



8
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, TUESDAY,**
11 **MARCH 11, 2025, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON**
12 **AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES,**
13 **LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE**
14 **330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

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

26
27 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
28 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
29

30 **OPENING**

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

34
35 Chair Kelly Boardman called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
36 Environment System Committee Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.
37

38 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the February 11, 2025, Meeting.**

39
40 Chair Boardman reviewed the previous Environment System Committee Meeting discussions. The
41 last meeting included a review of the preliminary results of the Environmental Dashboard Survey. At
42 that time, a decision was made to leave the survey open to receive more responses. The Committee
43 also spoke about the impacts of the new administration on the U.S. Forest Service. Both of those
44 items will continue to be discussed by the Environment System Committee at the current meeting.
45

46 **MOTION:** Maura Hahnenberger moved to APPROVE the February 11, 2025, Meeting Minutes.
47 Ella Abelli-Amen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
48 Committee.

1
2 **REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD SURVEY RESULTS**
3

4 **1. The Committee will Review and Discuss the Results of the Environmental Dashboard**
5 **Survey, Including New Responses.**
6

7 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee will review the results of the
8 Environmental Dashboard Survey, including some of the new responses received. Based on the file
9 sent out by Meaghan McKasy, it appears there have been 99 responses and some analysis conducted.
10

11 Ms. McKasy explained that the results are similar to the initial batch of data. The document she sent
12 to Committee Members has been updated to include the additional responses. The broadened sample
13 is shown in some of the data. For instance, there is more of a balance between working and retired
14 individuals, whereas before, the survey had more responses from retired individuals. There is more
15 of a distribution from different cities, as more people from Salt Lake have taken the survey. The age
16 range of respondents has become a little bit younger, as the two highest responses are now 65 and
17 older and 18 to 24. There were a few shifts in the results based on the additional responses.
18

19 Ms. McKasy referenced the question about interest in aspects of the Central Wasatch. Similar to the
20 earlier results, there is still a very interested sample. That being said, there is a slight shift from last
21 time. The health of the natural environment is still the most popular interest. However, the lowest
22 ranked last time was the economic aspects option. The lowest ranked this time is the transportation
23 aspects option. There was a bit more of a balanced response to engagement with the Environmental
24 Dashboard, which is likely a result of the broadened survey sample. Change over time in the Central
25 Wasatch was the main reason people wanted to visit the Environmental Dashboard followed by
26 progress towards meeting goals outlined in the Mountain Accord and the degree of success. Personal
27 education far outweighs the other motivations for visiting the Environmental Dashboard, with
28 recreation in second. There is a breakdown of the motivation results provided in the document.
29

30 Respondents were asked to elaborate on their motivations. Some of the written responses included
31 equality of resources and access. In addition, there were responses about preserving the area for
32 future generations. Ms. McKasy reviewed some of the responses for potential changes to the
33 Environmental Dashboard. Those remained similar, with additional visuals being the main desire.
34 As for the qualitative responses respondents were interested in seeing added to the Environmental
35 Dashboard, and there were different suggestions, like waste management and noise pollution. Some
36 respondents liked the Environmental Dashboard in its current form. Ms. McKasy ran some basic
37 inferential statistics. There were some slight differences where summative variables were made for
38 interest in aspects of the Central Wasatch mountains and the perceived importance of changes to the
39 Environmental Dashboard. She averaged all of the individual items to make an overall variable.
40 There is a significant relationship between interest and changes. That was present in the first round
41 of data, but it went from a medium-sized relationship to a small one. It is significant, but fairly small.
42

43 There was a positive correlation between interest and age. As the age increased, there was more
44 interest in aspects of the Central Wasatch. There was a small negative correlation with how often
45 they visited the Central Wasatch. Ms. McKasy stated that this was borderline significant, but it
46 indicates that as people visit the Central Wasatch more, there is less of an interest in these different
47 aspects. However, this is still a smaller survey size and this is a borderline significant relationship.
48

1 Ms. McKasy reported that there was a significant relationship when examining CWC members and
2 non-members. Members were significantly more interested in aspects of the Central Wasatch
3 mountains than non-members, which is to be expected. There was no significant difference between
4 those who had used the Environmental Dashboard before and those who had not as far as perceived
5 the importance of possible changes to the Environmental Dashboard. That was similar to last time.
6 With the additional survey responses, there were a few differences, but results are trending similarly.

