



**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”)
BOARD MEETING HELD MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 2023, AT 3:30 P.M.
THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND
VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS
MILLCREEK CITY HALL.**

Board Members: Chair Christopher F. Robinson
Mayor Erin Mendenhall
Mayor Michael Weichers
Mayor Monica Zoltanski
Mayor Roger Bourke
Mayor Jeff Silvestrini
Carlton Christensen

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Shane Topham, CWC Legal Counsel
Mia McNeil, Community Engagement Intern

Others: Kimberly Bell
Laura Briefer
Josh Van Jura
Brianna Binnebose
Dave Whittekiend
Carl Fisher
Patrick Shea
Ed Marshall

OPENING

1. Chair Christopher F. Robinson will Call the Meeting to Order and Welcome Attendees.

Chair Chris Robinson called the CWC Board Meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.

2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the CWC Board Meeting Held on June 5, 2023.

Both sets of Meeting Minutes were voted on in one motion.

3. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the CWC Budget Hearing Held on June 5, 2023.

MOTION: Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE the CWC Board Meeting Minutes from June 5, 2023, and the CWC Budget Hearing Meeting Minutes from June 5, 2023. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1 **UDOT LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON EIS RECORD OF DECISION**
2 **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**
3

4 1. **Josh Van Jura, with Assistance from Brianna Binnebose, will Present UDOT's Little**
5 **Cottonwood Canyon EIS Record of Decision with Discussion from the Board.**
6

7 Josh Van Jura and Brianna Binnebose were present to share information related to the Utah
8 Department of Transportation ("UDOT") Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact
9 Statement ("EIS") Record of Decision ("ROD"). Mr. Van Jura reported that the ROD was released
10 on July 12, 2023. The project began over five years ago and a significant amount of study had gone
11 into the potential solutions for Little Cottonwood Canyon. All of the previous studies that were done
12 on the canyon were considered. On July 12, 2023, UDOT received environmental clearance to begin
13 implementing transit-based solutions in the canyon. Mr. Van Jura noted that the purpose and need of
14 the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was as follows:
15

- 16 • "To substantially improve roadway safety, reliability, and mobility on SR 210 from Fort
17 Union Boulevard through the Town of Alta for all users on SR 210."
18

19 Mr. Van Jura added that one purpose of the project was to reduce congestion associated with queuing.
20 In 2050, that was expected to be nearly 2.5 miles long on Wasatch Boulevard and one mile long on
21 9400 South. Additionally, the travel time was expected to be 80 to 85 minutes by that year. He
22 clarified that the travel time did not account for difficult weather conditions and would simply be the
23 result of the volume of vehicles attempting to go up the canyon. Mr. Van Jura reviewed the timeline
24 of events that took place ahead of the ROD. He explained that the ROD was the final step in the
25 National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") process. There was now environmental clearance to
26 start implementing the Phase 1 solutions and start to address the existing traffic issues in the area.
27

28 Five primary alternatives were explored including Enhanced Bus Option With No Widening,
29 Enhanced Bus Option With Widening, Gondola from the Little Cottonwood Park and Ride, Gondola
30 Alternative B, and the COG Rail from La Caille. There were different costs associated with each
31 alternative. Mr. Van Jura noted that the costs were updated for the ROD. Travel times associated
32 with the different alternatives ranged from 36 to 63 minutes. Tolling was considered with all of the
33 alternatives. While none of the alternatives considered stops at the trailheads, none of the alternatives
34 precluded future stops, if additional environmental work was done in the future.
35

36 The intention was to have three phases of work. Phase 1 would be enhanced bus service, Phase 2
37 would include Wasatch widening and snowsheds, and Phase 3 would include the Gondola B
38 Alternative. The main benefit associated with the gondola was its ability to provide reliable travel
39 times. Mr. Van Jura explained that the gondola would operate on a separate alignment so it would
40 not be subject to slow-moving vehicles, adverse weather, slide-offs, and other factors. There would
41 be a consistent travel time and the cabins would arrive at a much higher frequency than a bus. Cabins
42 would arrive every two minutes. In addition to reliability, cost, and environmental impacts were
43 considered. The comments received from the public and other agencies had also been considered.
44

