



8
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, TUESDAY,**
11 **APRIL 14, 2026, AT 3:30 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,**
14 **SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

15
16 **Committee Members:** Kelly Boardman, Chair
17 Dan Zalles, Co-Chair
18 Adam Lenkowski
19 Meaghan McKasy
20 Brenden Catt
21 Maura Hahnenberger

22
23 **Staff:** Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations

24
25 **OPENING**

26
27 **1. Chair Kelly Boardman will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Environment**
28 **System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**

29
30 Chair Kelly Boardman called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
31 Environment System Committee Meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and welcomed those present.

32
33 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the March 10, 2026, Meeting.**

34
35 Chair Boardman reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the Environment System Committee
36 Meeting held on March 10, 2026. She reminded those present that Joanna Wheelton from the
37 Cottonwood Canyons Foundation shared information about the Trail Steward Program. There was
38 also a continued discussion on the Visitor Behavior Survey. The Committee talked about the Utah
39 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact
40 Statement (“EIS”) and possible suggestions related to the implementation. At the last Environment
41 System Committee Meeting, there was a discussion about the recent Legislative Session, Parleys
42 Canyon Gravel Pit, Roadless Rule, and the interactive map added to the Central Wasatch
43 Dashboard.

44
45 **MOTION:** Meaghan McKasy moved to APPROVE the March 10, 2026, Meeting Minutes. Dan
46 Zalles seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

1
2 **BOARD MEETING RECAP**
3

- 4 **1. The Committee will Discuss the April 13, 2026, CWC Board Meeting.**
5
6 **2. The Committee will Discuss Takeaways and Action Items Identified at the March 18,**
7 **2026, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**
8

9 Chair Boardman reported that at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, there was a discussion
10 about meeting cadence and how to forward comments to the CWC Board. The Stakeholders
11 Council Meetings will take place approximately three weeks ahead of the scheduled CWC Board
12 Meetings. There will be a review of CWC Board Meeting agendas during Stakeholders Council
13 Meetings, so it is possible for interested Council Members to attend the CWC Board Meeting and
14 share comments.
15

16 At the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, there was a Stakeholder Initiatives table created. Based
17 on that table, some of the more relevant projects for the Environment System Committee were
18 determined. This includes work on the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation
19 Area Act (“CWNCRA”), better trail signage, capacity study, behavioral education survey, unmet
20 needs within the U.S. Forest Service, storytelling with data, fire risk assessment, land acquisition,
21 and wilderness advocacy. Meaghan McKasy likes the idea of storytelling with data and noted that
22 there is a lot of data to work with. Chair Boardman pointed out that there is data on the Central
23 Wasatch Dashboard, but there is not a lot of storytelling. There might be opportunities to focus
24 on that.
25

26 Chair Boardman expressed support for the new meeting cadence and method for bringing
27 comments forward to the CWC Board. The Stakeholders Council is now better positioned to talk
28 about issues that are relevant to the CWC Board. This will likely increase communication between
29 the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. Chair Boardman noted that she presented a letter
30 at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, but there might need to be revisions before that is moved
31 forward.
32

33 Brenden Catt noted that during the Stakeholders Council Meeting, there were a lot of informative
34 side discussions. However, a lot of those side discussions were not shared with the larger group.
35 There were some issues that were worthy of a broader discussion. Ms. McKasy echoed those
36 comments and explained that she also heard some side conversations during the Stakeholders
37 Council Meeting. Mr. Catt stated that there could be breakout sessions with representatives from
38 each subcommittee. Co-Chair Dan Zalles liked that idea and thought it would be beneficial to
39 have someone from each subcommittee. This would ensure that all of the systems are represented
40 in the breakout discussions.
41

42 Maura Hahnenberger reported that she spoke to CWC Staff about reviewing the CWC Board
43 Meeting agenda in breakout groups. Even if there are no statements or letters forwarded to the
44 CWC Board, it is still possible for her to summarize the Stakeholders Council discussions. There
45 is time during each CWC Board Meeting for her to share Stakeholders Council updates. Director
46 of Operations, Sam Kilpack, expressed support for the ideas that have been shared. It is possible

1 to ensure there is subcommittee representation within each of the breakout groups. Co-Chair
2 Zalles suggested that Council Members be assigned to a breakout group before the Stakeholders
3 Council Meeting.

