



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

Committee Members: Kelly Boardman, Chair
Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
Brenden Catt
Doug Tolman
Maura Hahnenberger
Adam Lenkowski
Meaghan McKasy
Ella Abelli-Amen
Jonny Vasic
Pat Shea

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
Ben Kilbourne, Community Engagement Coordinator

OPENING

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

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

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the August 11, 2025, Meeting.

MOTION: Kelly Boardman moved to APPROVE the August 11, 2025, Meeting Minutes. Brenden Catt seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

CENTRAL WASATCH DASHBOARD DISCUSSION

1. The Committee will Discuss Changes Over Time to the Human Element Data on the Central Wasatch Dashboard and the Environmental Impact of those Changes.

Chair Boardman asked whether Committee Members took time to review what is currently included in the Human Element. Co-Chair Dan Zalles thought it made sense to review the Human Element as a Committee. Chair Boardman referenced a CWC mailer that recently went out. She noted that there was information about Mountain Accord deliverables on Page 16. There was an item midway down that stated: “Development of Adaptive Management Plan for Central Wasatch.” Under implementation, it stated: “The Plan would address changes in use and environmental conditions, as measured by the Central Wasatch Dashboard.” The status indicated that this has not been done, but the infrastructure is in place. She asked for additional information from CWC Staff about this item.

Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the item referenced was taken directly from the Mountain Accord charter. The concept of a capacity study started during the Mountain Accord process and it carried over to the Stakeholders Council. That morphed into the Visitor Use Study. The Environmental Dashboard also evolved from the original idea of a one-time paper report about the functioning health of the Central Wasatch mountains. It became the Central Wasatch Dashboard. The technology changed drastically between 2013 and 2018, which allowed there to be a shift from a static paper report to a dynamic and evolving online tool that was accessible to everyone. In addition, the CWC Board decided that there was no desire for the dashboard to make political commentary about the functioning health of the Central Wasatch mountains. The Central Wasatch Dashboard currently presents the existing data without commentary about the data that is included.

Ms. Nielsen explained that both the capacity study and dashboard are different than what was originally envisioned. The capacity study became the Visitor Use Study and the Environmental Dashboard became the Central Wasatch Dashboard. If the CWC Board makes a decision to focus on an Adaptive Management Plan moving forward, there would need to be some changes made to the way the Central Wasatch Dashboard presents data so that it includes more commentary. In addition, there would need to be some more direct conversations about capacity than there have been in the past.

Co-Chair Zalles noted that when looking at changes over time, there does not need to be commentary about whether the conditions are better or worse. It is possible to state that a certain metric is increasing or decreasing over time. For example, if pollution is increasing, the Central Wasatch Dashboard does not need to state that pollution is getting worse. There is a way to communicate without making specific commentary. Adaptive management is focused on making adjustments based on data, so if the data shows that trends are decreasing, increasing, or there is no trend, then that can be taken into account. Ms. Nielsen pointed out that the Central Wasatch Dashboard provides that for the most part. It shows the water quality trends at specific nodes in the Central Wasatch over time. It is possible to look at certain trends, but the dashboard does not make comments about those trends. The person interacting with the dashboard is asked to make their own extrapolations.

Chair Boardman had questions about the Mountain Accord deliverable. She asked if it had always been included in the table that was shared. Ms. Nielsen explained that it was always in the Mountain Accord charter, but the table itself has been expanded more recently. Chair Boardman wanted to

1 know if the CWC Board is moving in a direction where a more qualitative analysis is desired.
2 Ms. Nielsen does not know what each individual member of the CWC Board is thinking as far as
3 direction. She suggested that Chair Boardman make a public comment during the next CWC Board
4 Meeting.

5
6 Co-Chair Zalles asked that the Environment System Committee review the Human Element of the
7 Central Wasatch Dashboard. It is possible for Committee Members to discuss the changes over time
8 that are observed. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, asked what the Committee might want
9 to do with this information. Co-Chair Zalles stated that this is an exploratory task for the Environment
10 System Committee. The Committee can determine whether there is something actionable later on.

