



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 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 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Present: Danny Richardson, Chair
Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair
Mark Baer
Linda Johnson
John Knoblock
Mike Marker
Spencer Shaver

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

Others: Ralph Becker
Vaishali Apte

OPENING

1. Chair Danny Richardson will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Transportation Systems Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission 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 October 11, 2024, Meeting.

Chair Richardson reviewed information from the last Transportation Systems Committee Meeting. He noted that there were some excellent discussions during the last meeting, including a discussion about the Visitor Use Study. There was also a robust discussion about the traction laws. At that time, it was noted that traction laws were discussed at the CWC Board Meeting held on October 7, 2024. Jake Brown from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) shared information about traction law compliance during that CWC Board Meeting. Additionally, there were discussions about the sticker program at the last Transportation Systems Committee Meeting.

1
2 It was noted that UDOT installed a remote avalanche control system above Alta, which could keep
3 the roads open more often. Chair Richardson reported that the Legislature may fund additional
4 smaller plows for the smaller parking lots along the road for backcountry skiing. This could
5 eliminate or lessen the need to park on the road. There have been some No Parking signs removed
6 so there is more backcountry parking. He noted that there was a discussion at the last meeting
7 about the possibility of there being a media push to educate others about traction laws. During the
8 last meeting, there was also a lengthy discussion about parking in Big Cottonwood Canyon.
9

10 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Transportation Systems Committee Meeting
11 Minutes from October 11, 2024. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with
12 the unanimous consent of the Committee.
13

14 **TRACTION LAW DISCUSSION**

- 15
16 1. **Chair Richardson will Share Updates on the Traction Law, Including Funding,**
17 **Enforcement, and Stickers.**
18
19 2. **The Committee will Review the Traction Law Brainstorming Document and Desired**
20 **Action Items from that List.**
21

22 Chair Richardson reported that there is a Traction Law Brainstorming document. All Committee
23 Members have seen the document and there are approximately 15 possible ideas listed. The
24 Transportation Systems Committee is interested in identifying three or four items on the list and
25 determining what might be best to pursue. Chair Richardson went through and color-coded items
26 on the list to indicate ideas that are currently in progress. He believes the CWC Board,
27 Stakeholders Council, and subcommittees are making a difference and that work is moving ahead.
28

29 Committee Members reviewed the list of brainstormed ideas. Chair Richardson mentioned the
30 idea of having rental car companies provide compliant vehicles. He pointed out that this is
31 something that is happening. Many of the rental companies are obtaining the stickers and putting
32 snow tires on the vehicles. John Knoblock noted that one rental car company does not want to do
33 this. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, believes it is Hertz that is not currently taking this
34 action. Mike Marker heard that it was more than Hertz and was any company with a fleet that
35 moves around the country. If a car rental company has a locked-in fleet of cars that does not leave
36 the Salt Lake area, it is easier for that company to participate in the sticker program and have snow
37 tires. However, some rental companies use different business models. Chair Richardson
38 understands the perspective of those companies but stressed the importance of winter tires.
39

40 Additional discussions were had about the rental car companies choosing not to participate in the
41 sticker program or having snow tires on their vehicles. Mr. Knoblock noted that the companies
42 that do not have these items in place could still provide information to renters to clarify that the
43 vehicle being rented is or is not traction control-compliant for the Cottonwood Canyons. Ralph
44 Becker commented that he is listening in on the meeting out of interest in the subcommittee
45 discussions.
46

1 Chair Richardson further reviewed the Traction Law Brainstorming document. Another item on
2 the list is to get security companies to offer overtime work for officers. He explained that this
3 approach has now changed with the \$400,000 that has been allocated to certain municipalities for
4 enforcement. The next item on the list is to only allow vehicles with stickers up the canyon on
5 snow days. He explained that this is connected to enforcement, which is what the Transportation
6 Systems Committee is interested in. Co-Chair Kurt Hegmann asked if there is enforcement
7 happening. The sticker program is in place, but he wondered whether there is regular enforcement.
8

