



**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 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  
Meaghan McKasy  
Brenden Catt  
Maura Hahnenberger  
Ella Abelli-Amen  
Adam Lenkowski  
Jonny Vasic  
Olivia Juarez  
Doug Tolman

**Staff:** Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

**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 3:04 p.m. and welcomed those present.

**2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the October 14, 2025, Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to APPROVE the October 14, 2025, Meeting Minutes. Meagan McKasy seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

Chair Boardman reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the Environment System Committee Meeting held on October 14, 2025. At that meeting, there was a continued discussion about modifying visitor behavior in the Central Wasatch. This is something that will continue to be discussed. At the last meeting, there was also a discussion about funding needs, as requested by the Economy System Committee. Some of the items mentioned included the need to acquire and compile more over time data for the Central Wasatch Dashboard and security cameras at trailheads. She clarified that the cameras could serve multiple purposes, such as counting the number of visitors, disincentivizing

1 graffiti, and increasing overall safety. During the last meeting, there was a discussion about funding  
2 sources for land acquisitions, which is one the original goals of the Mountain Accord. There is the  
3 Legislative and Land Tenure Committee at the CWC Board level. It is possible to attend those  
4 meetings and pay attention to the work that is being done. Committee Members can then discuss how  
5 to assist in those efforts. The Environment System Committee also discussed whether there could be  
6 a Short-Term Projects Grant Program application to start a fund for land acquisition.

## 7 8 **VISITOR BEHAVIOR IN THE CENTRAL WASATCH**

### 9 10 **1. The Committee will Discuss Modifying Visitor Behavior in the Central Wasatch.**

11  
12 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee has previously discussed  
13 modifying visitor behavior in the Central Wasatch. This will be a continuation of those previous  
14 discussions. She noted that visitor management could be an effective way to handle the flow of  
15 visitors, overcrowding, and bottlenecks. Chair Boardman had a conversation earlier in the day about  
16 the Mountain Accord. There are a lot of people who are unaware of the Mountain Accord and what  
17 it accomplished. It would be beneficial to educate the public further about that document.

18  
19 Meaghan McKasy noted that knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors tend to go in order. It is difficult  
20 to shift attitudes without that baseline knowledge. It is also difficult to shift behaviors without the  
21 appropriate knowledge and attitudes. She noted that it might make sense to increase the level of  
22 knowledge before starting to focus on attitudes and behaviors. Ms. McKasy pointed out that a lot  
23 comes down to what goal the Environment System Committee wants to achieve. For example, it  
24 might be possible to start at the attitude stage if the goal is to address traffic issues, because people  
25 are already aware of the problem. There could be a behavior-oriented campaign because that  
26 knowledge level already exists. When it comes to the Mountain Accord, there might be a lower  
27 knowledge level associated with that work. As a result, it would be best to start with education.

28  
29 Jonny Vasic confirmed that there are people he knows who are unfamiliar with the Mountain Accord  
30 and what it is intended to accomplish. An awareness campaign from the CWC about the Mountain  
31 Accord would be meaningful. One of the goals of the Mountain Accord relates to a Federal  
32 Designation, so increased awareness is important as far as public support in the future.

33  
34 Chair Boardman noted that at the end of each meeting agenda, there is a discussion about what there  
35 is a desire to focus on at the next meeting. She asked everyone on the Committee to think about their  
36 motivation for joining the Stakeholders Council and Environment System Committee, as well as what  
37 each person would like to see accomplished. She pointed out that everyone has volunteered their time  
38 to benefit the Central Wasatch and asked the Committee to think about the motivation behind that.

39  
40 Co-Chair Dan Zalles liked the idea of focusing on Mountain Accord education. The Mountain Accord  
41 gives a sense of identity to the mountains and defines certain principles. He expressed his support  
42 for an educational component of some sort. Maura Hahnenberger does not think it is a bad thing to  
43 educate people about the Mountain Accord, but the document itself does not have a lot of entry points  
44 for individuals who care about the Central Wasatch. Most of the items included in the Mountain  
45 Accord do not relate to individual actions. While people can learn more about the Mountain Accord,  
46 there are not a lot of actionable items for individuals who care about the area. Ms. Hahnenberger  
47 suggested finding effective partners that have broader communication pathways. For instance, there  
48 could be information on the Ski Utah website about how to reduce user impacts.

