



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

15
16 **Committee Members:** Kelly Boardman, Chair
17 Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
18 Adam Lenkowski
19 Brenden Catt
20 Ella Abelli-Amen
21 Olivia Juarez
22 Meaghan McKasy
23 Maura Hahnenberger
24 Jonny Vasic

25
26 **Other Stakeholders:** John Knoblock
27 John Adams
28 Mike Marker
29 Tom Diegel
30 Kim Doyle

31
32 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
33 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
34

35 **OPENING**

36
37 **1. Chair Kelly Boardman will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Environment**
38 **System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

39
40 Chair Kelly Boardman called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
41 Environment System Committee Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.
42

43 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the November 12, 2024, Meeting.**

44
45 Chair Boardman reviewed the Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2024. At the last meeting, a
46 few new members were introduced and Ella Abelli-Amen presented information about the Plant

1 Stewardship Program from the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. There was a discussion about
2 the rollout of the Environmental Dashboard survey as well as some of the pros and cons associated
3 with the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRRA”).
4

5 **MOTION:** _____ moved to APPROVE the November 12, 2024, Meeting Minutes. John
6 Knoblock seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
7

8 Ahead of the next agenda item, Kim Doyle was introduced to the Committee. Director of
9 Operations, Samantha Kilpack, explained that Ms. Doyle is a new member of the Stakeholders
10 Council, but has not joined a subcommittee at this time. Ms. Doyle reported that she is the Vice
11 President of Resort Operations at Brighton Ski Resort and is excited to serve on the Stakeholders
12 Council.
13

14 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY**

15 16 **1. The Committee will Plan the Rollout of the Environmental Dashboard Survey.**

17
18 Chair Boardman believes the rollout of the Environmental Dashboard survey will be connected
19 around the time of the Central Wasatch Symposium. She asked CWC Staff about a potential
20 rollout date. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, asked what timeframe the Environment System
21 Committee is currently considering. Chair Boardman explained that it was previously determined
22 the survey would be available for one month. It makes sense to have it open before the Central
23 Wasatch Symposium and close after the symposium so the survey is accessible as more
24 information is shared.
25

26 There was discussion about the communication rollout for the Environmental Dashboard survey.
27 Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC will be very busy in the first week of January. The Short-Term
28 Projects Grant Program opens on January 7, 2025, and the Central Wasatch Symposium is on
29 January 9 and 10, 2025. She does not want to add something else that is significant in that first
30 week. The CWC Board has expressed support for the Environmental Dashboard survey. The next
31 time the Stakeholders Council will meet is in February 2025. The intention is to hold a
32 Storyboarding Workshop that month. She believes the survey should open now or the week after
33 the symposium.
34

35 Co-Chair Dan Zalles suggested that the Committee think about the labor and time involved in the
36 rollout. He thought it made sense to discuss the details of the rollout process and choose the date
37 accordingly. It seems the Environmental Dashboard survey rollout will involve sending out an
38 email with the link. Ms. Nielsen reported that there is a lot of work involved for CWC Staff
39 because there is outreach that needs to be done. Co-Chair Zalles asked whether CWC Staff will
40 handle the rollout work or if it can be done by members of the Environment System Committee.
41 Ms. Kilpack believes it will be a joint effort. Community Engagement Coordinator, Mia McNeil,
42 will create some social media content for the survey and share that on the CWC social media
43 accounts. It is also possible to send an email, add the survey link to the newsletter, and so on.
44 There are a few different approaches, but Committee Members can also share the survey with their
45 own networks and organizations.
46

1 Dr. Meaghan McKasy noted that there was a discussion about the Environmental Dashboard
2 survey at the last Environment System Committee Meeting. It seems like it would be a burden for
3 respondents to complete the survey before the holidays. It makes sense to talk about the
4 Environmental Dashboard survey at the Central Wasatch Symposium and do a soft launch. After
5 the Central Wasatch Symposium, it makes sense for more detailed survey information to be shared.
6