45 Mr. Van Jura acknowledged that a gondola will have a high visual impact. UDOT recognized that
46 the gondola towers will create a visual change in the canyon. However, there were benefits to
47 consider, like the small construction footprint and fewer barriers to wildlife. Moving forward, there
48 were some next steps associated with the Phase 1 implementation. For instance, identifying the bus

1 service provider. Senate Bill ("S.B.") 002 during the last Legislative Session allocated \$150 million
2 to enhanced busing, resort bus stops, a mobility hub at the gravel pit, and tolling in both Little
3 Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. UDOT now needed to determine who would run
4 the bus service, procure the necessary buses, start working on the mobility hub design, work on the
5 resort bus stop design, and procure the tolling infrastructure. Mr. Van Jura shared additional
6 information about enhanced bus service. It was estimated that there would be a 10 to 15-minute
7 service originating from both the gravel pit and 9400 South/Highland. It was unclear whether the
8 buses would stop at Snowbird and continue to Alta or whether there would be direct service provided.
9

10 As for the gravel pit mobility hub, there was work being done with the property owner. It was
11 anticipated that there would be 1,500 parking stalls at the gravel pit. Should the Utah Transit
12 Authority ("UTA") choose to provide inbound valley bus service, the mobility hub would
13 accommodate valley routes as well as kiss-and-ride opportunities and parking. Mr. Van Jura clarified
14 that it was a mobility hub and not a parking structure. UDOT was also looking at resort bus stops,
15 which included one at Snowbird Entry 1. There would be 700 to 800 lockers, so people would be
16 able to store their personal items. Additionally, there would be a place to wait that was warm. At
17 Alta, the bus stop would be between the Alta and Rustler Lodges. It was reiterated that tolling was
18 being considered in the canyon. It was estimated that the toll would be between \$25 and \$30. That
19 amount would be variable. If there was good transit adoption and 30% of vehicles were reduced from
20 the road, the amount could be reduced. On the other hand, if the 30% reduction in vehicles did not
21 occur, the number could increase. He explained that tolling was only for people who were traveling
22 to or above Snowbird Entry 1. Mr. Van Jura noted that there would only be tolling for 50 days a year.
23 Those dates included Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays, and holiday periods, from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
24

25 Occupancy restriction technology was not viable at the current time. Mr. Van Jura shared information
26 about winter roadside parking restrictions in the upper canyon. People parked parallel to the white
27 line. He shared an example photo and noted that it was not possible to see the line in snow conditions.
28 In addition, when vehicles parked there, people walked on the road to reach their destination, which
29 resulted in unnecessary hazards. Between Snowbird Entry 1 and Snowbird Entry 3, there would not
30 be winter roadside parking permitted. That would reduce approximately 230 stalls in the canyon.
31

32 Mr. Van Jura reported that Phase 1 was mostly funded. Approximately \$240 million was needed for
33 that work and approximately \$210 million had been obtained. There was a constrained funding
34 source, but there was confidence that there was enough money to complete the Phase 1 work. UDOT
35 was committed to making sure Phase 1 was a success. Mayor Jeff Silvestrini pointed out that many
36 members of the public wanted to focus on the enhanced bus service. That should be done robustly as
37 it could eliminate the need to continue with the later phases of the project. He noted that there were
38 some timelines included in the presentation slides, but there were some things that were difficult to
39 predict, such as finding a vendor for the buses. He wondered whether it would be possible to receive
40 a more definitive timeline as he wanted to be able to share that information with others. It was
41 important for members of the public to have a better idea of when the rollout would occur. Mr. Van
42 Jura explained that the goal was to have all of the Phase 1 items in place by Fall 2025. Tolling could
43 not be implemented before there was a low-cost transit alternative in place.
44

45 Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the project were not yet funded. Mr. Van Jura reported that Phase 2 would
46 include three items, which included the widening of Wasatch Boulevard. The road widening would
47 assist with the enhanced bus service, because it would allow for queue jumping. When there were
48 backups, buses could drive on the shoulder and jump the line to enter the canyon. He believed that