4
5 Chair Boardman asked for Committee Member feedback on the brainstormed ideas. She reminded
6 Committee Members that the ideas include the CWNCRRA, better trail signage, capacity study,
7 behavioral education survey, unmet needs within the Forest Service, storytelling with data, fire
8 risk assessment, land acquisition, and wilderness advocacy. It is possible to send this list to
9 Committee Members so there can be a prioritization of tasks. She pointed out that the behavioral
10 education survey work is already underway. As for storytelling with data, that is something that
11 could make the Central Wasatch Dashboard more valuable. Land acquisition continues to be
12 suggested at the Stakeholders Council level, but there might need to be a separate subcommittee
13 created for that.

14
15 Ms. Hahnenberger reported that three of those items were discussed at the CWC Board Meeting
16 held on April 13, 2026. Based on the update that was shared at the meeting, CWNCRRA discussions
17 are continuing to take place with jurisdictional partners, ski resorts, and water stakeholders. The
18 Stakeholders Council can engage in the CWNCRRA discussions when it is appropriate to do so. As
19 for a capacity study, the CWC Board is interested in pursuing this. They propose to put out a
20 request for information (“RFI”) to better understand what the study would entail and what it would
21 cost.

22
23 The Stakeholders Council was tasked with putting together the scope of the RFI. It might be
24 appropriate for a group of Council Members to come together and create that document for the
25 CWC Board. The scope of the RFI could be discussed by the various subcommittees, but the
26 document would likely be created outside of the subcommittee meetings. Ms. Hahnenberger next
27 discussed land acquisitions. She informed the CWC Board that this is an interest of the
28 Stakeholders Council. There were several Board Members who expressed some interest, but there
29 was no specific direction received. Mayor Erin Mendenhall suggested that there be a connection
30 made with Salt Lake City Public Utilities. Some of the other Board Members also expressed an
31 interest in a potential acquisition.

32
33 Co-Chair Zalles listened to the audio recording of the CWC Board Meeting. During the meeting,
34 it was noted that Salt Lake City Public Utilities has funds to make land purchases. It sounds like
35 there is a willingness to use those funds to purchase applicable lands. The Stakeholders Council
36 can let them know what lands are for sale, as several subcommittees have discussed parcels that
37 are for sale.

38
39 Co-Chair Zalles shared comments about the fire risk assessment suggestion. He noted that this is
40 an important item. Additionally, he will share some data related to water quality in the canyons
41 later on in the meeting. Chair Boardman thanked Committee Members for providing their
42 feedback.

1 **VISITOR BEHAVIOR SURVEY DISCUSSION**

2
3 **1. The Committee will Discuss Modifying Visitor Behavior in the Central Wasatch by**
4 **Creating a Survey.**

- 5
6 **a. What Behaviors will be Targeted?**
7 **b. How Can a Survey Educate the Public?**
8 **c. Who Can We Partner With?**
9

10 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee previously discussed the idea
11 of a survey related to modifying visitor behavior. There was an informal Zoom call held that
12 included Ms. McKasy, Ms. Hahnenberger, Co-Chair Zalles, and Chair Boardman. During that
13 Zoom call, there were additional discussions about what the survey would look like. Something
14 there was no consensus on was how the survey would be shared. During previous Committee
15 discussions, there was a suggestion to have a QR code and reach out to the Utah Transit Authority
16 (“UTA”) about sharing the code. There were also suggestions to have the QR code posted at
17 resorts and on trail signage. In addition, there were discussions about partners like Save Our
18 Canyons, Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, UDOT, and UTA. Chair Boardman explained that the
19 questions included in the visitor behavior survey will ultimately be guided by the format chosen
20 to disseminate the survey.

21
22 There is clarity on some other issues, such as the behaviors that should be targeted and how the
23 survey can educate respondents. Chair Boardman asked for Committee Member feedback on how
24 the survey should be disseminated. Mr. Catt noted that bus service concluded in Big Cottonwood
25 Canyon last weekend, so a lot depends on the anticipated release date for the survey. As for the
26 scope of the survey and whether visitor use for the day or over a period of time should be
27 considered, he feels it makes sense to focus on visitor use on the day that the survey is completed.
28 Dissemination will depend on the desired release date, and he would prefer there to be a point-in-
29 time visitor use analysis.

