



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

- 10 **Present:** Danny Richardson, Chair  
11 Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair  
12 John Knoblock  
13 Linda Johnson  
14 Ed Marshall  
15 Roger Borgenicht  
16 Amber Broadway  
17 Patrick Shea  
18 Spencer Shaver  
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 Transportation**  
26 **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 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the June 10, 2024, Meeting.**  
32

33 Chair Richardson reviewed some of the information from the last Transportation Systems Committee  
34 Meeting. He reported that Kurt Hegmann was elected to serve as Co-Chair and CWC Staff introduced  
35 a Stakeholders Council newsletter. During the meeting, Patrick Shea asked about his letter to the  
36 Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), which has since been sent. At the last meeting, there  
37 was also a review of the discussions that occurred during the CWC Board Meeting. Chair Richardson  
38 reminded Committee Members that the three priorities from the Priorities Survey were the Big  
39 Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”), Millcreek Canyon shuttle and Federal  
40 Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant, and summer transportation in the canyons. A lot of  
41 information was covered at the last Committee Meeting.  
42

1 On Page 4 on Line 10, Linda Johnson asked that the word “equitable” be added to the sentence.

2  
3 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting  
4 Minutes from June 10, 2024. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
5 unanimous consent of the Committee.

6  
7 **BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT UPDATE**

8  
9 1. **Chair Richardson will Give a Brief Update on the Big Cottonwood Canyon**  
10 **Environmental Assessment.**

11  
12 Chair Richardson reminded Committee Members that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon  
13 Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) work is still on hold pending the associated lawsuits.  
14 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that UDOT is currently scoping for the Big  
15 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment. UDOT will be at the Stakeholders Council Meeting  
16 in September 2024 to address the entire Stakeholders Council and share information.

17  
18 John Knoblock reported that with the BCC MAP, the restriping of the park and ride at the bottom of  
19 Big Cottonwood Canyon will be done by Salt Lake County. Salt Lake County stated that this work  
20 will occur in the fall, likely in either September or October. Ms. Nielsen clarified that it is part of the  
21 BCC MAP, but not part of the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment.

22  
23 **TIMED ENTRY IN NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS**

24  
25 1. **The Committee will Discuss National Parks and National Forests that Employ a “Timed**  
26 **Entry” System.**

27  
28 Chair Richardson shared information about the employment of a timed entry system. He has done a  
29 lot of reading and research on this matter. Timed entry is a means of controlling and regulating visitor  
30 numbers. Some of the visitor counts in parks have doubled over the last 10 years. As a result, there  
31 are concerns about visitor management. Different parks have different takes on timed entry. For  
32 instance, some have implemented timed entry year-round while others only have timed entry during  
33 the summer months. Most of the timed entry costs are between \$1 and \$3.

34  
35 recreation.gov is the website where reservations can be made and 10 different parks are listed,  
36 including Arches National Park and Zion National Park. Each has a slightly different implementation  
37 of timed entry, but the overall goal is the same, which is to control visitor levels. Timed entry controls  
38 the number of visitors that can come into a park within a certain window. Chair Richardson reported  
39 that Zion National Park has timed entry that is primarily for hikes and the reservations are open two  
40 months in advance. There is also a lottery system that is open the night before for those interested in  
41 more last-minute reservations. Zion National Park also has a free shuttle available, because it is  
42 important to control the traffic near the park as well. Chair Richardson reiterated that timed entry is  
43 a management tool used to address increased visitation.

44  
45 Ultimately, timed entry appears to be beneficial for the visitor experience and can protect the resource.  
46 Chair Richardson noted that the limited last-minute reservations might be disappointing for  
47 destination travelers. He pointed out that entrance staffing may also be required to check and verify  
48 passes, so there need to be employees available to implement the timed entry system. For parks near

1 population systems that have a lot of same-day or spur-of-the-moment visits, the timed entry might  
2 be burdensome, but for destination areas, the timed entry system appears to be a good option.

