



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

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

24 **Others:** Dennis Goreham (Stakeholders Council)
25 Patrick Nelson
26 Bob Thompson
27

28 **OPENING**
29

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

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

36 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the May 12, 2026, Meeting.**
37

38 There was no quorum present of the Environment System Committee, so a vote was not taken on
39 the May 12, 2026, Meeting Minutes. A vote will be taken on the Minutes at a future meeting.
40

1 **WATER QUALITY DATA DISCUSSION**

2
3 **1. Representatives from the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities and Salt Lake**
4 **County will Discuss Water Quality Data with the Committee.**
5

6 Chair Boardman welcomed Patrick Nelson and Bob Thompson to the Environment System
7 Committee Meeting. Mr. Thompson explained that he is the Watershed Section Manager from
8 Salt Lake County Watershed Planning and Restoration. There is a lot of water data collected in
9 water bodies throughout Salt Lake County. It was noted that a Water Quality Information graph
10 was shared with Committee Members ahead of the meeting, which includes information about Big
11 Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, and Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Thompson clarified
12 that data is normally looked at differently. When the collected data is aggregated, converted into
13 a single number, and then plotted over the years, there is essentially a snapshot created of what is
14 happening with water quality in one location. In this example, another snapshot from a different
15 location has been superimposed over that. He suggested the Committee look at data differently.
16

17 Mr. Thompson shared the Salt Lake County Stream Water Quality Dashboard. Data is looked at
18 on a site-by-site basis. He zoomed in on an area of Big Cottonwood Creek to illustrate the reason
19 the data is not aggregated into one number. The blue line shown represents Big Cottonwood Creek
20 as it flows out of the canyon. There is another blue line labeled the East Jordan Canal Extension,
21 which flows into the Big Cottonwood Creek. Mr. Thompson explained that Big Cottonwood
22 Creek water is used for drinking water, but there are also water rights downstream, so water has to
23 be pulled into the creek channel from outside sources. He next shared an image of Big Cottonwood
24 Creek as it flows into Cottonwood Lane and pointed out water splashing in from a pipe. The water
25 that is splashing in is a greenish-gray color, and the fish shown are trying to stay in the clear Big
26 Cottonwood Creek water. There is water coming from a canal that is flowing into Big Cottonwood
27 Creek to replace the creek water that has been taken out for drinking water purposes. He stated
28 that the water in Big Cottonwood Creek is exchanged with water that comes from Utah Lake.
29

30 Mr. Thompson explained that if data from the sites in Big Cottonwood Canyon is aggregated with
31 the data from the Utah Lake water, then the canyon conditions are not really known. This approach
32 looks at what is happening in the canals in Utah Lake. He acknowledged that the canals in Utah
33 Lake can have some fairly polluted water. The Stream Water Quality Dashboard was further
34 reviewed. Mr. Thompson shared information about water quality trends. He mentioned the area
35 where the Big Cottonwood Creek water flows into the Jordan River and reviewed E. coli data.
36

37 The State standard is 206 organisms per 100 mL of water, but there are a number of samples that
38 exceed water quality standards. The water quality of Big Cottonwood Creek as it flows into the
39 Jordan River is impaired if it is still going to be considered a cold-water fishery. Mr. Thompson
40 reviewed additional sections of the map and provided context for the numbers shown. Further
41 upstream, there is a positive change. In the canyon itself, the E. coli numbers meet the standard,
42 the pH is stabilized, and the maximum water temperatures are 11 to 12 degrees Celsius, which
43 supports a cold-water fishery. In the canyon itself, the data indicates that there is healthy water
44 quality. He advised the Environment System Committee to look at areas on a site-by-site basis.
45 It was added that both Little Cottonwood Canyon and Millcreek Canyon show the same patterns.
46

1 Co-Chair Dan Zalles asked if it would be possible to review the Central Wasatch Dashboard and
2 the E. coli data displayed there. While the Central Wasatch Dashboard was accessed, Chair
3 Boardman requested information about the water sampling plan. She wanted to understand how
4 frequently the water is sampled and how the water samples are taken. Mr. Thompson reported that
5 there is a monthly sampling run that looks at E. coli and physical water quality parameters. On an
6 annual basis, there is additional data collected, such as stream stability data. In addition, there are
7 special studies. The reason there is monthly data collected is to see water quality trends over time.
8

9 There is a sampling location near the Silver Lake Nature Trail, and there have been E. coli
10 exceedances over the years. This space is attractive to beavers and moose. Since there is a lack
11 of predators near this stream corridor, there are also elk and deer in the area. It is common to have
12 a lot of wildlife present in and around a stream corridor, so it is expected that there would be E.
13 coli levels that occasionally rise above the natural background level due to the concentration.
14 There were further studies done, and there was wildlife DNA, but almost no trace of human DNA.
15