7 Ms. Nielsen suggested that the Environmental Dashboard survey be released the week after the
8 Central Wasatch Symposium. Committee Members expressed support for the proposed timeline.
9 Information about the Storyboarding Workshop was shared. Ms. Nielsen explained that it will
10 take place in February, but the date has not been determined at this time. Once there is clarity
11 about when Phoebe McNeally is available, the date for the Storyboarding Workshop can be
12 officially set. She reminded those present that the Storyboarding Workshop is in response to
13 recommendations from the Environment, Recreation, and Transportation System Committees.
14 There was a desire to provide formal feedback on the Environmental Dashboard as far as the utility
15 and interface. Ms. McNeally will be the one to facilitate the Storyboarding Workshop, so
16 participants can share feedback directly with the developers. It will be specifically for
17 Stakeholders, but the workshop will also be open for members of the public to attend. She
18 reiterated that the date has not been finalized at this time. Co-Chair Zalles asked if the
19 Storyboarding Workshop will occur after the next Environment System Committee Meeting takes
20 place. Ms. Nielsen suggested that it be scheduled in late February.
21

22 Chair Boardman likes the idea of a soft launch of the Environmental Dashboard survey. The
23 survey can open after the Central Wasatch Symposium and run until the Storyboarding Workshop.
24 Ms. Nielsen reported that the program for the symposium will be released tomorrow. There is one
25 presentation where that kind of soft launch might be appropriate, which is at the end of the
26 presentation from Mary Pendergast from the Sageland Collaborative on biodiversity in the area.
27

28 Ms. Kilpack asked whether there should be time between the close of the Environmental
29 Dashboard survey and the Storyboarding Workshop. This was confirmed. Once the date is set
30 with Ms. McNeally, a week will be built into the timeline to analyze data. Approximately three
31 weeks before that will be the release of the Environmental Dashboard survey. The launch date
32 will be determined by working backward based on the schedule of the Environmental Dashboard
33 development team. Once the promotional materials have been created, Committee Members will
34 be able to share them.
35

36 It was noted that there was a comment left in the Zoom chat box. Dr. McKasy stated that research
37 shows early to mid-week is an ideal time to send surveys out for engagement, such as a Tuesday
38 or Wednesday. Ms. Kilpack confirmed that those days will be considered in the scheduling
39 process.
40

41 Brenden Catt asked how the data received from the Environmental Dashboard survey will be
42 analyzed and how it will be shared with Committee Members ahead of the Storyboarding
43 Workshop. It would be beneficial to know what will happen after the survey rollout occurs. Co-
44 Chair Zalles believed the Committee would receive the raw data, such as how many respondents
45 there were and what the overall responses looked like. After that, it will be possible to look at the
46 data more closely and see how particular segments of the population respond. Ms. Kilpack

1 reported that CWC Staff will ensure the raw data is available to Committee Members ahead of the
2 Storyboarding Workshop. There can be collaboration via email to discuss the data. Alternatively,
3 there can be a small group of volunteers selected to meet and review the data ahead of the
4 Storyboarding Workshop. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that the results of the survey can also be passed
5 on directly to Ms. McNeally and her team.
6

7 Mr. Catt stated that the raw data will speak for itself, but a more detailed review of the data also
8 needs to be done. Most individuals will be able to evaluate the raw data if it is shared ahead of the
9 Storyboarding Workshop. However, a more detailed look at the data might take longer.
10 Dr. McKasy suggested that the Committee brainstorm what there is an interest in analyzing. For
11 example, the Committee could look at whether there is a significant difference in answers from
12 those who have accessed the Environmental Dashboard in the past versus those who have not
13 accessed it. There might be some demographic differences to consider during the review of the
14 survey data.
15

16 Mr. Catt believed the more detailed review of the data should be framed in the context of the
17 objectives. The intention is to take the data points and determine how to improve the
18 Environmental Dashboard based on the information received. He suggested that there be
19 brainstorming done ahead of time to facilitate efficiency later on. Ms. Nielsen noted that it is
20 possible to time the Environmental Dashboard survey response date so the data is available ahead
21 of the meeting in February.
22

23 John Knoblock noted that the Environment System Committee could create a brainstorming
24 document. That document can be accessed through the shared Google folder. Committee
25 Members can then share comments and ideas between Environment System Committee Meetings
26 and the document can be reviewed at the next meeting. Committee Members expressed support
27 for that idea.
28

29 Mr. Catt wanted to better understand why February has been selected for the Storyboarding
30 Workshop. Ms. Nielsen explained that it could take place in March if that is desired by the
31 Committee, as the intention was simply to wait until after the CWC events scheduled in January.
32 She reminded Committee Members that the CWC runs on a fiscal year. If the Storyboarding
33 Workshop results in meaningful suggestions for the Environmental Dashboard, the team would
34 only have until July to set out the plan of work that is needed and for that work to be approved by
35 the CWC Board.
36

