

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

Q

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION ("CWC") STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2024, AT 1:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 1330 EAST CHAMBERS AVENUE IN MILLCREEK.

0		
9	Present:	Amber Broadaway, Co-Chair
10		Danny Richardson
11		Kurt Hegmann
12		Linda Johnson
13		Roger Borgenicht
14		Mike Marker
15		Pat Shea
16		John Knoblock
17		Dan Knopp
18		Tom Diegel
19		

20Staff:Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director21Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations

23 **OPENING**

251.Co-Chair Amber Broadaway will Open the Public Meeting as Co-Chair of the26Transportation Systems Committee of the CWC Stakeholders Council.

Co-Chair Amber Broadaway called the Central Wasatch Commission ("CWC") Stakeholders
Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and welcomed those
present. She noted that attendees were participating in the meeting both in person and virtually.

31 32 2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the November 6, 2023, Meeting.

34 Both sets of Transportation Systems Committee Meeting Minutes were approved in one motion.

35 36

33

22

24

3. <u>Review and Approval of the Minutes from the December 11, 2023, Meeting.</u>

MOTION: Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting
 Minutes from November 6, 2023, and December 11, 2023. Danny Richardson seconded the
 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT RECAP

1 2 3

4

5

1. <u>The Committee will Recap the Last Meeting's Presentation and Discussion on a</u> <u>Special Transit District.</u>

6 Co-Chair Broadaway shared information about the presentations from the last Transportation 7 Systems Committee Meeting. Carlton Christensen from Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") and 8 Caroline Rodriguez from High Valley Transit attended. A lot of interesting information had been 9 shared. She had not realized how many passengers High Valley Transit moved annually. Linda 10 Johnson was worried about the position UTA was taking on transit. UTA was founded to improve air quality in the valley and transport people effectively. She believed something needed to be 11 done since there had not been any arrangement made with the Utah Department of Transportation 12 13 ("UDOT") to transport people in Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. It 14 seemed UTA did not believe the traffic issues were theirs to solve inside or outside the canyons. 15 That was something she felt the Transportation Systems Committee needed to discuss further.

16

17 Co-Chair Broadaway believed UTA would be a good partner, but right now, there was a lack of clarity about who had the authority to do what. That was one of the reasons she had reached out 18 19 to Devin Weder, who was the new Project Manager for UDOT. She wanted to understand what 20 to expect with Phase I since there were now some lawsuits. According to Mr. Weder, there was 21 some uncertainty, but he hoped to attend a future Transportation Systems Committee Meeting. 22 Co-Chair Broadaway noted that those who were in the canyons regularly lived with the existing 23 issues. She was not overly optimistic that UTA would be able to return to the 15-minute ski bus 24 service in the near term since there were still hiring challenges that the organization was facing.

25

26 Ms. Johnson had spoken to some residents in Big Cottonwood Canyon and there was interest 27 expressed in a Special Transit District. The reason those residents wanted a Special Transit District 28 was to ensure that proper and adequate service was provided. The impression she got from Mr. Christensen was that he wanted the canyons to form a Special Transit District and then pay UTA 29 30 for that. She wanted to speak to the Wasatch Front Regional Council ("WFRC") and the 31 Legislators to determine whether that was what the intention was when UTA was created. Ms. 32 Johnson reported that she had worked with UTA up until the COVID-19 pandemic and had been 33 to their facility many times. The representative from High Valley Transit indicated that the UTA 34 facilities were needed. A Special Transit District to support the efforts of UTA was not impossible, 35 but it was not part of the original plan. She believed the Committee should look into that further. 36

37 Danny Richardson asked for additional details about the discussions with UTA. Co-Chair 38 Broadaway reported that UTA had been good a partner to the resorts. UTA wanted to solve some 39 of the specific challenges that faced the area, so some near-term employee solutions were 40 established, as those were the most controllable elements. Mr. Richardson wondered whether there 41 was a collaboration with High Valley Transit. Co-Chair Broadaway clarified that the reason Mr. 42 Christensen and Ms. Rodriguez had been invited to the previous Transportation Systems 43 Committee Meeting was so Committee Members could learn more. A Special Transit District 44 would likely require coordination and collaboration between the towns, County, UDOT, and UTA. 45 She did not believe there was opposition from UTA about a Special Transit District, but it was

Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting - 01/08/2024

unlikely to be initiated by UTA. It could be initiated by other entities and then UTA could be
 approached about what that partnership would look like. Special Districts were discussed further.