16 Chair Boardman asked for additional information about water quality in the canyons.
17 Mr. Thompson explained that the biggest issues he sees in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little
18 Cottonwood Canyon are related to the legacy mining issues. Co-Chair Zalles expressed
19 appreciation for the information that has been shared. Chair Boardman asked what water quality
20 concerns Mr. Thompson and Mr. Nelson have for the Central Wasatch. She also wanted to know
21 if human activities in the watershed are impacting water quality in the Central Wasatch. Chair
22 Boardman requested additional information about water rights and possibilities for expansion.
23

24 Mr. Thompson stated that the biggest long-term impact in the canyons has to do with the changing
25 climate. The changing climate is not providing the type of water and the amount of water that has
26 been seen over the years. If there is less water quantity, then water quality problems become more
27 pronounced. Mr. Nelson reported that the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities does
28 monthly sampling. There is also sampling done at the water treatment plants on a less regular
29 basis. Chair Boardman asked if water is a limiting factor to growth in the canyons. Mr. Nelson
30 explained that the State owns the water, and then there are water rights. He understands the water
31 rights are spoken for in the Jordan Basin. Additional information about water rights was shared.
32

33 Mr. Nelson reported that the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities does a lot of accident
34 responses. He explained that there is a reliance on partnerships with the Unified Police Department
35 (“UPD”), Salt Lake County Sheriff, Utah Highway Patrol, and the Utah Department of
36 Transportation (“UDOT”). Increased use of the canyons can result in more accidents and wildfires,
37 which is the reason these partnerships are so important.
38

39 Dennis Goreham noted that roadside parking is often mentioned as a potential pollution source.
40 He asked if this is accurate. Mr. Thompson clarified that incidents that have caused pollution in
41 the creeks have to do with accident scenarios where there is a release. Work is done to contain
42 that release before it starts to spread down the creek. Nothing has been measured that indicates
43 roadside parking is a direct threat to water quality. However, the operation of roads can be. A
44 special study will be undertaken this winter that will look at the conductivity of water in response
45 to the road salt that is applied before, during, and after a snowstorm. A metric can be created to
46 help UDOT and local road planners determine how much solution to put down before a storm

1 event based on the expected magnitude of the storm. The intention is to limit the amount of salt
2 entering the waterways. The study will be done in Millcreek before it is applied to other canyons.
3

4 Co-Chair Zalles shared information about the Central Wasatch Dashboard and the aggregation.
5 He believes there should be a discussion about the dashboard at a future Environment System
6 Committee Meeting, specifically about the way data is displayed. Mr. Nelson thanked the
7 Environment System Committee for their work and interest in learning more about the data.
8

9 Chair Boardman asked if there is anything Mr. Thompson or Mr. Nelson would like to
10 communicate to the public. Mr. Thompson reported that small actions can have a notable impact
11 because the streams respond to every stimulus. He wished more people knew how profound their
12 impacts can be. Co-Chair Zalles asked if there are other factors that impact water quality outside
13 of climate. Riparian protections were mentioned. Salt Lake City has had a riparian ordinance in
14 place since 2010. Protecting the streamside vegetation near water bodies is critical for protection.
15

16 The riparian policy can make a tangible difference in the cleanliness of the water, but it also
17 provides more resilience in years where there is less snowpack running down the canyons.
18 Mr. Thompson emphasized the importance of protecting those areas because they are very
19 sensitive to disturbance. Mr. Nelson added that it is not possible to have recreation without funds
20 to manage recreation. He mentioned the lack of funding to clean restrooms, handle trail work, and
21 clean invasive species. The public land agencies are not fully funded. In the Central Wasatch,
22 there are many people who have moved to the area specifically because of the beauty of the
23 canyons. The amount of funding dedicated to management does not match the level of demand.
24 It would be beneficial to have more funding available so that additional management can be
25 provided.
26

27 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, pointed out that the Central Wasatch National Conservation
28 and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCR”) is a water protection bill that would also bring
29 management resources into the area. Chair Boardman thanked Mr. Thompson and Mr. Nelson for
30 attending the Environment System Committee Meeting and providing additional information.
31

32 **VISITOR BEHAVIOR SURVEY WORKSHOP**

34 **1. The Committee will Continue Work on a Visitor Behavior Survey.**

35
36 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee will continue discussions about
37 a visitor behavior survey. Meaghan McKasy created an outline, which was reviewed by the
38 Committee. There are three tabs in the document. The first tab is brainstorming, the second tab
39 is the working outline, and the third tab includes information submitted by Mr. Goreham.
40

41 Chair Boardman noted that whether there is a more traditional survey or something trivia-based,
42 the goal is to educate visitors and encourage them to make better decisions. Ms. McKasy reviewed
43 the outline document. She considered the submitted comments and started to create a rough
44 outline. There would be a landing page, and then the first question would be transportation-related.
45

1 There have been previous discussions about the survey being accessible at trailheads, on buses,
2 and in other relevant locations. The first question asked of survey respondents was how they
3 accessed their Central Wasatch destination. Additional questions can be filtered based on the
4 response. There is also a draft question that asks survey respondents if there is an interest in
5 learning more and getting involved in organizations that support the health of the Central Wasatch.
6 If there is a positive answer shared, there can be information from partner organizations listed in
7 the survey.

