



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 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
Olivia Juarez
Meaghan McKasy
Ella Abelli-Amen
Jonny Vasic

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

Others: John Adams, Stakeholders Council

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 July 8, 2025, Meeting.

Chair Boardman referenced a typo on Page 2, Line 27 and asked that this be corrected.

MOTION: Doug Tolman moved to APPROVE the July 8, 2025, Meeting Minutes, as amended. Meaghan McKasy seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

CENTRAL WASATCH TRANSPORTATION AND SYSTEMS DISCUSSION

1. The Committee Will Discuss How Transportation Planning Can Balance Environmental Protection with Economic Health and Sustainability within the Context of the Mountain Accord.

Chair Boardman explained that the Environment System Committee will talk about how to balance transportation planning with environmental protection, economic health, and sustainability. She shared a synopsis of the Mountain Accord charter. There have been a few comments suggesting that transportation takes over, and it is difficult to talk about the environment, economy, and recreation in that context. Looking at the Mountain Accord charter, it seems the different areas of focus are connected. The transportation solutions that are implemented will impact the environment, economy, and recreation. The goal of the Mountain Accord was “to create and build a consensus that would include responsible stewardship of natural resources, preservation of quality recreation experiences, establish an environmentally sustainable transportation system, and contribute to a vibrant economy.”

Chair Boardman pointed out that it is not possible to look at transportation independently of the other focus areas. Responsible stewardship of natural resources is under attack by the current administration. As for the preservation of quality recreation experiences, that involves maintaining a healthy environment, preventing overcrowding, providing access, protecting resources, and ensuring transportation. Right now, the UDOT transportation proposals are tied up in lawsuits. The intention is for the Environment System Committee to discuss the balance between the different system groups.

The intended outcomes include protecting the watershed, Federal protections for land, including limiting the expansion of ski areas, clustering development, accommodating and managing roads for recreational uses, integrating transit solutions, and creating transportation connections using transit, walking, biking, and reducing vehicle use. Chair Boardman felt it would be useful for the Environment System Committee to think about how transportation solutions are evolving and how those solutions will impact the other focus areas, such as the environment, economy, and recreation.

LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON TRANSPORTATION FACILITATION DISCUSSION

1. The Committee Will Identify Organizations and Communities Involved in Transportation Planning in Little Cottonwood Canyon.

2. The Committee Will Discuss How the CWC Can Facilitate Collaboration Between These Groups to Address Short-Term Transportation Solutions in Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Chair Boardman reported that she put together a brainstormed list of organizations and communities involved in transportation planning in Little Cottonwood Canyon. She hopes this can be the start of a larger discussion. Additional organizations can be added. A lot of the entities named are involved in either the transportation solutions for Little Cottonwood Canyon or the current lawsuits. Chair Boardman likes the idea of creating an inventory and thinking about short-term solutions that the organizations can collaborate on. She wants to see items move forward, even with the lawsuits.

Chair Boardman reviewed some of the linked materials and organizations, which include the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact

1 Statement (“EIS”). Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) is involved with the ski bus service and has vans
2 for employees. There is also the Save Our Canyons lawsuit to consider. In addition, there is an
3 organization called Save Not Pave and Canyon Guard. Cottonwood Heights is also involved in
4 transportation solutions. There was a presentation at the Transportation System Committee Meeting
5 recently from Wasatch Transit Solutions, which will look at regional solutions involving rail. There
6 is also the lawsuit from Friends of Alta. Two entities that are involved in traffic management,
7 especially on canyon closures and traction control days, are the Sandy City Police Department and
8 the Cottonwood Heights Police Department. Other organizations on the list are Snowbird and Alta.
9 Committee Members were asked if other organizations and communities could be added.

10
11 Chair Boardman would ideally like to have the different organizations and communities meet so that
12 the focus can be on the implementation of certain transportation solutions. It was noted that Maura
13 Hahnenberger left a comment in the Zoom chat box stating that the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance
14 should be added. Doug Tolman shared some information about Canyon Guard and the current efforts
15 for collaboration with some of the organizations on the list. Canyon Guard is a 501 (c)(3) organization
16 that is based in Alta. It is comprised largely of Alta residents and those who care deeply about Little
17 Cottonwood Canyon. Canyon Guard is focused on transit solutions. The organization is not officially
18 named in any of the lawsuits, but several members of their Board are Plaintiffs in the Friends of Alta
19 lawsuit. Work is being done to find a solution so the Phase I items can move ahead. The organization
20 is also working on some Legislative efforts. In terms of what has been happening, lawyers are
21 currently in conversation with UDOT about what legal framework can be set up to permit Phase I
22 opportunities to move forward without invalidating the legal claims made in the litigation. Save Our
23 Canyons is supporting the efforts of Canyon Guard on that, so there are conversations taking place.

