



1  
2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
4 **COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY,**  
5 **DECEMBER 8, 2025, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-**  
6 **PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS AT THE**  
7 **CWC OFFICES LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE**  
8 **STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

9  
10 **Present:** Danny Richardson, Chair  
11 Kurt Hegmann, Co-Chair  
12 Eva De Laurentiis  
13 Dani Poirier  
14 Doug Tolman  
15 Morgan Mingle  
16 Kim Doyle  
17 Roger Borgenicht  
18 Mark Baer  
19 Shauna Hart  
20 John Knoblock  
21

22 **Staff:** Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
23 Will McKay, Communications Director  
24

25 **OPENING**

26  
27 **1. Chair Danny Richardson will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the**  
28 **Transportation System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders**  
29 **Council.**

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

34 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the November 10, 2025, Meeting.**

35  
36 Chair Richardson reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the November 10, 2025, Transportation  
37 System Committee Meeting. At the last meeting, there was a discussion about the results of a  
38 survey that was sent out to Transportation System Committee Members. There was agreement  
39 that transportation solutions need to be affordable, accessible, provide equal access, and offer  
40 convenience. There was some variation on the cost to build and operate a transportation solution,

1 but there was general agreement on connections to existing transit. There were some interesting  
2 discussions on transit opportunities during the last Transportation System Committee Meeting.  
3

4 **MOTION:** Dani Poirier moved to APPROVE the Minutes from November 10, 2025. Shauna  
5 Hart seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
6

7 **UDOT PRESENTATION: TRANSIT-BUILDING IN THE CENTRAL WASATCH.**  
8

9 **1. Devin Weder from UDOT will Discuss Transit-Building in the Central Wasatch.**  
10

11 Other items on the meeting agenda were discussed before Devin Weder from the Utah Department  
12 of Transportation (“UDOT”) arrived. After his arrival, there was a presentation from UDOT  
13 related to transit-building in the Central Wasatch. Chair Richardson summarized some of the  
14 discussion had about the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment, including a  
15 suggestion to extend the public comment period to 60 days. Mr. Weder reported that 30 days is  
16 standard for an Environmental Assessment, but it will now run until January 12, 2026, instead.  
17

18 Chair Richardson reported that at the last Transportation System Committee Meeting, there was a  
19 lengthy discussion about transit solutions, the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental  
20 Impact Statement (“EIS”), and enhanced buses. He noted that enhanced buses will not solve the  
21 transportation problem, so it is important to consider other transit solutions as well. Chair  
22 Richardson asked for feedback from Mr. Weder about transportation in the canyons. Mr. Weder  
23 discussed bus lanes and the environmental impacts. From the UDOT point of view, there are some  
24 limitations with cog rail, but the gondola does not have the same limitations. UDOT has not  
25 changed their position about what they think is the best solution for Little Cottonwood Canyon.  
26

27 A question was raised about the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS lawsuits and whether Phase  
28 I of the EIS can move forward. Mr. Weder reported that the last time at court was in May 2025.  
29 There has not been communication from the court since then. The lawsuit is challenging the entire  
30 EIS. He explained that it does not only mention the gondola, but the mobility hub and capacity.  
31 Mr. Weder had hoped there would be a decision made by now, but that has not happened.  
32

33 Co-Chair Kurt Hegmann asked why the old railroad bend was not used when solutions were  
34 considered. Mr. Weder clarified that he was not involved in the EIS at that phase, so he cannot  
35 speak to that specifically. However, in general, it needs to meet Federal standards for railways.  
36

37 John Knoblock mentioned the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment. He did not  
38 see anything in there that addresses traffic choke points on the road. The worst of the traffic issues  
39 occurs during inclement weather when the roads have snow and ice and the visibility is poor. It  
40 seems like there are a couple of choke points that make the road difficult. It would be nice if those  
41 could be addressed in some manner. For example, adjacent to the power plant, there are some  
42 shale outcrops that result in some tight bends on the road. In addition, there is a tight bend after  
43 Storm Mountain, and there is the S-Curve. There are a few areas that cause a significant amount  
44 of traffic issues. Mr. Weder reported that all of those were considered during the concept phase,  
45 but a choice was made to focus on improvements that would help the buses. The idea was to aim

