



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2024, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS AT THE CWC OFFICES LOCATED AT THE GATEWAY, 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

- Present:** Danny Richardson, Chair  
Amber Broadway, Co-Chair  
Roger Borgenicht  
Kurt Hegmann  
Stuart Derman  
Linda Johnson  
Mike Marker  
Pat Shea  
Grace Tyler  
John Knoblock  
Dani Poirier
- Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations

**OPENING**

- 1. Chair Danny Richardson will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Transportation Systems Committee of the CWC Stakeholders Council.**

Chair Danny Richardson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.

- 2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the January 8, 2024, Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting Minutes from January 8, 2024. Roger Borgenicht seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

1 **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE PRIORITIES SUMMARY**

2  
3 **1. Committee Members will Review and Discuss the Results of the Transportation**  
4 **Systems Committee Priorities Survey and Determine Priorities for the Committee.**  
5

6 Chair Richardson noted that there were previous discussions about inviting Devin Weder, the new  
7 Project Manager for the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) to address the full  
8 Stakeholders Council. He asked for an update about that request. Co-Chair Amber Broadway  
9 explained that an update will not be given to the subcommittee or Council but an update may be  
10 shared with the Commission. It was her impression that UDOT was willing to have a conversation  
11 with the CWC Board. Chair Richardson suggested that this be pursued, as it is valuable to hear  
12 from UDOT. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, explained that she will speak to the Chair of  
13 the CWC this week about the agenda and will mention the desire to hear from UDOT at that time.  
14

15 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, shared the results of the Transportation Systems  
16 Committee Priorities Survey. She noted that five responses were received. One of the responses  
17 stated that there is a desire to examine possible options for transit solutions, as detailed in the  
18 Mountain Accord. Another response stated that while short-term fixes are needed, long-range  
19 planning is also essential. The Committee should focus on a flexible year-round bus system that  
20 gets people out of their vehicles in order to protect the Wasatch, improve access, and improve the  
21 canyon experience. The commenter acknowledged that driving private vehicles to recreational  
22 opportunities is deeply ingrained in the community and patterns of behavior must be shifted.  
23

24 Ms. Kilpack continued to read the responses received from the survey. One stated that the  
25 priorities for the Transportation Systems Committee in 2024 should focus on implementing first-  
26 class bus and shuttle service in the Cottonwoods and Millcreek Canyon, with bus and shared ride  
27 mobility hubs strategically placed to provide a convenient, frequent, transit alternative into the  
28 canyons. The last response suggested providing a plan to the CWC for an all-season transportation  
29 system that serves the unique needs of the Central Wasatch, offering service from Salt Lake City  
30 to Park City via Parley’s Canyon, up Millcreek, Big Cottonwood, and Little Cottonwood, with the  
31 following characteristics: reliable service, minimal footprint and infrastructure in the canyons,  
32 serve the disparate needs of all users, minimize personal vehicle travel to access, provide a mix  
33 between express and local schedules, and integrate with the larger Salt Lake Valley system.  
34

35 The survey also mentioned action items identified by CWC Staff and the Transportation Systems  
36 Committee. It asked respondents to indicate their preferred priorities for the Committee.  
37 Ms. Kilpack shared the responses to that question. Based on the current results, it looks like most  
38 people found implementing actions from the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan  
39 (“BCC MAP”) to be the highest priority as well as a transit district and Millcreek Canyon shuttle.  
40

41 Chair Richardson noted that there were only five responses. He asked those who have not  
42 answered the survey to do so after the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting so there are  
43 additional responses to consider. Linda Johnson pointed out that based on the survey results so  
44 far, there is a lot of support for a Special Transit District. She has questions about the taxes charged  
45 already. Ms. Johnson also informed the Committee that the U.S. Forest Service has certain  
46 requirements related to the placement of bus stops. For instance, there are restroom requirements.

