



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 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
Eva De Laurentiis
Dani Poirier
Doug Tolman
Morgan Mingle
John Knoblock
Kim Doyle
Roger Borgenicht
Shauna Hart

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

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.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the October 20, 2025, Meeting.

Chair Richardson reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the October 20, 2025, Transportation System Committee Meeting. At the last meeting, there was discussion about the proposed Solitude Mountain Resort parking lot. The Planning Commission has not approved the proposal. As a result, it is not appropriate for the CWC Board to take a position. Chair Richardson shared information about the Rental Car Agency Letter. A letter was drafted at the Transportation System Committee level that was sent to the Stakeholders Council. It was then forwarded to the CWC Board. It was noted that the Rental Car Agency Letter was approved by the CWC Board.

1
2 Chair Richardson reported that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little
3 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) work is still pending due to the
4 lawsuits. He shared information about the Millcreek Canyon shuttle. Currently, the U.S. Forest
5 Service is on furlough, so the Forest Service has not been able to review the updated study. As for
6 transportation and transit in Little Cottonwood Canyon, there will be additional discussion during
7 the current meeting about a possible recommendation. At the last meeting, the Transportation
8 System Committee discussed the Resolution from the CWC Board opposing the rescission of the
9 Roadless Rule. He reminded those present that the CWC Board expressed opposition to that
10 rescission. Chair Richardson discussed Big Cottonwood Canyon and roadside parking. Some
11 unique changes could take place in Big Cottonwood Canyon in the future. He noted that the Town
12 of Brighton discussed changes that would better define ski area boundaries and ski area support
13 facilities. This could potentially impact the parking proposal mentioned earlier.
14

15 **MOTION:** Kurt Hegmann moved to APPROVE the Minutes from October 20, 2025. Doug
16 Tolman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
17

18 **UDOT PRESENTATION: TRANSIT-BUILDING IN THE CENTRAL WASATCH.**

19

20 **1. Devin Weder from UDOT will Discuss Transit-Building in the Central Wasatch.**

21

22 Devin Weder from UDOT was unable to be in attendance so the UDOT presentation was
23 rescheduled for a future meeting.
24

25 Doug Tolman asked for additional information about the UDOT presentation. Executive Director,
26 Lindsey Nielsen, reported that Committee Members had questions at the last meeting and an
27 outreach was conducted. It made the most sense to have Committee questions answered by
28 someone at UDOT. Chair Richardson noted that it is important to have continued communication.
29 He stated that the UDOT presentation will focus on transit-building in the Central Wasatch.
30

31 **TRANSIT INTEREST EXPLORATION EXERCISE**

32

33 **1. The Committee will Discuss Attributes of Available Transit Modes.**

34

35 **2. If There is Sufficient Time and Agreement, the Committee will Begin to Develop a** 36 **Transit Mode Recommendation for the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board** 37 **Approval.** 38

39 Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, reported that this portion of the agenda is focused on a transit
40 modes discussion. The idea is to have a conversation with Committee Members before something
41 is forwarded to the Stakeholders Council. This exercise will explore interests, assess Committee
42 Member perspectives, and then move into a recommendation for the Stakeholders Council and
43 CWC Board consideration.
44

45 Ms. Kilpack reported that she sent a survey to the Transportation System Committee asking the
46 Committee Members to rank the importance of different attributes to a potential transit mode.

1 Approximately two-thirds of the Transportation System Committee completed the survey. There
2 will now be a conversation about the survey results. This includes areas where there is alignment
3 as well as areas of difference. The most important attributes, as ranked by the Committee, will be
4 discussed. Each transit mode will then be evaluated through the lens of those attributes.

5
6 Ms. Kilpack pointed out that the Transportation System Committee might not agree on everything
7 during the Committee discussions. However, it is possible to schedule additional meetings to
8 further these discussions. There is a Transportation System Committee Meeting scheduled in
9 December. A week and a half after that meeting is the Stakeholders Council Meeting. Ms. Kilpack
10 explained that during discussions like these, conflict is normal, inevitable, and expected. She
11 asked Committee Members to keep an open mind during the transit interest exploration exercise.

12
13 The results of the Committee Member survey were shared. Ms. Kilpack reported that there is
14 general agreement about the importance of affordability. Most of the survey responses indicated
15 that affordability is fairly important, as is equal access and accessibility. Convenience was also
16 important to the survey respondents. There was a little more variation in the cost to build and
17 operate a transit mode. As for the ability to mitigate traffic congestion and take cars off the road,
18 this was important to all survey respondents. There was agreement about connectivity to the
19 existing transit network and there was some agreement on the noise impacts. She noted that there
20 was a little bit of disagreement about watershed impacts, but generally, survey respondents
21 believed it was important. The ability to serve many user groups was also considered important.