1 would be attractive for people trying to determine how to visit Little Cottonwood Canyon. The second
2 part of the Phase 2 work was related to avalanche mitigation. The 20-year average indicated that
3 there were 56 closure hours per year. With the implementation of the snowsheds, it was anticipated
4 that it would be reduced to 11 closure hours per year. Two locations were being considered, which
5 included the White Pine and White Pine Shoots as well as Little Pine. The third part of the Phase 3
6 work had to do with trailhead parking improvements at White Pine, Lisa Falls, Gate Buttriss, and
7 The Bridge. This work would minimize erosion and invasive weeds and improve user experience.

8
9 Mr. Van Jura discussed Phase 3 of the project. He explained that the gondola alternative was
10 unfunded, but it would provide additional reliability in terms of transit service. Mayor Mike Weichers
11 asked about the Phase 2 work. He wondered how the enhanced bus system would be evaluated.
12 Mr. Van Jura explained that it would come down to the traffic metrics. The traffic metrics included
13 travel times, adoption rates, and so on. Mayor Roger Bourke noted that UDOT was not precluding
14 stops at trailheads. He wondered whether that included the gondola. Additionally, he wanted to hear
15 about potential tolling exemptions. Mr. Van Jura did not anticipate that the gondola would touch
16 down at trailheads, but it was possible that supplemental buses would be able to in the future. As for
17 the tolling exemptions, that was something that would need to be determined. Exemptions may be
18 implemented for employees, residents, and service vehicles, but those determinations still needed to
19 be made.

20
21 Mayor Monica Zoltanski was pleased to hear about the 10 to 15-minute bus service. She wondered
22 whether warming stations would be built to accommodate riders. Mayor Zoltanski also wanted to
23 know what UDOT would do to acquire buses and hire the appropriate number of drivers. Mr. Van
24 Jura clarified that there had not been any work done on bus shelters at 9400 South/Highland. That
25 was something that would need to be looked into further as the work continued. At this point, it was
26 essential to determine who the service provider would be. There were still some outstanding
27 questions. Mayor Zoltanski asked about potential improvements next season. Mr. Van Jura clarified
28 that he was the Project Manager for the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS, so he did not have
29 information about what would be done by UDOT to address existing issues during the next ski season.

30
31 Mayor Zoltanski asked about tolling at Snowbird Entry 1. She wanted to understand whether there
32 would be a toll booth or if there would be something electronic in place to prevent additional backups.
33 Mr. Van Jura confirmed that a toll booth would not work, because it would lead to slowdowns. There
34 needed to be electronic tolling in place. That would likely be a combination of express pass
35 transponder technology in conjunction with license plate readers. Mayor Zoltanski wondered whether
36 roadside parking restrictions would be implemented in the current ski season. This was denied.

37
38 Laura Briefer requested that in the design and implementation part of Phase 1, there be a way for the
39 public to be involved. There were a lot of public impacts associated with the Phase 1 work, so it
40 made sense for members of the public to be able to share feedback. Mayor Erin Mendenhall asked
41 about the assumptions being made about different components of the strategy. For example,
42 restrooms at the parking locations and the services required for those facilities. Mr. Van Jura reported
43 that it was assumed there would be restrooms at the trailhead facilities, mobility hubs, and resort bus
44 stops. Mayor Mendenhall explained that she had concerns related to water and the watershed. Water-
45 related assumptions were important to consider. Mr. Van Jura explained that there would need to
46 work with all of the respective partners. There could be individual discussions related to water use.
47 Those types of conversations would likely happen as the design work continued to move forward.

1 Mayor Weichers asked for an update on the mobility hub location. He believed it was originally
2 proposed to be on the southeast corner of the gravel pit. Mr. Van Jura explained that there was
3 continued work with Walker Development to best integrate the mobility hub onto the site. There
4 needed to be a smooth traffic flow. Various spots on the site were still being considered, but part of
5 the decision would come down to the geotechnical work that would be done in the area.