1  
2 Discussions were had about a potential Special Transit District and whether the Utah Transit  
3 Authority (“UTA”) would control that or not. It is important to ask those kinds of questions and  
4 find out additional information. Chair Richardson wanted some clarification about what a Special  
5 Transit District might look like. Dani Poirier stated that there were a handful of UTA bus stops in  
6 the Cottonwoods in previous years, where there were restrooms. She thought it might be possible  
7 to push for UTA buses to stop there again in the future. Other Committee Members agreed.  
8

9 Patrick Shea reported that Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County have a Public Lands Division. It  
10 seems within the scope of those governing units to work with the Forest Service to build new  
11 restrooms at the beginning of trails. Ms. Johnson explained that she tried to push for new restrooms  
12 in the past when she was on the Planning Commission and there was pushback. It is important to  
13 determine what the wants and needs are and then make a plan to move that work forward. She has  
14 heard from UTA that there is a desire to see a Special Transit District like Salt Lake City to improve  
15 bus service. However, Salt Lake City taxes its residents to achieve this extra service. There are  
16 questions about why UTA is no longer responsible for what they were five years ago.  
17

18 John Knoblock spoke about trailhead restrooms, which is a prerequisite for a bus stop. He reported  
19 that the Forest Service is doing a Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan and the draft document is  
20 supposed to come out at the end of this month or at the beginning of March. As part of the Tri-  
21 Canyon Trails Master Plan, there will be trailhead improvements listed that relate to signage and  
22 restrooms. He noted that there will be an opportunity to provide public comment when the draft  
23 document is released. If there are areas where the Committee wants to see bus stops, it is important  
24 to make sure the trailheads show restrooms on the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan document when  
25 adopted. With respect to funding, he envisioned that a percentage of the tax revenue generated by  
26 the ski resort industry could be used to address transit needs without increasing taxes on others.  
27

28 Ms. Poirier was not sure whether any of the Transportation Committee Members also participate  
29 on the Economy Systems Committee, but she has heard the Ski Hill Resources for Economic  
30 Development (“SHRED”) Act will be discussed. In that, a portion of the fees generated at the  
31 resorts will go back to the Forest Service. However, as it currently stands, that is a pretty small  
32 percentage. She noted that there may be an opportunity to collaborate with the Economy Systems  
33 Committee, as some of those fees could ultimately be used for trailhead restrooms. Co-Chair  
34 Broadway shared additional information about the SHRED Act. She clarified that it involves a  
35 portion of the Forest Service fees for those who have Forest Service lands. She noted that not all  
36 of the ski resorts have Forest Service lands. Instead of those fees being sent to Washington, a  
37 portion would be redirected to the local forest for use in ways that were deemed appropriate.  
38

39 Mr. Knoblock asked how much the SHRED Act could generate in the area. He has heard an  
40 estimate of \$3 million per year that would be back in the Salt Lake Ranger District. Co-Chair  
41 Broadway has not heard a specific number, but there have been discussions with the Forest  
42 Service about the SHRED Act in the past. Chair Richardson thanked everyone for the information  
43 shared. He encouraged those who have not completed the survey to do so ahead of the next  
44 meeting. Mike Marker asked about the chart that was shown. Ms. Kilpack explained that once all  
45 of the responses are in, she will distill the information into something that is easier to review.  
46

1 **PURPOSE AND DELIVERABLES UPDATE**

2  
3 **1. Chair Richardson will Share Updates on the Committee Purpose and Deliverables**  
4 **Worksheet.**

5  
6 Co-Chair Broadway reported that a copy of the Committee Purpose and Deliverables Worksheet  
7 was sent to Chair Richardson. It is possible to wait until the surveys are all submitted and compiled  
8 to continue the deliverables discussion. As a group, there needs to be alignment on what the  
9 Transportation Systems Committee wants to achieve. Chair Richardson noted that the Mountain  
10 Accord talked about: “A sustainable, safe, efficient, multi-modal transportation system that  
11 provides year-round choices to residents, visitors, and employees; connects to the overall regional  
12 network; serves a diversity of commercial and dispersed recreation uses; is integrated within the  
13 fabric of community values and lifestyle choices; supports land use objectives and is compatible  
14 with the unique environmental characteristics of the Central Wasatch.” That statement and the  
15 survey results are important to consider. Chair Richardson asked that the worksheet be sent out.  
16