24
25 Chair Boardman understands that there is some money available to help address the problems. It
26 would be nice to use that money on the Phase I solutions. Mr. Tolman believed she was referencing
27 the Cottonwood Canyon Transportation Infrastructure Fund (“CCTIF”), which was confirmed. He
28 explained that at least \$50 million of it is programmed to be used in the UDOT Five-Year Plan.
29 Mr. Tolman stated that his interpretation of the UDOT position is that, since the lawsuit is claiming
30 the whole National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process was flawed, any item, including
31 items in Phase I, like busing and tolling, cannot be implemented because there could be legal
32 consequences. That being said, the majority of the Plaintiffs have approached UDOT to talk about
33 the Phase I items.

34
35 Co-Chair Dan Zalles asked about the timeline for the litigation. He wanted to know if it would be
36 multiple years before the lawsuits are resolved. Mr. Tolman reported that the discovery period is
37 almost over, and the process will move forward in the fall. Chair Boardman asked if there is another
38 Central Wasatch Symposium planned, which was confirmed. She wondered whether there was a goal
39 or topic that would thread through the presentations. Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, stated that
40 there is nothing like that planned at this point, but the intention is to build on what was introduced
41 during the first Central Wasatch Symposium. The next symposium details have not been finalized.
42 Chair Boardman pointed out that it might be a good venue to bring together different organizations.
43 Some of these organizations are not working together, so there is opportunity for collaboration.

CENTRAL WASATCH TRANSPORTATION FACILITATION DISCUSSION

1. **The Committee Will Identify Organizations and Communities Involved in Transportation Planning in the Central Wasatch, Including Wasatch Boulevard, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Millcreek Canyon, Parleys Canyon, and the Wasatch Back.**
2. **The Committee Will Discuss How the CWC Can Facilitate Collaboration Between These Groups.**

The Environment System Committee continued to discuss Little Cottonwood Canyon as well as transportation planning in the Central Wasatch. Chair Boardman shared an example of an effective addition, which is the Ski Bus Priority Access Program. Co-Chair Zalles asked for additional information about the program. Ms. Kilpack reported that the Sandy City Police Department creates a traffic pattern where vehicles are directed to the shoulder of the road so commuters can pass without being stuck in canyon traffic. There is a desire for Cottonwood Heights to participate in this program as well to address the traffic issues in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Ms. Kilpack noted that there were several meetings with Cottonwood Heights last year. However, the difficulty was not having the same kind of shoulder that the Sandy City side has. There have been issues determining how to manage traffic in the Cottonwood Heights area based on the way that the roads are laid out.

Chair Boardman read an article in 2023, which stated that Cottonwood Heights added three new officers to control that area. Based on what she saw last year, that was not happening. Ms. Kilpack believed the officers are there trying to help mitigate traffic on the canyon closure days, but she is not sure what is happening the rest of the time. Officers are there supporting to some extent, but not to the level that Sandy City has in place. There was additional discussion about the traffic levels.

Olivia Juarez referenced the list of organizations and suggested the Labor Network for Sustainability for the broader Central Wasatch. It is not based locally and is not focused on Little Cottonwood Canyon, but they have a transit equity platform. There would likely be a lot of information that could be shared as local opportunities for collaboration are developed. She believes the organization has applicable solutions. It was also suggested that the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) be added.

Co-Chair Zalles asked what the Environment System Committee can do that will not be duplicative of the efforts made by the Transportation System Committee. Chair Boardman believes the Committee can think about transportation solutions in the context of the environmental impacts. It is possible that the environment could be negatively impacted if enough thought is not given to what is pursued. Chair Boardman pointed out that the environment needs to be considered with all of the transportation planning efforts underway, as that aligns with the Mountain Accord charter.