30
31 Chair Boardman explained that during the Zoom call, the participants considered whether this
32 should be a study where data is collected or if the intention is to share a message with survey
33 respondents. Ms. McKasy likes the context-specific approach associated with a point in time. One
34 of the benefits of this specificity is that someone could take the same survey multiple times and
35 respond to the questions in different ways. For instance, if someone on the bus took the survey, it
36 would direct the respondent to bus-related transportation information. She likes the idea of people
37 being able to take the survey multiple times from different locations. Mr. Catt reported that some
38 of the resorts he visited during the winter season have emailed him 24 or 48 hours after he visited.
39 Those resorts requested feedback on his experience. He wondered if it would be possible for this
40 survey to be included in outreach like that. Adam Lenkowski felt there was still uncertainty about
41 the overall goal of the visitor modification survey. It seems like a lot of questions are focused on
42 transportation.

43
44 Co-Chair Zalles reported that the goal of the survey is to educate and inform survey respondents
45 in a way that connects to their experience in the Central Wasatch. As an example, if someone is
46 hiking, there could be information provided about trail etiquette. If someone is on a bus, there

1 could be information about transportation. This would make it possible to take the survey multiple
2 times.

3
4 Mr. Lenkowski asked for additional information about the date the survey will be released. It
5 seems like there is a lot of content that needs to be pulled together to educate people based on their
6 responses. Ms. McKasy explained that distribution was the main issue highlighted during the
7 Zoom call. If the focus is on creating a knowledge-based engagement tool, then that creates a clear
8 pathway for the Environment System Committee. She does not want to rush the survey release.
9 Though it would be nice for the survey to be accessible to visitors during the hiking season, the
10 Committee is still determining the overall goal of the survey, so she does not believe that timeline
11 is realistic.

12
13 Ms. Kilpack believed the idea for the survey came out of a desire to change behaviors and
14 encourage visitors to take public transportation. Ms. McKasy confirmed that this was the original
15 idea, but there have been additional discussions about what the Environment System Committee
16 wants to accomplish. Ms. Kilpack reported that there is an increase in visitation in the fall and
17 winter months. It might make sense to aim for survey release in time for one of those seasons.
18 Ms. McKasy pointed out that not rushing the survey will allow the Committee to work with other
19 organizations that might also benefit from this kind of educational survey. There could be outreach
20 conducted to relevant organizations about linking to their websites to provide additional
21 information. Mr. Lenkowski clarified that he does not believe the survey should be rushed, but he
22 would like to see things move forward. The links to partner websites will be critical in providing
23 relevant information.

24
25 Co-Chair Zalles explained that the challenge will be the educational content and who will write
26 the information. It might be possible to use existing content from partner organizations, but a
27 decision needs to be made. Ms. McKasy reported that when it comes to survey creation, it is
28 typically best to remain in the survey and not encourage access to outside sources. However, in
29 this case, the goal is education, so directing survey respondents elsewhere at certain times makes
30 sense. There will be information included in the actual survey, but the survey can also direct
31 respondents to partner websites with additional information. She stressed the importance of
32 working with partners.

33
34 Chair Boardman asked what the Environment System Committee envisions as far as next steps.
35 Co-Chair Zalles thought it made sense to create a broad roadmap. He explained that this would
36 start with an initial question about the visitor, and then that could lead to another set of questions
37 depending on the answer provided. The Environment System Committee can determine locations
38 where links to partner websites should be included. Once there is consensus on that, it will be
39 possible to share the draft survey with other subcommittees. Ms. McKasy reported that it is a
40 common practice to write everything in a Word document and include instructions as far as
41 filtering questions or branching questions, so everything is laid out in the document. This makes
42 it possible to see everything clearly before it is put into a survey platform. It will be possible to
43 share that document and receive comments before anything is finalized. Changes can be made in
44 the document before it is put on a survey platform. Additional discussions were had about the
45 survey. Chair Boardman believed there was consensus on the survey focused on an individual

1 visit. It seems there is support for a behavior modification survey. The intention is to encourage
2 visitors in the area to make better decisions.

