



1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
4 **COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY,**
5 **JUNE 10, 2024, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON**
6 **AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS AT THE CWC**
7 **OFFICES LOCATED AT 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY,**
8 **UTAH.**
9

10 **Present:** Danny Richardson, Chair
11 Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair
12 Linda Johnson
13 Spencer Shaver
14 Pat Shea
15 Mike Marker
16 Tom Diegel
17 Roger Borgenicht
18 Barbara Cameron
19

20 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
21 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations
22

23 **OPENING**
24

25 **1. Chair Danny Richardson will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the**
26 **Transportation Systems Committee of the CWC Stakeholders Council.**
27

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

31 It was noted that there was not a quorum present at the start of the meeting. There was discussion
32 about potentially shifting the scheduled time so it can accommodate more Committee Members.
33 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that a quorum of the Committee has six members.
34 It was noted that Mike Marker is attending the meeting virtually and there is now a quorum.
35

36 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the April 8, 2024, Meeting.**
37

38 Chair Richardson briefly reviewed what was discussed during the April 8, 2024, Transportation
39 Systems Committee Meeting. There was a lengthy conversation with Lance Kovel from the U.S.
40 Forest Service regarding shuttles and trailheads. Many important questions were asked.
41

1 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting
2 Minutes from April 8, 2024. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
3 unanimous consent of the Committee.
4

5 **3. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the May 13, 2024, Meeting.**
6

7 Chair Richardson reviewed the discussions during the May 13, 2024, Transportation Systems
8 Committee Meeting. Kurt Hegmann was elected as Co-Chair of the Committee and CWC Staff
9 reviewed the Transit Map that was recently created. The map is now on the CWC website.
10 Additionally, there was a presentation from the CWC Youth Council about their projects.
11

12 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting
13 Minutes from May 13, 2024. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
14 unanimous consent of the Committee.
15

16 There was discussion about the Ski Hill Resources for Economic Development (“SHRED”) Act
17 and sources of funding. Linda Johnson noted that the ski areas are spending money on parking,
18 but are also taking in some unexepcted money. Some of that could be allocated to help the Forest
19 Service address their needs. It is possible to think more about what is happening with the money.
20

21 **STAFF UPDATE**
22

23 **1. Staff will Discuss the New Stakeholders Council Newsletter.**
24

25 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, shared information about the new Stakeholders Council
26 newsletter. During the Stakeholders Council Retreat, there was a discussion about how the
27 subcommittees can better communicate with one another and how the organization can better
28 disperse information. Instead of having all of the subcommittees share updates at the Stakeholders
29 Council Meetings, it was determined that a newsletter will be sent out each month. The newsletter
30 will include a brief summary of each of the subcommittees and their work. The newsletter will be
31 sent out to the entire Stakeholders Council to improve communication. This will allow there to be
32 more in-depth discussions and breakout sessions at the Stakeholders Council Meetings. Ms.
33 Kilpack asked that after each meeting, Committee Members send out a few bullet points to
34 highlight what the Committee is working on or discussing. That can be included in the newsletter.
35

36 Tom Diegel is supportive of the newsletter. Having information sent out to Council Members will
37 ensure that the Council discussions are more robust. Additionally, the newsletters will make it
38 possible for Council Members to catch up on meetings that were missed. He also believes this
39 will increase engagement on the Council. Mr. Diegel suggested that the Chair or Vice-Chair of
40 each subcommittee send bullet point information to CWC Staff for inclusion in the newsletter.
41

42 It was noted that Patrick Shea left a question in the Zoom chat box. He wanted to know when the
43 letter to the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) will be sent. Chair Richardson reported
44 that the CWC Board acknowledged the letter that was forwarded and discussed the proposed
45 questions. As for when it will actually be sent to UDOT, there is some uncertainty about the
46 timeline. Ms. Kilpack clarified that the request was approved by the CWC Board. Ms. Nielsen is

1 working on drafting a letter for Board Members to review, comment on, and send to UDOT. It
2 was noted that CWC Board updates can also be included in the Stakeholders Council newsletter.