37 Chair Boardman feels it makes sense to release the Environmental Dashboard survey after the
38 Central Wasatch Symposium. There should be some time before the next Environment System
39 Committee Meeting in February to review the data received. She asked for volunteers to sort
40 through the results and put them into a format that could be reviewed at that meeting. The
41 Storyboarding Workshop can occur after that work takes place. Chair Boardman asked about the
42 time needed to review the data. Dr. McKasy believes at least a few hours will be needed for
43 review. It was noted that the next Environment System Committee Meeting is scheduled for
44 February 11, 2025. Discussions were had about when the Environmental Dashboard survey should
45 close so there is time to organize ahead of that meeting. Dr. McKasy asked that there be at least a
46 week provided for her to review the responses. It was suggested that the survey be released the

1 week of January 13, 2025, and close around February 4, 2025. That will provide approximately
2 three weeks for those interested to take the survey.
3

4 Discussions were had about the proposed timeline. Ms. Nielsen reported that after the Central
5 Wasatch Symposium, there will be a lot of communications sent out, such as surveys and thank
6 you messages. She asked if there is support for the Environmental Dashboard survey to be released
7 on January 21, 2025. Dr. McKasy pointed out that if there is a need to extend the cutoff date for
8 the survey based on the collection numbers two weeks out, that can be done and the timeline can
9 be adjusted accordingly. Chair Boardman liked that idea and noted that early responses can still
10 be reviewed. Dr. McKasy offered to do a preliminary analysis once the initial responses start to
11 come in.
12

13 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD HUMAN ELEMENT DISCUSSION**

14 **1. The Committee will Discuss Adding Information to the Human Element Section of** 15 **the Environmental Dashboard.** 16

17
18 Chair Boardman explained that there will now be a discussion about what should be included in
19 the Human Element of the Environmental Dashboard. So far, there is the Visitor Use Study
20 information that was produced by Utah State University. At the last Stakeholders Council
21 Meeting, Devin Weder from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) shared information
22 about the Big Cottonwood Canyon environmental study. He mentioned that some modeling has
23 been done in the canyons and there is traffic data. Chair Boardman stated that there is a desire to
24 understand what the Stakeholders Council recommends for integrated comprehensive planning
25 that will protect the water, land, environment, recreation, and economic prosperity, as agreed to in
26 the Mountain Accord. It seems certain elements are being left out in the studies. One suggestion
27 is to have a better idea of the visitation levels by season or month. It sounds like that data can be
28 obtained.
29

30 In the past, there were discussions about a capacity study. That ultimately evolved into the Visitor
31 Use Study. However, many are still interested in what was originally contemplated. Chair
32 Boardman believed the Committee should look at what needs to be in place so visitors can have a
33 quality experience in the canyons. She stressed the importance of better understanding the
34 capacities of the different resorts and businesses that operate in the canyons. She asked participants
35 to discuss this.
36

37 John Adams noted that every vehicle in the canyon needs a parking spot. He previously met with
38 UDOT and asked them if it is possible to restrict vehicles entering the canyon based on parking
39 availability. Determining the capacity of actual visitors is difficult, but it might be possible to start
40 with the number of vehicles the canyons can carry based on the parking spaces that are available
41 to use. Mike Marker reported that it is possible to prevent vehicles from entering the canyons. It
42 was noted that when the roads are dangerous, then access can be prevented. Mr. Marker pointed
43 out that there was once a scenario where there was no parking available and someone was
44 prohibiting access.
45

1 Mr. Marker discussed the capacity studies that he has seen. In addition to measuring the number
2 of visitors, the studies provide information about the impact on the asset. Some models talk about
3 how to measure trail conditions on a five-point scale. He feels that is something that should be
4 monitored to determine the impact of visitation on canyon trails. Co-Chair Zalles expressed
5 support for that approach. He asked if the U.S. Forest Service uses a rating scale for the trails.
6 Mr. Marker reported that when Dr. Jordan Smith shared information about the Visitor Use Study,
7 he talked about White Pine and Red Pine being four and five-rated trails. The description was
8 consistent with other studies that he has seen. However, in the written document that was
9 submitted, it was not mentioned.

10
11 Mr. Knoblock suggested that some questions be posed to Zinnia Wilson from the Forest Service.
12 The Forest Service has an app that is used to monitor the trails to prioritize trail maintenance
13 projects. That kind of information might be beneficial to consider as far as a rating system. Mr.
14 Marker reported that in the Forest Plan, there is commentary that suggests this is happening and
15 decisions are being made based on wear and tear, but nothing is stated about objective assessments.