3
4 Ms. McKasy explained that behavior modification is different than a knowledge-based survey.
5 She shared a link in the Zoom chat box to the notes that were made at the last meeting. A lot of
6 what has been discussed is knowledge-focused. It could be argued that there is potential for
7 behavior modification through education. Co-Chair Zalles reported that there was a Google Drive
8 document created with ideas. It is possible to continue to work off that document. He offered to
9 draft a flowchart for the survey that can be reviewed at the next Environment System Committee
10 Meeting.

11 **LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON EIS AND MOUNTAIN ACCORD DISCUSSION**

12 **1. The Committee will Discuss UDOT’s Plan to Move Forward with Phase I of the EIS.**

13
14
15
16 Chair Boardman shared information about the letter that she added to Google Drive, “Refinement
17 to UDOT’s Little Cottonwood Canyon Phase I Implementation Plans.” She noted that there were
18 only a few edits suggested by Council Members. It is possible to send the letter out again and ask
19 Council Members to add comments and contributions. She asked about next steps for the letter.
20

21 Ms. Kilpack stressed the importance of Council Members reviewing the draft letter before the next
22 Stakeholders Council Meeting. It is possible to further discuss the letter at that meeting, but the
23 intention is for it to be reviewed and workshopped as much as possible before the next meeting.
24

25 Co-Chair Zalles does not think it makes sense to forward a policy position on the Phase I work.
26 Instead, it makes sense to inform the CWC Board that there was a letter written by Alta Ski Area.
27 He sent an email out approximately a week after the last meeting, but is not sure that it was read.
28 Chair Boardman is not sure that she saw that email and asked that it be sent out again to the
29 Committee.
30

31 Chair Boardman reported that John Knoblock spoke to Devin Weder with UDOT. She asked if
32 CWC Staff has the document that was shared, which was confirmed. Some of the work included
33 in Phase I of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was shared. The letter in the Google Drive
34 folder highlights improvements that could be made to the Phase I work. Co-Chair Zalles reiterated
35 that it might make more sense to share the letter from Alta Ski Area with the CWC Board rather
36 than forward a letter with recommendations. He does think the Council should share specific
37 recommendations. Chair Boardman pointed out that Alta Ski Area already wrote a set of
38 recommendations in their letter. The CWC Board is being urged to look at the various suggestions
39 and consider the Phase I work.
40

41 Ms. Hahnenberger mentioned the Stakeholders Council discussion on the letter. Based on some
42 of the comments shared during the meeting, she does not believe there is support to forward the
43 Alta Ski Area letter to the CWC Board. It seemed that Council Members understood the Alta Ski
44 Area letter was based on their specific perspective and their business needs. As a result, the
45 Stakeholders Council does not necessarily need to forward that letter to the CWC Board. However,

1 there are certain areas of consensus, so it is possible to focus on areas where there is Stakeholders
2 Council support.

3
4 Chair Boardman asked about the best way to draft the letter, present it to the Stakeholders Council,
5 and then vote on whether to move it forward to the CWC Board. She wanted to understand the
6 most efficient way to share information. Co-Chair Zalles stated that he re-sent his email to
7 Committee Members. That email expresses what he believes should be done in this case. He is
8 suggesting that the letter from Alta Ski Area be forwarded to the CWC Board, but that there be a
9 reframe of what the CWC Board is being asked to do. Ms. Kilpack explained that it is difficult to
10 workshop a letter during a scheduled Stakeholders Council Meeting due to the number of
11 participants and the time available. It is best for a letter to be workshopped ahead of the scheduled
12 Stakeholders Council Meeting. Chair Boardman offered to reach out to Hilary Arens and Danny
13 Richardson about edits to the letter.

14 15 **CANYON CAPACITY DISCUSSION**

16 17 **1. The Committee will Discuss Canyon Carrying Capacity.**

18
19 Chair Boardman explained that the next agenda item relates to canyon capacity. This is something
20 that she has been speaking to John Adams about, as he has been focused on the establishment of
21 capacity in the canyons. She posed several questions to the Environment System Committee:
22

- 23 • Why do we want a capacity study?
- 24 • How do we determine what capacity is?
- 25 • What are some of the markers?