17 **OTHER ITEMS**

18  
19 Chair Richardson reiterated the importance of all Committee Members completing the survey. He  
20 also asked Committee Members to read the deliverables information that will be distributed.  
21

22 Roger Borgenicht asked if there is anything at the Legislature this year that impacts the work done  
23 by the CWC. Mr. Shea stated that he is in contact with a lobbyist and has been told that currently,  
24 there has been no public discussion about any further funding for the Cottonwood Transportation  
25 Plan. However, he pointed out that it is still possible that the matter will be discussed in the future.  
26

27 Ms. Kilpack referenced a message left in the Zoom chat box by Ms. Nielsen. Information about  
28 the Short-Term Projects Grant Program cycle was shared. It opens on March 3, 2024, and anyone  
29 can submit funding proposals. There is \$95,000 in the budget to disperse for short-term projects  
30 this fiscal year. If any individual or organization has an idea for a project, it can be submitted.  
31

32 Chair Richardson asked about the schedule for future Stakeholders Council and Transportation  
33 Systems Committee Meetings. Ms. Nielsen reported that the next Stakeholders Council Meeting  
34 is scheduled for March 20, 2024, at 3:30 p.m. It will take place at Millcreek City Hall. The next  
35 Transportation Systems Committee Meeting is scheduled to take place on March 11, 2024.  
36

37 Ms. Poirier reported that Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has been running a backcountry shuttle  
38 on Saturdays in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. She expressed  
39 appreciation to the CWC Short-Term Projects Grant Program for assistance with that funding.  
40 However, a sponsor that supported the project last year is unable to do so this year, so additional  
41 funding is needed to keep the shuttle service going. If anyone can think of potential avenues for  
42 funding, she asked that those be shared. Mr. Shea asked about the annual cost of the shuttle service.  
43 Ms. Poirier stated that the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance is currently looking for \$18,000 to keep  
44 it running through the remainder of the season. Without the additional funding partner, it will be  
45 necessary to scale the service back until it is possible to obtain the necessary funding.  
46

1 Mr. Shea asked who provides the shuttles. Ms. Poirier reported that Utah Mountain Shuttles are  
2 used. Chair Richardson asked where the shuttle stops. Ms. Poirier stated that there are stops at  
3 Solitude Entry 1 and Entry 2, Brighton, and Alta Lodge. The hope is that in future seasons, it will  
4 be possible to obtain a permit with the Forest Service and drop off at trailheads with appropriate  
5 restrooms. Ms. Johnson wanted to know the full cost of the service. Ms. Poirier explained that it  
6 is approximately \$30,000 for the season. She offered to share her email address in the Zoom chat  
7 box so anyone with potential donor ideas can contact her or reach out for more information.  
8

9 Mr. Knoblock wondered if there is an update on the meeting with Bekee Hotze about the Millcreek  
10 Canyon shuttle. He wanted to know if she was satisfied with the potential parking locations.  
11 Ms. Nielsen explained that the Millcreek Canyon Committee has been working towards the  
12 implementation of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle program. Last summer, the Forest Service sent a  
13 memo to the CWC requesting that certain items be included in a Feasibility Proposal, which was  
14 essentially the background research necessary for the shuttle. The requests included a proposed  
15 service plan, an estimate of the total cost to run a shuttle program, potential parking areas, and  
16 companies that may be able to partner with the CWC and others. The reason the Forest Service  
17 has come around to the idea of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle has to do with the Federal Lands Access  
18 Program (“FLAP”) grant construction that will close off the upper portion of the canyon to the  
19 public starting in 2025. To maintain public access in that portion, the shuttle was contemplated.  
20