1 for incremental improvements with a significant impact. It was noted that UDOT and the U.S.  
2 Forest Service can work together in the future to determine how to improve the S-Curve.  
3

4 Mr. Knoblock reported that even with the optimal six-minute bus headways, approximately 85%  
5 of visitors will go up Big Cottonwood Canyon in a personal vehicle. Based on those numbers, it  
6 would seem appropriate for the Environmental Assessment to focus on improved traffic flow for  
7 vehicles. If there were a way to look at improving the road geometry around the power plant and  
8 the S-Curve, that would make sense, since it would impact most of the visitors in the canyon.  
9

10 Mr. Knoblock asked how to focus on improvements for buses while also considering  
11 improvements for vehicles. He wants to improve the vehicle traffic flow when there is snow on  
12 the road. Mr. Weder noted that this is a canyon road, so there is a need to reduce the number of  
13 vehicles entering per hour to keep the road flowing. Buses will always be mixed in.  
14

15 Mark Baer asked about the gravel pit area. He noted that there is a lot of construction happening  
16 there and would like an update on the UDOT plans for that area. This could be a meaningful  
17 intermodal hub. Mr. Weder reported that the northern section of the gravel pit has separate  
18 ownership from the southern two-thirds. Cottonwood Heights has cleared the northern section for  
19 development. He reiterated that there are separate developments that are taking place in the area.  
20

21 Mr. Weder mentioned the Environmental Assessment and noted that there are full concepts  
22 included for the mobility hub, which is the parking garage with 1,700 spaces. There are also full  
23 concept designs for the interchange and transitway. There are designs shown in the Appendix.  
24 Mr. Baer noted that this is all still in the development phase. He hopes it will be built to capacity  
25 to accommodate future needs. Additionally, he pointed out that indoor retail space would do well  
26 in the area. Mr. Weder reported that right now, it is all covered parking, with all of the bus  
27 operations on the ground floor. Unfortunately, it is not possible to have commercial leases.  
28 Mr. Knoblock noted that a recommendation for commercial could be shared with Cottonwood  
29 Heights.  
30

31 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Transportation System Committee has discussed the capacity of  
32 buses. It might be beneficial to increase vehicle occupancy as well. He asked if there has been  
33 consideration of carpool signage and accommodation at the transit hub. Mr. Weder explained that  
34 the intention is to meet the 2050 capacity for bus service in the parking garage. That means until  
35 2050, there would be room in the garage for people to carpool. There was additional discussion  
36 about carpooling and incentives that could be offered. Mr. Baer asked for an update on tolling in  
37 the Cottonwood Canyons. He noted that this will likely encourage carpooling. Mr. Weder stated  
38 that a major part of the Environmental Assessment is the same tolling system that has been  
39 recommended in Little Cottonwood Canyon. In this case, it is proposed to be somewhere between  
40 Spruces and Solitude. Co-Chair Hegmann asked why that location was selected. Mr. Weder  
41 explained that the idea is not to have as much of an impact on lower-income groups. Co-Chair  
42 Hegmann stated that he is a Mill D cabin owner. Mill D is not in favor of this because there are  
43 already parking issues. Mr. Weder confirmed that different scenarios have been considered.  
44

45 In response to a question about the public comment period, it was clarified that there will not be  
46 another comment period once this one closes. Chair Richardson noted that Utah Transit Authority

1 ("UTA") does not have enough bus drivers. Mr. Weder reported that the UTA driver issues have  
2 mostly been solved. In the last year or two, there have not been the same kind of issues.  
3

4 Chair Richardson reported that there has been some discussion about a canyon transit district.  
5 Mr. Weder explained that two years ago, there was a line that added to state that UDOT can operate  
6 a public transit service. He noted that a special transit district can tax. UDOT could not, but it  
7 would be possible for them to provide service. Co-Chair Hegmann mentioned the analysis  
8 conducted by Mr. Knoblock that found the buses could absorb 16% of visitors. He pointed out  
9 that 16% might not cover the growth. Mr. Weder stated that he would have to do some math on  
10 the percentage.  
11