26
27 Chair Boardman stated that there are concerns that as transportation capacity increases, there will
28 be environmental impacts as well as impacts to the quality of the visitor experience. One of the
29 limiting factors outside of parking capacity and the road is water. She explained that this has to
30 do with water rights in the canyon and the sewage infrastructure. As the number of visitors
31 increases, it is important to consider the impacts on water quality, erosion, wildlife habitat, and the
32 overall experience. Based on previous comments, it sounds like the CWC Board is interested in
33 pursuing a capacity study.

34
35 Co-Chair Zalles reported that during the CWC Board Meeting, there were comments shared by
36 Mr. Adams about capacity in the canyons. He spoke about the tension between the pressure for
37 growth and the natural capacity. It is important to consider what the environment can support.
38 Co-Chair Zalles referenced a previous discussion about the proposed Solitude Mountain Resort
39 parking expansion. Chair Boardman informed those present that dispersed uses are also increasing
40 in the canyons. When she joined the Stakeholders Council five years ago, there was tension
41 whenever someone mentioned capacity, so it is encouraging that there is now a willingness to
42 discuss this.

1 **COMMITTEE UPDATES**

2
3 **1. The Committee will Share Updates, if any, on the Proposed Gravel Pit in Parleys**
4 **Canyon.**

5
6 There were no updates shared on the proposed gravel pit in Parleys Canyon.
7

8 **2. The Committee will Share Updates, if any, on the Potential Recession of the Roadless**
9 **Rule.**

10
11 Chair Boardman reported that Save Our Canyons has a meeting scheduled at Millcreek Common
12 on May 13, 2026. A link to the Save Our Canyons event was shared in the Zoom chat box.
13

14 **3. The Committee will Discuss the Central Wasatch Dashboard Landing Page Map.**
15

16 The Environment System Committee discussed the interactive map on the Central Wasatch
17 Dashboard landing page. Chair Boardman liked the fact that the map was not overcrowded. She
18 noted that while there are traffic counters shown, the roads are not a layer on the map. It might
19 make sense to add the roads as well. There is a wildlife icon included, but this icon is only shown
20 in one location. In addition, she pointed out that the color for the Proposed White Pine Watershed
21 Management Area is similar to the Proposed CWNCRRA Boundary. There was discussion about
22 the wildlife icon. Ms. Kilpack explained that the icons are entry points to the Central Wasatch
23 Dashboard information.
24

25 **4. The Committee will Discuss the Need for New Leadership Beginning in July.**
26

27 Chair Boardman reported that there needs to be new leadership for the Environment System
28 Committee in July, as both the Chair and Co-Chair have served two terms. Ms. Kilpack thanked
29 Chair Boardman and Co-Chair Zalles for the work that has been done for the Committee. Chair
30 Boardman asked that those interested in serving as Chair or Co-Chair reach out to CWC Staff.
31

32 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**
33

34 **1. The Committee will Determine Whether to Meeting Next in May or June.**
35

36 There was discussion about the next Environment System Committee Meeting. Co-Chair Zalles
37 believed the Committee should meet in May to continue work on the survey.
38

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

41 Co-Chair Zalles explained that he will share water quality data with the Environment System
42 Committee. He would propose that there be a related item added to the next meeting agenda. Co-
43 Chair Zalles reported that he has previously made comments about time series plots in the Central
44 Wasatch Dashboard. Since those are not currently available, he looked at the water quality data
45 and plotted out the data points for Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, and
46 Millcreek Canyon streams. He reviewed the E. Coli levels by year, which included data from 2010

1 to 2025. The pH levels by year were also reviewed, with canyon information from 2010 to 2025.
2 He also shared information about the dissolved oxygen levels by year from 2010 to 2025. Co-
3 Chair Zalles proposed that a water quality expert be asked to review these tables and share their
4 perspective.

5
6 Chair Boardman thanked Co-Chair Zalles for his work charting the water quality data. It was
7 determined that there will be additional discussion about this at the next scheduled meeting.

8
9 **OTHER ITEMS**

10
11 There were no further discussions.

12
13 **CLOSING**

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

17
18 **MOTION:** Kelly Boardman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.
19 Meaghan McKasy seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
20 Committee.

21
22 The Environment System Committee Meeting adjourned at 5:03 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 *April 14, 2026.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____