



8  
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
10 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, TUESDAY,**  
11 **FEBRUARY 11, 2025, 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 Maura Hahnenberger  
19 Brenden Catt  
20 Jonny Vasic  
21 Ella Abelli-Amen  
22 Meaghan McKasy  
23 Pat Shea  
24 Doug Tolman  
25  
26 **Public:** Kirk Nichols  
27 Glenn Eurick  
28  
29 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
30 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations  
31

32 **OPENING**

- 33  
34 **1. Chair Kelly Boardman will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Environment**  
35 **System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

36  
37 Chair Kelly Boardman called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council  
38 Environment System Committee Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.  
39

- 40 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the December 10, 2024, Meeting.**

41  
42 **MOTION:** \_\_\_\_\_ moved to APPROVE the December 10, 2024, Meeting Minutes. \_\_\_\_\_  
43 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
44

1 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY**

2  
3 **1. The Committee will Review the Results of the Environmental Dashboard Survey.**

4  
5 Meaghan McKasy shared an overview of the Preliminary Summary Report she wrote regarding  
6 the results of the Environmental Dashboard Survey. The survey was created by the Environment  
7 System Committee and then distributed. Ms. McKasy reviewed the demographics of the  
8 respondents and their relationship to the CWC. For those associated with the CWC, there were  
9 questions about their position and how it is characterized. As for the basic demographics, 17 of  
10 the respondents were working and the rest were either retired or partially retired. She shared a  
11 breakdown of the cities that respondents were from. Eight respondents were from Cottonwood  
12 Heights and seven respondents were from Millcreek. There were a lot of cities represented in the  
13 responses received. 21 of the respondents were 65 or older. A question was asked about the  
14 frequency of use in the Central Wasatch and “multiple times a week” was the most common  
15 response. There were questions about interest in different aspects of the Central Wasatch  
16 mountains, such as the health of the natural environment, economic aspects, recreational aspects,  
17 and transportation aspects. The health of the natural environment was the option respondents were  
18 most interested in with economic aspects being the lowest.

19  
20 There was an open response section where respondents were able to share other aspects that  
21 interest them about the Central Wasatch mountains. Ms. McKasy reported that there were  
22 submissions related to parking, traffic, the number of visitors, dogs, building and development,  
23 politics, wildlife, water and air quality, preservation, and access. The survey also had questions  
24 specifically related to the Environmental Dashboard. For instance, whether or not respondents had  
25 engaged with the Environmental Dashboard. Eight respondents had not engaged with the  
26 Environmental Dashboard and 18 only engaged with it once the survey was received. The  
27 remainder were familiar with the tool.

28  
29 Ms. McKasy reported that there was a question about topics that made respondents want to visit  
30 the Environmental Dashboard. The most common responses were an interest in seeing changes  
31 over time in the Central Wasatch mountains and progress toward meeting the goals expressed in  
32 the Mountain Accord. There was a question about the motivation to use the Environmental  
33 Dashboard and the most common response was personal education. When asked to elaborate on  
34 their motivation, there were some comments related to the government. For example, users wanted  
35 to be able to lobby the State, influence change, and be better informed. The survey also asked  
36 about potential changes to the Environmental Dashboard. Respondents were generally supportive  
37 of all the options, but the one that received the most support was increasing the number of visuals  
38 through charts, maps, and graphs. The items that received the least amount of support were a main  
39 page with the most important data and text or email notifications. There was still interest in those  
40 items, but not as much. Ms. McKasy explained that there was an open response section for other  
41 data that should be included. Some of the suggestions were: impacts of domestic animals on  
42 wildlife, improvements to air quality graphs, Forest Service and private property boundaries,  
43 additional transportation and access information, more Human Element information, and accident  
44 data. She believed the accident data desired was vehicular.

1 The last question on the survey asked for feedback about any additional changes that could be  
2 made. Ms. McKasy shared some of the feedback received. Someone stated that the Environmental  
3 Dashboard is not so much a current information display as it is an explanation of systems.  
4 Someone asked about the addition of thresholds. She thought that was interesting as far as the  
5 overall health of each system and what systems are more at risk. Someone else asked that a home  
6 button be added to the bottom of each page for easier navigation. Some basic inferential statistics  
7 were run. In addition, Ms. McKasy made some summative variables for interest in aspects of the  
8 Central Wasatch and possible changes to the Environmental Dashboard. Some correlations were  
9 run to look at the relationship between interest in aspects of the Central Wasatch mountains and  
10 potential changes. There was a significant relationship between the two. People who were more  
11 interested in the Central Wasatch were generally more interested in seeing changes made to the  
12 Environmental Dashboard.