9 Linda Johnson shared information about a situation that happened recently, where she discussed
10 the sticker program and enforcement with others. Committee Members talked about where the
11 sticker can be obtained. Ms. Johnson feels it should be easier to find. Signage at car rental
12 locations, advertising in newspapers, and other forms of education are all avenues that can be
13 pursued. She thinks there should be a law, similar to what is in Colorado, where vehicles are
14 unable to be in certain locations without a compliant vehicle. It was noted that enforcement can
15 be a challenge. Ms. Johnson discussed what has happened in Colorado. With the Cottonwood
16 Canyons, there could be a rule implemented and signage posted at the mouth of the canyons. From
17 there, information will spread to others and it will become more widely known what is expected.
18

19 Chair Richardson pointed out that Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon are
20 different than Parley's Canyon and Millcreek Canyon. For example, there are more snow plows
21 and controls in Parley's Canyon, because it is not as steep. Mr. Knoblock noted that to require
22 traction-equipped vehicles in the canyons throughout the winter season would require State
23 Legislation. Chair Richardson asked if this is something the Transportation Systems Committee
24 wants to advocate for. It could be something to focus on in the future. Ms. Johnson noted that
25 UDOT could potentially pursue that. Mr. Knoblock made note of the suggestion to only allow
26 vehicles with stickers up the canyon on snow days. He believes the intention is to wave through
27 vehicles with stickers, but cars without stickers will be pulled over so there can be an inspection.
28

29 Another item on the list is to turn around non-compliant vehicles at the canyon base. Mr. Knoblock
30 pointed out that non-compliant vehicles will be turned around on snow days. However, turning
31 those vehicles around is not always simple to do. It would be nice to talk to representatives from
32 the Unified Police Department ("UPD"), Cottonwood Heights, and Sandy to ensure that there has
33 been some consideration of how the vehicle turnarounds will take place.
34

35 Chair Richardson reported that for Little Cottonwood Canyon, the inspection will be at the bottom
36 gate rather than the mouth of the canyon because there is a parking lot trailhead that can be used
37 for a safe turnaround. Big Cottonwood Canyon is a little more problematic because there is not
38 the same opportunity for a turnaround. Ms. Johnson noted that in the past, the inspections used to
39 take place in Big Cottonwood Canyon further up the canyon entrance into the parking lot. Those
40 with stickers went to the right and everyone else was stopped. Those who did not pass went into
41 the parking lot and were able to turn around. Chair Richardson believed it made sense for the left
42 lane to be for inspection and the right lane to be the pass-through area for those with stickers.
43

44 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, noted that a request was previously made by
45 Mr. Knoblock to communicate with whoever the coordinator was at UDOT for the sticker
46 program. She reported that it is Alex Fisher. While Ms. Fisher was unable to attend the current

1 Transportation Committee Meeting, there is a willingness to participate in a future meeting.
2 Ms. Kilpack suggested that Committee Members brainstorm questions to ask when she can attend.
3

4 The Traction Law Brainstorming document was further reviewed. There is a suggestion to
5 improve skier education about the traction laws and to improve traction law signage at the base of
6 the canyons. Another suggestion is to provide notification on traction-compliant days. Chair
7 Richardson believed the latter would involve stations announcing that it is a snow day during the
8 morning news. Other suggestions on the list are to have automated traction-compliant sticker RFD
9 readers, to determine the best locations for pull-arounds, increase fines for non-compliant vehicles
10 in the canyon on snow days, require resorts to pay for traffic control on busy days and require all
11 vehicles entering the canyon between November and April to be equipped with traction devices,
12 regardless of current road conditions. It was reiterated that some of these items are underway.
13

14 Chair Richardson reported that his version of the list was color-coded to highlight what is already
15 in progress. He also separated the information and educational items from the enforcement items.
16 Ms. Kilpack pointed out that if Committee Members are each prepared to choose three action items
17 there is a desire to discuss further, which might be a productive use of the meeting time. That
18 might make it clear what the Transportation Systems Committee wants to look into further.
19