22
23 Ms. Kilpack shared a spreadsheet with calculations. The variance score shown for each attribute
24 is the degree to which people disagreed on the importance of an issue. The five issues with the
25 most disagreement were: the cost to build and operate, safety, watershed impacts, watershed
26 impacts, and wildlife and vegetation impacts. It makes sense to have a discussion about those
27 issues. It might be possible to shift the degree of disagreement or move toward consensus.

28
29 Co-Chair Kurt Hegmann suggested that the discussion begin with the positives rather than areas
30 of disagreement. It makes sense to focus on the agreement areas to start. Ms. Kilpack believed
31 there is room to reach consensus on areas where there is disagreement. Doing so will make a
32 potential recommendation stronger. Once that kind of discussion takes place, the modes can be
33 evaluated further based on the areas of agreement. Ms. Kilpack noted that the current areas of
34 agreement include: convenience, ability to move cars off the road, connectivity to the existing
35 network, and ability to serve many user groups. Those were all valued highly by respondents.

36
37 It was reported that the differences in the survey answers might not be because of a true difference
38 in values. It could be that there was a desire to express that some values are more important than
39 others. Mr. Tolman agreed. He wanted to rank everything four or five, but ranked a few items
40 three out of necessity to highlight the importance of certain items in comparison. Ms. Kilpack
41 mentioned the last question in the survey, where respondents were asked to rank items. There
42 were some usability issues, and she did not receive complete responses from everyone. John
43 Knoblock asked what would be done with the survey data. Ms. Kilpack explained that it is being
44 used as a baseline to see where Committee Members are aligned in their interests and where there
45 is no alignment. The Transportation System Committee previously expressed a desire to advance

1 a recommendation that supports a particular transit mode. However, there was no clear agreement
2 from Committee Members on the specific transit mode.

3
4 Co-Chair Hegmann believed that at the last Transportation System Committee Meeting there was
5 a consensus that enhanced buses are the appropriate first step. The question was what should come
6 after the enhanced buses because it is unlikely that buses will be able to solve all of the issues.
7 Other Committee Members agreed with the statement that enhanced buses should be the first step.
8 Ms. Kilpack noted that there appears to be agreement that buses should come first but since buses
9 will not be able to solve all of the issues, there is a desire to look at what solution would come
10 next. Mr. Tolman felt it was irresponsible to forward a recommendation that would lead to a
11 development project before seeing what enhanced buses or bus rapid transit could do in the area.

12
13 Mr. Knoblock thought it made sense to focus on enhanced buses but noted that buses in that critical
14 three-hour period in the morning can move approximately one-quarter of the visitors. That may
15 or may not solve the traffic issues. It is important to look at the numbers and consider other
16 possibilities. He pointed out that it is necessary to consider snowstorms and accidents. It only
17 takes one accident to create an issue on the road. Morgan Mingle noted that there are two enhanced
18 bus options consisting of enhanced bus and enhanced bus with roadway widening. She asked for
19 clarity about which one the Transportation System Committee is interested in seeing implemented.

20
21 Dani Poirier suggested that the Committee be cautious about forwarding a recommendation until
22 all of the details are known. Wasatch Backcountry Alliance met with Wasatch Transit Solutions
23 and there were a lot of questions that Wasatch Transit Solutions did not have answers to as far as
24 the rail proposal. It is difficult to move forward without all of those answers. When reading
25 through the EIS alternatives, conditions, and factors matrix that was sent out, she was curious
26 about how some of the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) scores were arrived at. It might
27 be possible for the Transportation System Committee to make a recommendation on Phase One,
28 but anything beyond that seems to be premature at this stage, given the information that is known.

29
30 Mr. Knoblock reported that he spoke to Ralph Becker with Wasatch Transit Solutions recently.
31 He stated that the rail analysis is moving forward slowly. Mr. Tolman believed that based on the
32 survey data, there is consensus around priorities. There appears to be a lot of consensus overall,
33 but there is still some uncertainty about whether a rail alternative should be recommended.

34
35 Ms. Mingle has a slightly different view on the suggestion to focus on enhanced buses, see whether
36 that works out, and then explore another transit alternative. She would advise a recommendation
37 that is in strong support of enhanced buses with urgency to explore these other transit options.
38 Having buses co-mingled with personal vehicles is unlikely to provide enough of an incentive for
39 people to adopt ridership. Having a bus lane would change things, but it is not necessarily viable
40 in the canyons. In Park City, one of the biggest incentives to encourage ridership is paid parking.
41 It also encourages behavior when someone in a personal vehicle sees a bus able to pass traffic.
42 Enhanced busing can only do so much when it is stuck in the same traffic as personal vehicles.
43 Mr. Knoblock agreed and noted that it can be difficult to encourage others to ride the bus.