13  
14 Ms. McKasy wanted to see if there was a relationship between age and how often people visit the  
15 Central Wasatch mountains, but she did not find a relationship between them and an interest in  
16 potential changes to the Environmental Dashboard. She looked at the categorical variables, such  
17 as whether the respondents were CWC members or non-members. There was no significant  
18 difference between those groups as far as interest in the Central Wasatch or wanting to see changes  
19 to the Environmental Dashboard. There were also no significant differences between those who  
20 had used the Environmental Dashboard before and those who had not when it came to the  
21 perceived importance of possible changes. She explained that the data highlights where efforts  
22 can be devoted in the future.

23  
24 Chair Boardman thanked Ms. McKasy for her work on the Environmental Dashboard Survey. She  
25 was curious about how many decision-makers answered the survey. It was clarified that the survey  
26 did not ask for information about specific careers, but simply whether the respondent was working  
27 or retired. However, there was an option to leave a name and email address, so there is some  
28 identifying information for those who chose to share those details. Chair Boardman pointed out  
29 that the general responses are in line with what was happening 10 years ago. It does not appear  
30 the overall concerns have changed. Certain concerns might have increased over time, but the  
31 overall concerns remain the same. She wondered if there would be different feedback if the  
32 respondents were involved in the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), Utah Department of  
33 Transportation (“UDOT”), ski resorts, and so on. Ms. McKasy explained that this is not a  
34 representative sample. While the survey data received so far is useful, the survey can still be  
35 shared with others. There could be targeted outreach to those entities.

36  
37 Co-Chair Dan Zalles believes the Environmental Dashboard Survey results are especially useful  
38 ahead of the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop. The information can be used to  
39 guide those discussions. He is not concerned about the response size at this time, because the  
40 survey can continue to be used in the future. Ms. McKasy reported that all of the responses are  
41 time-stamped. It is possible to continue to collect information and sort out the first set of responses  
42 from the future responses. Jonny Vasic left a comment in the Zoom chat box. He wanted to know  
43 how many people need to take the survey before the Environment System Committee felt there  
44 was a good sample size. Ms. McKasy explained that in survey methodology, there is the law of  
45 diminishing returns. Once there are more than 1,000 respondents, there is less of a difference in

1 terms of representative responses. The Committee has utilized a convenient sample of respondents  
2 who are available to them.

3  
4 Mr. Vasic noted that the Committee needs to be careful about drawing conclusions based on the  
5 42 responses. He originally wanted the survey to outline how the Environmental Dashboard can  
6 become more usable. Before he joined the Environment System Committee, he had not heard  
7 about the Environmental Dashboard and still does not use it all that often. He wants to be able to  
8 use the survey results to determine how to make it a more useful tool. Ms. McKasy pointed out  
9 that a common survey response indicated that there is a desire to see more visuals on the  
10 Environmental Dashboard.

11  
12 Co-Chair Zalles pointed out that there seems to be an interest in baseline conditions. For example,  
13 a comparison and contrast between the past and present conditions. During the Environmental  
14 Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop, it will be possible to have a conversation about what can be  
15 done to meet that interest. Ms. McKasy noted that the timing of the Environmental Dashboard  
16 Survey is beneficial because some of the responses and takeaways from the survey can be  
17 discussed. She attended a data symposium last week at Utah Valley University and the keynote  
18 speaker reiterated that data can only take someone so far. While people can read data and analyze  
19 data, if that data cannot be communicated clearly, then people are less likely to relate to what is  
20 being shared.

21  
22 Chair Boardman mentioned the survey demographics. She acknowledged that there were a  
23 number of older respondents, but believes that provides a historical view of what has been  
24 happening in the Central Wasatch. It would be meaningful for the Environmental Dashboard to  
25 be used as a planning tool by the entities responsible for planning major projects in the area. The  
26 data could be used more widely and collaboratively. She stressed the importance of outreach to  
27 decision-makers to encourage the use of the Environmental Dashboard, but also ensure that the  
28 tool has all of the necessary information.

29  
30 Kirk Nichols noted that he has a library with several thousand books, but new faculty members  
31 have only half a shelf. As for his students, they are more likely to use online tools than read  
32 physical books. The way information is most commonly received has shifted over the years, so it  
33 makes sense for the Environmental Dashboard to be designed in a way that appeals to younger  
34 demographics as well.