20 It was noted that simplicity is often best. Requiring everyone to be in compliance during certain
21 months would likely be the simplest approach. Ms. Johnson pointed out that UDOT would be the
22 ones responsible for setting those dates. She stated that traction devices are important during the
23 winter months because there is always uncertainty about what the conditions will be later in the
24 day. Mr. Knoblock noted that there might be pushback on requiring traction control devices all
25 winter since that means there would need to be officers checking every day rather than only on
26 snow days. That would increase the cost of enforcement. Ms. Johnson explained that if a law is
27 in place, there is an expectation that people will obey that law. There will not necessarily need to
28 be enforcement 24/7. If a problem arises, then that person will be held responsible. Presumption
29 of liability is important to keep in mind. Discussions were had about the car rental companies.
30

31 Ms. Johnson reported that the law is if a car is in the State for 30 days, then it is supposed to be
32 registered, but that law is not enforced. In Colorado, that was enforced and it made a difference.
33 Committee Members wanted to understand how some of the different ideas could move forward.
34 Chair Richardson stated that suggestions can ultimately be shared with the CWC Board through
35 the process in place. Ms. Johnson stated that the CWC Board could communicate the suggestion
36 to UDOT. If UDOT believes it is an appropriate path forward, then that is something that will be
37 pursued. However, if there is no support from UDOT to implement the suggestion, it will not
38 move ahead. It would be worth having someone comment at a Wasatch Front Regional Council
39 (“WFRC”) Meeting. However, this can only be done with support from the CWC Board.
40

41 It was suggested that signage at the bottom of the canyons be prioritized. Mr. Knoblock reported
42 that some signs have been installed. Ms. Johnson does not feel that the signs are strong enough.
43 It would be best to advertise the information further. There should be a sign at the bottom of each
44 canyon as well as a sign before vehicles make it to that point. Additionally, there could be a sign
45 in the airport near the rental car locations. There are a lot of ways to share traction information.
46

1 Mr. Knoblock reported that permanent signs were placed at the bottom of each canyon and he
2 believes there is an overhead electronic sign on I-80 that can include traction law messaging. He
3 suggested that the Transportation Systems Committee brainstorm where else canyon user
4 education can be shared. For example, through the CWC channels or even in ski shops. Ms.
5 Johnson wondered whether there should be signs in both directions at the corner of Wasatch
6 Boulevard and 7200. There could be one placed on 7200 and one on Wasatch Boulevard.

7
8 Ms. Kilpack shared images of new signs in place as of November 4, 2024. Those pictures were
9 linked by Vaishali Apte. Committee Members expressed their appreciation for the information
10 that was presented. There was support for the signage that has been added for educational
11 purposes. Chair Richardson feels it is important that there is information shared as the winter
12 season approaches. The more information that is shared, the higher the compliance levels will be.

13
14 Chair Richardson asked Committee Members to further review the Traction Law Brainstorming
15 document. If there are a few items there is a desire to prioritize, he asked that those items be
16 brought back and discussed further at the next Transportation Systems Committee Meeting. He
17 reiterated that the main focus seems to be on items related to compliance and education.

18
19 Chair Richardson reported that there was an article in The Salt Lake Tribune recently about the
20 sticker program and compliance. It is 10 pages long and there are images of people checking tires.
21 This is the kind of information that needs to be shared with as many people as possible. In the
22 article, there was a section about the multi-agency plan from UDOT to increase enforcement of
23 the tire traction law in the Cottonwood Canyons. The \$400,000 initiative includes traction checks
24 in both canyons and increased ticketing for illegally parked vehicles. Canyon drivers note that
25 UDOT does not enact the traction law until the road has become dangerous. By that point, vehicles
26 not equipped to handle snowy conditions are already in the canyons and are likely to disrupt traffic.

27
28 Ms. Johnson believes the article should be distributed at the Snowbird Thanksgiving dinner and
29 the ticket offices for Snowbird and Solitude. It would be an easy way to share important
30 information. Chair Richardson read additional portions of the article. In the article, Amber
31 Broadway was quoted as saying, "...we remain hopeful that all the rental car agencies out of SLC
32 airport will get on board with this program, too." All but two rental agencies based out of the Salt
33 Lake City International Airport plan to participate in the sticker program. Additionally, resorts
34 will post participating rental car agencies on their websites. Visitors need to ensure that their
35 vehicle has a sticker before taking it off of the rental lot. The article was very informative.