3 4 **RECAP OF JUNE 3, 2024 BOARD MEETING GUEST PRESENTATIONS**

5 6 **1. Chair Richardson will Review the Presentation from UDOT Given at the June 3,** 7 **2024, Board Meeting.**

8
9 Chair Richardson reported that there were two guest presentations at the CWC Board Meeting held
10 on June 3, 2024. He took notes during the meeting in order to share relevant updates with the
11 Transportation Systems Committee. Devin Weder, who is the UDOT Project Manager was present
12 at the recent meeting. The UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement
13 (“EIS”) Phase 1 work is on hold due to the litigation. As for the questions posed in the letter from
14 Mr. Shea about the buses, there were some discussions about that. Carlton Christensen from Utah
15 Transit Authority (“UTA”) stated that UTA is not purchasing more buses, as it does not fit into the
16 budget. In addition, the Legislature gave the money to UDOT. As a result, there is a possibility
17 that UDOT might be the ones to purchase the buses with UTA potentially operating the buses. Mr.
18 Christensen also informed the CWC Board that there are limited bus suppliers to choose from.
19 There would be a need for approximately 60 new drivers in order to staff the buses mentioned.

20
21 According to Mr. Christensen, the buses will likely be clean diesel buses rather than electric buses
22 for the canyons. This primarily is because of the braking needs. Electric buses do not have the
23 same braking system and will not be ideal for the canyons in the near future. Chair Richardson
24 next reported that UDOT is currently working on a Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Study.

25
26 Chair Richardson shared information about the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan
27 (“BCC MAP”). The key points are restriping the park-and-ride lot, implementing a supplemental
28 shuttle, enhanced bus service with a dedicated bus lane and resort mobility hubs, improvements at
29 the intersection of Fort Union Boulevard and Wasatch Boulevard, tolling, restrictions to canyon
30 roadside parking, incentivizing transit, and year-round bus service with canyon trailhead stops.

31
32 The Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Study will look at reducing traffic congestion,
33 tolling, mobility hubs, and resort bus stops. The timeline for the study is as follows:

- 34
35
- 36 • Pre-Scoping Activities (Spring 2024-Fall 2024);
 - 37 • Scoping (Fall 2024-Winter 2024);
 - 38 • Environmental Study (Winter 2024-Fall 2025);
 - 39 • Decision (Winter 2025).

40
41 Chair Richardson explained that the only overlap between the Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big
42 Cottonwood Canyon work will be the mobility hub. It is encouraging that there is a focus on Big
43 Cottonwood Canyon. He believes UDOT is doing its best to work through the lawsuits so the
44 Little Cottonwood Canyon Phase 1 work can move forward. However, he does not know what
45 that timeline will look like. Mr. Diegel noted that the Forest Service is implementing a fee program
46 starting in the fall for certain trailheads, including Spruces, White Pine, and Cardiff. He wondered
whether there had been a conversation between UDOT and the Forest Service about the fee

1 program and tolling. He noted that the program will occur in the winter, but he is not certain about
2 summer.

3
4 Mr. Diegel reported that he took a hike in Big Cottonwood Canyon yesterday. Every time he visits
5 during the summer season, he tries to understand why there is not a Big Cottonwood Canyon bus.
6 It is busy during the summer season for 12 hours a day, as opposed to the winter season when it is
7 busy for a few hours in the morning and a few hours in the afternoon. Another question for UDOT
8 has to do with the lack of bus service in the summer since it is very busy during that season.

9
10 Ms. Johnson stated that she spoke to UDOT about an unrelated issue and was thanked for the word
11 she used during her comment at the CWC Board Meeting. UDOT is trying to focus on equitable
12 use of the canyons. This means not only skiers in the winter season but all kinds of users. The
13 people she spoke to at UDOT have expressed support for more equitable use of the canyons.