44
45 Ms. Poirier reported that in 2020, the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance conducted a series of
46 interviews with UDOT, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), and Stadler. One of the main takeaways

1 from UTA was that buses will not work unless there are incentives to remove personal vehicles
2 from the road. The Transportation System Committee could consider a recommendation of
3 enhanced buses coupled with other strategies, like tolling. Mr. Knoblock explained that the reason
4 tolling has been proposed for Big Cottonwood Canyon is so there tolling can be implemented in
5 both Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon in the future. A question was asked
6 about the ski resort's position on tolling. It was noted that Kim Doyle from Brighton Resort is
7 present. Ms. Doyle does not know the official resort stance on tolling in the canyon, but noted that
8 visitors are already paying for a parking reservation on the weekends. Asking for a toll in addition
9 to the cost of a parking reservation might be too much. Chair Richardson reported that in the last
10 few years, some of the ski resorts have implemented paid parking. There has been a discount
11 provided for those carpooling in order to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. Mr. Knoblock
12 asked if the paid parking program would be eliminated if there was canyon tolling put in place.
13 Ms. Doyle explained that a lot would depend on how the toll was implemented.

14
15 There was discussion about who would collect the toll funds. Ms. Doyle reported that most of the
16 money collected through the parking program at the ski resort is used to pay for the reservation
17 system. It is not something that necessarily makes the resort money, but it addresses a current
18 need. The Committee next discussed incentivizing transit use and the importance of making the
19 transit experience as smooth as possible. Chair Richardson asked about the variable parking rate
20 at Brighton Resort. Ms. Doyle reported that after noon, no parking reservation is needed. There
21 is also encouragement to spread out use with the Twilight Pass, which is available after 2:00 p.m.
22 It is more affordable than the seven-hour pass that is available in the morning. The ski resort is
23 always looking at different ways to spread out ski resort use throughout the day.

24
25 Ms. Kilpack noted that there were some proponents for recommending the rail alternative but
26 neither of those Committee Members is present at the current meeting. It sounded like the
27 Committee might be moving more toward recommending enhanced buses with incentives such as
28 tolling and paid parking. A comment was made about the last meeting, where the memo included
29 some assumptions that rail would be less expensive than a gondola. There was uncertainty about
30 whether the Committee wants to be that definitive at this point. Chair Richardson noted that it is
31 possible to encourage the Wasatch Transit Solutions analysis so that there is better information
32 available. The Committee recommendation could include language about encouraging enhanced
33 buses and carpooling, as well as examining tolling. Mr. Knoblock noted that in the past, there was
34 a discussion about a potential Tri-Canyons Special Transit District, so there was a specific focus
35 on the canyon needs. It was noted that Mr. Weder from UDOT was scheduled to speak to the
36 Transportation System Committee about that but the presentation needed to be rescheduled.

37
38 Ms. Kilpack reported that there was a recent code change that Mr. Weder informed her about.
39 UDOT does not need to create a Special Transit District to operate transit. She does not know that
40 a Special Transit District is something that is still on the table, because it sounds like that is no
41 longer required for UDOT. There will be additional information shared when Mr. Weder is
42 available to present to the Transportation System Committee at the next meeting.

43
44 Chair Richardson asked the Transportation System Committee if there is support to make a
45 recommendation at the current meeting or if there is a desire to have an additional discussion.
46 Ms. Kilpack commented that it sounded like there is general support for enhanced buses. If there

1 is a desire to forward a recommendation, the specifics of that need to be worked out. It was
2 mentioned earlier that there were two alternatives, one of which included road widening.
3 Ms. Kilpack believes the Transportation System Committee is supportive of further exploration of
4 additional transit modes.

5
6 Mr. Tolman asked if there is a benefit to reframing enhanced buses as bus rapid transit. It was
7 recalled that bus rapid transit was evaluated as part of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.
8 It was ultimately determined that the first phase would be enhanced buses. There was discussion
9 about bus rapid transit. Mr. Tolman mentioned the bus rapid transit lines that he has seen
10 elsewhere. He believes there are designated lanes in more congested areas but there are shared
11 lanes through the majority of the route. Mr. Tolman noted that there could be a designated lane
12 for bus rapid transit near the top and bottom of the canyon with the lane shared in other areas.