6
7 Chair Robinson noted that an estimated \$30 million was needed to complete the Phase 1 work.
8 However, there had been discussions about how to obtain that amount. He asked for clear information
9 about the timelines for Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3. Mr. Van Jura reported that UDOT was
10 optimistic that the Phase 1 work would be completed by Fall 2025. As for the other two phases, those
11 were still unfunded. Funding was outside of the scope of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS,
12 but there could be funding on a State or Federal level as well as public/private partnership funding.

13
14 Chair Robinson asked whether Mr. Van Jura would stay at the CWC Board Meeting a little bit longer
15 to listen to the request that had come from the Stakeholders Council. He was interested in hearing
16 some feedback. Chair Robinson explained that the majority of the Stakeholders Council had
17 recommended that the CWC write a letter in response to the ROD that had been released by UDOT.

18 19 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE**

20 21 **1. Stakeholders Council Co-Chairs John Knoblock and Carl Fisher will Provide an Update** 22 **on the Activities of the Stakeholders Council.**

23 24 **a. The Stakeholders Council Convened on Monday, July 31st, 2023. The Co-Chairs** 25 **will Present the Stakeholders Council's Letter to the Board Concerning UDOT's** 26 **EIS Record of Decision.**

27
28 Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Council, Carl Fisher, reported that two formal actions came out of the
29 last Stakeholders Council Meeting. One of those actions was a ROD letter. Mr. Fisher read the ROD
30 letter, which was also included in the Meeting Materials Packet for additional Board Member review.
31 Ultimately, there was majority approval from the Council on the document. Mr. Fisher explained
32 that there was a desire to have discussions outside of the legal framework. He noted that Kirk Nichols
33 had recently written an op-ed article for the Salt Lake Tribune related to that.

34
35 Chair Robinson discussed the idea of there being a supplemental EIS in instances where there was a
36 controversial ROD. He wondered whether that was a common practice. Mr. Van Jura explained that
37 a supplemental EIS was required when conditions changed or when assumptions were incorrect. It
38 was not always done after a controversial project. Frequently, there was a supplemental EIS if there
39 was a need to amend something within the original record. Chair Robinson referenced the list of
40 failures included in the Stakeholders Council letter. If there was agreement about those failures, he
41 wondered whether that would be a catalyst for a supplemental EIS. Mr. Van Jura believed so but
42 explained that the Environmental Specialist would need to speak specifically on that matter. Chair
43 Robinson asked about the idea that the only way to comment or have a dialogue was through
44 litigation. Mr. Van Jura pointed out that he was present at the CWC Board Meeting to discuss the
45 ROD. There were opportunities to have discussions and he was open to hearing from others.

46
47 Mayor Silvestrini was interested in knowing whether UDOT would respond to the five failures listed
48 in the Stakeholders Council letter. It would be useful to know how UDOT would formally respond

1 to those items. Mr. Van Jura offered to do some research and reach back out to the CWC. Chair
2 Robinson believed that the response to the letter would impact the way that the CWC Board acted.

3
4 Ex Officio Member, Carlton Christensen, was appreciative of the discussions that had taken place.
5 He was not certain that the CWC Board should take a vote on the Stakeholders Council letter at the
6 current time. That being said, it would be possible for individual entities to take a position. Chair
7 Robinson believed it would be best to hear from UDOT before the CWC Board considered a position.
8 Mr. Van Jura pointed out that there was some nuance because asking UDOT to respond to the letter
9 would be considered a formal response. Mayor Silvestrini asked him to take the letter back and find
10 out whether UDOT was interested in making a formal response. It would assist in the process of
11 moving forward. Mr. Van Jura confirmed that he would take the Stakeholders Council letter back to
12 UDOT.

13
14 Chair Robinson thanked Mr. Van Jura for attending the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Silvestrini
15 appreciated the way that Mr. Van Jura had addressed the CWC and the dialogue that had taken place.