21 CWC Staff had provided a Feasibility Proposal to the Forest Service but was unable to find suitable  
22 parking areas. Last summer, the Forest Service stated that the shuttle work will not be able to  
23 continue since the parking details were not finalized. Ms. Nielsen noted that parking and shuttle  
24 costs are not new obstacles. The reason there is not a shuttle program in Millcreek Canyon is that  
25 those obstacles existed back in 2012 when the shuttle was first contemplated.  
26

27 The Millcreek Canyon Committee found two vacant lots on either side of I-215, right off of 3800  
28 South. Those are UDOT-owned lots. Members of the Millcreek Canyon Committee, Del Draper  
29 and Mr. Knoblock, met with representatives from UDOT to discuss potentially using those lots as  
30 staging and parking areas. Ms. Nielsen shared that information with the Forest Service the last  
31 time she met with them and there was some hesitation. All the details need to be finalized before  
32 the Forest Service expresses enthusiasm. It is necessary to find out how many parking spots are  
33 in the lots, if there is approval to use the lots, the permits needed, what the lots are currently being  
34 used for, and whether or not there will be full access to the parking lots. A full plan is necessary.  
35

36 Mr. Marker wanted to understand the hesitation from the Forest Service. Ms. Nielsen explained  
37 that their concerns have to do with a shuttle dropping off a large number of visitors at one trailhead  
38 at one time. This results in an increased impact when compared to individuals arriving at trailheads  
39 at various times. When a larger number of people are let off in one place at one time, it impacts  
40 the land and the ecology more, which is something that needs to be considered.  
41

42 The other component that needs to be finalized is the funding. Ms. Nielsen reported that shuttle  
43 programs are popular but are also expensive. Another consideration for a Millcreek Canyon shuttle  
44 is the toll since there is currently a toll in the canyon. The funds from the toll go back to the Forest  
45 Service to maintain the facilities and trails in Millcreek Canyon. As a result, this cannot be a free  
46 shuttle program, because there cannot be a net loss to the Forest Service. The income needs to be

1 maintained in order to maintain the facilities. Some numbers were considered and if the shuttle  
2 was run every day of the year, it would be self-sustaining at a \$7 one-way ridership fee. That being  
3 said, if it is run every day of the year, there needs to be enough staff, shuttle vans, and parking  
4 spots. If the shuttle service is offered on weekends (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday), that reduces  
5 the number of parking spaces needed, but will increase the rider fee in order for the program to be  
6 self-sustaining. In that scenario, the fee will increase from \$7 to between \$25 and \$27. That will  
7 ultimately make riding the shuttle less accessible, which is something important to think about.  
8 The next step is to iron out some of the details and submit a Business Plan to the Forest Service.  
9

10 Ms. Kilpack reported that the deadline to apply for the Short-Term Projects Grant Program is April  
11 1, 2024. All proposals need to be submitted ahead of that date. Mr. Knoblock asked about the  
12 money that the Legislature appropriated last year for transit in the Cottonwood Canyons. He  
13 wanted to know if any of that was available despite the lawsuits related to the gondola. Ms. Nielsen  
14 understood that UDOT has that money and will ultimately make decisions about how to spend the  
15 money. Mayor Dan Knopp will soon reach out to UDOT to discuss a number of issues. She  
16 believed appropriations are on the list of matters he wanted to check in with UDOT about.  
17 Discussions were had about the lawsuits that have been filed as well as discussions with UDOT.  
18

19 Chair Richardson reviewed the action items for Committee Members to complete ahead of the  
20 next Transportation Systems Committee Meeting. He asked all Committee Members to fill out  
21 the survey. Anyone not receiving emails can reach out to CWC Staff in order to address that issue.  
22

## 23 CLOSING

### 24 25 1. Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation Systems 26 Committee Meeting.

27  
28 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to ADJOURN the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting.  
29 Roger Borgenicht seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
30 Committee.  
31

32 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee  
33 Meeting adjourned at 4:23 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, February 12, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_