Co-Chair Zalles wanted to know whether the Transportation System Committee had discussed this already. Ms. Kilpack clarified that the Transportation System Committee has not had this conversation. It is worth remembering that everything is interconnected. The Transportation System Committee is looking at specific transportation items, but it makes sense for the Environment System Committee to look at transportation through the lens of environmental impacts. Finding ways to encourage different organizations and communities to work together is also in line with the mission of the CWC. Mr. Tolman reported that he sits on both Committees and there has been some variation of this conversation at the Transportation System Committee level. There is some frustration that

1 there are many different groups attempting to focus on solutions, but the groups are not necessarily
2 working together. There are different political and social barriers to some of those connections.

3
4 Meaghan McKasy pointed out that the CWC has a systems thinking approach. She reminded those
5 present that the different subcommittees were created to be more efficient. The subcommittees can
6 then come together during the Stakeholders Council Meetings. It might make sense to have this kind
7 of discussion at a future Stakeholders Council Meeting rather than tackling it separately. Chair
8 Boardman feels like there needs to be checks and balances on transportation solutions. As the
9 Environment System Committee, it is important to be part of the conversation. Ms. McKasy believes
10 that all of the subcommittees need to have checks and balances. Chair Boardman explained that she
11 wanted to create an inventory that highlights the different entities involved. There are many different
12 entities expending effort towards transportation solutions, but the Mountain Accord is not necessarily
13 considered in those efforts. It would be beneficial to bring people together and to focus on the charter.

14
15 Co-Chair Zalles noted that the Environment System Committee can brainstorm some of the criteria
16 that must be met. This can be done to determine preferred transportation solutions. The outcomes
17 can then be presented as a way to start the discussion. It is possible to think about the critical
18 transportation issues that exist. Chair Boardman added that the Committee can discuss how different
19 transportation solutions accommodate and manage growth. Co-Chair Zalles noted that every solution
20 has trade-offs, so taking time to brainstorm those could be useful. Chair Boardman believes the main
21 question when it comes to transportation is whether the goal is to accommodate everyone who wants
22 to spend time in the canyons. That could be contrary to the goals of the Mountain Accord, which
23 references year-round sustainable transportation that also considers the environment. The trade-offs
24 need to be considered, such as water pollution from vehicles spilling oil, trash, and air pollution.

25
26 Mr. Tolman stated that there are many transportation-centric discussions. As a result, it is necessary
27 to think about how the Environment System Committee can participate in those discussions without
28 duplicating efforts. In the Transportation System Committee Meetings, there have been a lot of
29 discussions about individual actions that can move forward. This includes increasing the number of
30 stickers on vehicles to increase participation in the traction program and looking into vehicle count
31 numbers. The Environment System Committee has the opportunity to look at things differently. It
32 might be possible for there to be a panel hosted on environmentally sustainable mountain transit. This
33 could involve an air quality researcher or a water quality researcher. Mr. Tolman referenced a
34 sociogram, which is a visual representation of the social relationships within a group. It is possible
35 to map the various organizations and communities to see where gaps might exist and who is best to
36 approach with different solutions. He reiterated that there could be a panel with some outside voices.

37
38 Ms. McKasy expressed support for the sociogram because it is a positive visual representation. Given
39 the list that has been brainstormed already and the number of organizations that are involved in the
40 transportation discussions, the sociogram could be visually powerful. However, she noted that the
41 work of the Transportation System Committee is not necessarily something for this Committee to
42 discuss. Ideally, the Transportation System Committee will not only be focused on moving as many
43 people as possible up the canyon, because that does not align with the Mountain Accord. Chair
44 Boardman clarified that there has not been a critique of the Transportation System Committee. She
45 is supportive of what has been happening at that level. She intends to relate that work to the
46 environment. Many different entities are involved in the current transportation discussions, but the
47 question is whether those entities are still working under the vision of the Mountain Accord.

1 Mr. Tolman asked if Ms. McKasy has any experience with sociograms. Ms. McKasy has not
2 personally done that work, but she has seen several examples. Mr. Tolman thought it would be
3 something interesting to have for the next Central Wasatch Symposium. The Committee can look
4 into this. Brenden Catt noted that there is a lot of data on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. It might
5 be worth using some of that in a presentation or to inform some of the decisions made.

6
7 Chair Boardman does not think the goal of the Environment System Committee is to come up with a
8 transportation solution, but to make sure everyone is on board with the vision of the Mountain Accord
9 and to encourage different entities to work together. Ms. McKasy referenced previous comments
10 made about the Transportation System Committee. She does not want the work of different
11 subcommittees to be oversimplified, as all of the different systems are interconnected. Chair
12 Boardman reiterated that she is not criticizing the Transportation System Committee. She wants to
13 understand the goals of the different entities listed and their alignment with the Mountain Accord.

