



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, MAY 12, 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.

10 **Present:** Danny Richardson, Chair
11 Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair
12 Mike Marker
13 Roger Borgenicht
14 Ian Reddell
15 Mark Baer
16 Doug Tolman
17 Tom Diegel
18 Pat Shea

19
20 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
21 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations
22 Ben Kilbourne, Communications Director
23

24 **Others:** John Knoblock, Stakeholders Council Chair
25

26 **OPENING**

27
28 **1. Chair Danny Richardson will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the**
29 **Transportation System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”)**
30 **Stakeholders Council.**

31
32 Chair Danny Richardson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
33 Transportation System Committee Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.
34

35 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the April 14, 2025, Meeting.**
36

37 Chair Richardson reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the April 14, 2025, Transportation System
38 Committee Meeting. At the last meeting, the Committee discussed the local press regarding
39 transportation, the ski industry, and tourism. There were also discussions about the Baseline Study
40 and how the Central Wasatch Dashboard will be promoted. At the last meeting, there was a
41 mention that Cottonwood Heights could potentially leave the CWC. Director of Operations,

1 Samantha Kilpack, clarified that Cottonwood Heights has chosen to remain with the CWC.
2 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that there will be a new Cottonwood Heights
3 representative and that the representative will attend the CWC Board Meeting scheduled in June.
4

5 **MOTION:** Danny Richardson moved to APPROVE the Minutes from April 14, 2025. Kurt
6 Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
7

8 **2024-2025 SKI SEASON NUMBERS**

9

10 **1. Chair Richardson will Share Progress on Gathering Transit Ridership Data for the** 11 **2024-2025 Ski Season.**

12

13 Chair Richardson informed those present that he used to work for Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”)
14 and sometimes reaches out with questions. He filled out two GRAMA requests and spoke to
15 different individuals. Some of his questions were answered and there seemed to be a willingness
16 to share information. He pointed out that the ski season is not over yet, so the final numbers are
17 not available at this time. However, there are 69 total buses. Work is being done with a contract
18 company to run some of the buses in Little Cottonwood Canyon. In his correspondence with UTA,
19 he explained that his intention is to determine some baseline information. Most of the buses have
20 seating for 36, but the maximum number of people allowed on a bus is 70. In the next few days,
21 he will do some calculations to determine the current ski bus capacity. He pointed out that some
22 of the smaller buses only allow 24 passengers, but it is still possible to determine rough numbers.
23

24 Discussions were had about employee buses. Chair Richardson reported that Snowbird has 34
25 ride-share vans that are primarily used for employees. Snowbird tripled their carpool spaces and
26 the Alta parking reservation system increased carpooling by 20%. Alta has commented that 40%
27 to 50% of the rental cars in their parking lot have Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”)
28 stickers, which means those vehicles are pre-approved. There are no official numbers yet, but it
29 seems there are approximately 1,200 vehicles per hour in Little Cottonwood Canyon. According
30 to Mike Maughan, the biggest problem at Alta has to do with transportation. Chair Richardson
31 also reached out to Ski Utah, who has promised to provide the total skier days. However, it is not
32 possible to break that down by resort, as that is private information. Chair Richardson clarified
33 that a skier day refers to a single day of skiing or snowboarding at a ski resort. It essentially tracks
34 the number of skiers at a resort. There has been some progress made as far as data gathering.
35

36 John Knoblock noted that a comment was left in the Zoom chat box by Tom Diegel. Mr. Diegel
37 suggested that there be outreach conducted to the individual resorts for the skier days. Based on
38 past communication with the resorts, it seems unlikely that the individual resort information will
39 be released. Chair Richardson agreed that the ski resorts are unlikely to release that information,
40 but the total number is something that indicates whether or not it was a strong season. It is a
41 comparable year-to-year number. He has collected the data from past years for comparison.
42

1 **RENTAL CAR TRACTION LAW EFFORTS**

2
3 **1. The Committee will Discuss Recent Efforts to Improve Traction Law Compliance**
4 **from Rental Cars and Develop a Plan for the 2025-2026 Season.**
5