11
12 Committee Members reviewed the Human Element of the Central Wasatch Dashboard. It was noted
13 that the different colors on the map indicate the time of day. Co-Chair Zalles pointed out the trail use
14 data that was collected during the Visitor Use Study. It would be nice to have more current data.
15 Chair Boardman believed the Committee should discuss the type of data that is needed to show
16 changes over time in the Human Element section. Co-Chair Zalles pointed out that the trail use data
17 could be updated to include more current numbers. Chair Boardman asked about more easily acquired
18 data that might highlight some of the trends. This could include auto numbers from the Utah
19 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) as well as bus use data. She referenced the information that
20 was shared by John Knoblock during the last Stakeholders Council Meeting.

21
22 Co-Chair Zalles further reviewed the information in the Human Element. Brenden Catt wanted to
23 know whether the DIGIT Lab has finished making the adjustments that were previously requested.
24 This was denied. Ms. Kilpack reported that there is still work being done on the landing page map.
25 There was communication with the DIGIT Lab last month about that. Incorporating a lot of data sets
26 into the map without it being cluttered or difficult to use has proven to be a challenge. As a result,
27 there is work being done on a map with multiple layers, including jurisdictional and water boundaries.
28 There are still some other items being worked on by the DIGIT Lab that need to be completed.

29
30 Mr. Catt stated that the trail use data is the only data that is currently available under the Human
31 Element. At one point, there was a discussion about moving some of the data from the Air Quality
32 section to the Human Element section. As for the Early AM filter that is shown on the map, it
33 indicates the hours are from 12:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. He believes that it should change to 12:00 a.m.

34
35 Ms. Kilpack reported that the cross-listing of data is intended to take place at the same time as the
36 Human Element expansion. As the Human Element is updated, it is possible to pull in the data that
37 will be cross-listed. She reported that the Human Element expansion has been delayed due to a recent
38 budgetary constraint. That work will need to be paused for a few months. There is still a list that
39 outlines everything there is a desire to accomplish. Additionally, some items can be worked on
40 through the regular maintenance contract with the DIGIT Lab. However, a lot of the Human Element
41 expansion will take longer than originally anticipated. Co-Chair Zalles asked for additional
42 information about the budgetary constraint. Ms. Nielsen explained that it is due to a reduction in
43 membership contributions after the budget was approved. The budget is already tight and there was
44 not enough to cover a budgetary deficit of that size, so adjustments were made. The expansion of the
45 Human Element is an important project, but it is also the largest project in the current budget.

46
47 Co-Chair Zalles asked about the membership contribution amounts. Ms. Nielsen reported that there
48 is a formula that is used and there are established tiers. Doug Tolman noted that there could be a

1 conversation in response to the comments made by Mr. Knoblock at the last Stakeholders Council
2 Meeting. It is possible to look at the existing list and highlight the priorities. Ms. Kilpack explained
3 that she will reach out to Mr. Knoblock so the sources for the numbers in the document are included.
4

5 Chair Boardman expressed support for a prioritization of items that could be added to the Human
6 Element. This is something the full Stakeholders Council could work on as a follow-up to the
7 presentation from Mr. Knoblock at the last meeting. Discussions were had about the data that was
8 shared by Mr. Knoblock at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting. Chair Boardman stated that the
9 UDOT data about the number of vehicles on the road is useful. While there is no clarity about the
10 number of people in each vehicle or the reasons for accessing the area, that data makes it possible to
11 look at trends. If the canyons are being used more throughout the year, this could indicate a need for
12 transportation solutions that extend beyond the winter season. Co-Chair Zalles asked if there is
13 current Central Wasatch Dashboard data that looks at pollution levels, air quality, and water quality.
14 Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. Co-Chair Zalles thought it made sense to look at that information.
15

16 The Environment System Committee reviewed Page 8 of the Meeting Minutes from the last
17 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Co-Chair Zalles reiterated that the trail use data on the Central
18 Wasatch Dashboard only goes until 2022. Ms. Nielsen reminded those present that the data was
19 collected by Dr. Jordan Smith and his team during the Visitor Use Study process. She also noted that
20 the CWC Board has not reviewed the data that was collected by Mr. Knoblock. There is uncertainty
21 at this point about whether or not the data is defensible and will be incorporated into the Central
22 Wasatch Dashboard. If the data is able to be referenced, there can be a discussion about additions.
23

