



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2025, 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 IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Present: Danny Richardson, Chair
Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair
Linda Johnson
Ian Reddell
Patrick Shea
Roger Borgenicht
Mark Baer
John Knoblock
Doug Tolman

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

Others: Katie Balakir

OPENING

1. Chair Danny Richardson will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Transportation System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.

Chair Danny Richardson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Transportation System Committee Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present. He then took a moment to congratulate CWC Staff on the Central Wasatch Symposium. It was a wonderful event, and he thanked everyone involved in organizing the two-day symposium.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the December 9, 2024, Meeting.

Chair Richardson reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the December 9, 2024, Transportation System Committee Meeting. The Committee discussed the traction law and noted that during the first few weeks of enforcement, some backups occurred. The sticker program was discussed and a suggestion was made that there be some sort of express lane for vehicles with a sticker. The

1 Committee discussed ski resorts sharing information about traction laws, parking, and snow days.
2 Comments were also made about the Visitor Use Study, Forest Plan, and a Millcreek Canyon
3 shuttle. When the CWC budget discussions occur, the hope is that there will be funding allocated
4 for an update to the Fehr & Peers study that was conducted in 2012. There were several action
5 items outlined during the last Transportation System Committee Meeting, including a letter to
6 rental car agencies, ski resort website information, and baseline data collection. The
7 Transportation System Committee also reviewed the proposed 2025 meeting schedule.
8

9 Chair Richardson reported that there were discussions about the fee booth in Millcreek Canyon
10 during the last meeting. The fee booth generates funding that is used to service the area. There
11 are no fee booths in Little Cottonwood Canyon or Big Cottonwood Canyon at this time. It was
12 noted that there was not a quorum present. As a result, the Meeting Minutes will be voted on when
13 there is a quorum of the Transportation System Committee. The vote was taken at 4:00 p.m.
14

15 **MOTION:** Linda Johnson moved to APPROVE the Minutes from December 9, 2024. Kurt
16 Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
17

18 **TRACTION LAW DISCUSSION**

19 20 1. **Staff will Relay Information Gathered at the Last Ski Bus Priority Access Program** 21 **Planning Meeting.** 22

23 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, shared information about the Ski Bus Priority Access
24 Program Planning Meeting that took place recently. Things are going well on the Sandy side and
25 some minor issues are being worked out on the Cottonwood Heights side. The Cottonwood
26 Heights Police Department is smaller and there are not the same resources there as in Sandy.
27

28 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, noted that during a previous Transportation System
29 Committee Meeting, there was a question raised about snow tires on shuttles in the canyon. She
30 was told that it is ultimately up to the resorts who contract those shuttles. John Knoblock reported
31 that he spoke to someone from the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) during the Central Wasatch
32 Symposium. He mentioned that one of the Solitude vans ended up sideways in the road, which
33 shut down the canyon for approximately 15 minutes. According to the UTA representative, some
34 of the vans are 4x4, but not all of them are. An offer was made to look into that further.
35

36 Chair Richardson reported that he has a meeting scheduled with UTA next week on behalf of the
37 Transportation System Committee. He will speak to them about various transportation issues. For
38 example, additional buses, improved scheduling, snow tires on vans, and so on. There are a
39 number of items he plans to talk to them about. The idea is to have an open dialogue with UTA.
40

41 Ian Reddell likes the idea of a meeting with UTA. He would like to see increased bus frequency.
42 Currently, the buses seem to be quite full. However, during the Central Wasatch Symposium, it
43 was noted that more buses do not necessarily equate to more people getting up the canyon. He
44 does not understand that concept, because there would be more users in the canyon from buses if
45 there were additional buses available. Mr. Reddell reiterated the need for increased bus frequency

1 and noted that a few years ago, there was a reduction in the service. He does not know whether
2 the bus frequency has returned. The demand for bus service appears to be greater post-COVID.