16
17 Mr. Knoblock asked what action should be taken on this particular item. Mr. Marker pointed out
18 that if there is no measurement, then there cannot be management. There needs to be baseline
19 information so it is possible to see how conditions are changing over time. An Environmental
20 Dashboard without some kind of metric does not make sense. There needs to be information about
21 the conditions.

22
23 Mr. Knoblock offered to speak to Ms. Wilson to see if there is some metric that can be extracted
24 from the trail maintenance tool that is used to determine trail maintenance projects. For instance,
25 something that indicates the condition of the trails themselves. It was noted that Park City
26 measures PFOS in the drinking water and takes action in various ways, such as making it illegal
27 to sell ski wax locally that can leave PFOS in the snow. Action can be taken and then the original
28 measurement can be used to determine whether the action has led to improvement. Mr. Knoblock
29 noted that Salt Lake City Public Utilities can be approached for additional information. Co-Chair
30 Zalles noted that it is possible to set up monitors to measure the air quality. Looking at the air
31 quality in the canyons in relation to traffic could be informative when it comes to some of the
32 traffic control discussions.

33
34 Additional discussions were had about what could be included in the Environmental Dashboard.
35 Olivia Juarez shared the NatureScore map from NatureQuant. It was explained that nature
36 deprivation means living in a place that does not have sufficient tree canopy, vegetation, water,
37 and natural surroundings. The Salt Lake Tribune reported on some of the data from Salt Lake
38 County. It might be worthwhile to reach out to NatureQuant for more accessible data. Ms. Juarez
39 explained that the data could outline how many people living in these nature-deficient areas visit
40 the Central Wasatch to access nature. Mr. Marker mentioned the link between the quality of the
41 canyon experience and the economy. Newcomers to Utah were interviewed and many respondents
42 stated that they came for the mountains. It is important to manage the experience and the resources
43 so it continues to be a draw. Chair Boardman asked Ms. Juarez to think about how the map data
44 could be included in the Human Element section of the Environmental Dashboard. In terms of
45 transportation planning, Chair Boardman stressed the importance of considering the uses,

1 numbers, and trends, as well as what there is a desire to achieve. There will continue to be
2 conversations about the Environmental Dashboard.

3
4 **FOREST PLAN DISCUSSION**

5
6 **1. The Committee will discuss the 2003 Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan.**

7
8 Chair Boardman reported that she reviewed the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan. She
9 noted that the plan is dated, but some ideas have been discussed at an Environment System
10 Committee level mentioned in the plan. The main goals outlined in the strategic plan were to:
11 ensure sustainable ecosystems, provide multiple benefits for people within the capabilities of the
12 ecosystem, and ensure organizational effectiveness. Chair Boardman referenced the section that
13 addresses the Central Wasatch Management Area and asked for Committee Member feedback.

14
15 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Forest Plan is supposed to be updated every 20 years, which means
16 that the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan should have been updated in 2023. However,
17 the Forest Service stated that they are behind and there are a lot of forests around the nation with
18 much more outdated plans. As a result, this one is unlikely to be updated for at least another
19 decade. That being said, amendments are made to the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan
20 as needed. The Forest Service is open to suggestions for amendments. If the Environment System
21 Committee has any proposals for amendments to the Central Wasatch section, those can be
22 submitted.

23
24 Co-Chair Zalles asked about the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan the Forest Service has been
25 working on. He wanted to understand how it relates to the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest
26 Plan. Mr. Knoblock clarified that the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan is a separate effort, but the
27 2003 Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan specifically calls out a trails plan in the Central
28 Wasatch.

29
30 Chair Boardman shared information from the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest Plan. It talks
31 about additional development in the Central Wasatch and how that would generally involve
32 replacement or modification of existing facilities or modification of existing ski runs. New resort
33 developments would be confined to resort boundaries. There is also talk about carrying capacity
34 and balancing the uses. She asked how the Visitor Use Study will be used by the Forest Service
35 and how it relates to their reference to carrying capacity. Mr. Marker noted that the Forest Service
36 does not like to talk about carrying capacity in actual numbers. Tom Diegel explained that the
37 Forest Service is unwilling to conduct a carrying capacity study, but is also unwilling to accept a
38 carrying capacity study that has been conducted elsewhere. Mr. Marker explained that he
39 mentioned this during the Transportation System Committee Meeting. The carrying capacity study
40 disappeared over time and the CWC ended up with the Visitor Use Study, which was very different
41 than what was originally envisioned. In one of the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meetings,
42 the Forest Service stated that they would ignore a carrying capacity study. It is troubling that there
43 is this kind of attitude.