16
17 Mr. Fisher shared additional information about the Stakeholders Council. There had been a
18 discussion about a new structure for the Stakeholders Council moving forward. He reported that
19 following the Stakeholders Council Mini Retreat, a report had been written by Avenue Consultants.
20 It reviewed what was working and what was not working within the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Fisher
21 and John Knoblock were recently elected as the new Stakeholders Council leadership. As a result,
22 the Mountain Accord, the Interlocal Agreement, and the Avenue Consultant report had been
23 examined. One of the key findings from the report was that Council Members did not feel enough
24 strides were being made to implement the Mountain Accord. There was a desire to implement the
25 Mountain Accord the focus moving forward. During the Mountain Accord process, there were
26 different Systems Groups: transportation, recreation, environment, and economy. From there, the
27 various Systems Groups came together to reconcile the different ideas.

28
29 It had been suggested that the Stakeholders Council be divided into Systems Groups. This would
30 push Council Members to revisit the Mountain Accord and bring ideas back to the CWC for
31 advancement. The Stakeholders Council Meetings would provide opportunities to reconcile the
32 different ideas that had been proposed within the groups. Mr. Fisher noted that the proposal had been
33 discussed at an Executive/Budget/Audit Committee level and he had also spoken to a lot of different
34 Council Members. There were approximately seven members who did not agree with the approach.
35 However, it was not necessarily that the structure was not supported, but it was felt there needed to
36 be more clarity about how deliverables would be shared. He had taken that feedback and was working
37 to create a clear structure. Mr. Fisher reported that the new Stakeholders Council structure passed
38 during a vote, with the caveat that the Council could continue to have other subcommittees, such as
39 the Millcreek Canyon Committee. There was no desire to lose what had been achieved.

40
41 Mr. Fisher believed that moving forward, the odd months would be for the Systems Groups Meetings
42 while the even months would be for the Stakeholders Council Meetings. There would be an every-
43 other-month structure in place. Mayor Silvestrini noted that there had been a presentation from
44 Stakeholders Council leadership during the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting. He
45 believed the Stakeholders Council wanted to be more engaged and he encouraged that. The CWC
46 should not be a top-down organization. It was important to have better exchanges between the CWC
47 Board and the Stakeholders Council. He did not have a problem with the Council returning to the
48 roots of the Mountain Accord but stressed the importance of the existing subcommittees.

1
2 Mr. Fisher reported that a questionnaire would be sent out to Council Members asking them which of
3 the Systems Groups they wanted to serve on. From there, it would be possible to start scheduling
4 some of the meetings. Mayor Zoltanski welcomed the new Stakeholders Council leadership. She
5 thanked them for stepping up to serve. As for the Stakeholders Council, she thought it would be
6 useful to have a subcommittee that focused on the EIS phasing. That would be relevant and a way
7 that the Stakeholders Council could participate in that process in a meaningful way. The feedback
8 and the discussion highlights could be shared with the CWC Board and could also benefit UDOT.
9 Mayor Silvestrini agreed that it was important for the CWC to focus on the Phase 1 project work.

10
11 Chair Robinson wondered whether there was enough Stakeholders Council consensus to move
12 forward with the newly proposed structure. Mr. Fisher confirmed this. The intention was to move
13 forward with the Systems Groups structure while addressing some of the outstanding concerns. He
14 liked the suggestion that had been shared by Mayor Zoltanski and thought it made sense.

15
16 Mr. Fisher noted that there were additional Stakeholders Council-related items to share with the CWC
17 Board. He referenced the Millcreek Shuttle Proposal that was included in the Meeting Materials
18 Packet. Mr. Fisher had spoken to the Chair of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Tom Diegel, to
19 make sure that he was supportive of that proposal. Mr. Diegel was impressed with the proposal and
20 was grateful for the work that had been done by Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen. Lastly, there
21 was a desire from the Stakeholders Council to have more engagement with UDOT on the
22 implementation of Phase 1. A lot of people in the community felt the same way. People wanted
23 Phase 1 to be a success as there was an opportunity to build trust and solve issues within the canyon.