7
8 Co-Chair Dan Zalles asked for clarification about the correlation between interest and change. He
9 asked if that had to do with changes to the Environmental Dashboard, which was confirmed.
10 Ms. McKasy reviewed the summative variables description in the document. Interest in aspects of
11 the Central Wasatch mountains and the perceived importance of possible changes to the
12 Environmental Dashboard interface were considered. People more interested in the Central Wasatch
13 mountains were more likely to think that there should be changes made to the Environmental
14 Dashboard.

15
16 Chair Boardman thanked Ms. McKasy for the work that has been done so far on the Environmental
17 Dashboard Survey. Brenden Catt asked if there is a way to analyze the correlation between the
18 motivations for visiting and potential changes to the Environmental Dashboard. He wanted to
19 understand if there is a correlation between someone interested in using the Environmental Dashboard
20 for education and someone who wants more visuals on the Environmental Dashboard. Ms. McKasy
21 asked Mr. Catt to leave a comment in the Zoom chat box with the specific variables he would like her
22 to look into. She can then find that information and share it with the Committee.

23
24 Adam Lenkowski asked about the questions where survey respondents were able to write their own
25 answers. He wanted to know if there are any missing datasets that were specifically mentioned.
26 Ms. McKasy reported that the broad reoccurring request was to have more information on the human
27 impact. This includes wanting to know more about access, trailheads, traffic, safety, and so on.

28
29 Mr. Lenkowski noted that there is a dataset from the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance for winter
30 trailhead use. He asked if that has been released, as it is human impact information that could be
31 valuable to integrate into the Environmental Dashboard. As far as safety, a possible dataset for that
32 could be the search and rescue call numbers or descriptions. He is not certain that a list or map exists
33 with that information, but someone on the Committee might have contacts with relevant groups.

34
35 Chair Boardman wanted to know if emergency preparedness was one of the responses that was
36 submitted. Ms. McKasy offered to share the qualitative data with the Environment System
37 Committee. She reported that some of the responses related to safety included: skier safety, property
38 boundaries, accident data, and wildfire information. As for the earlier question from Mr. Catt about
39 correlations between motivations for visiting and potential changes to the Environmental Dashboard,
40 the issue with running correlation is the way the motivation question was phased. She explained that
41 it was an open-response question, so all of the data is qualitative. It is not possible to run a correlation,
42 as a result. She offered to look into the data further and report back to the Committee.

43
44 Chair Boardman reviewed some of the standout information from the survey so far. The environment
45 is clearly a priority for survey respondents, as is building out the Human Element of the
46 Environmental Dashboard. The correlation between age and interest in visiting the Central Wasatch
47 is interesting. She wanted to know if older visitors to the Central Wasatch are feeling that it is a hassle
48 to visit in some ways. There is a desire to better understand where the responses are coming from.

1 Ms. McKasy agreed that it is an interesting finding. She reiterated that the Environmental Dashboard
2 Survey is still a small sample, but there are notable results that can be explored further.

3
4 **ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD WORKSHOP DISCUSSION**

5
6 **1. The Committee will Discuss and Prioritize the Suggestions and Comments from the**
7 **Environmental Dashboard Workshop.**

8
9 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, explained that some notes were taken during the
10 Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop event that took place recently. There is not a
11 concise summary of the notes at this point, but she offered to share the rough version of the notes
12 with Committee Members. Ms. Kilpack noted that a lot of the people who attended the workshop
13 had already taken the Environmental Dashboard Survey and were members of the Stakeholders
14 Council. Attendees were not given a specific opportunity during the workshop to take the survey.

15
16 Chair Boardman asked if any feedback was received from Phoebe McNeally following the workshop.
17 Ms. Kilpack reported that a lot of useful feedback was received during the Environmental Dashboard
18 Storyboarding Workshop. There was a meeting with Ms. McNeally last week to discuss some of the
19 changes that can be implemented. She will start to cross-reference elements in the Environmental
20 Dashboard that are related to human impacts, so the Human Element will include some of the data
21 that already exists on the Environmental Dashboard. It can be compiled in a more user-friendly way.