24 Co-Chair Zalles asked if the document will be discussed at the next CWC Board Meeting.
25 Ms. Nielsen does not believe so and asked about the status of the data collection. Ms. Kilpack
26 reported that the data collection is not complete, but a lot has been collected. It has all been compiled
27 by Mr. Knoblock, but the document is still a work in progress. Co-Chair Zalles believes it makes
28 sense for the Environment System Committee to look into what has been collected and prioritize
29 items. Ms. Kilpack stated that once the data collection is complete and the data sources have been
30 added, CJ Blye, who presented at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, has offered to review the
31 document.
32

33 It was stated that the most easily quantifiable, replicable, and defensible information relates to resort
34 skiing and traffic counts. Chair Boardman added that public transportation data could fall into that
35 category as well. Discussions were had about the information currently on the Central Wasatch
36 Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles asked to review the vehicle count information, as well as the air quality
37 and water quality information that is included on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. Adam Lenkowski
38 commented on the graphs on the Vehicle Emissions page. It makes sense to include those in the
39 Human Element section as well, so there is improved navigation. This section includes some of the
40 most useful data on the dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles agreed that the information is important.
41

42 The Environment System Committee reviewed the information on the Vehicle Emissions page. Co-
43 Chair Zalles pointed out that the data is from 2009 to 2023 and looks at different locations. 7800
44 South via Wasatch Boulevard shows a bit of a decrease over time. Co-Chair Zalles next discussed
45 the information related to Parley's Canyon West. It was noted that the top graph breaks information
46 out into months and years, while the bottom graph looks only at the annual data. Chair Boardman
47 asked that Committee Members review the data currently available on the Central Wasatch
48 Dashboard before the next Environment System Committee Meeting takes place. Co-Chair Zalles

1 wanted to know if it is possible to review the air quality and water quality information at this meeting.
2 It was noted that the meeting is currently running behind schedule. Chair Boardman asked that a
3 review of the Central Wasatch Dashboard be done independently before the next scheduled meeting.
4

5 **ROADLESS RULE DISCUSSION**

6 7 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Potential Rescission of the Roadless Rule.**

8
9 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee will discuss the potential
10 rescission of the Roadless Rule. She made some notes based on the information that she had received.
11 Since 2001, 45 million acres have been protected from road construction, logging, mining, ski resort
12 expansion, and other development. Some of the areas in the Wasatch that have been protected include
13 White Pine, Cardiff, Silver Fork, Mineral Fork, and others. She explained that 323,000 acres in the
14 Wasatch are protected, including the Wasatch Crest Trail, Desolation Lake, and Dog Lake.
15

16 Co-Chair Zalles understands that there is a comment period taking place related to the Roadless Rule.
17 All of the media coverage he has read at this point has indicated that there will likely be a lot of
18 litigation. Co-Chair Zalles reported that the Trump administration wants more logging and mining,
19 but also has stated that wildfires need to be controlled. He pointed out that existing law allows for
20 wildfire mitigation without needing to eliminate the Roadless Rule. Data shows that putting roads
21 into an area can cause fires because of humans entering wilderness areas. He does not believe the
22 comments submitted will be taken into account. Given what he has read about the likelihood of
23 litigation, he thought it made sense for the Environment System Committee to discuss this matter.
24

25 Chair Boardman believes this issue highlights the importance of the Central Wasatch National
26 Recreation and Conservation Area Act (“CWNCR A”). Co-Chair Zalles thought it might be
27 meaningful for the CWC Board to take a formal position on the Roadless Rule. Mr. Tolman reported
28 that a lot of his work this week has been dedicated to researching and communicating information
29 about the proposed Roadless Rule rescission. He has been trying to think about what the impacts to
30 the CWNCR A would be and the main concern relates to the proposed Mount Aire wilderness area.
31

32 When the Wilderness Act was passed in 1964, it directed the U.S. Forest Service to inventory all areas
33 that could become wilderness. Those became known as Inventoried Roadless Areas. Years later,
34 there was a rule stating that the areas currently inventoried as roadless must be protected as roadless,
35 partly for their ecological health, but also to preserve them as possible wilderness areas. If the
36 Roadless Rule is rescinded and the CWNCR A is not passed in the near future, roads could be built in
37 areas where there is a desire to turn them into wilderness. One of the goals of the CWNCR A is to
38 designate new wilderness, and without the Roadless Rule, designating wilderness will become more
39 challenging.
40