24
25 Mayor Zoltanski wondered whether there was support from the CWC Board to create a Phase 1
26 Implementation Committee. That was something that could be put on the next agenda for
27 consideration. It would allow the Stakeholders Council to form a subcommittee dedicated to the EIS
28 work as it moved ahead. The Executive/Budget/Audit Committee would discuss that at the next
29 meeting and the item would be brought back to the CWC Board at the next CWC Board Meeting.

30 31 **COMMITTEE UPDATES AND REPORTS**

32 33 **1. The EBAC Met on July 27, 2023. Meeting Minutes are Included in Board Meeting** 34 **Materials.**

35 36 **a. Chair Robinson will Provide Background to the Board on the Proposed Board** 37 **Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed I-80 South Quarry Open-Pit Mine.**

38
39 Chair Robinson reported that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting Minutes were included
40 in the Meeting Materials Packet. He noted that there was a Resolution on the current meeting agenda
41 related to the opposition to the proposed I-80 South Quarry Open-Pit Mine. A request had been
42 received from the Stakeholders Council previously to write a letter about this. CWC Legal Counsel
43 had been commissioned to draft that in the form of a Resolution, which was now before the CWC
44 Board. There had been discussions about the matter at the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee level.

45
46 Mayor Zoltanski noted that the CWC Board had signed off on a letter last year. She wondered what
47 the Resolution would achieve that the letter had not already accomplished. Chair Robinson explained
48 that the previous letter was to encourage Salt Lake County to enact an ordinance that restricted

1 extractive industries in the canyon. The current Resolution was intended to express collective
2 opposition to the mine on behalf of the CWC. He noted that the Resolution itself went through many
3 of the reasons there was opposition. Mayor Silvestrini asked to hear more about the document from
4 Mr. Fisher since the original letter had been forwarded by the Stakeholders Council. Mr. Fisher
5 explained that there was a public comment at a previous Stakeholders Council Meeting, and the
6 Council was asked to request that the CWC Board weigh in and express opposition to the mine.

7
8 Mayor Zoltanski wondered whether the CWC Board had received adequate information and briefing
9 on the matter. She was not as familiar with the issue as some others on the CWC Board. The
10 Resolution made some declarations of facts and she did not currently feel qualified to affirm or
11 question those. She felt there needed to be a formal presentation before the Resolution was passed.
12 Chair Robinson wondered when and how that kind of presentation could occur. Discussions were
13 had about who to invite to speak to the CWC Board. Mayor Silvestrini pointed out that the CWC
14 Board had already opposed the concept of the mine in the letter that was submitted to Salt Lake
15 County. As a result, he was not certain that a full presentation was necessary. Chair Robinson asked
16 about the timeline and the public comments. Mayor Silvestrini explained that the public comment
17 period had ended, but there would still be value in moving forward with the Resolution in a formal
18 manner.

19
20 Mayor Zoltanski reiterated her desire for there to be a presentation on the process. She was hesitant
21 to vote on a Resolution without having all of the updated information available to discuss. Mayor
22 Weichers supported the comments shared by Mayor Zoltanski. It was necessary to be educated on
23 the matter. Chair Robinson suggested that the vote be tabled until more information was gathered.

24
25 **b. Chair Robinson will Update the Board on CWC Staffing.**

26
27 Chair Robinson reported that Ms. Nielsen had arranged for some interviews with a handful of
28 potential candidates. There was a Hiring Committee that would participate in that process.
29 Ms. Nielsen explained that the Hiring Committee would include Chair Robinson and Ms. Nielsen.
30 Any interested CWC Board Members could join the Hiring Committee and participate. She reported
31 that interviews for the Director of Operations position were scheduled for August 11, 2023. On
32 August 8, 2023, and August 10, 2023, she would sit down with the Community Engagement
33 Coordinator candidates. The intention was to have support staff in the office by the beginning or
34 middle of September. Discussions were had about potential Hiring Committee Members who did not
35 have conflicts.

