



8
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY,**
11 **MAY 12, 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 Olivia Juarez
19 Ayja Bounous
20 Doug Tolman
21 Meaghan McKasy
22 Maura Hahnenberger

23
24 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
25 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations
26 Will McKay, Communications Director

27
28 **Others:** Dennis Goreham
29 John Knoblock

30
31 **OPENING**

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

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

38
39 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the April 14, 2026, Meeting.**

40
41 **MOTION:** Olivia Juarez moved to APPROVE the April 14, 2026, Meeting Minutes. Meaghan
42 McKasy seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
43

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 Chair Boardman reminded Committee Members that there have been Environment System
7 Committee discussions about a visitor survey intended to modify visitor behavior. Since the last
8 meeting, Co-Chair Dan Zalles has added to the survey document. Now that the semester has
9 ended, it is possible for Meaghan McKasy to work with Co-Chair Zalles on the survey document.

10
11 Chair Boardman reported that the Recreation System Committee also wants to add to the survey
12 document. Some members of that Committee are attending the Environment System Committee
13 Meeting. Co-Chair Zalles reviewed the document and explained that there are several potential
14 questions listed. The first questions focus on the reason the survey respondent is in the area.

15
16 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, suggested that some background information about the
17 visitor behavior survey be shared for the benefit of the members of the Recreation System
18 Committee. Co-Chair Zalles explained that the Environment System Committee discussed the
19 fact that a survey is a useful way to educate visitors. This educational survey could modify certain
20 visitor behaviors. The survey could be administered via a QR code that is posted on buses, at
21 trailheads, at restaurants, or in picnic areas. The idea is for the survey to be engaging and short.

22
23 Ms. McKasy explained that the Environment System Committee previously discussed the desire
24 to create a survey. The initial idea was to encourage behavior changes. There were several
25 conversations about how to encourage positive behaviors from visitors. However, it makes sense
26 to address the existing levels of knowledge before moving onto campaigns that will influence
27 attitudes or behaviors. The Committee determined that it would make sense to focus on knowledge
28 first. A survey that is fun and engaging could be meaningful, so Committee Members have been
29 brainstorming potential questions to include in the survey. The Committee has discussed including
30 links to relevant information within the survey. Co-Chair Zalles also suggested that there be quiz
31 questions included at the end of the survey. The Environment System Committee does not want
32 the survey to have too many questions, as the intention is to reach as many people as possible.

33
34 Chair Boardman added that the survey is something that could be taken multiple times, because
35 many of the questions will vary depending on the answers provided. Co-Chair Zalles explained
36 that the information will vary based on the reason the survey respondent is in the area. Doug
37 Tolman expressed support for the survey concept that has been outlined. He wondered if framing
38 it as trivia rather than a formal survey would encourage more people to engage with what is created.
39 When someone has completed the survey, there can be a call to action included at the bottom.

40
41 Co-Chair Zalles read one of the questions included in the survey document: “Which volunteer
42 activities can people do in the Central Wasatch?” The intention is to encourage survey respondents
43 to consider different volunteer opportunities in the area. Chair Boardman liked the ideas shared
44 by Mr. Tolman and noted that there were also positive comments left in the Zoom chat box.

1 Olivia Juarez believed a dialogue box will appear after a selection is made for each question. Co-
2 Chair Zalles confirmed that it is possible to indicate the correct quiz answers and provide additional
3 information to survey respondents. He asked about the survey software that could be used.
4 Ms. McKasy reported that she has used Qualtrics in the past. She added that the current survey
5 document is being used to brainstorm various ideas. There can be some filter questions where
6 survey respondents receive certain questions based on the activity or travel mode selected.
7

8 Ms. McKasy likes the idea of framing this as a quiz or as trivia, because it might be more fun for
9 respondents, and that could encourage more participation. That being said, it is still possible for
10 the questions to vary based on the reason for visiting and the travel mode used. Chair Boardman
11 reported that the Environment System Committee has previously discussed who it might be
12 possible to partner with. For instance, the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation, Save Our Canyons,
13 Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and other relevant organizations. There could be links to
14 organization websites included in the survey. She reiterated that the goal is to educate visitors so
15 better decisions can be made when visiting the Central Wasatch. Ms. McKasy agreed that it makes
16 sense to reach out to partners and determine if there is a willingness to allow relevant links.
17