6 At the last meeting, the letter that Chair Richardson sent to the rental car companies was discussed.
7 He did not receive a response from the rental car companies, but he did receive a response from
8 the airport. The airport sent the letter to the individual companies, but he still did not hear back.
9 He plans to rework that letter and hand deliver it to the various rental car companies. He wants to
10 ask the companies to pre-sticker their vehicles and share information about the traction law. This
11 will ensure that visitors to the area are aware of the traction law requirements. Chair Richardson
12 noted that there was talk at the Legislature this year about potentially requiring rental car
13 companies to sticker their vehicles. That could be meaningful if it eventually moves forward.
14

15 In August or September, the letter can be rewritten and delivered to the rental car companies. Co-
16 Chair Kurt Hegmann asked about adding that action item to the calendar to make sure is done.
17 Ms. Kilpack confirmed that it can be added to the CWC calendar and there can be a reminder. It
18 was noted that the Transportation System Committee can work on drafting that letter in the future.
19 Continuing to focus on the rental car companies could eventually lead to positive results.
20

21 Ms. Kilpack asked whether there was an issue with the rental car companies at the airport not
22 having the authority to make a decision about the stickers and information sharing. Chair
23 Richardson stated that each agency might have different rules and restrictions. Starting this in
24 August or September would allow time for the necessary permissions to be obtained. Discussions
25 were had about the rental car companies. It was noted that the vehicles are often moved over State
26 lines and that is the problem with focusing on the sticker program. Chair Richardson commented
27 that the traction law is technically Statewide and does not only apply in Little Cottonwood Canyon.
28

29 Doug Tolman left a comment in the Zoom chat box. There was a bill passed this year incentivizing
30 rental cars to register in the State. That is something that the Committee can look into further. Mr.
31 Diegel left a comment stating that vehicles following the traction law could mean fewer accidents.
32

33 **“BASELINE STUDY” DATA GATHERING DISCUSSION**

34
35 **1. Committee Members will Share and Review Progress on their Data Gathering for a**
36 **“Baseline Study” Documenting Visitor Data in the Central Wasatch.**
37

38 Chair Richardson asked for an update on the Baseline Study data-gathering process that has been
39 taking place recently. Mr. Diegel reported that he is on the Recreation System Committee. There
40 was a Committee Meeting held last week and he also sent an email out recently talking about
41 bicycle use in the canyons. Strava is a tool that could be used to measure that. He is looking into
42 a counter that does not count vehicles but only counts bicycles. He knows that transportation does
43 not necessarily relate to bicycle counts, but transit must consider bicycle use. Chair Richardson
44 referenced bicycle lanes and the connection between that use and transportation.
45

1 It was noted that a response was received from Adam Shaw with the U.S. Forest Service. Not all
2 of the information included in the email directly relates to transportation, but there are some
3 applicable numbers. This is something that can be forwarded to the Transportation System
4 Committee Members. Chair Richardson further discussed the Baseline Study process so far. Mr.
5 Knoblock reported that a spreadsheet was added to the Google Drive folder for the Stakeholders
6 Council. It is possible to consolidate all of the Baseline Study data there. He hopes it will be
7 possible to pull together the information that has been collected by the end of the month. Based
8 on his conversations with Ian Reddell, it does not seem that the Forest Service was forthcoming
9 with information about parking space counts. As a result, the rough number of spaces will be
10 counted using available images and data. Discussions were had about recent studies and tolling.
11 Mr. Knoblock believed it was determined that both Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little
12 Cottonwood Canyon need to be tolled simultaneously to prevent shifting issues to one canyon.
13

14 Mr. Knoblock reported that he spoke to the contractors who are working on redoing the trail around
15 the corner of Elbow Fork. He was told that they have drawings of all of the parking areas that are
16 being built at the top of Big Water, Alexander Basin, and the new parking area that is being put in
17 at Elbow Fork. It is possible to obtain a total parking count for those parking lots. Chair
18 Richardson stated that UDOT has been asked for vehicle counts. Mike Marker explained that he
19 found some data and that summary was shared with members of the Committee. It was the
20 information found on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. He did not receive a proper response from
21 UDOT. Chair Richardson stressed the importance of the Baseline Study gathering process.
22 Mr. Marker pointed out that with the UDOT data, critical months are missing. The counter is fairly
23 sophisticated and can count vehicles in different lanes. Chair Richardson was unsure why there
24 would be missing months of data. Mr. Knoblock offered to reach out to Devin Weder about this
25 matter. Chair Richardson reiterated that the vehicle count numbers are important to know.
26