3
4 Mr. Knoblock shared information about the 972 bus route. For a year or two, it was a 15-minute
5 schedule, but now it is back to a 30-minute schedule. It is important to continue to reach out to
6 UTA and to encourage the schedule to return to 15 minutes. Linda Johnson noted that it is
7 necessary to consider parking locations for anyone who chooses to utilize the buses. Mr. Knoblock
8 reported that restriping the Big Cottonwood Canyon park and ride results in an additional 35
9 parking spaces. On the weekends, business parking is available near the 6200 South Park and
10 Ride. A sign can be made to further highlight that. There is currently a sign between the Utah
11 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) parking lot at the adjacent business parking to state: “No
12 Bus Parking.” However, there is fine print underneath that states bus parking is allowed on the
13 weekends. If a sign was made to clearly indicate that the area can be used for weekend overflow
14 bus parking, that would be beneficial. He stressed the importance of providing additional clarity.

15
16 Chair Richardson pointed out that there are a lot of ways to improve transportation. He wants to
17 ask UTA what is needed to implement some of those solutions moving forward. Patrick Shea
18 wanted to know what should be asked of Cowboy Partners as far as the weekend overflow parking.
19 Mr. Knoblock reported that he has already had discussions with Cowboy Partners. It went well
20 and he provided information to Devin Weder with UDOT. There is an open line of
21 communication.

22
23 Mr. Knoblock mentioned the \$150 million that UDOT has and the additional \$20 million per year.
24 He asked whether CWC Staff had read through the legislation. Ms. Nielsen stated that she has not
25 read through the legislation, but that money is specifically set aside for the Cottonwood Canyons.
26 Mr. Knoblock thought it made sense to use some of that money sooner rather than later to address
27 the current needs. For example, it could be used for the purchase of 4x4 vans. He suggested asking
28 Kirk Cullimore about this, as he is the Chair of the Appropriations Committee. Ms. Nielsen
29 clarified that there are not any meetings scheduled with him and it is too late to make that request
30 for the Legislative Session. There is a process that needs to be followed. The CWC has put in
31 their appropriations request already, so what has been suggested could not be completed in time.

32
33 Ms. Johnson believes solutions need to be implemented now. She expressed concerns about some
34 of the comments made by UTA during the Central Wasatch Symposium. At that time, it was stated
35 that part-time winter buses were not the priority, because UTA needs to supply commuters with
36 buses throughout the year. Mr. Knoblock hopes to see some progress made during the session.

37
38 Katie Balakir from HEAL Utah introduced herself to the Committee. She has been working with
39 UTA over the last few months in a different capacity. Her recommendation is to ask a
40 representative from UTA to attend a future Transportation System Committee Meeting.
41 Ms. Balakir sat in on a presentation recently where the fleet manager provided an update on the
42 buses, service, and future plans, including the electrification of buses. There was information
43 provided about budget concerns over the next four years. With the new presidential
44 administration, transportation funding will likely be more limited. There are a lot of obstacles, but
45 UTA will be able to speak about the decisions being made. She suggested reaching out to them
46 for context.

1
2 Ms. Balakir explained that some interesting information about electric buses was shared during
3 the UTA presentation she attended. The Committee has previously discussed electric buses for
4 canyon service and it seems that there have been some recent updates as far as the timeline, the
5 cost of electric buses, and funding. She recently spoke to Kyle Stockley, the Vehicle Support and
6 Capital Program Manager at UTA. He oversees the electrified bus transportation plan.
7

8 Chair Richardson noted that the CWC Board has an Ex Officio Member who is employed with
9 UTA. Carlton Christensen might be someone the Committee can reach out to. Ms. Balakir shared
10 a comment about the next Legislative Session. She reported that the session had not started, but it
11 had already been a difficult process. As far as appropriations requests, it seems a lot of cuts will
12 be made this year. It might be difficult to submit a new appropriations request given the timeline,
13 but since there is a deficit, it will also be more difficult to obtain approval. Mr. Knoblock pointed
14 out that the \$150 million is already in a designated fund. The request is to have some money
15 appropriated out of the existing fund so it can address some of the current canyon needs.
16 Additional discussions were had about the \$150 million and how that funding will be utilized.
17

18 **2. The Committee Will Review Results and Outcomes from the Last Meeting's Action**
19 **Items Related to Traction Law Compliance:**
20