22
23 There have also been discussions about developing a map for the front page of the Environmental
24 Dashboard. The map should be engaging and feature some of the most sought-after data. As
25 discussed during the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop, all of the data cannot be
26 integrated into the map, but it is possible to include highlights there. There are some cosmetic changes
27 that Ms. McNeally and her team will work on as well. CWC Staff will continue to meet with them
28 and discuss what data suggestions might be feasible to collect or add to the Environmental Dashboard.

29
30 Maura Hahnenberger stated that her main takeaway from the Environmental Dashboard
31 Storyboarding Workshop was the desire to improve the formatting so users can better access the data.
32 She has spent a lot of time on the Environmental Dashboard and was surprised that during the
33 workshop, there were datasets shown that she had not seen before. Work can be done to improve the
34 way the information is displayed and indexed. It is possible to more effectively showcase what exists.

35
36 Mr. Catt asked if there were discussions about troubleshooting the datasets. He recalled that during
37 the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop, a few of the links were down. He asked if
38 those links have since been restored. Ms. Kilpack thanked him for the reminder. Executive Director,
39 Lindsey Nielsen, stated that it was the Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”) links that
40 were down at that time. She offered to look into those links and ask Ms. McNeally for information.
41 Mr. Catt stressed the importance of making sure what is currently there functions before adding more.

42
43 Chair Boardman mentioned the Google Drive folder. There is a document with brainstormed ideas
44 to build out the Human Element. One example is a more comprehensive Visitor Use Study. She
45 asked if that is something that has been discussed by other System Committees or at the CWC Board
46 level. Ms. Kilpack reported that the Chair of the Stakeholders Council, John Knoblock, has been
47 talking about gathering some of the data that Council Members would like to see included in the
48 Human Element. The document that was referenced is for the Visitor Use Study and there is a desire

1 to have more data as part of that study. Several datasets have been identified that could be collected
2 by members of the System Committees, either by conducting research or reaching out to their
3 respective organizations. The Transportation System Committee has been looking into some of that
4 data collection. The Recreation System Committee will meet later in the week to discuss different
5 tasks. It was noted that any Environment System Committee Members interested in assisting with
6 that data collection process can do so. She recommended reaching out to Mr. Knoblock.

7
8 Co-Chair Zalles asked if any of the other System Committees have discussed air quality data. That
9 was something mentioned during the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop. If the
10 Transportation System Committee and Recreation System Committee are not looking into this, it is
11 something that the Environment System Committee could take on. Ms. Kilpack noted that no other
12 System Committee has discussed that, so it could be a potential action item for this Committee.
13 Ms. Nielsen shared information about PurpleAir. Co-Chair Zalles pointed out that the information
14 could be added to the Environmental Dashboard. Ms. Kilpack believes the PurpleAir monitors are
15 listed.

16
17 Ms. Nielsen shared additional information about the meeting with Ms. McNeally and her team. There
18 were discussions about the feedback received during the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding
19 Workshop and the easy fixes were identified. One of the easier items is to add timestamps to the data
20 sets to clearly identify when the datasets were last updated. There will be work on a homepage map,
21 but that might take a little longer. There will be a table of contents and there have been discussions
22 about an introductory video to explain what the Environmental Dashboard is and how to use it. The
23 longer-term fixes include the addition of data that does not already exist. There will be a projection
24 submitted by Ms. McNeally to outline the timeline and cost. She thanked everyone for their feedback.

25
26 Co-Chair Zalles noted that during the workshop, there were discussions about adding short videos for
27 some of the more complicated datasets. Ms. Nielsen reported that the individual how-to videos would
28 be considered a long-term addition. At this point, the intention is to focus on short-term items, such
29 as the table of contents, homepage, and introduction video. From there, it will be possible to see what
30 other improvements can be made to the Environmental Dashboard.

31
32 Mr. Catt wanted to understand whether individuals are visiting the Environmental Dashboard with
33 one specific element in mind. There are different motivations for visiting the Environmental
34 Dashboard, which include education, recreation, and even scientific reasons. He asked if those
35 motivations are being adequately captured in the elements on the Environmental Dashboard. For
36 example, there might be someone who wants to use the Environmental Dashboard to find
37 transportation data. He wanted to know if that person would immediately make the connection
38 between transportation data and the Human Element or another section. There might be a bit of a
39 disconnect there. It might be possible to explore that further during this improvement process.