8
9 Ms. McKasy reminded those present that previous discussions determined that the goal is not
10 necessarily to collect a lot of demographic information. However, it would be useful to determine
11 how far people are traveling to reach the Central Wasatch and how often visitation is taking place.

12
13 The information that was submitted by Mr. Goreham has to do with signage in the Central Wasatch
14 and trail etiquette. Chair Boardman believed the document from Ms. McKasy captured a lot of
15 what was discussed at the last Environment System Committee Meeting. She asked how long the
16 survey would take for someone to complete. Ms. McKasy explained that it would depend on how
17 the knowledge testing questions are created. For instance, there could be a question about the
18 canyons that allow dogs, and then there could be information provided once the question has been
19 answered. If there is a call-and-response style survey, then it will take a little bit longer to
20 complete. If this survey is intended to be fun and lighthearted, it should be between five and seven
21 minutes.

22
23 Chair Boardman liked the suggested question about the canyons that allow dogs, because that
24 would be relevant to many different users. Ms. McKasy asked if there is a desire to have certain
25 questions shown based on the activity that brought the survey respondent to the area. Co-Chair
26 Zalles thought it would be challenging to make the questions specific to the reason someone came
27 to the Central Wasatch. Ms. McKasy reported that the organizational flow of the survey will be
28 more complicated if it is tailored to specific responses, but it is something she can create. It might
29 make sense to have set questions rather than have questions tailored to specific answers.

30
31 Ms. McKasy explained that she can work from the shell that has been created and then build it out
32 more before the next Environment System Committee Meeting. It is possible to make it more
33 complex at that time if there is a desire to include tailored questions. Chair Boardman asked about
34 the next steps. Ms. McKasy clarified that she likes to make sure the document is strong before
35 moving it to a survey format. The next steps include additional work within the existing document.
36 She asked the Committee Members to review the document and provide additional feedback.

37
38 Mr. Goreham thought the survey was related to visitor behavior, but noted that there are some draft
39 questions about the kind of wildlife that is in the canyons. He wanted to understand how that
40 relates to behavior. Ms. McKasy believed it would make sense to change the title of the survey
41 because it has evolved over time. Knowledge tends to be the first step in a communication
42 campaign. Since there is a desire for this survey to be short and easy to engage with, a Committee
43 decision was made to focus on knowledge and a small amount of demographic information.

44
45 Co-Chair Zalles addressed the question about wildlife. He explained that the intention is to engage
46 survey respondents and provide education. Ms. Kilpack believed the primary purpose of the

1 survey is to gather information about what people know, and the secondary purpose is to educate
2 through the survey questions. Committee Members agreed with that statement. Chair Boardman
3 noted that the intention is to provide survey respondents with information that will encourage
4 better decision-making in the future. Additional discussions were had about resources to include.

5
6 Doug Tolman mentioned the recent changes to Wildlife Management Areas. There was a QR code
7 created and then posted at the front of every Wildlife Management Area. There is now a five-page
8 educational module. At the end, there is an option to contribute to a stewardship fund. He pointed
9 out that the survey could be a funding stream for the CWC and offered to share more information.

10 **COMMITTEE UPDATES**

11 **1. The Committee will have New Leadership Beginning July 1, 2026.**

12
13 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee will have new leadership
14 starting on July 1, 2026. It was noted that Olivia Juarez will be able to assume the role of Chair in
15 November, but until that time, Chair Boardman continues to serve in the position. Ms. McKasy
16 will serve as Co-Chair of the Environment System Committee starting on July 1, 2026.
17 Ms. Kilpack expressed appreciation for the two terms that Chair Boardman and Co-Chair Zalles
18 have served on the Environment System Committee. She acknowledged their efforts and hard
19 work.
20
21

22 **2. The Committee will Share Updates, if any, on the Following Topics:**

23 **a. Proposed Gravel Pit in Parleys Canyon.**

24
25 Mr. Tolman heard that the plaintiff and defendant have agreed on a schedule, and the discovery
26 period might close at some point in July. There are 200 days after the discovery period for the
27 administrative record period. After that time, the briefings can happen. It will be almost a year
28 before there are any changes with the litigation. Mr. Tolman reported that there have been no
29 changes to the Air Quality Permit since the public hearing was held back in February 2026.
30
31