1  
2 Ms. McKasy believed that visitor behavior in the Central Wasatch is a different focus than the Federal  
3 Designation. It is important to determine the goal that the Committee wants to achieve. Chair  
4 Boardman sees the disconnect between the Mountain Accord and modifying visitor behavior, but she  
5 also sees some connections. Part of the vision of the Mountain Accord is to reduce impacts on  
6 ecosystems. Reducing impacts related to traffic and air aligns with the goals of the Mountain Accord.  
7 It is possible for visitors to think about how their individual actions can reduce impacts. Increased  
8 awareness of the Mountain Accord will also be beneficial if the Central Wasatch National  
9 Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”) is eventually considered. Ms. McKasy thought  
10 that made sense, but noted that the average person might struggle to make those connections.  
11

12 Chair Boardman further discussed visitor behavior and the use of public transportation. If there are  
13 more buses added, but visitors are still unwilling to use those buses, then the situation will not change.  
14 Olivia Juarez would be in support of an education campaign. She asked what the strategy would be  
15 and how information would be distributed. Chair Boardman thought it made sense to discuss this at  
16 the next Environment System Committee Meeting. The Committee can think about how information  
17 will be shared and brainstorm appropriate partners to contact. It was reiterated that the goal the  
18 Committee wants to achieve needs to be finalized before any outreach steps are conducted.  
19

20 Ms. McKasy agreed with an earlier comment from Co-Chair Zalles that whenever something is  
21 backed by research, it will be more impactful. Something that is often seen in behavior-related studies  
22 is that when one behavior is influenced, others are influenced as well. There is a human desire to be  
23 consistent in behaviors. Even though not every item on the drafted list may be the most impactful,  
24 there may be a spillover effect where other behaviors are positively impacted. Chair Boardman shared  
25 information about the ways she has accessed the canyons. When she worked at Solitude Mountain  
26 Resort, it didn’t make sense to backtrack when she could be there before the crowds arrived. As a  
27 result, she drove to the resort. However, with Alta, there is the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) bus  
28 that comes through her neighborhood. She does not need to backtrack, which means she is not losing  
29 time and money by using the bus. The more coordination there is with UTA and the ski resorts, the  
30 better. Transit must make sense for people. It needs to be easy, have connections, and be a positive  
31 experience. This is one way that visitor behavior in the Central Wasatch could change. Chair  
32 Boardman suggested that there be continued communication with UTA and the ski resorts.  
33

## 34 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL RESORT PRESENTATION DISCUSSION**

### 36 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Presentations Given by Ski Resorts at the October 15,** 37 **2025, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**

38  
39 Chair Boardman asked for Committee Member feedback about the ski resort presentation at the last  
40 Stakeholders Council Meeting. There were some common threads on waste diversion, revegetation,  
41 habitat restoration, water resource management, and energy management. However, she did not see  
42 a combined effort in traffic management. It seems the ski resorts are largely working independently  
43 on that. Chair Boardman believes it would be beneficial if all of the ski resorts had a parking  
44 reservation system in place. The parking system could still be managed by the individual resorts, but  
45 it would be meaningful if there were similar policies across all of the canyon resorts. Co-Chair Zalles  
46 pointed out that Snowbird seems to be the only ski resort without a parking reservation system.  
47

1 Chair Boardman reported that Snowbird has stated there is uncertainty about the number of roadside  
2 parking spots that are available. She understands the resort not wanting to reserve spots that will not  
3 be available if there is avalanche mitigation happening in the canyon, but it is still possible to plan  
4 parking reservations around the roadside parking spaces that exist. Ms. McKasy noted that there are  
5 parking spaces that are not impacted by avalanche work. It should be possible to reserve those and  
6 then have a second wave of parking spaces available, depending on the conditions on particular dates.  
7 Co-Chair Zalles stated that there is one lot that is reserved at Snowbird, but it was clarified that a  
8 parking reservation is not required at Snowbird. Chair Boardman suggested messaging at the mouth  
9 of the canyon to state whether there is roadside parking available. Without a reservation, a visitor  
10 could be encouraged to take the bus. She stressed the importance of clear communication to visitors.