41 Mr. Tolman noted that if there is a desire to involve the CWC Board, there would need to be a faster
42 turnaround than normal. It is possible to suggest that the CWC Board submit a comment on the
43 Roadless Rule. Several cities have submitted Resolutions in opposition to the proposed rescission.
44 The CWC Board could sign a Resolution in opposition, because it would negatively impact the
45 chances of the CWNCR A moving forward. Co-Chair Zalles asked if there would still be an impact
46 if the Resolution was passed after the public comment period had ended. Ms. Nielsen reported that
47 the CWC Board Meeting was rescheduled and will take place on September 25, 2025. That meeting

1 will occur after the comment period has ended. However, there is a Resolution being created in
2 opposition, which will be presented to the CWC Board for consideration at the rescheduled meeting.

3
4 Mr. Tolman reported that Save Our Canyons has a comment form open that those interested can sign.
5 Alternatively, it is possible to submit an individual comment. Having a high quantity of comments
6 is important, as is making sure high-quality comments are submitted. Co-Chair Zalles asked if it is
7 possible to communicate information about this to the Stakeholders Council, which was confirmed.
8 Chair Boardman did not realize that a rescission of the Roadless Rule could impact the CWNCRRA.
9 That is important and should be clearly communicated to members of the Stakeholders Council.

10 11 **COMMITTEE GOALS**

12 13 **1. The Committee will Identify and Discuss Potential Projects and Goals.**

14
15 Chair Boardman reported that at the last Environment System Committee Meeting, there was a
16 discussion about transportation solutions and how those relate to the environment. She noted that the
17 different systems are interconnected. Chair Boardman asked what goals the Environment System
18 Committee would like to set and what potential projects there is a desire to focus on in the future.

19
20 Co-Chair Zalles commented that it made sense to follow what is happening politically in Washington
21 as far as environmental issues. In addition, he would like the Environment System Committee to
22 continue to push for solid data that shows change over time for issues that impact the environment.

23
24 Maura Hahnenberger mentioned the presentation from Ms. Blye at the last Stakeholders Council
25 Meeting. At that time, she discussed potential modifications that could reduce overall impacts to the
26 resource. In the Central Wasatch, parking is something that can be used to reduce impacts. For
27 example, once the parking reaches capacity, no more visitors can be allowed into the area. That is
28 one tool that could be used, but there were several other options shared by Ms. Blye that could
29 potentially reduce impacts to the resource. Ms. Hahnenberger liked the idea of modifying visitor
30 behavior and visitor attitudes. This is something the Environment System Committee could discuss
31 further. There could be signage, educational materials, or partnerships with other organizations.

32
33 Chair Boardman suggested speaking to the ski resorts about the implementation of timing for certain
34 pass products. This could encourage visitors at different times. For instance, there could be a pass
35 that allowed use from noon until the end of the day. A half-day season pass could shift some
36 behaviors. This is something that could modify the actions of visitors and spread out visitation.

37
38 Mr. Catt shared comments about modifying visitor behaviors and attitudes. There were some
39 interesting ideas shared during the Discussion Group portion of the last Stakeholders Council
40 Meeting. One idea was to make the experience of riding the bus more enjoyable than it is currently.
41 Frequently, visitors are at bus stops that do not have restrooms or trash receptacles. There are small
42 changes that can be made to modify visitor attitudes toward transit. As far as timing, expanding the
43 time that the ski resorts are operational might make sense. There could be more night skiing
44 encouraged, which would spread out the use and the traffic levels throughout the day.

45
46 Meaghan McKasy expressed support for focusing on attitudes and behaviors. Often, it is best to
47 address the attitudes before the behaviors. If the Environment System Committee is interested in
48 encouraging ski bus ridership, then the first thing the Committee needs to address is the attitude

1 toward the ski bus. If visitors have a negative attitude toward the ski bus, then that needs to be tackled
2 before anyone starts to encourage behavior change. In order to enact change, there will need to be
3 specificity about what the goals are. It was noted that CWC Staff is making note of all suggestions.