32 **b. Potential Rescission of the Roadless Rule.**

33
34 Mr. Tolman reported that the Roadless Rule rescission attempt is still in progress. There was a
35 town hall hosted. It was a successful event, and there were a lot of meaningful comments shared.
36 It was expected that the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) would be public already, but it
37 is not public at this time. There are comments prepared, and it is nerve-wracking waiting, but the
38 longer this is pushed back, the less damage can be done in the interim. Mr. Tolman added that
39 Senator Mike Lee recently announced an amendment to a fire bill. Based on his connections, it
40 seems that the amendment will likely pass, but the bill within which the amendment is included
41 will likely not pass.
42

43
44 Co-Chair Zalles read a recent article about the Roadless Rule. It stated that in the worst-case
45 scenario, if the Roadless Rule were eliminated by the government, local authorities could still
46 make a decision about whether or not roads should be opened up in a particular area. Decision-

1 making at the local level would still occur even if the Roadless Rule was rescinded. Mr. Tolman
2 shared an example of how the Roadless Rule has preserved certain parts of the Wasatch. In 2018,
3 Nordic Valley Ski Resort attempted to add nine to 11 additional lifts, including a gondola over the
4 mountain into Ogden. The main reason that was not allowed to move forward was because it was
5 located in an inventoried roadless area. He pointed out that developers who can make money off
6 of the forest will have an easier time in the future if the rescission of the Roadless Rule occurs.

7
8 **c. The Central Wasatch Dashboard.**
9

10 Co-Chair Zalles would like to have an additional discussion about the water quality data and what
11 is included on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. The conversation earlier in the meeting was
12 revealing and he believes there should be further discussion about what is shown on the dashboard.
13

14 Chair Boardman asked about the status of the landing page update. Ms. Kilpack reported that the
15 update is complete. She reviewed the Central Wasatch Dashboard with Committee Members.
16

17 **d. Issues Pertinent to Millcreek Canyon.**
18

19 Ms. Kilpack reported that there are members of the former Millcreek Canyon Committee on each
20 of the subcommittees. This agenda item will remain on future Environment System Committee
21 Meeting agendas so Committee Members can share updates about Millcreek Canyon.
22

23 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**
24

25 **1. The Committee will Determine Whether it will Meet Next in July or August.**
26

27 There was discussion about the next Environment System Committee Meeting date. Mr. Tolman
28 thought it made sense to meet in July if there is tangible survey work to do at that time. Ms.
29 McKasy asked if there was a firm deadline for the visitor behavior survey to be released, but this
30 was denied. Ms. Kilpack reported that, based on her last discussions with the Utah Transit
31 Authority (“UTA”), there is an openness to collaboration and adding a QR code to the survey on
32 buses. Based on this feedback, the goal might be to have the survey ready ahead of the next ski
33 season. Ms. McKasy stated that the Committee does not necessarily need to meet in July with that
34 timeline.
35

36 Chair Boardman reported that the Environment System Committee will meet in August. She asked
37 that feedback on the visitor behavior survey be submitted by July 14, 2026. There will be
38 additional work done on the document ahead of the next Environment System Committee Meeting.
39

40 **2. The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**
41

42 Chair Boardman reminded Committee Members to submit comments about the visitor behavior
43 survey by July 14, 2026. The next meeting will take place on August 11, 2026. In addition to the
44 survey, there can be another discussion about the water quality data on the Central Wasatch
45 Dashboard. Co-Chair Zalles thought it was important to understand the information that is

1 displayed and to consider the need for future modifications. Additional agenda item suggestions
2 can be submitted to Environment System Committee leadership ahead of the next meeting.
3

4 **OTHER ITEMS**
5

6 Chair Boardman asked Ayja Bounous to introduce herself to the other Committee Members.
7 Ms. Bounous explained that she is a recent addition to the Stakeholders Council and Environment
8 System Committee. She is a writer with projects that have environmental themes and also works
9 for Wasatch Adaptive Sports. She is excited to work with Committee Members moving forward.
10

11 Mr. Tolman reported that the U.S. Forest Service will release the Environmental Assessment
12 comment period for the Big Cottonwood Canyon watershed restoration project. Save Our Canyons
13 hopes there will be a lot of public participation, and emails will be sent out with information.
14

15 **CLOSING**
16

17 **1. Chair Boardman will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Environment System**
18 **Committee Meeting.**
19

20 **MOTION:** Doug Tolman moved to ADJOURN the Environment System Committee Meeting.
21 Meagan McKasy seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
22 Committee.
23

24 The Environment System Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:50 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 *June 9, 2026.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____