3  
4 Ms. Johnson thinks timed entry is a good option and is applicable to the National Forests where people  
5 all over the country plan vacations to visit specific locations. Timed entry could work in the canyons  
6 within the CWC study area, provided that it is not the only way to enter the canyons. She reminded  
7 Committee Members that the land belongs to the people. Access to the canyons must be equitable.  
8 The Transportation Systems Committee needs to take action as far as the Wasatch Front Regional  
9 Council (“WFRC”) and Legislature to see that the services that are being paid for are provided. If  
10 Salt Lake County is paying for transit up and down the canyons, it does not make sense to build more  
11 parking spaces in the canyons. She wants buses to run that are the right size, have the right frequency,  
12 and stop in the right places. The taxpayers in Salt Lake County are entitled to that service. Ms.  
13 Johnson reiterated that bus service is essential in the canyons.

14  
15 Mr. Knoblock noted that on the weekends and during the busy times of the year, it would make sense  
16 to have a shuttle bus. For example, a shuttle bus could take visitors to Snowbird during Oktoberfest.  
17 As for timed entry, having that kind of system in place when skiers want to ski on powder days could  
18 be problematic. There are certain details that would need to be finalized. Co-Chair Hegmann noted  
19 that there are some difficulties associated with timed entry, which is the reason tolling is often a  
20 simpler solution. That being said, he understands the equity issues.

21  
22 Discussions were had about snow days, summer days, and different nuances that would need to be  
23 taken into consideration with a timed entry system. It was noted that it will need to be a flexible  
24 system to account for demand, as there are holidays, powder days, and weekends to consider.

25  
26 Amber Broadaway reported that she went to Zion National Park with her family for spring break and  
27 used the shuttle. The shuttle in Zion was not timed. Visitors went to the park and waited in line to  
28 take the bus. Her wait for the bus was an hour and a half. It was a negative experience for the family,  
29 so the next day, e-bikes were rented to avoid waiting in line for another hour and a half. Chair  
30 Richardson confirmed that the timed entry there is for the hikes and not for the shuttle. Ms.  
31 Broadaway noted that since there were only buses and cyclists in the park itself, the experience was  
32 positive, but actually getting into the park was not a positive experience for her family.

33  
34 Ms. Broadaway noted that on the resort side of things, there would be a lot of concerns about timed  
35 entry in the CWC study area. The current reservation parking system is a form of timed entry, but  
36 instead of keeping all of the vehicles in the valley, it controls the number of vehicles that enter the  
37 canyon. She pointed out that a lot of National Park visitors are destination visitors on vacation. On  
38 the other hand, the ski resorts largely see local visitors. Something to consider is that destination  
39 visitors do not tend to have issues with managed and paid parking whereas locals do.

40  
41 Ed Marshall agrees that the timed entry system makes sense for National Parks. However, it is a more  
42 complicated situation with the canyons in the CWC study area. He noted that there are people who  
43 live there and businesses that operate in the canyons. This is not simply a matter of entering a park,  
44 as some need to use the roads to enter residences and businesses. The Forest Service has been talking  
45 about timed entry in Millcreek Canyon first, because of FLAP grant construction and the fact that  
46 they have determined a shuttle system is not viable at this time.

1 Mr. Marshall explained that the Forest Service is concerned that all of the Millcreek Canyon visitors  
2 who would normally visit the upper canyon will visit the lower canyon and will park along the  
3 roadside. The problems in Millcreek Canyon are very different from the ones in the Cottonwood  
4 Canyons. He noted that the main issue in Millcreek Canyon is that there is not enough parking for  
5 recreational users at peak hours. That results in full parking lots and a lot of roadside parking. That  
6 can lead to a clogged bicycle lane in the lower canyon and erosion in certain areas. The Millcreek  
7 Canyon Committee has discussed these issues many times. Mr. Marshall believes the question is how  
8 to address the Forest Service parking concerns without creating other problems. He believes that  
9 parking permits and fines for those without a permit would be a fairly simple system to implement.  
10 Additionally, that system will not negatively impact owners and businesses.