18 Co-Chair Zalles asked if the survey idea should be shared with the Stakeholders Council. There
19 could be a short presentation made at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting, and feedback could
20 be received. Chair Boardman noted that permission needs to be granted from the various partners
21 to include links to their websites. Mr. Tolman supported a call to action that includes information
22 about the stewardship and advocacy groups in the area, but stated that the CWC also deserves
23 recognition. The call to action could be to learn more about the work of the CWC.
24

25 There was additional discussion about a call to action and links that could be added to the survey.
26 Mr. Tolman clarified that there is no desire to have a lot of overlap with the Central Wasatch
27 Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles explained that the Central Wasatch Dashboard is focused on scientific
28 data, but the survey will be focused on providing information to visitors in an engaging manner.
29

30 Chair Boardman reiterated that the original idea was to create a behavior modification survey, but
31 the idea has shifted somewhat over time. She still believes the survey should provide information
32 to survey respondents about the different travel options, recreation options, and behavior options.
33

34 Chair Boardman asked to hear from the members of the Recreation System Committee. Dennis
35 Goreham serves on the Recreation System Committee and also represents the Wasatch Mountain
36 Club. The Committee previously discussed signage, but the U.S. Forest Service did not want to
37 pursue anything until the Tri-Canyon Trails Plan was completed. It is now done, so the Recreation
38 System Committee is able to further discuss signage. There is a desire to focus on directions and
39 interpretive information, but there is also a desire to focus on trail etiquette.
40

41 Mr. Goreham previously sent Co-Chair Zalles a list of the Committee discussion items. That list
42 can also be sent to the other members of the Environment System Committee. He likes the idea
43 of a survey that is fun and engaging, because there is a need for visitor education. It could be
44 possible to include some etiquette questions in the survey. Mr. Goreham pointed out that there is
45 a difference between what is legal and what is ethical. The etiquette information could highlight
46 that difference. He mentioned the Leave No Trace educational materials, which include diagrams.

1
2 Chair Boardman thanked Mr. Goreham for attending the Environment System Committee
3 Meeting. She stated that members of different subcommittees can assist with the survey. Co-
4 Chair Zalles thought there should be a clear way for survey suggestions to be communicated. Chair
5 Boardman noted that it might be time to start working on a formal draft version of the survey.
6 Ms. McKasy suggested that a more structured outline be created, and then feedback can be
7 submitted.

8 9 **LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON EIS PHASE 1 IMPLEMENTATION DISCUSSION**

10 11 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Implementation of Phase 1 of the Little Cottonwood** 12 **Canyon EIS.**

13
14 Chair Boardman reported that the letter discussed during the last Stakeholders Council Meeting
15 has been shared and additional suggestions have been made. The intention is to create something
16 that Council Members can agree on at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. Chair Boardman
17 believed that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) is moving in the right direction.
18 There is excitement that Phase I of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact
19 Statement (“EIS”) is moving forward. However, there is a desire for Phase I to serve the
20 communities that will be impacted and for all of the improvements made to be user-friendly.

21
22 Chair Boardman noted that in the Google Drive folder, there is a version of the letter with
23 comments. It is possible to review that during the Environment System Committee Meeting.
24 Additional suggestions can be shared. Committee Members reviewed the letter, “Refinements to
25 UDOT’s Little Cottonwood Canyon Phase I Implementation Plan.” John Adams had suggested
26 that the Stakeholders Council vote on each item, but CWC Staff pointed out that this would be
27 cumbersome. The intention is to workshop the letter before the next Stakeholders Council Meeting
28 instead. The letter will be distributed ahead of the next meeting, and then a vote can be taken.

29
30 Ms. Kilpack shared information about the timeline. All feedback is requested to be submitted by
31 May 20, 2026, as that will give Chair Boardman enough time to incorporate it into the letter. There
32 will be enough time for the letter to be distributed to Council Members ahead of the next meeting.
33 She expressed appreciation for the work that Chair Boardman has done on the letter so far.