36
37 **c. Staff Prepared a 2025 Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Program Feasibility Proposal**
38 **for the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, as Requested by District Ranger**
39 **Hotze, Due to be Submitted to the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest by 8**
40 **August 2023. The Proposal has been included in the Meeting Materials.**

41
42 Ms. Nielsen shared information about the 2025 Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Program Feasibility
43 Proposal that had been created for the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. She reported that the
44 Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP") grant was awarded to Millcreek and Salt Lake County.
45 Those funds would allow for some road improvements in the upper portion of the canyon. That
46 construction was slated to begin in the spring/summer of 2025. Since that construction would shut
47 off access to the upper portion of the canyon, District Ranger, Bekee Hotze, approached CWC Staff

1 to determine whether it would be possible to do the necessary research and determine whether a
2 Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Program was feasible. That was included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

3
4 Ms. Nielsen reported that she had looked into potential companies that could run a shuttle program
5 for the canyon. It was determined that 400 people per day would need to be serviced through the
6 shuttle program. That number was determined because 400 parking spots would become inaccessible
7 when the upper canyon became inaccessible to the public. A shuttle program of that size meant that
8 400 parking spaces would need to be found somewhere outside of the canyon. Ms. Nielsen had
9 spoken to Ex-Officio Christensen, an owner who was selling an undeveloped parcel of land near the
10 UTA Park and Ride at 3900 South and Wasatch, and the owner of the Olympus Hills Shopping Center.
11 Neither the UTA Park and Ride lot nor that commercial lot had the capacity or the availability to be
12 a staging area for a shuttle program of that size. As for the owner of the parcel of land, that would be
13 a wonderful place to potentially stage the shuttle program. It would be possible to reach out to
14 whoever purchased the lot to see what was envisioned for that particular piece of land.

15
16 The projected cost for a shuttle program of the estimated size was between \$1 million and \$2 million.
17 Ms. Nielsen explained that the cost estimates accounted for the initial capital cost of the sprinter vans
18 as well as operation and maintenance costs. In subsequent years, the costs would drop down only to
19 the operation and maintenance costs. CWC Staff would now share the proposal with the U.S. Forest
20 Service. From there, the Forest Service would determine whether a shuttle program was feasible. If
21 it was determined that it was, then the Forest Service would initiate a NEPA process.

22
23 **d. Work on the CWCNRA StoryMap, which was Approved During the June 2023**
24 **Board Meeting, Has Been Completed. The StoryMap is Currently Live on the**
25 **Central Wasatch Commission's Website.**
26

27 Ms. Nielsen reported that the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area
28 ("CWCNRA") StoryMap was an interactive version of the maps that were associated with the
29 CWCNRA Legislation. The interface was hosted by Esri. When the CWC Board opted to refocus
30 efforts toward projects outside of the Legislation, Esri was also going through some internal software
31 updates that kicked the StoryMap offline. Since the CWC was focused on projects other than the
32 Legislation in 2020, CWC Staff decided not to bring the StoryMap back online. However, the
33 StoryMap had now been brought back online and was on the CWC website to review.

34
35 **PUBLIC COMMENT**
36

37 It was determined that the Public Comment period would take place after the Action Items.

38
39 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to REORDER the CWC Board Meeting Agenda. Mayor
40 Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

41
42 Chair Robinson opened the public comment period.

43
44 *Kirk Nichols* introduced himself as a Stakeholders Council Member. He wanted to share comments
45 about the administrative appeal process. His intention at the end of the ROD was to do a citizens'
46 appeal. He explained that a citizens' appeal would normally go to an administrator in the agency who
47 was outside of the preparation of the EIS. That person would review the five points he considered to

1 be failures. Mr. Nichols stated it was the policy of the Forest Service to have an administrative appeal.

2
3 It was noted that the Forest Service was a cooperating agency. The Forest Service had not made any
4 administrative decision on the matter at the current time. Some information still needed to be obtained
5 from the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA"). From there, a Draft ROD would be issued and
6 there would be an administrative review process. That would not be done until the Forest Service
7 made a decision. There was some uncertainty about what process UDOT had in place as far as
8 administrative reviews went. Mr. Nichols reported that UDOT would not offer one to the public.
9 That being said, he was pleased to hear that the Forest Service would have an administrative appeal.