13
14 The UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was reviewed. One of the options that was evaluated
15 included a dedicated bus lane. Due to some of the canyon conditions, there are areas where it
16 would be difficult to create a dedicated lane and maintain the traffic lanes. It was noted that
17 enhanced busing involves more frequent and consistent service. Mr. Knoblock reported that there
18 is a new Mayor in Cottonwood Heights, so there is some uncertainty about what that will mean
19 for the area. A dedicated bus shoulder between Fort Union and the entrance into Little Cottonwood
20 Canyon is something that he believes is needed. This could increase the bus ridership. It is
21 possible to advocate that Cottonwood Heights focus on widening in a few different locations.

22
23 Ms. Nielsen reported that there have been discussions with the Cottonwood Heights Police
24 Department about this matter for many years. It is possible to have additional discussions. She
25 offered to do some additional research to determine the ownership and jurisdiction. Mr. Knoblock
26 thought it made sense to pursue this further, because it is a critical piece of enhanced busing.

27
28 Ms. Kilpack noted that the Transportation System Committee still needs to finalize the details of
29 the recommendation there is a desire to make to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. The
30 way that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS is written, there is a phased approach. If buses
31 are successful and solves the problems, then the other phases might not happen. It sounds like the
32 Committee would like more assurance that there will be a full effort to implement buses.

33
34 Chair Richardson asked if the recommendation would be to encourage enhanced busing. It is
35 possible to state that the Committee encourages the immediate addition of buses and an
36 investigation of bus lanes. Ms. Nielsen noted that whatever recommendation is made will be
37 considered by the Stakeholders Council and then the CWC Board. Chair Richardson does not
38 believe the recommendation needs to be too specific, but should state that there is a desire to
39 encourage enhanced busing as well as what that means more specifically. Ms. Kilpack believed it
40 would be appropriate for someone to draft language for Committee discussion at the next meeting.

41
42 Mr. Tolman reported that an email was received from Co-Chair Hegmann with the language from
43 Mark Baer. The email was shared with Committee Members. Mr. Knoblock took issue with the
44 following sentence: "The gondola will only move 1,000 people per hour." He wanted to know
45 what data that statement was based on, because the manufacturer's specification is different.

1 Ms. Kilpack pointed out that this language was drafted before the current Transportation System
2 Committee Meeting. It seems that the will of the Committee is not fully aligned with that language.

3
4 Eva De Laurentiis was not sure how much traction there would be from a Council or Board
5 perspective to reopen the EIS at this point. She wondered whether there should be advocacy for
6 another study of some sort. Ms. Nielsen stated that this question was brought forward by the
7 Transportation Committee during a CWC Board Meeting in January 2025. At that time, the CWC
8 Board was not in a position to advocate for reopening the EIS. It has been a year and that
9 perspective might have shifted, but Committee Members can listen to that meeting recording for
10 additional clarity. Ms. De Laurentiis wanted to better understand what the Transportation System
11 Committee is attempting to achieve. If the CWC Board has decided against reopening the EIS,
12 then she is not sure the Committee advocating for a particular solution will be meaningful.
13 Mr. Knoblock noted that Wasatch Transit Solutions is looking into a rail analysis.

14
15 Ms. Nielsen recalled Co-Chair Hegmann previously expressing an opinion that it is time for the
16 CWC Board to take a position on something. Ms. Kilpack explained that it is possible to approach
17 the CWC Board with a recommendation. The CWC is not a legislative body or a taxing entity, so
18 it is important to consider when the CWC Board does and does not have the power to take action.

19
20 Mr. Tolman thought it made sense to conduct a short analysis of what has already been done by
21 the CWC. He mentioned the MTS document. It is possible to ask the CWC Board to revisit that
22 and make sure it is still in line with the current view. Mr. Tolman pointed out that the document
23 is approximately four years old. Reviewing that document is not necessarily asking the CWC
24 Board to take a specific position, but it ensures that the position shared four years ago is still an
25 accurate representation. Mr. Knoblock would prefer there be more action-oriented steps pursued.

26
27 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Transportation System Committee forwarded the rental car agency
28 letter to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. The CWC Board has expressed support to
29 send that letter, with their names attached, to the rental car agencies. That was a recent example
30 of a successful communication process. Discussions were had about potential motion language.

31
32 Mr. Tolman is not sold on the idea that asking the CWC Board to do something is the most effective
33 choice at this time. He pointed out that the CWC Board is not the decision-making body for the
34 changes there is a desire to see implemented. Mr. Knoblock agreed. He thought that it made sense
35 to work with the new Mayor of Cottonwood Heights to ensure the tire inspections run smoothly.
36 Ms. Kilpack reminded those present that there are some different CWC Board Members now than
37 four years ago when the MTS document was created. The Committee discussed whether it makes
38 sense for the MTS document to be reviewed by the CWC Board. Mr. Knoblock hoped the Wasatch
39 Transit Solutions work might eventually encourage the CWC Board to support additional analysis
40 of a portion of the EIS. In the meantime, it makes sense to focus on more practical tasks.