34
35 Chair Boardman explained that the different interests represented on the Stakeholders Council all
36 have ideas about how to refine and improve the UDOT plan. There is a desire for tax dollars to be
37 spent on improvements that will actually work. The current version of the letter was reviewed.
38 The first item mentions slick roads and the associated mobility impacts on SR-210, so the idea is
39 to have dedicated snowplows stored up canyon to improve snow removal capabilities and flow.

40
41 Ms. McKasy noted that if there is data that can be used to support the points included in the letter,
42 then that data should be added. Chair Boardman liked that suggestion. Maura Hahnenberger
43 suggested removing the concept of dedicated snowplows from the letter. She pointed out that there
44 are a lot of logistics associated with that. The underlying desire is snow removal from the road
45 and a reduction in the hazardous traffic conditions, so it makes sense to focus on that instead.

1 Chair Boardman explained that some of the delays occur because the snowplows are being used
2 elsewhere. This means the first people in the canyon are dealing with unplowed conditions.

3
4 John Knoblock does not believe it would hurt to leave in the mention of the dedicated snowplows.
5 He noted that it might inspire some creative thinking from UDOT. Chair Boardman stated that
6 she will consider all of the feedback received when she works on the next draft of the letter.

7
8 The next item in the letter has to do with the traction law. The draft language mentions a
9 requirement that all vehicles entering Little Cottonwood Canyon be properly equipped from
10 November 1st to April 30th. Chair Boardman reported that a comment was added to the document
11 by a Council Member. It suggested adding minimal liability within the Utah Code to car rental
12 businesses that knowingly rent vehicles to individuals who subsequently are involved in any traffic
13 impairment situations. Mr. Knoblock was not sure that UDOT would support that addition. There
14 could be a mention of coordination with Cottonwood Heights and Sandy City to ensure traction
15 control is well enforced. Chair Boardman expressed support for that suggestion.

16
17 Mr. Tolman reported that House Bill (“H.B.”) 196 was passed in 2025, which gave ticketing
18 authority over traction control before a storm, during a storm, and immediately after a storm. There
19 has not been a difficult winter since then. He would like to see the impacts of that bill before
20 advocating for anything more. Mr. Tolman noted that the bill received a lot of pushback from
21 those outside of Salt Lake County. Mr. Knoblock noted that UDOT does not handle the traction
22 law enforcement, but the letter could mention the need for appropriate down canyon enforcement.

23
24 Another suggestion in the letter is to improve mainline reliability. The plan needs to address the
25 gridlock that occurs when the mainline between Snowbird and Alta is closed. Keeping the
26 mainline open with increased avalanche mitigation above this section of SR-210 will improve the
27 flow. Mark Baer added additional language to this section to state that snowsheds protecting the
28 road and various known avalanche areas should be studied and implemented. It can be made
29 retractable for non-winter periods if necessary. Discussions were had about retractable snowsheds.

30
31 Mr. Tolman agreed with the first half of this item, but the second half seems to imply that Phase
32 II items should be moved to Phase I. He feels it makes more sense to focus on improving the
33 implementation of Phase I. The Environment System Committee discussed the next item in the
34 letter, which has to do with exiting the canyon at the end of the day. It states that the current
35 merging system needs to be reevaluated to maximize flow as vehicles exit the canyon. Current
36 systems allow vehicles to exit the parking lots lower in the canyon, while impeding flow from up
37 canyon. A suggestion was added for a roundabout at the bottom of Little Cottonwood Canyon to
38 improve flow. Chair Boardman is not sure a roundabout is the most appropriate solution.
39 Mr. Knoblock noted that there could be more specificity added to that language.
40 Ms. Hahnenberger suggested that there be more clarity in the language so it is clear what locations
41 are being discussed.