3

4 Co-Chair Broadaway noted that funding was important to consider. The sales tax in Park City was 5 very different than the sales tax in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. At 6 the last meeting, Mr. Christensen pointed out that funding would be an important component. 7 Having an opportunity to learn more about the Phase I work would be beneficial because there 8 was money allocated in the Legislature. A lot would depend on how all of that worked out. In her 9 most recent discussion with Mr. Weder, it did not seem that UDOT expected that the additional 10 canyon service would necessarily come from UTA. That was not a given. As part of the UDOT plan, it was made clear that any additional or enhanced bus service could come from third-party 11 operators as well. Ms. Johnson pointed out that UTA had the right of refusal. Co-Chair Broadaway 12 13 had not gotten the impression that UTA would take that kind of approach at the current time.

14

15 Mike Marker was not sure how to reconcile some of the issues that had been discussed. He 16 appreciated the perspective shared by Co-Chair Broadaway that UTA had been a good partner. However, this was the second year that UTA did not have enough drivers. It was surprising two 17 years ago when UTA made the announcement mid-year to state that services would be cut and 18 19 there were driver shortages. This year, there was the exact same issue. He believed UTA needed 20 to anticipate staffing needs and focus on creative solutions. There was a tough employment market for every business across the valley. It was something that UTA needed to deal with creatively. 21 22 Mr. Marker had also heard that UTA was hiding behind their union contracts. He had never seen 23 a union contract that didn't have a stipulation to state that a contract could be renegotiated. He 24 had also never seen a union president or bargaining agent who wasn't willing to sit down and 25 discuss something if it meant there could be better wages and benefits provided. Mr. Marker 26 believed it was unacceptable that this was the second year where there were not enough drivers. 27 He also had little belief that UTA would adequately address those issues next year. Mr. Marker 28 felt the general public or the Legislature should hold UTA accountable for delivering services.

29

30 Patrick Shea believed the Legislature had plans to have a consolidated public transportation system. John Knoblock agreed that it was disheartening that staffing issues were still impacting 31 32 the level of UTA service. That being said, he understood the position of UTA. Within the union's 33 scope, it was not possible to pay extra to some drivers without paying all of the drivers that wage. 34 There were a lot of UTA drivers throughout the Wasatch Front. The canyon was not necessarily 35 the highest priority for UTA as the bus service was also used to get people to work and school. He 36 understood the difficulties facing the organization and believed that UTA was trying to address 37 what was possible given the current market conditions and the budget that was currently in place. 38 With a Special Transit District, it would be possible to pay the drivers more and hire seasonally. 39

40 Mr. Knoblock discussed funding options. The Cottonwood Canyons generated a lot between the 41 transient room taxes, restaurant taxes, and sales taxes. It might be possible to work with the 42 Legislature to take some of that and use it to address the transportation needs in the canyons. As 43 for the High Valley Transit ridership numbers, he was surprised at how large those were. He 44 wanted to see the math to understand how they could move that many per year.

45

1 Co-Chair Broadaway thought Special Transit Districts were interesting. There were opportunities 2 for the CWC to have those kinds of discussions with the appropriate entities. The role of the 3 Transportation Systems Committee was to introduce those sorts of ideas to the Stakeholders 4 Council and potentially to the CWC Board. She did not believe the conversation about a Special 5 Transit District was complete from a Committee standpoint or on a broader level. Co-Chair 6 Broadaway appreciated that representatives from UTA and High Valley Transit had made time to 7 share information with the Transportation Systems Committee during the last meeting.