21 **a. John Knoblock will Discuss his Correspondence with Ski Resorts Regarding**
22 **Traction Law Communication.**
23

24 Mr. Knoblock reported that he spoke to Amber Broadway about traction law communication. In
25 an email, he suggested that the daily ski report information include road status information and
26 vehicle traction requirements. Ms. Broadway liked the suggestion and stated that she would
27 mention it at the next meeting. It looks like Solitude has since added that information to the
28 website. Mr. Knoblock added that Snowbird has a lot of excellent information available. The
29 daily report includes the road status and there is a mention of vehicle traction information. Mr.
30 Knoblock offered to forward his communications with the ski resorts to CWC Staff for reference.
31

32 **b. Danny Richardson will Discuss His Research into the Availability of Snow Tire**
33 **and Sticker Information on Car Rental Agency Websites.**

34 **c. Danny Richardson will Discuss His Research into the Promotion of Rental**
35 **Cars on the Ski Resort Websites.**

36 **d. The Committee will Review and Finalize a Letter to Car Rental Agencies**
37 **Encouraging Participation in the Sticker Program.**
38

39 Chair Richardson reported that Committee Members received a draft of a letter to the rental car
40 agencies. UDOT has an agreement with five or six of the rental car agencies, but others have
41 chosen not to provide stickers on their rented vehicles. The idea is to send out a letter, which will
42 remind rental car agencies about the sticker program and ask them to participate when possible.
43 He hopes the Committee can encourage more rental car agencies to participate. Additionally, it
44 would be beneficial for rented vehicles to have a summary of the traction laws.
45

1 Chair Richardson reported that some comments were received on the draft version of the letter. A
2 suggestion was made to add information about the traction law and what it means. Moving
3 forward, the intention is to receive input from the rental car agencies. The letter will be used to
4 start the outreach process. Over the next couple of weeks, the wording can be finalized.

5
6 Ms. Johnson pointed out that most people will not have snow tires. Only people who go skiing
7 every day or drive up the canyon regularly will have snow tires in place. In addition, most people
8 do not know that there is a difference between 4x4 and all-wheel-drive. The rental car agencies
9 and renters will be less intimidated if all-wheel-drive and all-season tires are requested as the
10 minimum. Anything stricter than that is unlikely to move forward. Mr. Shea suggested that a
11 letter from UDOT, the Utah Highway Patrol, or the Salt Lake County Sheriff be pursued.
12 Information could be shared with the rental car agencies to encourage participation.

13
14 Ms. Johnson believes that whatever is requested of the rental car agencies should be manageable.
15 Chair Richardson noted that UDOT has specific language that outlines the minimum requirements.
16 Co-Chair Kurt Hegmann expressed his support for reaching out to the rental car agencies.

17
18 Mr. Knoblock noted that what Ms. Johnson has stated concerning the laws is correct. All-wheel-
19 drive with all-season tires makes it legal to access the canyons on traction control days. UDOT
20 does not want to push anything more restrictive than that, because there are a lot of people who
21 cannot afford the snow tires. There is a desire to strike a balance so there is traction compliance,
22 but not exclusion. Chair Richardson suggested the Transportation System Committee finalize the
23 letter, use the UDOT language, and ask for some response from the rental car agencies. He offered
24 to work out the final details with CWC Staff and start the outreach process.

25
26 Mr. Shea suggested that some news media be contacted so there is awareness of the request. Mr.
27 Knoblock asked CWC Staff for feedback on that suggestion. Ms. Nielsen stated that nothing can
28 come from the CWC without the approval of the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. Chair
29 Richardson pointed out that KSL has been mentioning traction laws in the mornings. Ms. Johnson
30 noted that the Committee can look into what has been done in Colorado as far as the rental cars.

31 32 **3. The Committee will Revisit Other Ideas to Improve Traction Law Compliance.**

33
34 There were no additional discussions related to traction law compliance.