11  
12 Ms. Johnson pointed out that there does not necessarily need to be a fee associated with the parking  
13 permit. It could simply be used to limit the number of vehicles in the canyon. Chair Richardson  
14 suggested that the Transportation System Committee research the possibility of a parking permit in  
15 Millcreek Canyon so that information can be shared in the future. Mr. Marshall noted that if the  
16 Forest Service and County decide to adopt a plan where there will be passes required to enter the  
17 canyon, such as timed entry, that will create a lot of issues for owners and businesses.

18  
19 Mr. Marshall reported that there are three businesses in Millcreek Canyon: Millcreek Inn, Log Haven,  
20 and the Boy Scouts. The cabin owners, Log Haven, and the Boy Scouts have plenty of parking of  
21 their own, are not parking in the Forest Service areas, and are not contributing to the problem. If the  
22 Forest Service issue with recreational users is solved through a timed entry system, it will significantly  
23 impact businesses. He pointed out that if there is a timed system, someone will need to be at the gate  
24 to check passes. This may actually create delays for those entering.

25  
26 Ms. Johnson believes the suggestion from Mr. Marshall is to have a parking permit for Millcreek  
27 Canyon when desired and for there to be enforcement. She likes the idea and believes it can be added  
28 to a list of possible solutions. Chair Richardson agreed that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution for  
29 the canyons and there might need to be a combination of different solutions.

30  
31 Mr. Marshall discussed the difficulty of informing restaurant guests in advance that timed entry would  
32 be needed to enter the canyon. For those who are holding weddings, it would be a challenge for all  
33 of the guests to have the appropriate reservation. Ms. Johnson stressed the importance of  
34 communication. Chair Richardson noted that recreation.gov, where timed entry reservations are  
35 made, also allows visitors to book a reservation at a restaurant, campground, and so on. It might be  
36 possible to consider that as part of the solution in the CWC study area. Mr. Marshall believed that  
37 would likely be more applicable to the Cottonwood Canyons than Millcreek Canyon. Chair  
38 Richardson reiterated that there might be more than one solution considered and implemented.

## 39 40 **SHUTTLE SYSTEMS IN NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS**

### 41 42 **1. The Committee will Discuss National Parks and National Forests that Utilize Shuttles.**

43  
44 Chair Richardson shared information about shuttles in National Parks and National Forests. He noted  
45 that Outside Magazine had an article about record numbers of visitors and vehicles. After a record  
46 year in Zion National Park, a shuttle system was implemented. The road in Zion is wide and straight.  
47 Additional shuttle examples were shared with the Transportation Systems Committee. Some of the  
48 shuttles are free and some of the shuttles cost money, depending on the National Park. Chair

1 Richardson reported that more and more parks are instituting shuttle programs. The shuttles vary and  
2 may be either buses or vans, but the intention is to move visitors and control crowds at specific  
3 locations. Success depends on planning and various incentives.

## 4 5 **MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE DISCUSSION**

### 6 7 **1. The Committee will Review and Discuss a List of Potential Obstacles to a Millcreek** 8 **Canyon Shuttle.**

9  
10 One of the keys to a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon is parking. Skyline High School is submitting a  
11 letter to the Forest Service and UDOT to state that it is appropriate to use their parking lot. There  
12 could be parking at the high school during certain times and the shuttle could start there. Ms. Nielsen  
13 clarified that a letter is not official at the current time. Members of the Stakeholders Council  
14 approached Skyline High School, because of the frontage road that is currently being used by the high  
15 school for parking while their parking lot is under construction. That area could potentially work for  
16 future shuttle staging and parking. Members of the Council approached Skyline High School and  
17 verbally received positive feedback. She reiterated that nothing official has been determined at this  
18 time. Chair Richardson thanked her for the clarification.