35  
36 The Committee discussed how the time of year may have impacted the survey results. In the  
37 winter, transportation tends to be a more significant focus for visitors, but in the spring, summer,  
38 and early fall, people tend to be less focused on transportation needs. The time of year that the  
39 Environmental Dashboard Survey was released may have influenced certain responses.  
40 Additionally, in the last month or so, UDOT released an environmental survey for Big Cottonwood  
41 Canyon. All of the recent discussions about transportation might also impacted the priorities in  
42 the responses received.

43  
44 Ms. McKasy reported that there could be comparisons made between the first round of survey data  
45 and future rounds of survey data. From there, it will be possible to determine differences based  
46 on the time of year the survey questions were answered. Co-Chair Zalles asked Mr. Nichols how

1 he believes students would respond to the current version of the Environmental Dashboard. The  
2 Environmental Dashboard is an online resource, but he wondered whether students would want  
3 more links to articles or more narratives provided. Mr. Nichols believed it would be better to ask  
4 the students themselves for feedback, but noted that more visuals would likely be a priority. The  
5 Environmental Dashboard could also be more interactive. He suggested speaking to different  
6 demographics. Co-Chair Zalles asked how many CWC Youth Council members responded to the  
7 survey. Ms. McKasy reported that there were four responses from the CWC Youth Council. It is  
8 possible to do additional outreach to members of the CWC Youth Council about the survey.

9  
10 Co-Chair Zalles believes it makes sense to reach out to the CWC Youth Council about the survey.  
11 Environment System Committee Members who are faculty can also share the survey with their  
12 students, when appropriate. Doug Tolman shared information about the Great Salt Lake  
13 Dashboard. It has a quarter of the elements but is used widely by professionals, planners, decision-  
14 makers, and students. It has become very important in a short period of time. He shared a link to  
15 that dashboard in the Zoom chat box. Included in the Environmental Dashboard Survey was a  
16 question about what should be added. He wondered whether the survey should ask what should  
17 be taken away. There is so much data on the Environmental Dashboard that it can be time-  
18 consuming to learn how to use it efficiently and to review all the data. There might be some clutter  
19 that does not need to be there.

20  
21 It was noted that the Great Salt Lake Dashboard relates to one topic, but the Environmental  
22 Dashboard covers multiple areas of interest. However, it is meaningful to consider what does not  
23 need to remain. Mr. Tolman stated that it might be possible to share the survey with the Save Our  
24 Canyons members. Additional discussions were had about the Great Salt Lake and the  
25 communication efforts. Co-Chair Zalles expressed interest in the Great Salt Lake Dashboard and  
26 offered to look at it after the Environment System Committee Meeting. It might be possible to  
27 learn something from that effort.

28  
29 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, reported that the next step for the Environmental  
30 Dashboard Survey and Preliminary Summary Report is to share the information with Phoebe  
31 McNeally, who will lead the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop. Mr. Nichols  
32 will also be involved in that workshop. The information will also be shared at the Stakeholders  
33 Council Meeting on February 26, 2025. She clarified that the meeting date was originally February  
34 19, 2025.

35  
36 There is a desire to represent all of the different systems on the Environmental Dashboard.  
37 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Economy System Committee will meet tomorrow. That Committee  
38 will talk about improvements to the Environmental Dashboard from the perspective of their  
39 system. She noted that Environmental System Committee Members are welcome to attend the  
40 public meeting.

41  
42 Chair Boardman reported that there is a deficit in the Human Element section of the Environmental  
43 Dashboard. None of the survey questions specifically asked what should be added to that section,  
44 but a lot of the responses alluded to what respondents would like to see added. For example,  
45 changes in conditions over time and traffic patterns. It would be useful to receive more feedback  
46 about what respondents would specifically like to see included in the Human Element. In addition,

1 it would be beneficial to know what kinds of visuals should be created to highlight certain trends  
2 over time. For example, there could be trends over time-related to the traction control laws. It  
3 might be worthwhile to determine whether or not the traction control measures are actually  
4 improving the conditions.

5  
6 Committee Members expressed an interest in additional survey responses from younger  
7 demographics. Ahead of the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop, it might be  
8 possible to re-open the survey and take a more targeted approach. Chair Boardman expressed  
9 support for that. Ms. McKasy does not see any harm in re-opening the survey. She reiterated that  
10 it is possible to filter the responses by the time stamps. Responses can then be looked at separately  
11 or combined. Committee Members believed it would be useful to receive additional survey  
12 responses from various demographics. There is an interest in hearing from people who spend time  
13 in the Central Wasatch.