36
37 Mr. Knoblock suggested that radio stations share information about traction control days. Co-
38 Chair Hegmann thought it would be nice if there was a way that those walking out of the security
39 area of the airport were able to see relevant information. There could be electronic messaging that
40 people see at the airport. Ms. Johnson reiterated the need to share the article. Chair Richardson
41 offered to reach out to The Salt Lake Tribune to see what there is a willingness to do. Ms. Nielsen
42 reminded those present that when there is outreach done to the media, there needs to be clarity that
43 individuals are not reaching out on behalf of the CWC as a whole, but as an interested citizen.

44
45 Chair Richardson shared information about his experience obtaining a sticker through the sticker
46 program. It took approximately three minutes, was free, and the sticker is now on his vehicle. As

1 for the UDOT website, which is udot.utah.gov, there is information about the traction law and
2 what traction devices are. There is a clear explanation of relevant information and enforcement.
3 The Little Cottonwood Canyon enforcement turnaround checkpoint will be at A Gate/Gate
4 Buttress. The Big Cottonwood Canyon enforcement turnaround checkpoint will be at the chain-
5 up area. Chair Richardson believes the information is new for this year. There is a lot of
6 information on the UDOT website as well as an article called, "Driving in Utah Winter Weather."
7 Mr. Knoblock noted that on the Snowbird website, there is a tab called "Getting Here," which
8 includes information on canyon driving. There is information there about the traction laws.

9
10 Chair Richardson discussed the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment. There will
11 be public meetings held on November 13 and 14, 2024. There is also a public comment period.
12 He next shared a copy of an email that highlighted information from Ms. Fisher. It stated that No
13 Parking signs around Spruces were taken down. UDOT and the U.S. Forest Service are continuing
14 to have conversations about how to maintain parking lots. The issue is that UDOT does not have
15 small plows to maintain smaller lots. There is work being done with the Forest Service to
16 potentially have those lots remain open, but the Forest Service cannot open a parking lot without
17 facilities. As for the park and ride at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon, that was restriped.
18 Chair Richardson reported that it went from 56 to 89 parking spaces as a result of the restriping.

19 20 **VISITOR USE STUDY**

21 22 **1. The Committee will Discuss Issues with the Visitor Use Study and Its Impact on the** 23 **Central Wasatch Moving Forward.**

24 25 **2. The Committee will Discuss Potential Action Items and Next Steps.**

26
27 Chair Richardson noted that there was a discussion about the Visitor Use Study at the last
28 Transportation Systems Committee Meeting. There was a point made at that time that the study
29 included numbers that appeared to be low. Additionally, there was a conversation about whether
30 the Visitor Use Study should be a capacity study, as intended during the Mountain Accord process.

31
32 Mr. Marker reported that he wrote out an eight-page document that highlights why the capacity
33 study is necessary for the work of the CWC. He pointed out that the Mountain Accord specifically
34 called out for a capacity study, which legitimizes the need for that kind of information. The CWC
35 exists solely to implement the Mountain Accord. There was a committee at one time that was
36 working towards a capacity study, but then the Utah State University study occurred.

37
38 Based on comments about the Visitor Use Study, some felt it missed specific areas of activity. Mr.
39 Marker pointed out that it specified no impact whatsoever in terms of the visitation. He noticed
40 that the Environmental Dashboard, while it misses out in some areas, specifically shares that over
41 the years, E. coli has increased to dangerous levels in almost all of the watershed areas along the
42 Wasatch Front. There is likely a correlation with visitation levels since those have also increased.
43 Mr. Marker noted that the national parks acknowledge that capacity is impacting visitation
44 experiences as well as the ability to manage the parks. He reiterated the need for a capacity study.

1 Mr. Knoblock discussed the Utah State University study. It turned into a summer trail use study
2 more than anything else. The study found that those visiting more popular trails are aware that
3 there will be more people on those trails. The suggestion is to harden those trails and focus use on
4 the more heavily used areas. While that information was useful, the Visitor Use Study was more
5 of a trail use study than the capacity study that was envisioned as part of the Mountain Accord.
6 He pointed out that the study underestimated the ski resort visitation numbers. There was not any
7 significant data on road bicycling, mountain bicycling, rock climbing, trail running, or other uses.