19  
20 Discussions were had about the land on the east side. It was noted that there are some parking spaces  
21 available. Chair Richardson reported that there have also been discussions about other parking areas.  
22 There is work being done to address the parking needs for a shuttle. Ms. Nielsen encouraged those  
23 interested in attending the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting to do so. The next meeting is  
24 scheduled for July 15, 2024, and it is possible to discuss this in more detail. Mr. Marshall reported  
25 that Mr. Knoblock and Del Draper have done a lot of work to address parking.

26  
27 Chair Richardson noted that the Forest Service recently indicated that timed entry is preferred over a  
28 shuttle. However, there was some pushback, because many are still interested in a shuttle for  
29 Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Marshall reported that the Forest Service has several major objections to a  
30 shuttle in the canyon. This includes the lack of parking in the valley, the start-up costs, the operation  
31 costs, potential damage to the environment at shuttle stops, and the lack of infrastructure. Chair  
32 Richardson believes a shuttle may be an important component of the solutions implemented. In  
33 Millcreek Canyon, there would likely be vans rather than full-size or double-length buses.

34  
35 Ms. Johnson wanted to see an agenda item at a future Transportation Systems Committee meeting  
36 that reviewed the costs of running a shuttle system and the income that comes to the State from the  
37 County and the ski industry. Every ski resort knows how many visitors the lifts can manage, but that  
38 information is not often shared. She noted that the information can be considered as long as it is  
39 general rather than there being specific numbers shared for a ski resort. Chair Richardson stated that  
40 carrying capacity is a number that some people do not like to use or discuss.

41  
42 Mr. Marshall pointed out that restaurants always have a limit on the number of visitors that can be  
43 handled, due to square footage limitations and the number of seats. Additional discussions were had  
44 about carrying capacity and the number of visitors the trails can accommodate. Mr. Knoblock  
45 reported that there is a rough number estimate for the ski resorts, where Snowbird can have  
46 approximately 8,000 and Alta can have approximately 6,000, but people are always afraid that there  
47 will be a permit limit. That is the reason some are hesitant to share detailed information. With respect  
48 to trails, the most popular trails like Cardiff, Donut Falls, Cecret Lake, and Lake Blanche, are often

1 very busy. There is likely a practical limit for the use in those areas, but there are still a lot of other  
2 trails that are quiet. He pointed out that there is variety available to users.

3  
4 Chair Richardson believes shuttles are part of a potential solution for the canyons. Shuttles are being  
5 used in National Parks for various reasons, so he does not believe the shuttle conversations should be  
6 shut down entirely. Parking issues for a Millcreek Canyon shuttle can be addressed.

7  
8 Mr. Shea asked that Mr. Marshall and Roger Borgenicht draft a short description of what they believe  
9 will be a plausible solution in Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Marshall believes the plausible solution is to  
10 have a parking permit system for the recreation Forest Service users. The problem is parking at peak  
11 hours at the recreational sites. On the other hand, the Boy Scouts, Log Haven, and the cabins have  
12 sufficient parking. The only ones with limited parking are Millcreek Inn and the Forest Service. The  
13 recreational users create an overflow from the Forest Service parking lots to the roadside. The Forest  
14 Service does not want roadside parking, because it impacts the bicycle lane and creates environmental  
15 impacts. Mr. Marshall believes a solution is to require a parking permit for recreational users of the  
16 Forest Service lands during peak hours only. If someone is parked without a permit or is parked on  
17 the roadside, there can be enforcement and a ticket issued.

18  
19 Mr. Knoblock expressed his support for the idea that has been proposed by Mr. Marshall. Co-Chair  
20 Hegmann believed the request is that this be formally written down so it can be shared. Mr. Marshall  
21 offered to speak to Mr. Shea about this matter after the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting.  
22 Discussions were had about the use of shuttles to bring visitors to events.