44
45 Mr. Knoblock pointed out that national parks control everything within the boundary of the park,
46 but there is not a solid boundary in the Central Wasatch, because there are a lot of private

1 inholdings within that boundary. There are State highways and County roads, and the Forest
2 Service does not own or control those roads. Ms. Nielsen explained that if the CWNCRA passed,
3 it would call for a Central Wasatch Area Management Plan. There would be an opportunity to
4 work with the Forest Service and interested parties to create a specific management plan for the
5 area in that case.

6 7 **CARDIFF CANYON PUBLIC ACCESS**

8 9 **1. Stakeholders Council Co-Chair Tom Diegel will Discuss Public Access to Cardiff** 10 **Canyon Trails.**

11
12 Mr. Diegel shared information about Cardiff Canyon and explained that it has been a contentious
13 area for decades. Cardiff Canyon is a bit different than the other sub-canyons in the Cottonwood
14 Canyons. While all of the Cottonwood Canyons have a mosaic of public land and private land,
15 Cardiff Canyon is more privatized than some of the other areas. There were many years when the
16 private landowners exercised their right to apply no trespassing rules there. There was
17 contentiousness between the landowners and the people who were skiing or hiking in the area.
18 Approximately 12 years ago, the Forest Service issued a Special Use Permit to the Cardiff Canyon
19 Owners Association to allow homeowners to cross the public land sections of Cardiff Canyon
20 Road by motorized means. The gate would open in the summer and was closed in the winter. For
21 a decade, the Special Use Permit was in place. The homeowners were able to cross public land to
22 access their private land. In turn, members of the public were able to cross the private land to
23 reach the adjacent public lands.

24
25 The Cardiff Canyon Owners Association chose not to renew their Special Use Permit in the spring
26 of 2022. It is unclear why that decision was made because the Forest Service wants to be able to
27 maintain public access to the land there. The homeowners want to maintain the motorized access
28 but inexplicably did not apply for renewal of the permit. For the last couple of years, the situation
29 has reverted to the way it was before, where there is no legal access by motorized means to the
30 private properties and there is no mandate that the owners allow public access across their lands.

31
32 Last season, there were reports that the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association hired people to stay
33 near Donut Falls and threatened those who wanted to walk beyond that area. There were also
34 chains and fences in place last season and this season. Mr. Diegel explained that earlier in the
35 year, County Councilwoman Dea Theodore decided to create a Citizen Committee because this is
36 part of her district. The Committee brought the stakeholders in Cardiff together to attempt to reach
37 a solution. The group met bi-weekly from February through July. Eventually, the Cardiff Canyon
38 Owners Association admitted that the Special Use Permit should have been renewed and a new
39 Special Use Permit should be applied for. However, whenever there is an application for a new
40 Special Use Permit, the Forest Service has to apply the National Environmental Policy Act
41 (“NEPA”) to it. If the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association had applied for renewal, that NEPA
42 process would not have been necessary. The NEPA process has the potential to turn this into a
43 multi-year process.

44
45 During the meetings, a document was drafted and sent to the Forest Service. It essentially stated
46 that if the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association were to apply for the permit, the Forest Service

1 was advised to consider the Committee discussions and determinations. As of now, the Cardiff
2 Canyon Owners Association has still not applied for the new permit. There is no legal motorized
3 access up the canyon now and the gate is locked year-round. It will be interesting to see what
4 happens this season.

5
6 Co-Chair Zalles asked about the gate being closed. Mr. Diegel believed the Forest Service closed
7 the gate all year to reemphasize that there is no legal motorized access. The only legal motorized
8 access was enabled by the Special Use Permit. There is now no legal way to cross the public land
9 in that way. As for determining where the public land and private land boundaries are, that is
10 challenging to identify, as the boundaries are somewhat unclear. Co-Chair Zalles asked about the
11 NEPA process and timeline. Mr. Diegel noted that if there is a Categorical Exclusion, this could
12 be fast-tracked.