8
9 Ms. Johnson asked whether the Visitor Use Study satisfied Committee Members as far as the trail
10 use. It is worth discussing whether the study should be redone or if what was completed is
11 considered sufficient. Mr. Knoblock believes the trail use data is reasonable as far as the hiking
12 use. Mr. Marker feels the study needs to go beyond what was done. He expressed concerns about
13 the numbers and the model that was used. If the study is done again or another study is conducted,
14 a completely different model would need to be used than what Utah State University used.
15 Mr. Marker has seen some capacity and visitation studies where the level of degradation is
16 measured on a scale of one to five and the degradation level is documented with photographs.
17 Nowhere in the written report from Utah State University was there discussion about degradation
18 of the trails.

19
20 Chair Richardson noted that Utah State University followed the Forest Service study model.
21 Mr. Marker pointed out that the CWC funded this study and the organization did not receive what
22 was needed. Ms. Nielsen confirmed that the organization funded the Visitor Use Study. It
23 originated from the Stakeholders Council. Over many CWC Board Meetings, the CWC Board
24 collectively decided to use the protocol the Forest Service used. The decision at the CWC Board
25 level to move away from a capacity study and towards a Visitor Use Study was done on purpose.
26 If the Transportation Systems Committee wants to request the CWC Board to do something
27 different, that request can move forward from the Stakeholders Council to the CWC Board.

28
29 Ms. Nielsen reiterated that there was a purposeful decision to fund the kind of study that was
30 ultimately conducted. Just because a capacity study was outlined in the Mountain Accord does
31 not mean that a capacity study is a requirement. She pointed out that a lot has changed since the
32 Mountain Accord was signed. For instance, the Mountain Accord called for a paper version of the
33 Environmental Dashboard that was static. However, the Environmental Dashboard now is a
34 dynamic digital resource. That being said, she reiterated that the Transportation Systems
35 Committee can forward a recommendation to the Stakeholders Council for a capacity study.

36
37 Chair Richardson asked if there is a desire to forward a recommendation to the Stakeholders
38 Council for a capacity study. Ms. Johnson suggested that there be a special meeting to lay out
39 what would need to be included for there to be a successful study. From there, it will be possible
40 to forward that information to the Stakeholders Council. Co-Chair Hegmann noted that there
41 might be others on different subcommittees who would like to participate in that kind of special
42 meeting discussion. Ms. Johnson stressed the importance of there being a clear plan in place.

43
44 Mr. Knoblock pointed out that the Recreation Systems Committee has also discussed the Visitor
45 Use Study. That Committee wanted to better understand how many people were backcountry
46 skiing versus resort skiing, how many mountain bicyclists were in the area, and so on. The

1 Recreation Systems Committee wanted more information on use. What that subcommittee has
2 discussed is slightly different than what was mentioned by Mr. Marker, which is a study that
3 analyzes the capacity of the canyons for increased recreation. The Utah State University team felt
4 the latter was addressed with respect to the hiking trails because the study looked at the capacity
5 of the Central Wasatch to handle increased recreation. He believes there needs to be a discussion
6 about whether a capacity study should determine a limit or if it is appropriate to use that word
7 more generally, where the intention is to determine the capacity of the system to handle more.

8
9 Ms. Nielsen noted that the Environmental Dashboard has been a topic of conversation within many
10 of the subcommittees. At the last Recreation Systems Committee Meeting, it was determined that
11 there is a desire for the CWC to host a Storyboarding Session in late January or early February. It
12 will essentially be a gathering for Stakeholders and members of the public to talk about how to
13 make the Environmental Dashboard better. For example, how to visually improve upon the
14 Environmental Dashboard, how to better display the data, and what data might be missing. That
15 is related to the current Transportation Systems Committee discussions. There is a desire to obtain
16 more data. A lot of the data that is desired does not currently exist, so the collection process would
17 need to start from scratch. This is especially true when it comes to recreation use data.