14
15 Barbara Cameron confirmed that Big Cottonwood Canyon is busy during the summer season. She
16 pointed out that even weekend bus service in the summer would be useful. As for equitable access,
17 she attended a Forest Service Quarterly Meeting on Thursday and the District Ranger, Bekee
18 Hotze, stated that the Forest Service is discussing eliminating all roadside parking and having
19 canyon parking by reservation only. Timed entry is something that is being considered as well.

20
21 Spencer Shaver reported that a similar presentation was given to Save Our Canyons later in the
22 week. He believes the scope of the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Study is winter
23 transportation. Chair Richardson pointed out that the use is more dispersed in the summer. Mr.
24 Shaver noted that there were some discussions about what the cost of the toll could be and the goal
25 for expected revenue. Ms. Johnson pointed out that the costs need to be reasonably fair. It is
26 necessary to inform UDOT that there is a desire to see service in both the summer and winter.

27
28 Ms. Cameron reported that Ms. Hotze presented some figures on cost analysis for the fees that will
29 be charged. She believes there will be over \$1 million per year coming into the Forest Service for
30 bus stops and other needs. She clarified that this is for the fees on Forest Service land. Currently,
31 at Silver Lake, it is \$10 for three days, \$20 for seven days, \$60 for a year, and \$80 for the America
32 the Beautiful Pass. The card needs to be displayed on the dashboard to have entry there.

33
34 Ms. Johnson asked how many vehicles come into the canyon in the summer as opposed to the
35 winter. It was noted that there are traffic counts that can be examined. Ms. Nielsen reported that
36 the information is on the Environmental Dashboard. Chair Richardson pointed out that the BCC
37 MAP talks about year-round transit service and it is one of the goals listed in the document.

38
39 **2. Chair Richardson will Review the Presentation from the U.S. Forest Service Given at**
40 **the June 3, 2024, Board Meeting.**

41
42 Chair Richardson reported that at the CWC Board Meeting, there was a presentation from Dave
43 Whittekiend with the Forest Service. He shared information about the Federal Lands Access
44 Program (“FLAP”) grant in Millcreek Canyon. During the meeting, Mr. Whittekiend reviewed
45 information about previous FLAP grant projects. The Millcreek Canyon FLAP grant project will

1 focus on the upper portion of the canyon. There is controversy about road widening in that area.
2 \$19.6 million of work was matched by \$7.3 million from various organizations and entities.
3

4 The Millcreek Canyon FLAP grant work will primarily focus on the road, but there is also a desire
5 to address parking at trailheads and picnic areas. As a result, the proposal includes some surface
6 parking to remove vehicles from the road. Currently, there is a public objection process. Chair
7 Richardson clarified that this is not a public comment period, but it is a time for objections to what
8 has been presented. Those objections can only be found in the Forest Service draft decision
9 document.
10

11 Chair Richardson noted that one concern has to do with parking at the mouth of Millcreek Canyon.
12 In order to have a Millcreek Canyon shuttle, there needs to be a certain amount of parking available
13 for vehicles. Skyline High School has offered some parking and that may be viable on the
14 weekends. However, according to Mr. Whittekiend, the Forest Service feels that shuttles can be
15 problematic and timed entry might be a better solution. Visitor management is their main focus.
16

17 During the CWC Board Meeting, information about other National Forests and National Parks was
18 shared. Those examples focused on solutions. Chair Richardson encouraged Committee Members
19 to look into the Zion National Park shuttle. He explained that there is a free shuttle that runs from
20 March to November. The shuttle is encouraged because Zion cannot handle all of the personal
21 vehicles. There was discussion about the Zion National Park shuttle. It was noted that there is
22 only one road in and one road out. In addition, there is not a long distance the shuttle needs to run.
23 Chair Richardson stated that a combination of solutions could be considered for the canyons.
24