40
41 Chair Boardman explained that the purpose of the Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding
42 Workshop discussion is to prioritize the suggestions made. It sounds like CWC Staff and Ms.
43 McNeally have determined some of those priorities already. This includes items such as timestamps,
44 table of contents, and indexing. Those changes will make it easier to navigate the data. Mr. Catt
45 pointed out that certain datasets might belong to multiple elements. The cross-referencing that was
46 mentioned earlier might be able to address that issue. Chair Boardman noted that there could be
47 future discussions about how the homepage map could guide that process.

1 Ms. Nielsen wondered if it might be easier to determine the motivation for visiting the Environmental
2 Dashboard if the icons on the homepage map were divided by system. For instance, those interested
3 in transportation data could click on the transportation icon, which would then allow the visitor to
4 choose either the Human Element or Air Quality Element. The reason she is hesitant to move forward
5 with a system approach on the Environmental Dashboard is that there is no economic data. As a
6 result, not all of the systems would be represented. There could be some economic data added, but
7 there has not been a desire to add that in the past. Chair Boardman thought it would make it easier to
8 see various changes over time if some of that economic data was included.

9
10 Mr. Catt recalled a discussion about the metadata that is collected to track clicks on certain elements.
11 He is curious whether that might inform how the different elements are displayed. Ms. Nielsen
12 confirmed this and Ms. Kilpack explained that this was discussed during the CWC Staff meeting with
13 Ms. McNeally. The team has access to the clicks within the Environmental Dashboard.
14 Ms. McNeally is looking to see if it is possible to provide access to the CWC on the more granular
15 click data. A suggestion was made to advertise the Environmental Dashboard or Environmental
16 Dashboard Survey on the ski buses in order to increase outreach. There was support for the suggestion
17 made.

18
19 Ms. Kilpack noted that the Environment System Committee can continue to solicit survey responses
20 and revisit the data. Alternatively, it is possible to move the data into the hands of CWC Staff if there
21 is comfort with the amount of data that has been gathered. Ms. McNeally has been asked to provide
22 the timeline and cost projections for the larger-scale updates that came out of the survey and
23 Environmental Dashboard Storyboarding Workshop. That outline will be received by April.

24
25 Ms. Nielsen stated that the Environment System Committee has done an excellent job with the
26 Environmental Dashboard Survey. From here, it might make sense to shift focus to a new project if
27 that is the consensus of the Committee. The survey data can continue to be analyzed as it comes in.
28 Chair Boardman asked Committee Members to think about potential items for the next agenda.

29
30 Mr. Lenkowski pointed out that the Environmental Dashboard Survey has received less than 100
31 responses. He suggested that the Committee brainstorm how to receive additional responses. There
32 could be a little bit of advertising done, such as the survey link being shared on the ski buses.
33 Discussions were had about the work done with the DIGIT Lab. Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC
34 has an ongoing maintenance agreement with the DIGIT Lab and work is being done to fold the smaller
35 updates into that agreement. The larger-scale items, such as data additions, will increase the costs.

36 37 **FOREST SERVICE NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

38 39 **1. The Committee will Discuss Recent Forest Service Cutbacks and Resource Deficits,** 40 **Identify Potential Impacts on the Implementation of the Mountain Accord, and Discuss** 41 **Ways to Mitigate Impacts and Support the Forest Service.**

42
43 Chair Boardman explained that the next item on the Environment System Committee Meeting agenda
44 relates to Forest Service cutbacks and resource deficits. Doug Tolman was able to speak to Zinnia
45 Wilson from the Salt Lake Ranger District and she expressed interest in compiling a list to send to
46 the CWC and Save Our Canyons. The list could outline different challenges and tangible ways the
47 organizations can assist. At this point, he is waiting on the list from the Forest Service. Mr. Tolman
48 noted that the list could include sourcing funding for trail maintenance projects and stewardship

1 projects as well as facilitating volunteer days. The Forest Service has lost a lot of seasonal staff who
2 would normally be handling that kind of work. He offered to follow up on the list.