4
5 Mr. Lenkowski mentioned the idea of limited hours and noted that half-day passes exist at most ski
6 resorts. There is not much incentive for those, because the cost is almost as much as a full day pass.
7 There is a mid-week pass for some resorts as well, but there is nothing widescale enough that appears
8 to have made a significant difference. As for the comments about the bus, he believes there is a plan
9 for a mobility hub, which would be beneficial, as a mobility hub would have certain amenities.

10
11 Chair Boardman shared information about Solitude opening at 8:00 a.m. and explained that it made
12 it harder for employees, ski patrol, and essential visitors to access the area. Any changes to the hours
13 of operation should be well thought through. Mr. Tolman reported that Brighton has a twilight pass,
14 which is intended to spread out recreation throughout the day. That being said, there are some
15 complications associated with that, because some residents have expressed concerns about rush hour
16 being in both directions. It can be difficult for residents to return home due to the traffic levels. In
17 addition, there is light pollution caused by night skiing, which needs to be taken into account.

18 19 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

20 21 **1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

22
23 Chair Boardman noted that some Committee goals have been outlined during the current meeting.
24 She asked that these be turned into agenda items for the Environment System Committee to address
25 in the future. Co-Chair Zalles thought it made sense to track the proposed parking lot for Solitude.
26 Mr. Tolman reported that next week, the Town of Brighton is considering an Ordinance that could
27 impact the viability of a parking lot on that plot of land. In one way or another, that situation will be
28 different by the time the next Environment System Committee Meeting takes place. There can be an
29 agenda item added so that an update on the parking lot is shared with the Committee at the next
30 meeting.

31
32 Ms. Kilpack offered to gather all of the suggestions that have been made during the current meeting.
33 There can be continued discussion at the next meeting. It is a productive practice to have a
34 brainstorming session before making decisions about potential action items. Co-Chair Zalles would
35 like there to be further discussion about tracking changes over time, data, and any observations. It
36 would be beneficial to hear more from Mr. Knoblock about the document that was created. Chair
37 Boardman reported that the next Environment System Committee Meeting will take place right before
38 the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. At the next Environment System Committee Meeting, it is
39 possible to brainstorm questions for the ski resort panel that will present at the Stakeholders Council
40 Meeting. There could be some questions specific to the environment determined at that time.

41
42 Chair Boardman wanted to know if there would be an opportunity for Council Members to ask the
43 ski resort panel questions. Ms. Kilpack was not certain, but offered to find out ahead of time. It is
44 also possible for the Committee to ask the ski resort panel to touch on certain topics in their
45 presentation.

46
47 Ms. Kilpack reported that Committee Members can work on questions ahead of the next meeting.
48 There can be Committee Member communication via email if there is a desire to have the questions

1 finalized beforehand. Ms. Nielsen thought it made sense to think about potential questions. Chair
2 Boardman asked Committee Members to brainstorm some questions ahead of the next meeting.

3
4 Co-Chair Zalles asked if the Environment System Committee is interested in discussing conservation
5 easements. It is something that has been discussed by the Millcreek Canyon Committee. Ms. Kilpack
6 reported that this is something that will be considered at the next CWC Board Meeting. She suggested
7 that Committee Members listen in on that meeting to understand the general CWC Board direction.
8 Ms. Hahnenberger shared information about the last Executive/Budget/Audit Committee discussion.

9
10 Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC does not have the budget to make large-scale land purchases. In
11 addition, there are concerns about the creation of an inventory of potential lands to purchase, because
12 those inventory lists could create a speculative market that results in increased prices. If the
13 Stakeholders Council is interested in pursuing land purchases, it would make sense to identify funding
14 sources that would enable the CWC to make purchases of this size. Council Members could direct
15 their energy towards identifying grants, donors, or other funds the CWC could potentially use. Chair
16 Boardman asked whether funds from a CWC license plate could be used for something like this.
17 Ms. Nielsen confirmed that it could be a potential revenue source in the future. The CWC license
18 plate is something that Community Engagement Coordinator, Ben Kilbourne, and Research Intern,
19 Emory Schwieger, have been looking into more recently. This is something that will continue to be
20 explored.

21 **OTHER ITEMS**

22
23
24 There were no other items discussed.

25 **CLOSING**

26 27 28 **1. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System Committee** 29 **Meeting.**

30
31 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.
32 There was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

33
34 The Environment System Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:26 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 *September 9, 2025.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____
11