14  
15 Mr. Tolman asked if there is interest in sending the Environmental Dashboard Survey out to Save  
16 Our Canyons members. The link to the survey could be added to one of the newsletters. Support  
17 was expressed for that outreach. Glenn Eurick noted that it can be sent out to Friends of Alta for  
18 consideration as well. Ella Abelli-Amen stated that it can also be shared with the Cottonwood  
19 Canyons Foundation email list. The survey can be re-opened and then remain open until the spring  
20 to allow for additional responses. There might be more feedback after the Legislative Session  
21 ends.

22  
23 Ms. Kilpack pointed out that the members of the Environment System Committee are all users of  
24 the canyons. She feels it would be appropriate for Committee Members to take the survey as well.  
25 Chair Boardman pointed out that other Stakeholders Council Members could also be encouraged  
26 to participate. The Committee discussed the questions in the Environmental Dashboard Survey.  
27 It did not appear there was any confusion about the questions based on the answers received so  
28 far.

29  
30 Co-Chair Zalles pointed out that none of the survey messaging indicates how long it will take to  
31 complete the survey. This is a fairly short survey and it would be best to highlight that. Some  
32 people might be more inclined to take the survey if there is an awareness of the time commitment.  
33 Ms. McKasy confirmed that it is possible to add a sentence to the introduction to state that it will  
34 only take five minutes. Co-Chair Zalles asked if there were any paper-based communications,  
35 such as a poster with a survey link. A QR code would make it possible for someone to scan the  
36 code and take the survey on their phone. It was pointed out that the responses might be slightly  
37 different because responses tend to be shorter when a cell phone is used to answer a survey instead  
38 of a computer.

39  
40 Chair Boardman suggested the Environment System Committee review the Mountain Accord and  
41 the signatures. Though the individuals who signed the Mountain Accord might not still be active  
42 in those spaces now, it is possible to look into the represented entities. There could be outreach to  
43 those involved with the Mountain Accord and the Environmental Dashboard Survey could be sent  
44 to them.

1 Ms. Kilpack reported that there seems to be a consensus of the Committee to re-open the  
2 Environmental Dashboard Survey. The survey can remain open as long as the Committee feels it  
3 is necessary. If there is interest in a physical flyer or poster to promote the survey, that can be  
4 created by CWC Staff. Chair Boardman expressed support for that approach. She explained that  
5 there is a desire to receive responses to the Environmental Dashboard Survey from a wider  
6 audience. Co-Chair Zalles offered to review the list of Mountain Accord signatures with a member  
7 of CWC Staff.

8  
9 Chair Boardman asked if the CWC has an email roster of those who were originally involved in  
10 the Mountain Accord. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the email addresses are  
11 not on the CWC website, but the roster is listed. She shared a link to the Mountain Accord page  
12 in the Zoom chat box and noted that the roster is listed at the bottom. Ms. Kilpack explained that  
13 some research will need to be done to determine who is still involved with the associated  
14 organizations. Co-Chair Zalles noted that this will be a labor-intensive task. Ms. Kilpack stated  
15 that some of the entities listed include Snowbird, Alta, and Draper. It is possible to contact those  
16 entities without reaching out to the specific individuals linked to the Mountain Accord. There can  
17 be outreach to relevant groups.

18  
19 Chair Boardman reiterated that the Environmental Dashboard Survey will be re-opened and  
20 Environment System Committee Members will focus on additional outreach efforts. The list of  
21 those who signed the Mountain Accord was reviewed. There can be a form letter written that  
22 requests those involved in the Mountain Accord process complete the Environmental Dashboard  
23 Survey.

## 24 **FOREST PLAN DISCUSSION**

### 25 **1. The Committee will Discuss Potential Impacts of the New Administration on the** 26 **Forest Service.**

27  
28  
29  
30 Co-Chair Zalles explained that there is a desire to discuss the potential impacts of the new  
31 administration on the Forest Service. There is some uncertainty about future funding and potential  
32 impacts on the Central Wasatch. He reported that there is currently a bill that would turn the  
33 Cottonwood Canyons into a State Park. Information about the bill was shared. It was clarified  
34 that it is not intended to pass, but is an attempt by Senator Kathleen Reibe to draw more attention  
35 to the Central Wasatch and the tri-canyon area as far as resources. The intention is to table the  
36 bill, but that can be monitored. Senator Reibe has expressed concerns that there is not enough  
37 State support and it is impacting her constituents. She wanted to bring this matter to the attention  
38 of the Legislature.