35 36 **4. The Committee will Determine Next Steps and Action Items.**

37
38 Discussions were had about finalizing the letter to the rental car agencies. It was noted that
39 additional suggestions and edits can be submitted. The intention is to have it finalized in the next
40 few weeks. It might be that the prospect of liability is what is shaping the behavior of the rental
41 car agencies. Chair Richardson expressed support for a paragraph that acknowledges this issue.

42
43 Ms. Nielsen clarified that the letter will not be submitted on behalf of the CWC. That is the reason
44 that there cannot be outreach to the media, because the letter is being submitted by an individual
45 rather than the organization. Ms. Nielsen proposes that the letter be transferred from Microsoft

1 Word to a Google document so everyone on the Committee can propose changes. Once the
2 Committee decides that the letter is in final form, then Chair Richardson can send it out.

3 4 **“BASELINE STUDY” DATA GATHERING DISCUSSION**

5 6 **1. The Committee will Review the Results and Outcomes from the Last Meeting's Action** 7 **Items:**

8 9 **a. John Knoblock will Share the Document Where he Outlined His Ideas on Data** 10 **Gathering.**

11
12 Mr. Knoblock reported that he added the document to the Google Drive folder for the
13 Transportation System Committee. He has it split it into Transportation System Committee-related
14 items versus the Visitor Use Study information that the Recreation System Committee will tackle.

15 16 **b. Mark Baer will Discuss His Research Into the Number of Buses, Vehicles,** 17 **Formal Parking Spaces, and Roadside Parking Spaces in Each Canyon.**

18
19 Mark Baer expressed support for the document that was shared by Mr. Knoblock. He noted that
20 he will continue to look into the research related to the number of buses, vehicles, formal parking
21 spaces, and roadside parking spaces in each canyon. Mr. Knoblock noted that the transportation
22 elements will be easier to gather information on than some of the Recreation System Committee
23 tasks. It will likely take a few months for all of the necessary information to be pulled together.

24 25 **c. The Committee will Discuss Potential Action Items and Next Steps for** 26 **Gathering Transportation Data.**

27
28 Chair Richardson asked how to move the Visitor Use Study work forward. Mr. Knoblock
29 explained that the first step would be to provide input. He sent out an email to the full Stakeholders
30 Council with a link to the draft methodology. Once there is support for that, it will be possible to
31 run the idea of compiling existing data by the CWC Board. From there, a timeline can be created.

32
33 Mr. Knoblock asked about budget timing for the organization. Ms. Nielsen explained that there
34 were previous discussions about funding an update to the Feasibility Study for the Millcreek
35 Canyon shuttle. The CWC runs on a fiscal year, so the fiscal year ends on June 30th and the new
36 fiscal year starts on July 1st. CWC Staff starts to work with the Executive/Budget/Audit
37 Committee and the Treasurer to build a new budget in the spring. Mr. Knoblock suggested that
38 the System Committees determine whether consultant time might be useful so that can be
39 accounted for in the budget process. Ms. Nielsen reported that a Tentative Budget came before
40 the CWC Board during the CWC Board Meeting in May. The CWC Board has the opportunity to
41 approve the Tentative Budget then. If notes are made on the Tentative Budget during the May
42 meeting, then CWC Staff will make the necessary adjustments. The Final Budget is brought before
43 the CWC Board at the CWC Board Meeting in June. Before assuming that a consultant will be
44 added to the next fiscal year's budget, she suggested speaking to the CWC Board.

1 Mr. Knoblock offered to share information about the System Committee work at the next CWC
2 Board Meeting as part of the Stakeholders Council Report. He offered to share the draft
3 methodology. Ms. Kilpack reported that there is an Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting
4 later this week. Ms. Nielsen expressed support for starting the discussion at that meeting and
5 determining the next steps. Ms. Johnson pointed out that to add a budget item to the next fiscal
6 year budget, the estimated cost needs to be known as well as the extent of the work.