18
19 Ms. Nielsen discussed the potential to work with Phoebe McNealy from the University of Utah,
20 folks from Utah State University, and former Stakeholders Council Member, Kirk Nichols, to
21 create a catalog of all of the data there is a desire to see reflected in the Human Element of the
22 Environmental Dashboard. The first step is determining what there is a desire to see. From there,
23 plans can be devised for the collection of that data. She explained that there are two components
24 to what can be pursued: undertaking the cataloging of the data there is a desire to see on the
25 Environmental Dashboard and the Storyboarding Session with Stakeholders and the public to talk
26 about improvements to the Environmental Dashboard. There is a lot currently being considered.

27
28 Co-Chair Hegmann believes the most important aspect of a capacity study is the creation of a
29 baseline. If there is a baseline measurement, it will be possible to interpret future data. This is a
30 complex and costly process, but if it is done once, then it will have enduring value. Ms. Johnson
31 agreed with the comments shared. She wants something that will outline the current levels of use.

32
33 Ms. Kilpack noted that Ms. Nielsen left a comment in the Zoom chat box. It stated that if the
34 Transportation Systems Committee wants to draft a recommendation before the next Stakeholders
35 Council Meeting on November 20, 2024, to request that the CWC Board consider incorporating
36 thresholds in the Environmental Dashboard, that would be the most appropriate next step.
37 Something could be written in the next week or so and then distributed ahead of the Stakeholders
38 Council Meeting. There could be a discussion about what was recommended at that meeting.

39
40 Mr. Marker is not sure how the discussion moved from the Visitor Use Study to the Environmental
41 Dashboard. He wonders whether something is being lost by combining the two. Mr. Knoblock
42 believes the two intersect to the extent that monitoring use is a tool to better understand the ability
43 of the canyons to handle more recreation. Collecting that data can be done in the Human Element
44 of the Environmental Dashboard. Dr. Jordan Smith previously stated that the capacity of any
45 system is individualized, so it is not possible to generalize the capacity of the Central Wasatch. It

1 might be possible to talk about the capacity of Gate Butress to handle more rock climbers or
2 something that is fairly specific rather than determining capacity in a more general sense.

3
4 Committee Members discussed who would draft a recommendation for Stakeholders Council
5 consideration. Mr. Marker stated that he could assist, but did not recall the CWC Board deciding
6 on a different direction for the Visitor Use Study. Mr. Knoblock noted that it was not clearly
7 stated. Mr. Marker expressed concerns about that process and the shift that occurred. Ms. Nielsen
8 explained that this decision happened several years ago and she was not the point person on the
9 Visitor Use Study at that time. All of the Stakeholders Council Capacity Committee Meeting
10 Minutes and recordings are available for review as well as the CWC Board Meetings. Ms. Johnson
11 pointed out that the question is now how to move forward in the best way.

12
13 Ms. Kilpack read from the Zoom chat box, where Ms. Nielsen commented that thresholds are
14 notoriously difficult to define, which is part of the reason that the Visitor Use Study veered away
15 from them. In addition, thresholds can be political. Ms. Kilpack asked if there was agreement
16 from the Transportation Systems Committee to bring this matter to the Stakeholders Council. If
17 there is a desire to take that approach, she suggested that there be discussions about what to bring
18 forward. One of the Committee Members can draft a brief letter, which can be emailed to CWC
19 Staff and other Committee Members. There can be suggestions made at that time. Once there is
20 a version of that letter everyone is satisfied with, it can move forward to the Stakeholders Council.

21
22 Chair Richardson stated that the Transportation Systems Committee feels the capacity component
23 is missing. There is a desire for a capacity study that looks into what can be handled in individual
24 sites. Ms. Kilpack believes the Committee wants to discuss bringing thresholds into the
25 Environmental Dashboard and for those to be considered as part of the future data collection. Mr.
26 Knoblock mentioned the Recreation Systems Committee discussions, where there was a desire to
27 have more data on the different types of recreation uses that are happening in the canyons.