42
43 The Environment System Committee next discussed the suggestion for direct bus service. The
44 letter states that if the goal is to increase ridership, then enhanced bus service needs to be efficient.
45 Express buses that bypass Snowbird will reduce travel time to Alta and be a more attractive option
46 for employees and canyon users destined for locations above Snowbird. Chair Boardman noted

1 that many people have been frustrated with the buses and the number of stops. The idea is that
2 there would be some buses that are direct to Snowbird and some that bypass Snowbird. This is
3 something that would make riding the bus a lot more attractive to employees as well as visitors.
4

5 The next item included in the letter has to do with convenient bus stops. It states that bus stops at
6 Alta need to be in locations convenient to visitors and employees. Chair Boardman explained that
7 UDOT placed the proposed bus stop for Alta between Alta Lodge and Rustler Lodge. This drops
8 people off in a location that does not have services. The other problem with that stop is that it is
9 in an avalanche path. The suggestion is to place bus stops in locations that are convenient to
10 visitors. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the Transportation Committee
11 Meeting will take place on May 13, 2026, and Committee Members are welcome to listen in.
12

13 Chair Boardman reviewed additional items in the letter, including demand management before
14 tolling. She explained that this item received a lot of feedback because of the wording used. There
15 did not seem to be Stakeholders Council support for the first sentence, which stated that tolling
16 will not reduce the number of vehicles in the canyon. Other language stated that vehicles unwilling
17 to pay the fee will be replaced by vehicles willing to pay. Parking reservations have been effective
18 in limiting vehicles destined for Alta and should be considered for all major destinations in Little
19 Cottonwood Canyon before tolling is implemented. Chair Boardman stated that Mr. Baer
20 disagreed with the inclusion of this item and submitted feedback about the first sentence.
21

22 Chair Boardman asked for Committee Member feedback about tolling and this section of the draft
23 letter. Ms. Juarez believed the disagreement has to do with the justification rather than the actual
24 item. Chair Boardman agreed that certain language can be removed from the letter. It can simply
25 request that there be demand management before tolling is pursued. She shared information about
26 the culture of competition for parking spaces. If everyone needed a parking reservation, then only
27 the vehicles with reservations would be waiting to enter the canyon. The current conditions create
28 an environment where people line up early to try to find a parking spot at Snowbird on powder
29 days. Those destined for Alta have parking reservations. She explained that the request outlined
30 in the draft letter is to have parking reservation systems implemented for all destinations.
31

32 Chair Boardman reported that parking reservation systems reduce the number of vehicles trying to
33 enter Little Cottonwood Canyon on powder days and weekends. The system seems to work well
34 for Alta. The hope is that Snowbird will implement that during the winter as well. She asked for
35 Committee Member feedback about tolling in the spring, summer, and fall seasons.
36

37 Mr. Tolman explained that the way this language has been phrased, it looks at tolling in a vacuum.
38 He pointed out that tolling is in the plan for Big Cottonwood Canyon. If one canyon is tolled and
39 not the other, there will be visitor use complications. In addition, tolling revenues have been
40 identified as one of the main revenue sources for transit. As much as he would like to sign the
41 Stakeholders Council letter, if there is anything about removing tolling or implying that the resorts
42 should be the ones in charge of this, he will be unable to support the letter. There are ways to
43 improve tolling and prioritize equitable access, which is what he feels should be the focus.
44

45 Mr. Tolman mentioned the recent University of Utah engineering student project. One of their
46 findings was that tolling would reduce the number of vehicles in the canyon. Chair Boardman

1 asked if there was a document released from the students. Mr. Tolman stated that a document has
2 not been released at this time, but there are some photographs of the presentation poster boards.

3
4 Mr. Knoblock agreed with the comment shared by Mr. Tolman. Tolling is a tool that can be used
5 to reduce the number of personal vehicles in the canyon on busy days, as there will be variable
6 rates. The Stakeholders Council can recommend that single occupancy vehicles have higher tolls.

7
8 Chair Boardman read additional items from the letter, including comments about dispersed access.
9 There is also an item related to the mobility hub location. She explained that there is no desire to
10 see a mobility hub where the proposed gondola might be. There is a preference to use existing
11 infrastructure. She further reviewed the proposed language, which includes a statement about
12 early access for dispersed recreation, which would spread out demand and reduce peak congestion.
13 Co-Chair Zalles thought it made sense for the document to define what dispersed recreation means.