11  
12 Chair Boardman asked if there were common threads in the ski resort presentations. Co-Chair Zalles  
13 was impressed with many of the actions taken by the ski resorts. He learned a lot from the  
14 presentation. Chair Boardman also learned a lot from the presentation and acknowledged that the ski  
15 resorts are doing a lot to focus on sustainability. There were some significant differences in the  
16 priorities from ski resort to ski resort, but it is clear that each resort wants to make sure their businesses  
17 are more environmentally responsible. Co-Chair Zalles wanted to know more about how growth is a  
18 factor in the ski resort business plans. Additionally, he would like to understand what growth looks  
19 like for those businesses. If there are growth targets for the businesses, then there are certain  
20 implications for the environment. Chair Boardman knows that Alta Ski Area wants to keep the visitor  
21 numbers at a level where it is still possible to provide a quality experience. That is part of the reason  
22 for their parking reservation system. Reservations act as a natural constraint, as it limits the number  
23 of people who can be at the resort at one time. Co-Chair Zalles mentioned Deer Valley Resort and  
24 the growth that is happening there. The ski resorts in the Central Wasatch appear to be more restricted.

25  
26 Chair Boardman did not know that any of the businesses in the canyons will want to share their plans  
27 for growth with the Environment System Committee. She explained that there are certain natural  
28 constraints to growth, such as the road and the amount of parking available. She pointed out that  
29 since the Mountain Accord was signed, there have been changes in ownership and business models.  
30 The Mountain Accord focused on an agreed-upon vision. She reiterated that it is unlikely the ski  
31 resorts in the canyons will want to share information about their plans for future growth.

32  
33 Adam Lenkowski reported that Alta is the only resort that has stated growth is not being sought after.  
34 The General Manager previously said there is a balance in place, and the intention is to ensure the  
35 user experience is positive. Chair Boardman noted that this ties into modifying visitor behavior. It  
36 might be possible to speak to the ski resorts about providing more incentives to ride the bus. Co-  
37 Chair Zalles asked if there is resistance from the resorts in Big Cottonwood Canyon about improved  
38 busing. Chair Boardman does not believe so. She has listened to recordings of some other meetings,  
39 and there were comments made about the money available for canyon transportation. She asked if  
40 the money has been specifically allocated for buses or if the money could be used for a potential  
41 gondola. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, was not certain how those funds are allowed to  
42 be spent.

43  
44 Doug Tolman reported that the Cottonwood Canyon Transportation Investment Fund (“CCTIF”) has  
45 approximately \$200 million in it currently, most of which has been appropriated by the Legislature.  
46 His understanding is that it is to be used for the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little  
47 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) and the Big Cottonwood Canyon  
48 Environmental Study. He believes some of the money has been used for the Environmental Study.

1 In Little Cottonwood Canyon, the argument UDOT is making is that progress is stalled by the  
2 lawsuits. Co-Chair Zalles asked when the Environmental Study will be completed. Mr. Tolman  
3 reported that it will be finished in the spring. Chair Boardman asked if the money in the CCTIF can  
4 be used for buses and vans. Mr. Tolman believes that the money can be used for the studies as well  
5 as the recommended items. There is some concern that the money is being used as a savings account  
6 for the proposed gondola in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Chair Boardman heard  
7 similar concerns at another meeting. Co-Chair Zalles asked for additional information about the  
8 funds. Mr. Tolman explained that the Legislature has been adding to the fund over the last several  
9 Legislative Sessions. It is intended to be used by UDOT in both of the Cottonwood Canyons.

10  
11 Co-Chair Zalles asked for an update on the status of the lawsuits. Mr. Tolman explained that he is  
12 unable to share a lot of information about the lawsuits, but there are active conversations happening  
13 between the various parties involved. There are attempts being made to find some common ground.

## 14 15 **CENTRAL WASATCH DASHBOARD DISCUSSION**

### 16 17 **1. The Committee will Discuss Ways to Increase Visitors to the Central Wasatch** 18 **Dashboard.**

19  
20 Chair Boardman reported that at the last Environment System Committee Meeting, the Committee  
21 was informed that there is not a lot of money available to make changes to the Central Wasatch  
22 Dashboard. It is an important resource, but might be underutilized. She asked Committee Members  
23 to discuss how to increase visitor traffic to the Central Wasatch Dashboard moving forward.

24  
25 Chair Boardman asked for suggestions about how to increase the number of visitors and make it a  
26 more valuable resource. Ms. McKasy pointed out that it depends on whether there is a desire to bring  
27 it to the Central Wasatch Dashboard. If the intention is for lawmakers and members of the Legislature  
28 to use the resource, there could be something prepared and distributed ahead of the Legislative  
29 Session. Co-Chair Zalles noted that news media could use it as a resource and potentially mention it  
30 in articles.