8

9 Mr. Marker pointed out that the Phase I document referenced 10 to 15-minute intervals for buses. 10 Co-Chair Broadaway explained that simply returning to the 15-minute frequency would make a 11 lot of people happy at this point. Right now, her focus determining how to return to 15 minute ski 12 bus service. She believed it could be done and all of the necessary resources were available. That 13 was something she would be spending her time on outside of the CWC because it was a priority.

15 MILLCREEK SHUTTLE UPDATE

16 17

18

14

1. <u>The Committee will Hear Updates on the Millcreek Shuttle and Discuss.</u>

Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that Tom Diegel had asked to share an update with the Transportation Systems Committee. Mr. Diegel explained that he was not formally on the Committee, but he represented the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, which was interested in transportation in the canyons. He referenced the Federal Lands Access Program ("FLAP") grant to work on the road in the upper canyon. Infrastructure would also be added to allow a shuttle to work in Millcreek Canyon. The reason there was not a shuttle currently was because the U.S. Forest Service did not feel the road or existing canyon infrastructure would accommodate one.

26

There had been discussions at the Millcreek Canyon Committee level about the proposed modification of the road in the upper canyon. Mr. Diegel reported that the issue would also be discussed at a Salt Lake County Council Meeting next week. He explained that a road design had been presented last summer, which was followed by a public comment period. Most of the comments were opposed to the major modifications that were proposed to be made to the road. Ms. Nielsen had put together a proposal to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") analysis for the shuttle happened concurrently with the FLAP grant project work.

34

35 Ms. Nielsen explained that the CWC was approached by Bekee Hotze with the Forest Service 36 approximately six months ago. She asked that the CWC do some background research related to 37 the feasibility of a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. The Feasibility Proposal was created, which 38 included rough shuttle stops, an estimate of the number of people the shuttle would need to 39 accommodate, and cost estimates. She had spoken to different shuttle programs to better 40 understand what would be needed to operate a shuttle program in Millcreek Canyon. Members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee had located potential parking and shuttle staging areas. What 41 42 still needed to be determined was how to fund a shuttle program in the canyon. During the research 43 process, it was estimated that 10 shuttle vans would be needed, which would cost \$1 million. 44 Operation costs after the initial capital investment would be \$1 million for maintenance and to run 45 the program. Ms. Hotze hoped the CWC could move the NEPA analysis forward so it could be completed before the FLAP grant construction started in 2025. She noted that timing was critical. 46

1

There were a number of firms in Salt Lake City that were well-equipped to run the NEPA analysis. Fehr & Peers had done the initial feasibility research and proposal that was part of the Salt Lake County 2013 Regional Transportation Plan. Fehr & Peers could theoretically be asked to participate in or do another NEPA analysis that was up to date in the next year or so. However, there would need to be a procurement process that was in line with the regulations from the State.

6 7

8 Ms. Nielsen explained that parking had always been the biggest hurdle for the shuttle program. It 9 had been highlighted as one of the major obstacles in the 2013 study done by Fehr & Peers. She 10 recommended that interested Committee Members read that study following the meeting. Mr. Shea wondered whether the NEPA would be for an Environmental Assessment or an actual 11 Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). Ms. Nielsen explained that whatever level of NEPA 12 13 was necessary would be determined through that process. It likely would not require a full EIS. 14 She reiterated that parking and staging areas were always the major obstacles for the shuttle 15 program, but funding was another obstacle that needed to be addressed. Mr. Knoblock pointed 16 out that there could be impacts on the toll fees if a shuttle was implemented. Currently, Millcreek 17 Canyon generates approximately \$1 million per year from the toll fees. Those were mostly paid 18 back to the Forest Service to maintain the picnic areas, trails, and other capital expenditures. It 19 was also important to think about how the potential reduction in toll fees would be addressed.