27 **PROPOSED PARKING LOT AT SOLITUDE RESORT**

28

29 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Potential Impact of the Proposed Parking Expansion** 30 **at Solitude Resort.**

31

32 Chair Richardson reported that he received an email from Save Our Canyons about the proposed
33 parking expansion at Solitude Resort. In addition, on the Save Our Canyons website, there is
34 detailed information about the proposed lot. The article on the website is informative. It includes
35 a diagram of what the parking lot could look like as well as information about land ownership.
36 Chair Richardson did not know that the Transportation System Committee needs to make a
37 recommendation on the proposal, but he asked Committee Members to review the article.
38

39 Mr. Marker asked if the CWC Board has provided any input on the proposal so far. Ms. Nielsen
40 explained that the CWC Board has discussed the potential parking expansion, but has not taken an
41 official position. Mr. Marker pointed out that the Mountain Accord mentioned transportation
42 minimizing vehicle use. It seems like implementing the Mountain Accord vision should mean
43 taking a stand against what has been proposed. Some of the Transportation System Committee
44 Members expressed opposition to the proposal. As a Committee, it might be possible to
45 recommend that a position be taken by the Stakeholders Council. It was noted that the proposal
46 would remove trees and increase traffic levels. Ian Reddell clarified that this is in the early stages.

1 At this time, there is a desire to find solutions in the canyons. There is a lot of roadside parking
2 that poses risks to the public. The intention is not necessarily to add more vehicles, but to remove
3 some of the potential hazards along the road. Vehicles could be in a more controlled environment.
4 There are private and public assets that can be coordinated to improve traffic and parking
5 conditions to better serve guests, employees, and the community. Mr. Reddell explained that there
6 is a desire to have continued discussions about the proposal. He reiterated that this is a concept.

7
8 Solitude has done a lot as far as higher-density vehicle use initiatives that reduce traffic in the
9 canyon. Mr. Reddell explained that the goal is still to increase carpooling and increase the bus
10 service. This is just another possible solution to the issues that currently exist. There are many
11 different stakeholders involved and everyone has their own priorities. It can be a challenge to find
12 some middle ground, but it is important to start having these conversations. He asked Committee
13 Members to remember that what has been proposed is simply an early concept.

14
15 Mr. Marker asked whether there was a desire to remove vehicles from the highway by placing
16 them in the parking lot. He wanted to know how many vehicles are being parked along the
17 highway if that is the case. Mr. Reddell reported that there is some drone imagery of the busiest
18 days in the canyon, where there were over 500 vehicles parked along the side of the road. Whether
19 those vehicles were all legally parked or not is a different conversation. However, those vehicles
20 were parked there. He believes there are 200 paid parking spots with the Town of Brighton
21 currently and there is also some additional roadside parking. Many vehicles are parked along the
22 side of the road and the goal is to eliminate that so there is a more controlled environment created.

23
24 Co-Chair Hegmann wanted to know what Mr. Reddell meant when he mentioned that this is an
25 early concept. There is a desire to better understand the timeline. Mr. Reddell explained that this
26 being in the early stages means that an image of the potential project has been provided to the
27 Town of Brighton. The concept has not been accepted and there is still work being done. Until
28 there is a Building Permit received, it is all considered to be in the early stages, because everything
29 is still preliminary. Mr. Diegel acknowledged that it is the early stages, but he pointed out that the
30 proposed parking lot would be across the street from the ski resort. If safety is one of the concerns,
31 he wants to understand how road crossings will be made safe for pedestrians. Mr. Reddell pointed
32 out there are different options that can be explored, but nothing has been finalized at this time.

33
34 Mr. Diegel shared information about what happened in Millcreek Canyon with the construction
35 work. It quickly shifted from something conceptual to something that would take place. Things
36 happen quickly, which is the reason there has been so much concern about this parking lot
37 proposal. Mr. Reddell asked whether the Millcreek Canyon work is on Forest Service land or
38 private parcels. Mr. Diegel reported that it is a Forest Service project being done with private
39 contractors. Mr. Reddell pointed out that there is a difference when work is done on a private
40 parcel versus a Federal parcel. Mr. Diegel noted that private entities are able to act faster. Mr.
41 Reddell confirmed that there are more regulations when it is a Federal property, but there are still
42 regulations within the Town of Brighton and the County that will be taken into consideration.