31  
32 Mr. Kilpack asked who on the Committee is currently using the Central Wasatch Dashboard. She  
33 reminded those present that the Central Wasatch Dashboard is a collection of data that is available  
34 elsewhere. It ensures that the data is all in a centralized location. This makes it easier to find  
35 information and also encourages users to explore different datasets. She asked Committee Members  
36 to discuss what makes the Central Wasatch Dashboard useful for them or what rationale there is for  
37 not using it. Ms. McKasy asked how often the CWC issues press releases. Ms. Kilpack explained  
38 that there are press releases whenever there is something the organization wants to share. For  
39 instance, when the CWC was seeking public comment on a Millcreek Canyon shuttle. There are  
40 typically four or five press releases per year, but it varies depending on the work that is underway.

41  
42 Ms. McKasy pointed out that the CWC could put out a press release informing others that the Central  
43 Wasatch Dashboard was recently revised. That press release could also highlight some of the  
44 different ways the resource can be used. Chair Boardman noted that the CWC Youth Council  
45 previously created a list of ideas. It is possible to revisit some of those ideas. She recalled that there  
46 was something related to real-time information, which could assist with visitor decision-making. It  
47 was noted that there could be a Plan Your Recreation Excursion section with real-time information.

1 Brenden Catt noted the true value of the Central Wasatch Dashboard is that it is a compilation of  
2 resources. It is meaningful to have all of these different resources located in one place. He pointed  
3 out that visitors to the Central Wasatch Dashboard might not be casual users, but academics or those  
4 who are taking a more holistic approach, like policy makers. Ella Abelli-Amen addressed the question  
5 posed by Ms. Kilpack about how the Central Wasatch Dashboard could be more useful. She works  
6 in the non-profit sector and does a lot of GIS mapping. If there was a way to download different  
7 datasets into GIS, that would make this resource more useful for her work. Chair Boardman liked the  
8 suggestion. Ms. Kilpack offered to speak to Phoebe McNeally about that during their next meeting.  
9

10 It was noted that Mr. Lenkowski shared some additional suggestions in the Zoom chat box. Chair  
11 Boardman reported that the CWC has put a lot of time and resources into the Central Wasatch  
12 Dashboard. She stressed the importance of making sure the resource is informative and well used.  
13

## 14 **BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT DISCUSSION**

### 15 16 1. **The Committee will Discuss the Big Cottonwood Canyon Watershed Restoration Project** 17 **and the Possibility of Prescribed Burns.** 18

19 Chair Boardman asked someone to speak about the watershed restoration project. Ms. Abelli-Amen  
20 reported that the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation is involved in this project. It is a Watershed  
21 Restoration Initiative Grant from the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. This project includes cut,  
22 pile, and burn treatments. There is also myrtle spurge work. The project is looking at watershed  
23 restoration through a lot of different lenses. Mr. Tolman stated that the U.S. Forest Service is about  
24 to undertake an Environmental Assessment (“EA”) for the rest of the project, which is largely related  
25 to the burning. The work sounds like it will be similar to what was done in Upper Millcreek Canyon.  
26 There will not be tracked machines used, and there will not be new roads built. It is safety and  
27 watershed protection oriented. The public comment period was supposed to happen in August or  
28 September, but due to staffing cuts and the government shutdown, it has been pushed back to the  
29 spring. When that public comment period opens, the Committee will be able to engage more directly.  
30

31 Chair Boardman asked what the forecasted start date is for the project. Mr. Tolman reported that it  
32 was supposed to be May or June 2026, but that was pending the public comment and EA happening  
33 on schedule. However, due to the staffing cuts and the government shutdown, there are delays. Chair  
34 Boardman wanted to know how long it would take for the actual work to be done. Mr. Tolman  
35 reported that there have to be certain burn windows with certain moisture levels, temperatures, and  
36 wind characteristics. He believed there was a five or six-year window, with it mostly being  
37 frontloaded. With a similar grant, the Pleasant Grove Ranger District is doing the same kind of work  
38 in American Fork Canyon. Co-Chair Zalles asked for information about the strategy for the  
39 treatments. He wanted to know how the trees are selected. Additionally, he would like to see some  
40 of the justifications and rationalizations for the treatments. Mr. Tolman confirmed that when the EA  
41 begins, it will be possible to comment. Based on what he knows, the vegetation clearing will be  
42 small-diameter trees, and none of it will be done by a commercial entity for logging. There is a  
43 different forest now than there was 200 years ago. For instance, there are certain areas where conifers  
44 would not have been historically, so it makes sense to clear those and replace them with willows and  
45 aspens.  
46