20

21 Mr. Shea wondered whether an estimate of revenue generated by the shuttle had been included in 22 the Feasibility Proposal. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. While it would be wonderful to offer a 23 shuttle in Millcreek Canyon for free, that might not be feasible, because of the existing toll there. 24 In the proposal, there were fee levels shown based on the number of days that the shuttle would 25 run. For example, if the shuttle ran every day, the fee would be lower, but if it ran only on the 26 weekends, the fee would be higher. That had been proposed to recoup the lost toll fees. Mr. Shea 27 asked what the base estimate was in terms of the fee. Ms. Nielsen did not recall the specific 28 amounts but stated that if the shuttle ran only on weekends, it would likely be over \$20 for a 29 roundtrip ride. If it ran every day, then the amount would be much lower, at closer to \$7 instead. 30 Mr. Knoblock pointed out that if the price was too high, it was unlikely to incentivize ridership.

31

32 Co-Chair Broadaway explained that it was difficult to encourage people to leave their personal vehicles and utilize transit. There were certain demographics that were more inclined to use 33 34 shuttles, but there were certain groups that were less likely to do so, which included destination 35 visitors on holiday. It was difficult to change behaviors, but efforts needed to be made to 36 encourage change. Ms. Nielsen reminded those present that the FLAP grant construction would 37 start in the summer/fall of 2025. That was when the Forest Service wanted to see the shuttle 38 service start. Mr. Knoblock noted that he had spoken to Zinnia Wilson at the Forest Service. She 39 gave him the impression that Ms. Hotze had given up hope that the shuttle would run during the 40 construction period. The reason for that had to do with the timing, but also that it would be difficult 41 to keep a lane open for the shuttle bus during the construction process. There were some challenges 42 there.

43

44 There was discussion about the car culture in Utah. It was difficult to change those behaviors, but

45 people were more likely to leave their personal vehicles when there was extreme congestion or 46 there was a reasonable alternative. It was also more likely that people would leave their personal vehicles when there was no parking available. Signs to state when parking was full could impact
some of the choices made. Co-Chair Broadaway noted that those signs were in Big Cottonwood
Canyon. Additionally, the reservation parking in Big Cottonwood Canyon had shifted behaviors.

4

Ms. Johnson shared a proposal that UDOT had mentioned, which was to have lockers at mobility hubs. That was not where the lockers needed to be for skiers as it made sense to have the lockers in the ski areas. She believed there needed to be another building at Brighton or Solitude where there were lockers, restrooms, and a bus center. That would be a better use for some of the parking spaces, as it was best to reduce the number of personal vehicles to lessen the air pollution. Co-Chair Broadaway noted that the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan ("BCC MAP") identified possible locations for mobility hubs in the canyon that would serve that kind of purpose.

12

13 Co-Chair Broadaway shared information about what was happening in Big Cottonwood Canyon. 14 Both of the ski resorts and the town now had parking reservations on Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays, 15 and holidays. There were also private buses for employees. She reported that traffic had largely 16 changed on the reservation days. On Saturday, there was no traffic until halfway up the canyon. Last year, that would have been a two-hour experience and this time it was more like 45 minutes. 17 Occupancy counts were done over the weekend and the average was 2.9 people. Co-Chair 18 19 Broadaway noted that this was a lot. Some significant improvements have been made recently. 20 There were still challenges associated with the reservations, but the ski resorts were committed.

21 She added that a carpool app had been developed and it was getting a lot of usage. It was not 22 possible to wait for UTA or UDOT to take action, so other actions had been taken in the meantime.

23 24

BCC MAP UPDATE

25 26 27

1.

<u>The Committee will Hear an Update on BCC MAP and Discuss.</u>

28 Town of Brighton Mayor, Dan Knopp, was present to discuss the BCC MAP. He first gave credit 29 to Co-Chair Broadaway for the changes that had been made to parking. It had worked far beyond 30 his expectations. There was not a long queue at 8:00 a.m. to enter the ski resorts. The parking reservation system has been working well so far. He had spoken to Mike Doyle at Brighton Ski 31 32 Resort and there was a commitment to continue with the parking reservation system three days a 33 week. There was an adjustment period that needed to be considered, but it was working beyond 34 expectations. Co-Chair Broadaway explained that a commitment had been made to share an 35 update with UDOT at the end of the season. The idea was to show them what the measures were 36 doing in the area. That information could be considered when the Phase I decisions were made.