13
14 Mr. Knoblock stated that there is a desire to establish legal public access for recreation in the area
15 and ensure the protection of the environment. The Cardiff Canyon Owners Association has been
16 using motorized means to access the lands and some of the structures built have environmental
17 concerns. For example, there is no sewer system there, so there are questions about the restrooms.
18 With respect to recreational access, he asked whether the owners would have an interest in selling
19 a trail easement. Mr. Diegel explained that the owners cannot sell the land. There are no water
20 rights and there is no legal vehicle access. That being said, this is an emotional issue for the owners
21 and is not necessarily related to economics. It is possible that there could be an easement proposed,
22 but he is not sure whether or not there would be support for that. Additional discussions were had
23 about the lands and the difficulties in the area. Mr. Diegel believed the best solution was for the
24 Special Use Permit to be applied for so there can be legal access for the owners and the public.

25
26 Mr. Knoblock reported that on the Salt Lake County website, the Assessor Parcel Viewer can be
27 used. There is an interactive map and it is possible to zoom in to see the ownership of the various
28 parcels. He pointed out that there is steep terrain, which is the reason there are some questions
29 about the property lines. In addition, some of the historic mining claims do not appear on the
30 Assessor Parcel Viewer because those are tax-exempt. The tool can be informative, but there are
31 still some unknowns.

32
33 Mr. Diegel explained that after the last CWC Board Meeting, he spoke with Laura Briefer. She
34 wanted to talk about Cardiff Canyon because she has concerns related to water. Ms. Briefer is
35 concerned about the number of people in the area and the lack of sanitation that is available.
36 Mr. Diegel reported that all of the water that comes out of the Cardiff Mine area has an orange
37 color. Co-Chair Zalles asked if people are still accessing Cardiff Canyon. Mr. Diegel believed
38 so. The gate is a challenge for visitors, but once there is enough snow to support a snowmobile,
39 there will likely be snowmobile traffic there. He pointed out that there is no enforcement in the
40 area, which is an issue. Mr. Knoblock reported that there is a trail camera mounted above where
41 the private property starts. Mr. Diegel stated that the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has a trail
42 counter in that area as well.

43
44 Co-Chair Zalles asked about the polluted water from the mine. He asked if the origin of the
45 polluted water is in the private lands of the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association. Mr. Diegel
46 reported that Salt Lake City is responsible for the culinary water in Big Cottonwood Canyon and

1 Cardiff Canyon supplies some of that culinary water. The orange water seen is based on his
2 experience in the area. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that the orange color does not necessarily mean
3 the water is polluted.

4
5 Mr. Knoblock asked if there is anything the Environment System Committee can work on. Mr.
6 Diegel reported that approximately one year ago, there was a Resolution that went from the
7 Stakeholders Council to the CWC Board and the Forest Service. It encouraged there to be some
8 sort of resolution. If the Committee believes it would be helpful, the letter could be revisited now
9 that discussions have taken place with Councilwoman Theodore. Though the Forest Service wants
10 public access to public lands, nothing can be done until the Cardiff Canyon Owners Association
11 applies.

12
13 A question was asked about whether there have been past discussions about Deaf Smith Canyon
14 and public access. This was denied. Co-Chair Zalles noted that it could be a future conversation.
15 Mr. Knoblock explained that the situation in Deaf Smith Canyon has similarities to Cardiff
16 Canyon.

17
18 Mr. Diegel reported that he will continue to pay attention to the Cardiff Canyon issue and will
19 share updates with the Environment Systems Committee via email or a presentation at a future
20 meeting.

21
22 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

23
24 **1. The Committee will Determine Its Meeting Cadence and Schedule for 2025.**

25
26 Ms. Kilpack suggested that the Environment System Committee Meeting schedule remain the
27 same.

28
29 **2. The January Meeting will be Canceled Due to the Central Wasatch Symposium.**

30
31 It was noted that the meeting in January will be canceled because of the Central Wasatch
32 Symposium.

33
34 **3. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

35
36 Chair Boardman reported that there will be discussions about the feedback from the Environmental
37 Dashboard survey at the next Environment System Committee Meeting. There will hopefully be
38 more information at that time about how to enhance the dashboard and build out the Human
39 Element.

40
41 **OTHER ITEMS**

42
43 There were no additional items discussed.
44

1 **CLOSING**

2

3 1. **Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System**
4 **Committee Meeting.**

5

6 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.
7 Dan Zalles seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
8 Committee.

9

10 The meeting adjourned at 4:43 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 System Committee Meeting held Tuesday,*
3 *December 10, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____