7
8 Ms. Nielsen asked whether the Central Wasatch Symposium attendees met the two new professors
9 in the Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Department at the University of Utah. Two new research
10 professors were hired and those professors have experience with visitor use management research.
11 She reminded Committee Members that the Visitor Use Study the CWC funded in 2023 followed
12 the U.S. Forest Service rules. Mr. Knoblock offered to speak at the Executive/Budget/Audit
13 Committee Meeting and report back to the Transportation System Committee. Ms. Nielsen
14 reported that the Co-Chairs of the Stakeholders Council are Ex-Officio Members of that
15 committee.

16 **FOREST PLAN DISCUSSION**

17 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Forest Plan and Its Impacts** 18 **on Transportation and Transit in the Central Wasatch.**

19
20
21
22 Mr. Knoblock reported that Lance Kovel from the Forest Service presented during the Central
23 Wasatch Symposium. That presentation included information about parking spaces as well as the
24 Forest Plan section that states the goal is not to increase parking in the canyons, except for transit
25 or other reasons, as needed. Mr. Kovel highlighted that there is not an enforceable limit, but there
26 is a goal that is in place. Spencer Shaver from Save Our Canyons was also at that presentation. In
27 the past, Save Our Canyons has expressed frustration about the additional parking lots built.
28 However, the view of the Forest Service is that prohibiting on-street parking and increasing off-
29 street parking is not an increase in parking, but a tradeoff. Discussions were had about previous
30 Salt Lake County Mountainous Planning Commission decisions related to parking in the canyons.

31
32 Ms. Johnson asked to discuss the Millcreek Canyon shuttle. She reported that the canyon will be
33 closed to traffic and representatives from Log Haven are upset about what is planned, as businesses
34 need to be informed about the work that is being done. Chair Richardson believed she was
35 speaking about the Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant. Ms. Johnson noted that the
36 upper section will be the focus and there are concerns about access. Mr. Knoblock clarified that
37 this summer, Millcreek Canyon will be closed above the winter gate. People who want to hike in
38 the upper part of the canyon will need to hike or bicycle there rather than use the road to access it.
39 The areas of the canyon that remain available will likely be far busier than in previous years.

40
41 Ms. Johnson stressed the importance of sharing information with the public, as there seems to be
42 some confusion. If shuttle buses will be available, then members of the public need to know that.
43 Many are confused about the FLAP grant work and the associated changes. Ms. Nielsen clarified
44 that there are no shuttles planned. Salt Lake County and the Forest Service have communicated
45 that the upper portion of the canyon will be closed. Mr. Knoblock suggested looking into the
46 Millcreek Canyon information that is listed on the Salt Lake County website. The Transportation

1 System Committee can review it to make sure all of the necessary information is available. It
2 might be possible to create a map with available parking locations and share that via social media.

3
4 Mr. Baer noted that there is no electronic reader board in Millcreek Canyon, similar to what is
5 located in Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. That could be recommended
6 to UDOT since an electronic reader board would be an effective way to share information. Mr.
7 Knoblock pointed out that it is a Salt Lake County road, so there would need to be communication
8 with them about a possible electronic reader board. Some of the fee station money could be
9 utilized. Additional discussions were had about the boards. Mr. Reddell informed the Committee
10 that it is possible to have mobile boards that are solar-powered and have Wi-Fi connectivity.

11 12 **FEE STATION DISCUSSION**

13 14 **1. The Committee will Discuss Fee Stations in the Tri-Canyons.**

15
16 Chair Richardson reported that Millcreek Canyon has a fee station that generates revenue for
17 various needs. Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon do not currently have fee
18 stations in place. He wondered whether there was a desire to see fee stations added in those
19 canyons.

20
21 Ms. Johnson heard from UDOT that there is a plan to put a fee station just before the turnoff at
22 Solitude. She is not supportive of that idea, because people are already up the canyon at that point.
23 Mr. Shea reported that Solitude is planning to build parking and other structures on the north side
24 of the road. That is a totally separate matter from the fee station. Mr. Knoblock explained that as
25 part of the Big Cottonwood Canyon environmental study, UDOT is reviewing the comments
26 related to tolling. The thought is that electronic toll stations could be placed just below Snowbird
27 Entry 1 and just before Solitude so those interested in using the trailheads below those locations
28 would not be impacted by the fees. The idea is that those visiting the ski resorts would be the ones
29 directly impacted by the toll, which would make it possible to change ski visitor behavior.