25 Mr. Diegel reported that he has been focused on the Millcreek Canyon FLAP grant for
26 approximately three years as a member of the Millcreek Canyon Committee. He explained that
27 there is some bitterness about the experience. Approximately one year ago, CWC Staff put a lot
28 of effort into researching the possibility of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle that would be concurrent
29 with the implementation of the road work. However, those efforts were shut down. The Forest
30 Service has continued to focus on the parking issue, even though both Skyline High School and
31 UDOT have both confirmed there is some available parking. Early on in the FLAP grant design
32 process, it was stated that there will be locations to enable shuttle stops, but when the final design
33 came forward, there were places for vehicles to pull over and a shuttle was not mentioned.
34

35 At the CWC Board Meeting, Mr. Whittekiend stated that there will be another FLAP grant process
36 to redo the lower portion of the canyon. Mr. Diegel pointed out that this would again pay for the
37 shuttle many times over. There are a lot of objections that he, and many others, have about the
38 FLAP grant project. Almost all of the comments received went against what was proposed, but
39 there have been claims made that the comments were taken into consideration. Before yet another
40 FLAP grant process is considered, he suggested that the Transportation Systems Committee and
41 the CWC continue to encourage a shuttle. The road should not only be improved for cars.
42

43 Mr. Marker noted that the Legislature puts forward \$20 million every year. This last time, it
44 changed from a cap of \$20 million to a percentage of sales tax. Everything being discussed seems
45 like it would fall into the category of State-funded activity. It is important to think about how to
46 use some of that money instead of looking to other sources for funding. Mr. Diegel liked this idea.

1
2 Mr. Diegel reported that the CWC Staff proposal for a Millcreek Canyon shuttle was for vans.
3 There was never any intention of having a Zion-scale shuttle bus. There are a lot of different
4 options. There was discussion about the reference Mr. Whittekiend made to visitor management.
5 Mr. Diegel noted that it is very clear the Forest Service wishes to pursue timed entry rather than a
6 shuttle bus. He pointed out that timed entry will eliminate spontaneity.

7
8 Mr. Diegel explained that he is trying to better understand who can object to the Forest Service
9 draft decision. He has received some confusing information so far about this process. There is
10 some uncertainty about whether someone had to have commented during the comment period that
11 was formalized and sponsored by Salt Lake County and the Federal Highways Administration
12 (“FHWA”). When he obtains the necessary clarifications, he will share them with the Committee.
13 It is not possible to comment as the Transportation Systems Committee, since there are a lot of
14 steps involved to move something to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. That being said,
15 it is possible to comment individually. He noted that the objection period ends on July 7, 2024.

16
17 Chair Richardson reported that at the CWC Board Meeting, there was a discussion about Ex
18 Officio Members. This matter was previously mentioned during the Stakeholders Council Retreat.
19 The CWC Board has recognized the comments made about additional Ex Officio Members. It
20 might be possible to have some ski resort representation at that level in the future.

21 22 **SHUTTLE OPTIONS DISCUSSION**

23 24 **1. Chair Richardson will Open a Discussion on Current Shuttle Options in Utah and the** 25 **Possibility of a Summer Shuttle in the Cottonwood Canyons.**

26
27 There were no additional discussions about the current shuttle options.

28 29 **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE PRIORITIES SURVEY**

30 31 **1. Committee Members will Discuss the Top Three Priorities from the Transportation** 32 **Systems Committee Priorities Survey:**

- 33
34 **a. Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan.**
35
36 **b. Millcreek Shuttle/FLAP Grant.**
37
38 **c. Summer Transportation in the Cottonwood Canyons.**
39

40 There were no further discussions on these items.

41 42 **OTHER ITEMS**

43
44 Ms. Johnson asked Committee Members if the time of the Transportation Systems Committee
45 Meeting works for everyone. She wanted to know whether another time might be preferred. Based
46 on Committee Member feedback, it seemed that this time worked well for those present.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

CLOSING

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

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

The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:30 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, June 10, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____