14
15 Additional language in the draft letter was read aloud and discussions were had about a shoulder
16 lane. Chair Boardman reported that the letter states the CWC Board should do everything possible
17 to promote the most extensive and comprehensive intermodal hub where the old gravel pit was
18 located. It was noted that there is some redundant language that could be removed, but the letter
19 could also state that there is Stakeholders Council support for what is proposed. Mr. Tolman
20 shared information about a bill that passed that will permit UDOT to lease portions of the mobility
21 hub and bus stops for amenities. The revenues from those leases will go back to the State
22 Transportation Fund. Chair Boardman thanked everyone for their feedback and noted that
23 additional comments about the contents of the letter can be submitted before May 20, 2026.

24 25 **NEW COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP DISCUSSION**

26 27 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Need for New Leadership Beginning in July.**

28
29 Chair Boardman reported that she and Co-Chair Zalles have served two terms as Chair and Co-
30 Chair. As a result, there is new leadership needed for the Environment System Committee.
31 Ms. Kilpack explained that a vote will happen at the Stakeholders Council level. The Environment
32 System Committee should discuss who there is a desire to see serve in those roles, but the official
33 decision will be made once there is a vote from the Stakeholders Council. Those interested in
34 serving in either the Chair or Co-Chair position were asked to reach out to CWC Staff.

35 36 **COMMITTEE UPDATES**

37 38 **1. The Committee will Share Updates, if any, on the Proposed Gravel Pit in Parleys** 39 **Canyon.**

40
41 There were no updates shared on the proposed gravel pit in Parleys Canyon.
42

1 **2. The Committee will Share Updates, if any, on the Potential Rescission of the Roadless**
2 **Rule.**
3

4 Mr. Tolman reported that the draft EIS was expected to be released at the beginning of the month,
5 but it looks like it will not be released until later in the month or in June. Despite this delay, the
6 public hearing is still scheduled to take place tomorrow evening at Millcreek Common.
7

8 **3. The Committee will Share Updates on Securing Expert Analysis of Water Quality**
9 **Data in the Canyons.**
10

11 Co-Chair Zalles reported that at the last Environment System Committee Meeting, he presented
12 some time series plots related to water quality. It would be meaningful for an expert to look at
13 some of the water quality data. Ms. McKasy suggested reaching out to someone at Salt Lake
14 County Watershed, because most of the data in the Central Wasatch Dashboard is from there. It
15 was suggested that there be outreach to Patrick Nelson from the Salt Lake City Department of
16 Public Utilities. Co-Chair Zalles thought it would be beneficial for this outreach to be conducted.
17

18 **MILLCREEK CANYON DISCUSSION**
19

20 **1. The Committee will Discuss Topics Pertinent to Millcreek Canyon as Desired.**
21

22 There was no information shared about Millcreek Canyon.
23

24 **CENTRAL WASATCH DASHBOARD DISCUSSION**
25

26 **1. Co-Chair Dan Zalles will Discuss the Central Wasatch Dashboard.**
27

28 Co-Chair Zalles shared comments about the Central Wasatch Dashboard. He explained that
29 whenever he visits the dashboard, it asks him to accept cookies. Even when he accepts, the next
30 time he visits the Central Wasatch Dashboard, it asks the same question. This might disincentivize
31 people to use the tool, as there could be user concerns related to privacy and data collection.
32 Ms. Kilpack reported that there is an explanation about the cookies when visitors access the site.
33

34 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**
35

36 **1. The Committee will Determine whether it will Meet Next in June or July.**
37

38 There was discussion about the next Environment System Committee Meeting. Chair Boardman
39 thought it made sense to meet on June 9, 2026, and continue to move forward with the survey
40 discussions. There was Committee Member support to meet on that date. At that meeting, the
41 Environment System Committee will continue work on the survey and discuss a July meeting date.
42

43 **2. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**
44

45 Chair Boardman asked that agenda items for the next meeting be shared via email.
46

1 **OTHER ITEMS**

2

3 No additional items were discussed.

4

5 **CLOSING**

6

7 **1. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System**
8 **Committee Meeting.**

9

10 **MOTION:** Olivia Juarez moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.
11 Doug Tolman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
12 Committee.

13

14 The Environment System Committee Meeting adjourned at 5:02 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*
3 *Tuesday, May 12, 2026.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____