12 Co-Chair Hegmann noted that buses do not sound like a long-term solution. Mr. Weder reported  
13 that growth has been included in all of the calculations. He shared information about the gondola  
14 calculations and the potential capacity. Mr. Knoblock clarified that the capacity depends on the  
15 number of gondola cars. Discussions were had about potential transit solutions and capacity needs.  
16 Mr. Knoblock reiterated that the worst transit problems occur when there is inclement weather.  
17 Mr. Weder mentioned backcountry access with the stops included in the concepts: Cardiff,  
18 Spruces, Silver Lake, and Silver Fork. He noted that there will be new restrooms at Cardiff.  
19

20 Mr. Knoblock noted that the UTA vans remove a substantial number of employees from the buses,  
21 which is beneficial. However, those vans are two-wheel drive. He asked if shifting to vans with  
22 four-wheel drive would tie into the Environmental Assessment work. Mr. Weder explained that  
23 this request would be separate from the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment. It  
24 is important not to clutter the assessment with items that do not need environmental clearance.  
25 Committee Members discussed four-wheel drive and potential investments into the UTA vans.  
26

27 Mr. Weder reported that UDOT works with the police and is trying to make sure incident reports  
28 are filled out in order to track the number of slides that occur. When there is a slide off, the focus  
29 tends to be on addressing the issue rather than ticketing. This makes it difficult to track everything  
30 that happens, since only ticketed incidents are reported. Mr. Weder explained that the hope is to  
31 see travel improvements through reduced travel times. That being said, there are a lot of variables  
32 that can impact travel times. He would like to see there be more compliance with the traction laws.  
33 Chair Richardson stated that there has been Committee outreach conducted to rental car companies  
34 about the traction laws. Additional discussions were had about traction law compliance.  
35

36 Mr. Knoblock asked if UDOT has a say in how the Cottonwood Heights Police Department  
37 handles the tire inspection process. Mr. Weder explained that there is coordination. If there are  
38 comments about how the tire inspection process is taking place, those would be best shared with  
39 Cottonwood Heights. Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, asked if there are additional questions  
40 for Mr. Weder before the remainder of the meeting agenda is discussed. Doug Tolman understands  
41 the concern about tolling beginning near Cardiff or Mill D, but does not understand why someone  
42 would potentially drive halfway up the canyon to take the bus. Mr. Weder explained that someone  
43 might want to skip half the bus ride by parking in Cardiff. That would result in another vehicle in  
44 the canyon. He noted that the exact tolling location still needs to be finalized.  
45

1 Chair Richardson thanked Mr. Weder for attending the Transportation System Committee  
2 Meeting. He appreciates that Committee Members were able to ask questions related to transit.  
3 Mr. Weder noted that Committee Members can still submit comments on the Environmental  
4 Assessment. Ms. Kilpack reported that the CWC Board will submit a comment on the assessment.  
5

6 **LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON TRANSIT MODES DISCUSSION**  
7

8 1. **The Committee will Continue Discussions from its November Meeting about Transit**  
9 **Modes for Little Cottonwood Canyon.**

10 2. **The Committee May Develop a Transit Mode Recommendation for Stakeholders**  
11 **Council and CWC Board Approval.**

12 Chair Richardson asked if there is an expectation that the Transportation System Committee will  
13 make a transit mode recommendation to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. Ms. Kilpack  
14 clarified that there has not been an expectation expressed from the Council or Board. It is likely  
15 that the Transportation Committee at the CWC Board level will meet in the next week or two.  
16 Transportation System Committee Members are welcome to listen in on that public meeting.  
17