28
29 Ms. Johnson offered to draft some language over the weekend and share it with Committee
30 Members. Ms. Kilpack explained that it does not need to be complicated and can be a broad
31 outline. Ms. Johnson believes it is important to be somewhat specific so the Stakeholders Council
32 is aware of what the Transportation Systems Committee wants to see move forward. Mr. Knoblock
33 suggested that the drafted language be included in the subcommittee folder so additions and edits
34 can be made. It was reiterated that whatever is drafted can be brief. Ms. Kilpack believes the
35 request that is being made is to incorporate thresholds. If there is an openness to that from the
36 Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board, it will then be possible to look into specifics.

37
38 Mr. Marker is not certain that the Transportation Systems Committee is asking for thresholds. He
39 believes that the Committee wants to understand what the level of activity is in the area and how
40 that is impacting the resource. There needs to be a baseline understanding of what is happening.
41 Ms. Kilpack asked whether the Committee wants a baseline study to be conducted, which was
42 confirmed. Mr. Knoblock stated that there is a desire to have baseline data related to the uses.

43
44 Mr. Knoblock reported that he tried to click on the Environmental Dashboard button on the CWC
45 website and it stated that a critical error had occurred. Ms. Kilpack offered to look into the issue.

1 **TRANSPORTATION UPDATES**

2
3 1. **Chair Richardson will Share Updates on Transportation Issues in the Central**
4 **Wasatch.**

- 5
6 a. **BCC Environmental Assessment.**
7 b. **Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Parking.**
8 c. **Millcreek Canyon Shuttle and FLAP Grant.**
9

10 Chair Richardson shared some transportation updates with the Transportation Systems Committee.
11 There were discussions earlier in the meeting about the UDOT Big Cottonwood Canyon
12 Environmental Assessment. He reiterated that there is information on the UDOT website and there
13 will be public meetings held on November 13 and 14, 2024. The public comment period will be
14 open from November 13 to December 13, 2024. He expressed excitement about this process.
15

16 Skyline High School finished the parking lot work at the school. There has also been some striping
17 done on Virginia Street. The Millcreek Canyon Committee had a meeting that included the Acting
18 District Ranger, Adam Shaw. The committee discussed the possibility of a Millcreek Canyon
19 shuttle. CWC Staff is applying for a grant to update the Fehr & Peers Feasibility Study.
20

21 Chair Richardson reported that in upper Millcreek Canyon, there are a bunch of brush piles. Those
22 piles will be burned when it is safe to do so. Salt Lake County, Millcreek City, and the Forest
23 Service are applying for the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant for improvements to
24 the lower section of Millcreek Canyon. Mr. Knoblock reported that there was a meeting on the
25 FLAP grant recently at Millcreek City Hall. Helen Peters shared information at that time. The
26 work contemplated for the lower portion of Millcreek Canyon includes the fee station, widening
27 the road where possible so there is a consistent width, and various parking improvements.
28

29 **NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

- 30
31 1. **The Next Meeting will be on December 9, 2024.**
32
33 2. **The Committee will Discuss Items for the Next Meeting Agenda.**
34

35 Ms. Kilpack reported that the next Transportation Systems Committee will take place on
36 December 9, 2024. There were discussions about what will be on the next meeting agenda. Chair
37 Richardson had a few ideas about what to discuss in the future, including whether there is
38 Legislation that should be supported and the impacts of the ski season. Mark Baer asked if there
39 is any movement towards the fee stations in the Cottonwood Canyons. Mr. Knoblock denied this.
40 He explained that the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment needs to be done before
41 tolling can be implemented because it needs to be done in both canyons at once. There is also the
42 issue of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) lawsuits.
43

44 Chair Richardson hopes there will be a Millcreek Canyon update at the next Transportation
45 Systems Committee Meeting. Mr. Knoblock suggested that there be a discussion about plowing

1 backcountry parking lots at the next meeting. Focusing on having winter backcountry lots plowed
2 consistently and well is something important to think about and for the Committee to discuss.

3
4 **OTHER ITEMS**

5
6 There were no additional items.

7
8 **CLOSING**

9
10 **1. Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation Systems**
11 **Committee Meeting.**

12
13 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN the Transportation Systems Committee
14 Meeting. Linda Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of
15 the Committee.

16
17 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Transportation Systems Committee
18 Meeting adjourned at 5:00 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*
3 *Friday, November 8, 2024.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____