the Environmental Dashboard Survey lately, there are other items the Committee can discuss at the next meeting.

Ms. Nielsen reported that details about the Storyboarding Session for the Environmental Dashboard will be shared at the Stakeholders Council Meeting in November. There will be an opportunity for the Environment Systems Committee to determine the next area of interest after that. It was noted that the Environment Systems Committee will meet before the next scheduled Stakeholders Council Meeting in November. Co-Chair Zalles suggested that the next Committee Meeting focus on the draft language for the survey email at that time. There can also be discussions about the dissemination of the survey. Mr. Shaver thought it would be interesting to have a conversation about the concept of ski resort expansion in the absence of the CWNCRRA passage. Co-Chair Zalles asked that he share some information about this proposal via email. It can then be added to the next meeting agenda.

Co-Chair Zalles noted that he reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the last Stakeholders Council Meeting. During that meeting, there was brainstorming about the CWNCRRA and what could be done if there was no Federal Designation. It would be worth reviewing some of the suggestions.

OTHER ITEMS

There were no additional discussions.

CLOSING

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

MOTION: Spencer Shaver moved to ADJOURN the Environment Systems Committee Meeting. There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 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, October 8, 2024.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____