14
15 It is important that the Environment System Committee does not lose sight of the environment as
16 transportation solutions are considered. Chair Boardman reported that at a recent Transportation
17 System Committee Meeting, there was a presentation from Wasatch Transit Solutions. She explained
18 that Wasatch Transit Solutions is looking at a regional rail system that would also service the canyons.
19 Chair Boardman does not know what the positives and negatives would be with that approach, but it
20 is necessary to think about those as different transportation solutions are discussed. Whatever is done
21 with transportation will have a significant impact on the other systems, including the environment.

22
23 Ms. Kilpack clarified that the goal of the Transportation System Committee is not to move as many
24 people as possible up the canyon. There are a lot of transportation goals in the Mountain Accord, but
25 generally speaking, the idea is to discourage additional vehicles in the canyon and focus on
26 transportation solutions that consider the other systems. Co-Chair Zalles thought it would be useful
27 to see an assessment of the different transportation options so the environmental impacts can be
28 considered. It might be worthwhile to listen to Transportation System Committee Meetings. Chair
29 Boardman explained that she wants there to be more of a focus on the Mountain Accord. In addition,
30 she would like to see more collaboration with the overarching goal of preserving the Central Wasatch.

31
32 It was noted that the Mountain Accord is the guiding document of the CWC. That being said, there
33 is some disconnect from that document within some of the conversations. One goal of the Central
34 Wasatch Symposium could be to reconnect others with the Mountain Accord. Co-Chair Zalles
35 pointed out that the Environment System Committee can be facilitators of conversations that focus
36 on the environmental impacts. That is one way the Committee can participate in the symposium.

37
38 Chair Boardman pointed out that it is difficult to talk about the environment, economy, or recreation
39 without considering transportation. She asked if there should be a change in thinking, driven by the
40 Committee, that it is difficult to talk about transportation without considering the environment,
41 economy, or recreation. Transportation solutions that are respectful to the environment could be the
42 key to having a healthy economy with healthy recreation, where transportation works well. Co-Chair
43 Zalles believed that it is the role of the Environment System Committee, because this Committee
44 reminds the others that the environment cannot be forgotten or overlooked in these conversations.

45
46 Mr. Tolman does not feel that any of the other subcommittees are putting the environment on the back
47 burner. While the discussions are focused on their particular system, the environment is still
48 considered. As for the Central Wasatch Symposium, hosting a panel called the Mountain Accord and

1 the Environment would be meaningful. There could be a member from each subcommittee invited
2 to participate. Alternatively, there could be academic researchers invited to provide an outside
3 perspective. Co-Chair Zalles stressed the importance of education about environmental impacts.

4
5 Chair Boardman mentioned the entities with lawsuits related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon
6 EIS. Those lawsuits have to do with the environment. It is not possible to have transportation
7 solutions without considering the environment. Co-Chair Zalles confirmed that transportation is an
8 issue that can impact the environment. It is also important to think about the economy and recreation.

9
10 There was discussion about the information available on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. Chair
11 Boardman stated that it would be useful to look at the past, present, and future conditions in the
12 Central Wasatch. She also noted that certain transportation solutions are beneficial to the
13 environment, such as the Ski Bus Priority Access Program, which moves vehicles to the side of the
14 road and reduces idling. In addition, more capable buses and vans on the road could be beneficial.

15
16 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Transportation Committee, which is associated with the CWC Board,
17 wants to determine what role the CWC can play in transportation for the upcoming Olympic Games.
18 There will be a meeting on August 27, 2025. It is possible for members of the Environment System
19 Committee to listen in on that meeting. Ms. Kilpack noted that the program for the Central Wasatch
20 Symposium is starting to be discussed, so all of this feedback will be taken into consideration. She
21 added that there was a conversation at the last Environment System Committee Meeting about
22 sustainable business models. That will be on a Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda in the fall.

23
24 John Adams noted that on the Central Wasatch Dashboard, there is a place for people to submit
25 comments. He did that for the first time recently and asked where the comment was sent. Ms. Kilpack
26 reported that the submitted comments were going to the DIGIT Lab at one point, but CWC Staff now
27 has more access. She will look for the comment that was submitted and make sure there is an alert
28 to know when new comments are submitted on the Central Wasatch Dashboard platform.