3
4 Chair Boardman asked for information about cutbacks that could impact the Central Wasatch.
5 Mr. Tolman does not recall the specifics but explained that the most pressing matter relates to staffing.
6 There are between 10 and 20 staff members lost, including seasonal positions. Ella Abelli-Amen
7 echoed the comments shared. Based on the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation's coordination with the
8 Forest Service, most of the Millcreek Canyon crew has been lost. Cottonwood Canyons Foundation
9 is planning to do more volunteer work than in the past. She asked if there is anything the Environment
10 System Committee can do to recruit more volunteers or funnel more volunteers into the different
11 events. The volunteer schedule will be on the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation website on March
12 15, 2025. It is possible to start focusing on the various volunteer events after that date. She noted
13 that the trail crew will be approximately half the size it normally is, so more volunteers are needed.

14
15 Ms. Abelli-Amen explained that last season, the Millcreek Canyon crew was a little bit short-staffed.
16 This made it difficult to get the picnic areas cleaned in time, so the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation
17 hosted some volunteer events early in the season to handle picnic areas. This included taking fallen
18 branches away from the site and cleaning out fire pits. The plan is to host some of those events this
19 season as well. She offered to let Committee Members know when those events will take place. If
20 the Environment System Committee is interested in hands-on participation, there could be a volunteer
21 event scheduled. Other Committee Members expressed support for participating in some volunteer
22 work. Ms. Abelli-Amen offered to send out information about the volunteer opportunities.

23
24 Olivia Juarez noted that there might be something the Environment System Committee or
25 Stakeholders Council can do in service of the employees who have lost their jobs. Elected officials
26 have been asking for stories from people who have been let go from different agencies. There is an
27 opportunity to elevate the stories of the employees who have been let go through these cutbacks.
28 Ms. Juarez has heard that social media videos are impactful. There are a lot of different ways to tell
29 these stories, but social media can be meaningful and straightforward. Chair Boardman asked about
30 the current view of this administration. She wanted to understand if there is a sentiment that the
31 employees are not needed or if the intention is to move things further into the private sector.
32 Ms. Juarez is not certain. She pointed out that there are people who have stewarded the mountains
33 and have had their lives completely disrupted. There is an opportunity for their stories to be heard.

34
35 Mr. Lenkowski noted that while it is important to focus on damage control, the larger issue still needs
36 to be resolved. It is necessary to acknowledge what is happening, including the impacts on lives and
37 the impacts on public lands. Chair Boardman asked if it would make sense to recapture funds by
38 tolling the roads into the canyons. Ms. Juarez acknowledged the comments left in the Zoom chat box
39 by Ms. Abelli-Amen and Jonny Vasic. She offered to follow up with them after the meeting.

40 41 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

42 43 **1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

44
45 Discussions were had about items for the next Environment System Committee Meeting agenda.
46 Chair Boardman suggested revising the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area
47 Act (“CWNCRA”) and what that looks like with the current administration. The CWC is looking for
48 an intern to research this kind of legislation nationwide. Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC has two

1 open positions. The first is a Communications Director position and the second is a Research
2 Internship position. Applications can be submitted for either position until March 30, 2025.

3
4 The CWC receives a lot of questions about the desire to pursue a National Conservation and
5 Recreation Area as opposed to a conservation area or recreation area. The answer is that the Central
6 Wasatch is unique compared to other areas in the United States. That is the reason a National
7 Conservation and Recreation Area is being pursued. Other questions have been received about the
8 CWNCR, such as what funding looks like for other conservation areas or recreation areas. It would
9 be interesting research for a student to do and that research would also benefit the CWC. The
10 internship will last for four months, will pay \$15 per hour, and there will also be school credit.

11
12 Ms. Hahnenberger explained that she is an Atmospheric Scientist and she does dust transport work.
13 One of her colleagues is finishing his PhD. Most of that PhD work was focused on dust deposition
14 on snow in the Wasatch mountains. She shared a link to one of the papers he worked on in the Zoom
15 chat box. If there is interest, she could ask her colleague to attend a future Environment System
16 Committee Meeting to share information about his work. Support was expressed for the presentation.

17
18 Ms. Abelli-Amen suggested a project that could be tackled by the Environment System Committee.
19 There could be encouragement for involvement in a trail ambassador program. She does not have
20 concrete ideas about how the Committee could assist with the program at this time, but the intention
21 is for it to be educational about trail etiquette and Leave No Trace principles. In this period of time
22 where there is limited enforcement and limited Forest Service presence on trails, it is more important
23 than ever that users be responsible. There will be a training program where interested individuals can
24 become volunteer rangers of sorts. Those individuals could lead volunteer programs once the highest
25 level of training has been received. She explained that this is something the Cottonwood Canyons
26 Foundation is currently working on. Committee Members expressed interest in assisting with this.