23  
24 Mr. Marshall shared another Forest Service objection to a Millcreek Canyon shuttle. He noted that  
25 replacing personal vehicles with a shuttle means the tolls that are collected will decrease. The tolls  
26 are used by the Forest Service after the cost of collection. It seems the Forest Service is concerned  
27 with replacing that revenue. Ms. Johnson pointed out that some of the revenue from the shuttle can  
28 be given to the Forest Service to replace the loss of the tolling amounts collected.

29  
30 Chair Richardson asked what the ski areas contribute back to the Forest Service. Ms. Broadway  
31 reported that it is a percentage of revenue within the permit-use area. The money that is submitted to  
32 the U.S. Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) goes to USDA in Washington and is allocated through  
33 the Washington Office. Ms. Broadway discussed the Ski Hill Resources for Economic Development  
34 (“SHRED”) Act which is still unpassed. The SHRED Act is intended to have portions of those fees  
35 stay in the forests where the fees are generated, but the SHRED Act is still not passed.

36  
37 Chair Richardson asked for additional information about the Millcreek Canyon Committee.  
38 Ms. Nielsen reported that one of the original Stakeholders Council Members, Brian Hutchinson,  
39 created the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Committee to build upon the 2012 Fehr & Peers Feasibility  
40 Study that mapped out the feasibility of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle system. The Millcreek Canyon  
41 Shuttle Committee was created in 2019 and tried to determine what would need to happen in order to  
42 have a shuttle in the canyon. This was before the FLAP grant in Millcreek Canyon. At the time, the  
43 Forest Service determined that the road would not hold a shuttle. The Millcreek Canyon Shuttle  
44 Committee morphed into the Millcreek Canyon Committee in order to discuss other issues.

45  
46 Chair Richardson reported that there was a brainstorming session held recently. Ms. Nielsen reported  
47 that it will be discussed in detail at the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. Chair Richardson  
48 noted that the participants created a list of 10 major issues and some suggested solutions. The group

1 met for approximately two hours and there were some wonderful discussions. Ms. Nielsen explained  
2 that what motivated the brainstorming session was a desire to work through all of the potential  
3 obstacles for a shuttle system. It was important for everyone to be on the same page in order to think  
4 about solutions for the various issues. The brainstorming session will be the foundation of the  
5 discussion scheduled to occur at the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting. It was noted that  
6 the current version of the brainstorming document is not in the final form. Work will continue to be  
7 done on that document at the next Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting.

8  
9 Mr. Marshall shared additional information about the history of the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle  
10 Committee. After the first meeting, it took time to re-establish a relationship with the Forest Service.  
11 He explained that it is important to understand that proper steps need to be taken. Ms. Nielsen  
12 reported that recordings and Meeting Minutes from early meetings of the committee are accessible  
13 on the CWC website. Those interested in the history of the committee can look there.

14  
15 Discussions were had about notices for the meetings. Ms. Nielsen reported that anyone can attend a  
16 public meeting and notice is posted, per the Open and Public Meetings Act, on the Utah Public Notice  
17 website. All of the meetings for the rest of the year are listed on the CWC website as well. For  
18 anyone subscribed to the CWC Board or Stakeholders Council via the Utah Public Notice website,  
19 an auto-alert is sent whenever CWC Staff uploads a meeting notice or meeting materials. In addition,  
20 the agenda is also physically posted on the bulletin board in the CWC Offices and Millcreek City  
21 Hall, which is the location of the CWC Board and Stakeholders Council Meetings.

## 22 **OTHER ITEMS**

23  
24  
25 There were no other items discussed.

## 26 **CLOSING**

### 27 28 29 **1. Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation Systems** 30 **Committee Meeting.**

31  
32 **MOTION:** Kurt Hegmann moved to ADJOURN the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting.  
33 Roger Borgenicht seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the  
34 Committee.

35  
36 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting  
37 adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee Meeting held on*  
3 *Monday, July 8, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

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