37

38 Mayor Knopp explained that the measures taken were intended to be intermediate steps until Phase 39 I moved ahead. However, Phase I is on hold currently as a result of the lawsuits. He hoped it 40 would be possible to meet in the middle and move the transportation efforts forward. As for the 41 BCC MAP, that had all started when a request had been made to the Legislature for \$10 million for transportation for Big Cottonwood Canyon. The funding had not been awarded, because 42 43 appropriate planning had not been done ahead of time. Mayor Knopp had later been informed that 44 the best path forward was to commission a study related to transportation in Big Cottonwood Canyon. The money was raised quite quickly and the CWC assisted with the request for proposal 45 ("RFP") process for the consultant. Within a short period of time, the BCC MAP was drafted. 46

1

2 Mr. Knoblock referenced the \$150 million appropriated by the Legislature. He did not believe it 3 was directly tied to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. This was confirmed as it was 4 intended to assist in both canyons. He noted that the lawsuits had caused some difficulties in 5 moving things forward. Nothing was likely to happen until there was some clarity about those. 6 Co-Chair Broadaway believed the best thing in Big Cottonwood was that the people who had the 7 authority to make decisions were on the same page and wanted to work together. She noted that 8 there were some unintended consequences related to the parking reservation system. For instance, 9 since parking was now free after 1:00 p.m. there was a rush of traffic at 1:00 p.m. up the canyon. 10 There were also more people taking the bus down than there were taking the bus up. This indicated that there were more drop-offs taking place than there were before. Mayor Knopp explained that 11 12 bus drivers had indicated that it was somewhat overwhelming towards the end of the day.

13

14 There was additional discussion about traffic in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Mayor Knopp reiterated 15 that the parking reservation system was working well. This was the first step, but others would be 16 pursued in the future. Co-Chair Broadaway asked whether there were any Committee Member questions related to the BCC MAP. Mr. Marker was pleased to hear about the success of the 17 parking reservations so far. He had heard that Brighton received some pushback from long-term 18 19 skiers as it was difficult to get a reservation and asked the Mayor to speak about that. Additionally, 20 he wanted to know more about the comments made by Carlos Braceras from UDOT. Mayor 21 Knopp explained that he had been asked not to speak for UDOT, so he would refrain from doing 22 so. The sense that he got was that there was disappointment about the lawsuits because there had 23 been a desire to move forward with Phase I. The first phase had common-sense solutions. Mr. 24 Marker pointed out that UDOT had turned down the opportunity to have problem-solving 25 conversations with the CWC. He was not sure what UDOT had anticipated given that decision.

26

27 Co-Chair Broadaway addressed the question Mr. Marker had asked about long-term skiers and the 28 reservation system. Solitude had a paid parking program in place for several years, so the starting 29 points between Solitude and Brighton were not the same. When dealing with parking, there was a finite amount of inventory, but the inventory needed to be managed. There were a lot of different 30 factors to consider. What she believed happened in Brighton at the beginning was simply the 31 32 learning curve for inventory management. Guests were also not used to dealing with a managed 33 parking program at that point. It took time to address and understand the inventory needs. Mayor 34 Knopp added that Brighton had put that in place seven days a week to start, which pass-holders 35 did not like. After a week or so, the reservations were shifted to Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Mayor Knopp reported that in the past, 100 to 150 tickets were written per day for illegal parking, 36 37 but now that number was at one or two per day. People were parking where they were supposed 38 to.

39

40 Co-Chair Broadaway noted that not everyone liked the program. There had been some missteps 41 where certain visitors did not believe there had been enough communication, there had been a 42 difficult experience in the parking lot, or there was no support for the fees. While a lot of positive 43 progress had been made, she wanted to make it clear that not all were in support. Mr. Knoblock 44 believed the dry days made it possible for people to get used to the reservation system. The powder 45 days could be a lot more complicated, so it was good that there was time for people to adjust.

46

1 Mr. Knoblock noted that something short-term that had been referenced in the BCC MAP was 2 restriping the park and ride lot at the bottom of the canyon. He wondered whether that was 3 something that would move forward. Mayor Knopp believed that was something that could be 4 pursued. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that if there was a desire to have the done in the summer, then 5 the discussions and plans would need to be further defined shortly. Mayor Knopp did not believe 6 that the task would be too difficult to accomplish. It was possible to increase the parking spaces 7 there. The BCC MAP also included suggestions for possible locations for mobility hubs in the 8 canyon.