30
31 Mr. Shea reported that the population of Utah is estimated to double in the next 20 years. Putting
32 in a fee that is devoted solely to the canyons is one way to make sure the canyons and ecosystems
33 are not destroyed. The sooner this kind of system is implemented, the better off everyone will be.
34 Co-Chair Hegmann does not believe there is opposition to tolling, but to the proposed locations.
35 It makes more sense to have tolls placed at the base of the canyons. Mr. Knoblock noted that he
36 and Barbara Cameron both included that in their comments on the Big Cottonwood Canyon
37 environmental study. The proposed locations would incentivize parking at Mill D. In his opinion,
38 the location of the tolling station or fee station should be lower down in the canyon.

39
40 Ms. Kilpack explained that the reason this item was included on the Transportation System
41 Committee agenda was because, at the end of the last meeting, the suggestion was made. Mr. Baer
42 noted that Millcreek Canyon has improved dramatically since the fees have been implemented and
43 used for canyon improvements. The canyons cost money to maintain. Fees are a direct funding
44 source and can also reduce the number of vehicles and pollution levels. In addition, the fees will
45 encourage visitors to carpool or utilize transit when possible. He also believes tolling should be
46 located at the base of the canyons. Mr. Shea added that a toll will reduce vandalism as well.

Discussions were had about the money generated from tolling and whether or not it would be used directly in the canyons. As far as locations, it was reiterated that there is a desire to see the booths located at the base of the canyons so ski resort users are not targeted. Chair Richardson suggested that there be additional discussions on this matter in the future when more details are known.

SKI BUS INCENTIVE DISCUSSION

1. The Committee will Discuss How to Incentivize the Use of the Ski Bus.

Chair Richardson reiterated that he will meet with UTA next week. There will be a discussion about incentivizing buses and there will also be a conversation about whether the Legislature can make the ski bus free. He noted that it would be a general discussion about transportation needs.

Mr. Shea reported that Mr. Christensen attended the Central Wasatch Symposium. He was able to speak with Mr. Christensen about the feasibility of expanding UTA service in the canyons. Mr. Christensen did not believe that was likely, but it is still worthwhile to continue those discussions.

Mr. Knoblock believes the plan is for UDOT to eventually take over the operation of the Canyon ski bus service. Ms. Nielsen does not know what the timing is on that, as it is connected to Phase I of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"). During the last Legislative Session, UDOT was given the authority to run transit service. She assumes that if the lawsuits are eventually resolved, it will be possible to move forward with that operational shift.

NEXT MEETING AGENDA

1. The Committee will Review the Action Items that have Been Decided Upon for the Next Meeting.

Chair Richardson noted that many of the previous action items will continue to be worked on.

2. The Committee will Discuss Topics for the Next Meeting Agenda.

Mr. Shea suggested that there be a focused discussion on the gondola during a future meeting. Mr. Knoblock shared additional comments about the ski bus. He has noticed that the ski buses heading to Big Cottonwood Canyon end up stuck in a lane of traffic. He asked if it would be possible for the buses to stay in the middle lane and then make a left-hand turn from that lane into Big Cottonwood Canyon. A bus turn lane might be beneficial there. Mr. Shea suggested speaking to Mayor Monica Zoltanski because that was done in Sandy. There could be a discussion between UDOT and Cottonwood Heights. It was determined that the Committee will discuss that further and make a formal recommendation, as that kind of solution can further incentivize ski bus use.

Co-Chair Hegmann believes it makes sense to revisit the three modes of transportation (buses, trains, and gondolas) based on what has been learned since those initial discussions took place. Mr. Knoblock suggested that the different transportation options be added to a future meeting agenda.

1
2 **OTHER ITEMS**
3

4 There were no additional discussions.
5

6 1. **Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation Committee**
7 **Meeting.**
8

9 **MOTION:** Kurt Hegmann moved to ADJOURN. Linda Johnson seconded the motion. The
10 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
11

12 The Transportation System Committee Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting held on Monday, January 13, 2024.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____