27
28 Chair Boardman reminded Committee Members that Mr. Tolman offered to follow up with the Forest
29 Service about the list. In addition, Ms. Juarez suggested a podcast episode about Federal employees
30 who have been displaced. Discussions were had about the CWC newsletter and how it can be used
31 for outreach. Committee Members also discussed incentives for volunteers at trail-related events.
32 Ms. Abelli-Amen stated that for some volunteers, providing lunch is enough, but a punch-card system
33 has also been developed. Volunteers who come for five days receive a hat. Volunteers who come
34 for 10 days receive a sweatshirt. That incentive program has been surprisingly successful. Two
35 volunteers came to 10 stewardship events last summer. Some sort of prize or raffle might assist with
36 incentivizing volunteers, but she does not believe there would be a lot of funding needed for that.

37 38 **OTHER ITEMS**

39
40 Chair Boardman mentioned the Legislative Session recap document from Mr. Tolman. It was
41 suggested that there be time allotted on the next agenda to review that document and the various
42 items. Chair Boardman asked if there was anything that should be reviewed at the current meeting.

43
44 Mr. Tolman explained that the first bill is one that he and Mr. Vasic both worked on quite a bit this
45 session. As it was initially written, it essentially would have greenlit the proposed mine in Parley's
46 Canyon. After four substitutions and a lot of pressure from environmental groups, the Utah League
47 of Cities and Towns ("ULCT"), and Salt Lake County, it was amended. Salt Lake County and the
48 sponsor have both directly stated that it will not impact Parley's Canyon. In his opinion, it is still not

1 a great bill, because it allows commercial gravel pits to expand without much local control. However,
2 he reiterated that Parley’s Canyon was more or less carved out of the bill due to the pressure.
3 Mr. Vasic noted that there was a lot of pushback, which he believes directly led to the revisions.
4

5 Senate Bill (“S.B.”) 195 is a transportation bill that passed this year. It was controversial because of
6 its impact on Salt Lake City’s traffic calming measures, but it also has a provision in it that requires
7 the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) to stick to the phasing in the Environment Impact
8 Study (“EIS”) Record of Decision for Little Cottonwood Canyon. Save Our Canyons has some
9 concerns about the language, but it prevents UDOT from skipping any phases, which is meaningful.
10 There were statements made by the drafters of the bill to note that if Phase I addresses the needs, then
11 Phase II should not be done, and if Phase II addresses the needs, then Phase III should not be done.
12 If needed, that language could be used in future litigation if a phase was proposed to be skipped. It
13 was clarified that Save Our Canyons does not have a formal opinion on the bill.
14

15 Mr. Tolman noted that S.B. 316 relates to the Military Installation Development Authority. He
16 explained that it has recently been used to bond two large ski resort developments. There is some
17 frustration about the funds being used in that way. This bill would have allowed the Military
18 Installation Development Authority to conduct its own National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”)
19 processes. That provision was removed, which is one of the wins from the session.
20

21 House Bill (“H.B.”) 196 was reviewed. Mr. Tolman explained that it has to do with vehicle traction
22 amendments. This was supported by UDOT, ski resorts, and others. It gives local authorities more
23 clarity and the authority to ticket people who have broken the traction law for both current and
24 predicted storm events. As for H.B. 229, it was a complicated bill about how and where certain types
25 of transportation could be funded. A group of homeowners at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon
26 believes this proposed Legislation is an attempt to mask misuse of funds by UDOT and recently
27 opened another lawsuit. There is now a fourth lawsuit against UDOT related to the EIS work.
28 Mr. Tolman reviewed some of the additional bills related to the Central Wasatch from the document.
29 There can be a more in-depth discussion about the Legislative Session at the next meeting.
30

31 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

32
33 There were no public comments.
34

35 **CLOSING**

36 37 1. **Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System Committee** 38 **Meeting.** 39

40 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.
41 Maura Hahnenberger seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
42 Committee.
43

44 The Environment System Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:35 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 Tuesday,*
3 *March 11, 2025.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____