18 Chair Richardson reported that, based on previous Committee discussion, there was support for  
19 enhanced buses. Based on the numbers, it will not solve the transportation issue. He recalled  
20 reading a comment from Ralph Becker with Wasatch Transit Solutions stating that their efforts are  
21 moving forward slowly. Chair Richardson asked if there are Committee Members who feel the  
22 Transportation System Committee is in a position to make a transit recommendation to the  
23 Stakeholders Council. Mr. Baer believes UDOT is focused on a financial project more than a  
24 transportation project. He noted that there are safety and visual issues to consider with a gondola.  
25 The lawsuit will continue to delay forward movement on a transit solution. There was no sufficient  
26 answer provided to explain why the old railbed in Little Cottonwood Canyon cannot be used. He  
27 would like to forward a recommendation to consider enhanced busing followed by rail.  
28

29 Dani Poirier noted that when the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was initially done, the rail  
30 alignment was on the north side of the highway. What she interpreted from the conversation with  
31 Mr. Weder was that the south side alignment might not be up to code. She believes there are a lot  
32 of unanswered questions about the rail system and would like to see those addressed before a  
33 recommendation is made. She would support moving forward with an enhanced bus  
34 recommendation. Once there is additional information about rail, that can be considered. Eva De  
35 Laurentiis left a comment in the Zoom chat box expressing support for the comments shared.  
36

37 Shauna Hart asked if anyone knew how UDOT reached its conclusions. She questioned whether  
38 the people involved and who made the final decisions for the Big Cottonwood Canyon  
39 Environmental Assessment. Chair Richardson was not certain. Mr. Knoblock believed that  
40 information was included in the assessment document. Ms. Hart explained that in her experience,  
41 the decisions that are made are just as much about the individuals making the decisions as the  
42 decisions themselves. It is important for everyone to consider who was involved in that process.  
43

1 Co-Chair Hegmann pointed out that not making a decision is actually a decision. That is what has  
2 happened in this case. Right now, the gondola is greenlit to move forward, so he believes the  
3 Transportation System Committee needs to clearly state its opposition to this mode of  
4 transportation. Mr. Knoblock mentioned the Pillars for Transportation Solutions document from  
5 the CWC Board. There was a push for the CWC Board to share their opinion, and the pillars  
6 document was the outcome. Mr. Tolman suggested that if a recommendation is forwarded to the  
7 Stakeholders Council and CWC Board, a request be made for the CWC Board to revisit the Pillars  
8 for Transportation Solutions document, because it has been four years since that was released.  
9

10 If there is no clear recommendation from the Transportation System Committee for a transit  
11 solution, there can still be a recommendation made that the gondola not move forward. That would  
12 be separate from making a positive recommendation for something. Mr. Baer agreed with Co-  
13 Chair Hegmann that taking no action is still an action. The Committee does not need to be firm  
14 on a rail alternative, as it could mention the need for further review. The CWC Board needs to  
15 know that the Transportation System Committee believes enhanced busing is needed. If there is  
16 additional infrastructure put in, he feels it should be for a ground-level rail system as opposed to a  
17 gondola system. He noted that there are many issues associated with the gondola alternative.  
18

19 Mr. Baer made a motion to forward a recommendation for enhanced busing, with consideration of  
20 a rail system, subject to further review and updates. Co-Chair Hegmann seconded the motion.  
21 The Transportation System Committee discussed the motion. Ms. De Laurentiis stated that  
22 enhanced busing is critical and needed. With the rail alternative, the issue some have is that a  
23 complete analysis and study have not been conducted. There is support for a more in-depth  
24 analysis of the effectiveness and cost of a rail option as opposed to a gondola. She is concerned  
25 about stating that rail would be a better option when there needs to be more study conducted.  
26 Ms. Kilpack noted that if there is a positive vote on the motion, Committee Members will need to  
27 create something that can be shared with the Stakeholders Council for review ahead of the next  
28 meeting.  
29

30 Mr. Knoblock wanted to understand the purpose of the motion. Chair Richardson explained that  
31 there is an intention to further the transportation discussions rather than do nothing. The  
32 Committee is encouraging forward movement. Co-Chair Hegmann added that this could alert the  
33 CWC Board that there might be a need to revisit the Pillars for Transportation Solutions document.  
34 Mr. Knoblock asked if that should be included in the motion language. There was discussion about  
35 appropriate language for a motion. Mr. Tolman pointed out that there could be some whereas  
36 statements. For example, “whereas the CWC conducted a robust public engagement process and  
37 released the Pillars for Transportation Solutions document,” and “whereas Phase I of the UDOT  
38 Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS has stalled due to lawsuits.” There could then be language to state,  
39 “as such, we recommend the CWC revisit the pillars and take a more active stance on solutions.”  
40