43
44 Mr. Tolman stated that there are 240 parking spots that are in the Town of Brighton official
45 inventory. 593 minus 240 is 353. That means there are 353 additional parking spots proposed
46 through this. For transparency, he is the primary author of the article that was posted on the Save

1 Our Canyons website. He did most of the research for that article and is willing to speak to
2 interested Committee Members after the meeting. There is a desire to reduce vehicles in the
3 canyons and focus on safety. Mark Baer wanted to know if there are simpler solutions than what
4 has been proposed near Solitude. Since people will need to cross the street to leave the parking
5 lot, this might create a new problem while attempting to address an existing problem. Mr. Reddell
6 clarified that there will need to be a traffic study conducted before anything is approved.

7
8 Mr. Knoblock referenced an earlier question about whether or not the Transportation System
9 Committee, Stakeholders Council, or CWC Board should take a position on this matter. The
10 Stakeholders Council is supposed to make recommendations and collect data. The Council does
11 not come out with a position that is independent of the CWC Board. As for the current proposal,
12 he is not supportive of the parking lot based on the impacts it will have on the area. There is
13 another parcel that would have room for 200 parking spaces. That could almost eliminate the
14 roadside parking within the Town of Brighton and seems to be a better match for the area. It might
15 be possible to compromise with some increased parking but also continue to focus on more buses.

16
17 Mr. Kilpack read some of the comments from the Zoom chat box. Ms. Nielsen wrote that the
18 Stakeholders Council does not take positions on issues independent of the CWC Board, but it is
19 possible for the Stakeholders Council to recommend that the CWC Board take action on an issue.

20
21 Mr. Diegel noted that the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) included
22 a lot of recommendations. It seems like the plan for the parking lot does not support the work
23 outlined in the BCC MAP. Mr. Reddell stated that he has a different perspective. He was not part
24 of the CWC when Amber Broadway was involved with the Stakeholders Council, so he does not
25 know everything that happened before. Chair Richardson does not feel it is appropriate for the
26 Transportation System Committee to make a recommendation, but it is possible to continue to
27 have discussions. He would like the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board to discuss this as well.
28 Mr. Marker pointed out that the role of the Stakeholders Council is to advise the CWC Board.
29 Additional discussions were had about the proposal. Mr. Reddell explained that he only has so
30 much information at this time. It is possible to share an update once more information is known.

31
32 CWC Staff was asked about making a recommendation. Ms. Nielsen noted that Committee
33 Members should have the document that outlines the process. If the Transportation System
34 Committee reaches an agreement, then a recommendation can be forwarded to the Stakeholders
35 Council for consideration. At the Stakeholders Council Meeting, the Council Members would
36 consider the recommendation and determine whether or not to forward a recommendation to the
37 CWC Board. The next Stakeholders Council Meeting will take place on June 4, 2025, and it is a
38 retreat. However, this item could still be added to the Stakeholders Council Retreat agenda. The
39 document that outlines the process was shared with both in-person and virtual participants.

40
41 Mr. Knoblock suggested that Mr. Tolman and Mr. Marker draft something that could be reviewed
42 via email ahead of the Stakeholders Council Retreat. It could then be presented to Council
43 Members. Mr. Tolman and Mr. Marker expressed support for this approach. Mr. Knoblock
44 suggested including the perspective shared by Mr. Reddell earlier in the discussions as well as the
45 safety concerns that have been expressed by other Committee Members. Trying to resolve the
46 existing issue is an important and worthy goal, but there is also concern about expanded parking.

1
2 Discussions were had about traffic calming measures that can be taken into account as well. Mr.
3 Knoblock mentioned the possibility of improving roadside parking for additional safety. In the
4 Zoom chat box, there was a question from Mr. Diegel about accidents specifically attributable to
5 roadside parking. Mr. Reddell is not aware of notable accidents happening along the roadside.
6

7 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved that Doug Tolman and Mike Marker draft a Position Letter
8 with regards to the Solitude parking expansion proposal and that the draft be emailed to members
9 of the Transportation System Committee for comment. Those comments will then be consolidated
10 so a letter can be presented to the Stakeholders Council at the June 4, 2025, Stakeholders Council
11 Retreat. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The motion passed, with Ian Reddell in opposition.
12