9

10 COMMITTEE MISSION, VISION, AND GOALS DISCUSSION

11 12

1. <u>Committee Members will Discuss Transportation Changes They Would Like to See</u> Within One to Three Years.

The Committee will Further Refine its Mission, Vision, and Goals.

13 14

2.

15 16 Co-Chair Broadaway believed there was still some work to do to better define the mission, vision, 17 and goals of the Transportation Systems Committee. She wanted to make sure everyone agreed with the Committee's work and goals. There was a desire to better understand what the vision of 18 19 the Committee was for the next one to three years. Ms. Johnson suggested that everyone on the Committee send CWC Staff a short statement about what they wanted to see achieved through the 20 Committee. From there, the Chair and Co-Chair could review the submissions and determine areas 21 22 of consensus. Ms. Nielsen explained that a short statement could be submitted or a poll could be 23 created. The latter might be easier for everyone to fill out. Ms. Johnson was supportive of 24 whatever made it easiest for the Committee leadership to analyze the outcomes. Ms. Nielsen 25 envisioned an open-ended poll with one question: "What are your priorities for the Committee?" 26 Co-Chair Broadaway wanted to make sure the work represented all interests.

27

28 Mr. Knoblock asked how Mayor Knopp saw the CWC Transportation Committee's work 29 dovetailing into the Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee's work. Mayor 30 Knopp explained that some of the Transportation Committee work was on hold because there was a desire to better understand what would happen with the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. 31 32 Ms. Nielsen reported that there would be a CWC Board Retreat held later that day. During that 33 retreat, the CWC Board would set priorities for 2024, which could include transportation-related 34 priorities. Any transportation priorities identified would be assigned to the Transportation 35 Committee. Once that Committee had its scope of work for the year, it would be possible to 36 determine where the intersection between the Transportation Committee and Transportation 37 Systems Committee was.

38

39 Ms. Nielsen informed those present that there were some transportation and transit-related projects

- 40 outlined during the Mountain Accord that had not been addressed yet. There was a lot to do when
- 41 it came to transportation work in the study area. There was discussion about growth in Utah.
- 42

DETERMINATION OF THE CHAIR

1 2 3

4

5

1. <u>The Committee will Determine the New Committee Chair, to be Approved at the Next</u> <u>Stakeholders Council Meeting.</u>

Ms. Nielsen explained that the way that the subcommittees were structured was that there was a Chair and a Co-Chair. There was an opening for the Chair of the Transportation Systems Committee. Co-Chair Broadaway would continue to serve as Co-Chair. Ms. Nielsen had spoken to Mr. Richardson who had an interest and willingness to serve in the Chair position. There was support for Mr. Richardson to take on the position. Ms. Nielsen explained that the appointment would be formally approved during the Stakeholders Council Meeting on January 17, 2024.

12

18

The next Transportation Systems Committee Meeting was scheduled for February 12, 2024. Co-Chair Broadaway noted that before the next meeting, Committee Members could answer the poll question. She felt it was worthwhile to have Mr. Weder attend a future meeting, so she offered to reach out to him again to schedule that. At the next meeting, the transportation goals set by the CWC Board for 2024 could be reviewed and discussed. The poll results will also be considered.

19 <u>CLOSING</u> 20

21 2. <u>Co-Chair Broadaway will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation Systems</u> 22 <u>Committee Meeting.</u> 23

MOTION: Amber Broadaway moved to ADJOURN the Transportation Systems Committee
 Meeting. Danny Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent
 of the Committee.

27

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems CommitteeMeeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

1 I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central

- 2 Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting held on
- 3 *Monday, January 8, 2024.*
- 4

5 <u>Teri Forbes</u>

- 6 Teri Forbes
- 7 T Forbes Group
- 8 Minutes Secretary
- 9
- 10 Minutes Approved: _____