10
11 *Patrick Shea* had left a comment in the Zoom chat box. He felt that there needed to be an actual cost-
12 shared for Gondola B Alternative so there would be conservative fiscal management of the project.

13
14 *Ed Marshall* had left a comment in the Zoom chat box. He believed a proposal related to the
15 feasibility of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle should have been presented to the Millcreek Canyon
16 Committee for vetting before being presented to the full CWC Board and the Forest Service.
17 Additional comments were shared by Mr. Marshall. He explained that he had concerns about bicycles
18 racing down Millcreek Canyon. The engineering proposals for the FLAP grant did not include
19 anything that would control those bicycles and the engineers did not believe there was a way to control
20 speeding from downhill bicyclists. The feasibility proposal referenced a bicycle shuttle van. He was
21 concerned about the canyon becoming a raceway for bicycles as a result of that. Mr. Marshall felt
22 those sorts of discussions should have been had at the Millcreek Canyon Committee level first.

23
24 There were no further comments. The public comment period was closed.

25 26 **ACTION ITEMS**

27 28 **1. Consideration of Resolution 2023-15 - Expressing Opposition to the Proposed I-80 South** 29 **Quarry Open-Pit Mine.**

30
31 **MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to TABLE the Consideration of Resolution 2023-15 –
32 Expressing Opposition to the Proposed I-80 South Quarry Open-Pit Mine. Mayor Mendenhall
33 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

34 35 **2. Consideration of Resolution 2023-16 - Approving Signers on Zions Bank Accounts.**

36
37 Chair Robinson explained that the Resolution would allow Ms. Nielsen to have signature authority
38 on the Zions Bank accounts for the organization as Blake Perez had been removed.

39
40 **MOTION:** Mayor Mendenhall moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-16 – Approving Signers on
41 Zions Bank Accounts. Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
42 unanimous consent of the Board.

43 44 **3. Consideration of Resolution 2023-17 - Approving an Interlocal Agreement with the** 45 **Town of Brighton for Joint Funding of Tri-Canyon Restroom Maintenance.**

46
47 Chair Robinson believed the next three motions could be approved in one motion. All three are
48 related to agreements between Salt Lake City, Brighton, and the Forest Service. The Resolutions had

1 to do with Tri-Canyon restroom maintenance. It was determined that the motions could be made at
2 once.

3
4 **4. Consideration of Resolution 2023-18 - Approving an Interlocal Agreement with Salt**
5 **Lake City Corporation for Joint Funding of Tri-Canyon Restroom Maintenance.**
6

7 A motion was made that included Resolution 2023-17, Resolution 2023-18, and Resolution 2023-19.
8

9 **5. Consideration of Resolution 2023-19 - Approving an Agreement with United States**
10 **Forest Service for Joint Funding of Tri-Canyon Restroom Maintenance.**
11

12 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-17 with the Town of Brighton,
13 Resolution 2023-18 with Salt Lake City, and Resolution 2023-19 with the Forest Service. Mayor
14 Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
15

16 **6. Consideration of Resolution 2023-20 - Approving an Employment Agreement with**
17 **Lindsey Nielsen.**
18

19 Chair Robinson explained that the Resolution was an Employment Agreement with Ms. Nielsen. The
20 contract had been reviewed several times by the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee. There was one
21 blank, shown in yellow, which was the amount per month that would be given to Ms. Nielsen as a
22 parking or transportation allowance. The number under consideration was \$120 per month. CWC
23 Legal Counsel, Shane Topham, confirmed that the \$120 amount had been inserted into the contract.
24

25 **MOTION:** Mayor Zoltanski moved to APPROVE Resolution 2023-20 – Approving an Employment
26 Agreement with Lindsey Nielsen, with the addition of the transportation allowance. Mayor Silvestrini
27 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
28

29 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**
30

31 There were no Commissioner Comments.
32

33 **CLOSING**
34

35 **1. Chair Robinson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Board Meeting.**
36

37 **MOTION:** Mayor Zoltanski moved to ADJOURN the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Weichers
38 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
39

40 The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Monday, August 7, 2023.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____