13 Ms. Nielsen explained that whoever is drafting the letter has two and a half weeks to do so because
14 it needs to be included in the Meeting Materials Packet for the Stakeholders Council Retreat. She
15 suggested sending a draft version to the Transportation System Committee beforehand. It can be
16 a letter or a recommendation. The recommendation template was shared with the Committee. Mr.
17 Knoblock asked that the first draft be shared in the next week so there is time for comment.
18

19 **SR-210 SAFETY CONCERN**

20 21 **1. Co-Chair Kurt Hegmann will Discuss a Safety Concern with the Traffic Pattern on** 22 **SR-210 Near Snowbird Resort.**

23
24 Co-Chair Hegmann shared a safety concern related to the traffic pattern on SR-210 near Snowbird
25 Resort. It is possible to inform UDOT about the issue so some sort of action can be taken. Mr.
26 Knoblock suggested contacting Alex Fisher-Willis with UDOT, who might be able to assist.
27 Discussions were had about the current issue and what could potentially be done to address this
28 matter. Mr. Knoblock asked whether CWC Staff would be able to reach out to UDOT. Ms.
29 Nielsen asked Co-Chair Hegmann to send an email to CWC Staff outlining all of the details.
30

31 **MEETING RECAP AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

32 33 **1. The Committee will Review the Action Items that Have Been Decided Upon for the** 34 **Next Transportation System Committee Meeting.**

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

36
37 Patrick Shea suggested that there be a separate discussion about the gondola alternative. There are
38 a number of important transportation-related issues to discuss, but he believes time should be
39 dedicated to discussing the gondola that has been proposed as well. It would be worthwhile to
40 hear Committee Member opinions. Mr. Knoblock feels a Transportation System Committee
41 Meeting could be dedicated to gondola issues. Chair Richardson expressed support for this. Mr.
42 Shea thought it made sense to look at information from both sides so all information is considered.
43

44 Ms. Kilpack reminded Committee Members that the CWC Board previously discussed the gondola
45 as part of the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) discussions. That background
46 information can be reviewed ahead of the Transportation System Committee Meeting discussion.

1 Mr. Knoblock noted that it might make sense to hold a Special Meeting of the Committee to talk
2 about the gondola, but reminded those present that the CWC Board previously did not take a
3 position. Mr. Shea suggested inviting someone from UDOT to share information about the
4 decision. Mr. Knoblock was not certain a representative from UDOT would be willing to attend.
5

6 **OTHER ITEMS**

7

8 Mr. Diegel reported that he has been in touch with the Forest Service on behalf of the Wasatch
9 Backcountry Alliance as has Allen Sanderson on behalf of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance. The
10 communication has been about the parking signage near Spruces and White Pine. He explained
11 that the signs are in the wrong place and are pointed in the wrong direction. In the case of White
12 Pine, the Unified Police Department (“UPD”) and the Salt Lake County Sheriff were ticketing
13 people who were parking on the road even though there were no “No Parking” signs and the
14 parking was done outside of the avalanche path. This was not supposed to happen, but there was
15 no coordination between UDOT, Forest Service, UDOT, and the Salt Lake County Sheriff.
16 According to Ms. Fisher-Willis, there will be a meeting of those entities so there is more
17 consistency.
18

19 Mr. Diegel reported that Alta applied for a permit to expand the Wildcat parking lot onto more
20 public land. In turn, some of the roadside parking would be eliminated. There was a lot of
21 feedback during the public comment period. The Forest Service decided not to allow the Wildcat
22 parking lot expansion onto public land. As a result, the roadside parking will continue there.
23

24 Ms. Kilpack shared some CWC Staff updates with the Transportation System Committee.
25 Community Engagement Coordinator, Mia McNeil, will leave the CWC at the end of the month.
26 There is a new full-time Communications Director, Ben Kilbourne, who has now joined the CWC.
27

28 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

29

30 There were no public comments.
31

32 **CLOSING**

33

34 **1. Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation System** 35 **Committee Meeting.**

36

37 **MOTION:** Danny Richardson moved to ADJOURN. Kurt Hegmann seconded the motion. The
38 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
39

40 The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting adjourned at
41 4:58 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting held Monday, May 12, 2025.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____