41
42 Roger Borgenicht commented that if there is enhanced busing with properly situated mobility
43 hubs, allowing only buses on high-demand days could be explored. That could be a long-term
44 solution. He explained that there could be express buses to each of the resorts and another bus that
45 would drop off visitors at trailheads for hiking or backcountry skiing. This is something he

1 believes could work. The concern was that the enhanced bus solution will not be designed or
2 funded to succeed.

3
4 Mr. Knoblock reported that according to UTA, with five-minute headways, that is 12 buses per
5 hour with 40 seated passengers. That totals 480 people per hour. However, there is a need to
6 move a lot more than that up the canyon. The math stands in the way of buses being the ultimate
7 solution. Mr. Borgenicht pointed out that there could be buses to each of the resorts and then a
8 bus to the trailheads. Mr. Knoblock confirmed that it is possible to look into different options, but
9 it will not be beneficial if the buses are stuck in the same traffic as personal vehicles. Practical
10 steps need to be taken, such as the implementation of tolling and a bus bypass lane.

11
12 Ms. Kilpack summarized some of the Transportation System Committee discussions. There
13 appeared to be broad support for different variations of enhanced busing. The Committee needs
14 to decide whether there has been enough discussion for a recommendation to be made. She
15 reiterated that there is one more Transportation System Committee Meeting scheduled before the
16 next Stakeholders Council Meeting. If the Committee wants to put something together that is
17 advanced to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board, there will be one meeting to do so. She
18 suggested that Committee Members think about next steps so there can be appropriate planning.

19
20 Mr. Knoblock asked who the Chair will be of the Transportation Committee at the CWC Board
21 level. Ms. Nielsen clarified that this has not been determined. Mr. Knoblock wondered who the
22 new Chair of the CWC Board will be. Ms. Nielsen reported that Mayor Erin Mendenhall will take
23 over the Chair position from Jeff Silvestrini. Mayor Roger Bourke will serve as Co-Chair and
24 Commissioner Christopher Robinson will serve as Secretary/Treasurer. Mr. Knoblock suggested
25 that CWC Staff ask the new Chair of the CWC how best to move recommendations forward.
26 Mr. Tolman would like to hear the UDOT presentation before a Committee recommendation is
27 made.

28
29 Ms. Kilpack acknowledged that there is a desire to hear from UDOT before finalizing next steps.
30 She reminded those present that there is a week and a half between the next Transportation System
31 Committee Meeting and the Stakeholders Council Meeting. She noted that Shauna Hart is new to
32 the Committee and asked if she had any comments to share. Ms. Hart did not have enough context
33 to contribute to the discussion. She pointed out that having more information available before a
34 decision is made tends to result in a better decision.

35 36 **MEETING RECAP AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

37
38 1. **The Committee will Review Any Action Items that have been Decided Upon for the**
39 **Next Meeting.**

40
41 2. **The Committee will Discuss Topics for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

42
43 Ms. Nielsen reported that there will be continued discussion at the next Transportation System
44 Committee Meeting about a possible recommendation to the Stakeholders Council and CWC
45 Board. In addition, there will be a presentation from UDOT. Ms. Kilpack reminded Committee
46 Members that it is possible to share resources and comments between Committee Meetings.

1
2 Chair Richardson informed Committee Members that on November 13, 2025, UDOT will hold a
3 sticker program kickoff event at the Cottonwood Maintenance Shed. From 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.,
4 it is possible to obtain a sticker. There is a press release from UDOT with all of the information.
5

6 Chair Richardson shared information about a feasibility evaluation of the Little Cottonwood
7 Canyon Intelligent Transportation System. There is a project that the Civil Engineering
8 Department at the University of Utah has chosen to conduct. It is a one-year study to design a
9 better transportation system for Little Cottonwood Canyon. Those interested in this work can
10 attend an event on November 19, 2025, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Information has been emailed
11 to the Committee.
12

13 **CLOSING**

14

15 **1. Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation System** 16 **Committee Meeting.** 17

18 **MOTION:** Danny Richardson moved to ADJOURN. Doug Tolman seconded the motion. The
19 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
20

21 The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting adjourned at
22 4:57 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*
2 *Central Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting held Monday,*
3 *November 10, 2025.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____