29 30 **IMPACTFUL ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS DISCUSSION**

31 32 **1. The Committee Will Identify Exemplary Environmental Goals and Shared** 33 **Environmental Goals Among Local Businesses in the Context of the Upcoming 2034** 34 **Olympics.**

35
36 Chair Boardman referenced the Stakeholders Council Meeting agenda item that will be discussed in
37 the fall. She would like to ask the ski resorts what they see as the limits for growth. For example,
38 how much the resorts want to grow over time and if the resorts can make those kinds of decisions.
39 Co-Chair Zalles stressed the importance of being specific about what growth means. It might have
40 to do with the number of visitors, the amount of money, the number of ski lifts, and so on. Chair
41 Boardman explained that she wants to better understand their vision for the future. There can then be
42 discussions about how to support those goals while focusing on the vision of the Mountain Accord.

43
44 Mr. Adams reported that there has been outreach to the ski resorts previously about specific skier
45 numbers, but that is proprietary information. All of the goods and services related to the ski resorts
46 require moving people up and down the canyons, but it is still possible to ask the ski resorts about
47 their future vision. Ms. McKasy believes that Los Angeles has stated that the 2028 Olympic Games
48 will discourage single-occupancy vehicles during the games. She offered to find the press release.

1
2 Mr. Tolman stated that in the last few years, the Utah Legislature has been sending a lot of money to
3 a project called 47G, which is developing and deploying air taxis for the 2034 Olympics. The
4 intention is to have electric helicopters running between venues. He has some environmental
5 concerns as well as some user experience concerns due to the flight path. Save Our Canyons wants
6 to continue to discuss that. Chair Boardman asked if there were other questions for the discussion in
7 the fall. One of the measures for sustainability with the resorts is the carbon footprint. As mentioned
8 in a previous meeting, Solitude has reduced CO2 emissions by putting vans on the road for employees.
9 However, the Ikon Pass model encourages people from different places to travel to certain resorts.

10
11 Co-Chair Zalles believes there are two categories of questions: what green practices are the resorts
12 adopting and how do the resorts want to grow their business. If there is going to be a discussion with
13 ski resort representatives, it is important to keep the categories in mind. Chair Boardman asked
14 Committee Members to think about additional questions before the next meeting. She noted that at
15 the last meeting, there was a discussion about how the resorts influence the way the public thinks
16 about the environment. She reminded those present that resorts have the ability to reach others.

17 18 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

19 20 **1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

21
22 Chair Boardman asked for potential items for the next Environment System Committee Meeting
23 agenda. Ms. Kilpack noted that ideas can also be submitted to the Chair, Co-Chair, or CWC Staff
24 after the meeting. Ms. McKasy thought it made sense to talk about the Central Wasatch Symposium
25 at the next meeting. Ms. Kilpack confirmed that there is a desire to hear from members of the
26 Stakeholders Council about the Central Wasatch Symposium. There will likely be a Google Form
27 created so that ideas for the symposium can be submitted. It is also possible to make
28 recommendations during subcommittee meetings. She reiterated that CWC Staff wants to hear
29 suggestions.

30
31 Information about the Central Wasatch Symposium was shared. Ms. Kilpack reported that the first
32 Central Wasatch Symposium was a gathering of different experts, speakers, and researchers on issues
33 related to the Central Wasatch and the work of the CWC. There were panels, speakers, and Terry
34 Tempest Williams offered the keynote address. She would recommend that Committee Members
35 review the Central Wasatch Symposium page on the CWC website. There is a record of everyone
36 who spoke and there are also recordings of the presentations, with the exception of the keynote
37 address. The goal of the Central Wasatch Symposium is to bring together the voices and expertise of
38 everyone who cares about the mountains. It is possible to learn from one another, share ideas, and
39 explore solutions. The next Central Wasatch Symposium will take place on January 8 and 9, 2026.

40
41 Co-Chair Zalles suggested that Committee Members review the Central Wasatch Dashboard to see if
42 it is possible to discern some human impacts over the last 20 years or so. It would be informative
43 ahead of the discussion that is planned to take place in the fall with the full Stakeholders Council.

44 45 **OTHER ITEMS**

46
47 There were no other items discussed.
48

1 **CLOSING**

2
3 1. **Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System Committee**
4 **Meeting.**

5
6 **MOTION:** Dan Zalles moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting. Meagan
7 McKasy seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

8
9 The Environment System Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:30 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 *August 12, 2025.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____
11