47 Ms. Abelli-Amen shared information about areas where these treatments have already been done. It  
48 is not so much about cutting down trees, unless there are standing dead trees. It mostly has to do with

1 collecting dead wood, flammable material, and fuels. The intention is to reduce the fuel load, so if a  
2 fire did come through, it would not be as catastrophic and dangerous. Chair Boardman believed the  
3 Environment System Committee should watch out for the comment period. In the meantime, if those  
4 familiar with the project have concerns, she asked that relevant information be shared with the  
5 Committee. It sounds like the practices planned to be employed are respectful of the environment.  
6 Ms. Abelli-Amen explained that she is always thinking about things from an invasive species  
7 perspective. Something she has noticed in places where these treatments have taken place is that in  
8 the burn scars, there are sometimes invasive species that come up. She would love to see a component  
9 of this project include invasive species treatment after the fire treatment takes place.

## 10 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

### 13 **1. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

14  
15 There was discussion about items for the next Environment System Committee agenda. Chair  
16 Boardman reported that the next meeting will take place on December 9, 2025. She asked Committee  
17 Members to think about what motivated them to serve on the Stakeholders Council and the  
18 Environment System Committee. She would also like to know what Committee Members want to  
19 see accomplished by the Committee in the future. At the next meeting, the Committee can also build  
20 on some of the discussions that took place during the current meeting. Committee Members  
21 expressed support for continued conversations about visitor behavior as well as brainstorming ways  
22 to bring more visitors to the Central Wasatch Dashboard. Chair Boardman noted that at the next  
23 meeting, the Committee can aim to reach consensus on three behaviors that there is a desire to change.  
24 She pointed out that the list from Ms. Hahnenberger is comprehensive and can be used during the  
25 brainstorming session. As for the Central Wasatch Dashboard, she asked Committee Members to  
26 think about who the ideal audience would be and how to better promote it to those user groups.

27  
28 Mr. Catt reported that before the meeting, a report was shared with the Stakeholders Council. It might  
29 be a useful tool to frame the discussion about modifying visitor behavior. There are some items in  
30 that report that could inform who the audience is and what behaviors have looked like in the past.  
31 Chair Boardman noted that it is also possible to look into other environmental efforts as well. For  
32 example, the Committee can look at what is being done to protect the Great Salt Lake, funding efforts,  
33 and how public interest has been generated. Mr. Tolman offered to share information about CCTIF  
34 with the Environment System Committee. Over the last two years, approximately \$1.5 million of the  
35 \$200 million has been spent. His assumption is that it was on the Big Cottonwood Canyon study.

36  
37 Chair Boardman reminded Committee Members that the Central Wasatch Symposium will take place  
38 in January 2026. Ms. Kilpack reported that the program for the event is still coming together. The  
39 event will take place on January 8 and 9, 2026, and the symposium program will be released shortly.

40  
41 Mr. Catt recalled filling out a survey recently requesting input on the frequency and timing of the  
42 Stakeholders Council Meetings. Last week, he received a number of invites for meetings next year.  
43 He asked about the results of that survey. Ms. Kilpack reported that the majority of Council Members  
44 wanted to continue to meet for two hours, but move to quarterly meetings. This shift aligns with the  
45 CWC Board Meetings, which will also be quarterly in 2026. The Stakeholders Council will meet the  
46 month before each CWC Board Meeting so recommendations can be forwarded in a timely manner.  
47 Ms. Kilpack clarified that Stakeholders Council Meetings are no longer on the third Wednesday of

1 the month. The meetings will take place on the first Wednesday of the month instead. This puts the  
2 Stakeholders Council Meeting a month ahead of the CWC Board Meeting instead of two weeks ahead.

3  
4 Chair Boardman thanked the attendees of the Environment System Committee Meeting. If there are  
5 additional ideas for the next agenda, she asked that those be emailed to the Chair or Co-Chair. Ms.  
6 Kilpack expressed appreciation for everyone who has taken the time to participate on the Committee.

7  
8 **OTHER ITEMS**

9  
10 There were no additional discussions.

11  
12 **CLOSING**

13  
14 1. **Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System Committee**  
15 **Meeting.**

16  
17 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.  
18 Brenden Catt seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

19  
20 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 on Tuesday,*  
3 *November 11, 2025.*  
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes  
7 T Forbes Group  
8 Minutes Secretary  
9

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