39  
40 Co-Chair Zalles asked how Senator Reibe was using the bill as a way to communicate. It was  
41 clarified that the bill is assigned to go to the Senate Economic Development and Workforce  
42 Services Committee. However, there has been some verbal communication that Senator Reibe  
43 does not plan to read that in committee. It is believed the intention is to draw attention to the  
44 current issues. It was recommended that the Environment System Committee watch what happens  
45 with the bill before having a robust conversation about what it could mean, especially since it is  
46 likely to be tabled.

1  
2 Ms. Abelli-Amen noted that the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation works closely with the Forest  
3 Service. Not hiring any seasonal employees will impact a lot of the Forest Service operations.  
4 The Forest Service is looking for the trail crew to take on a lot of the trail projects this summer.  
5 These are uncertain times and it seems that changes will continue to occur. Co-Chair Zalles asked  
6 for additional details about the Forest Service work. Ms. Abelli-Amen reported that there are  
7 already a few of their employees on the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation payroll. The hope is to  
8 be able to have a five-person trail crew this summer, which is a lot smaller than usual. Chair  
9 Boardman asked who funds the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. Ms. Abelli-Amen stated that  
10 it is a non-profit organization and funding is received from a variety of grants. Some of the trail  
11 funding is uncertain.

12  
13 Co-Chair Zalles asked about the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant work in Millcreek  
14 Canyon. He noted that the work was planned to start in the summer. Ms. Abelli-Amen has not  
15 heard anything about the status of the FLAP grant work in Millcreek Canyon but would be  
16 interested to know. Co-Chair Zalles discussed the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan and the  
17 associated projects.

18  
19 It was stated that State Parks and UDOT are branches of the Legislature. As for the history of  
20 State Parks, there are times when the parks have money and times when the State Legislature  
21 decides to sell off the parks. Whenever the latter has been attempted, the Federal Government has  
22 stepped in. Discussions were had about State Parks and some of the land purchases that have taken  
23 place.

24  
25 Mr. Tolman noted that Save Our Canyons is concerned about the possible implications of the bill  
26 mentioned earlier. However, based on conversations with the bill sponsor, it is unlikely to move  
27 forward. He will be concerned if it is heard in committee, but is not overly concerned at this point.

28  
29 Chair Boardman referenced the 2003 Forest Plan. Co-Chair Zalles clarified that there is the 2003  
30 Forest Plan, but the Forest Service is also working on the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan. During  
31 the Central Wasatch Symposium, there was a presentation about wildfires. Those are left alone  
32 unless there is a threat to people or property. He is not certain whether those are State or Forest  
33 Service crews. It was clarified that the Forest Service funding is separate from the firefighting  
34 funding. Chair Boardman suggested that Environment System Committee Members pay attention  
35 to any Federal decisions that could impact the implementation of the Mountain Accord and other  
36 CWC work.

37  
38 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

39  
40 **1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

41  
42 Chair Boardman asked that there be time allotted on the next Environment System Committee  
43 agenda to further discuss the Environmental Dashboard Survey results. Ms. Kilpack informed  
44 those present that the next Environment System Committee Meeting is scheduled for March 11,  
45 2025. There should also be time allotted to discuss the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding  
46 Workshop. Chair Boardman asked for additional agenda items. It was suggested that there be a

1 Legislative Session recap. The Committee can discuss bills that are relevant to the work of the  
2 Committee and the CWC.

3  
4 Pat Shea wanted to know if Solitude joined the other ski resorts on the Legislation for traction  
5 laws. Chair Boardman believed so. The resorts sent out an email in the fall to all of their  
6 employees asking them to have their tires checked and to participate in the sticker program. Chair  
7 Boardman took a moment to remind Committee Members that the Environmental Dashboard  
8 Storyboarding Workshop will take place on February 24, 2025. The workshop will run from 5:30  
9 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Ms. Nielsen explained that the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding  
10 Workshop was scheduled in response to a Stakeholders Council request. Council Members wanted  
11 to speak directly to the developers of the Environmental Dashboard. This is essentially an in-  
12 person Environmental Dashboard survey. Attendees can provide feedback on how the  
13 Environmental Dashboard works currently and how it could be improved. There will also be  
14 discussions about the expansion of the Human Element. The developers of the Environmental  
15 Dashboard will listen to the comments and discuss feasibility.

16  
17 **OTHER ITEMS**

18  
19 There were no other items discussed.

20  
21 **CLOSING**

22  
23 1. **Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System**  
24 **Committee Meeting.**

25  
26 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.  
27 Dan Zalles seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
28 Committee.

29  
30 The meeting adjourned at 4:25 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 on*  
3 *Tuesday, February 11, 2025.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

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