41 Mr. Baer thought there should be some mention of enhanced buses and a recommendation against  
42 an aerial transportation solution. Mr. Knoblock noted that the proposal could request that the CWC  
43 Board actively work to resolve the lawsuits in a way that will allow enhanced busing to move  
44 forward. Committee Members discussed the lawsuits and the impacts to enhanced busing.  
45 Mr. Tolman pointed out that the CWC Board could issue a formal statement supporting Phase I of  
46 the EIS, but he is not sure what authority the CWC Board would have to mediate. He reported

1 that there is movement happening with the lawsuits. Ms. Kilpack summarized the comments  
2 made:

3

- 4 • The Transportation System Committee agrees that there is a desire for the CWC Board to  
5 revisit the Pillars for Transportation Solutions document and evaluate transit alternatives  
6 through the lens of the Mountain Accord.
- 7 • The Transportation System Committee recommends enhanced busing to the extent  
8 possible, with an eye towards research on an additional mode, if necessary.

9

10 Several Committee Members believed there should be a clear statement against the gondola.  
11 Additional discussions were had about language for a motion. Mr. Tolman stated that he is close  
12 to being ready to vote on this but would like to see the language for rail before a vote is taken.

13

14 Ms. Kilpack reported that there are a few different ways to bring something to the Stakeholders  
15 Council. One way is to advance something through the Committee with a vote. Since there is  
16 nothing written out for the Committee to vote on, it is not possible to forward something that way.  
17 However, an individual Stakeholder can bring something to the Stakeholders Council. That might  
18 be the most appropriate route for the Transportation System Committee in this case. There can be  
19 as much consensus reached as possible during this meeting and via email. Co-Chair Hegmann  
20 suggested that Google Docs be used to see if a consensus can be reached. There does not need to  
21 be a vote, but the Stakeholders Council can be informed that the document is part of the  
22 Transportation System Committee's work. It was determined that language will be drafted and  
23 Co-Chair Hegmann will bring this matter to the attention of the Stakeholders Council.

24

## 25 **COMMITTEE UPDATES**

26

### 27 **1. Public Comment Period for the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Study Runs** 28 **from December 3 - January 9. The CWC will Submit a Public Comment.**

29

30 Chair Richardson reported that UDOT released the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental  
31 Assessment recently. There is a public comment period that runs from December 3, 2025, to  
32 January 9, 2026. He assumes the CWC Board will submit a public comment on the Environmental  
33 Assessment, but members of the Transportation System Committee are also able to submit  
34 comments as individuals. There was a KSL story on the Environmental Assessment, and the  
35 document is also available to review on the UDOT website. It hints that there is some connection  
36 to Little Cottonwood Canyon as well, because the transit hub, buses, and facilities connect.

37

38 The Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment talks about additional transit and  
39 facilities. Ms. Hart will suggest to the Utah Wildlife Federation Board that the Environmental  
40 Assessment be reviewed. There can be consensus on whether a public comment should be issued.  
41 Chair Richardson encouraged Committee Members to provide comments. Ms. Poirier reported  
42 that some groups and organizations are requesting that UDOT extend this, so it is a 60-day  
43 comment period due to the holidays. If others believe 60 days would be beneficial, she encouraged  
44 individuals and organizations to request a public comment period extension.

1 Chair Richardson reported that tolling was mentioned in the Environmental Assessment. There  
2 was a mention of tolling at the mouth of Solitude and not at the mouth of the canyon. That is an  
3 interesting concept. He noted that there could be public comments provided on the location. The  
4 Environmental Assessment also looks at enhanced bus service. There is a lot of information  
5 included in the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment and he encouraged  
6 Committee Members to review the document. He reiterated that it is possible to submit comments.  
7

8 Mr. Knoblock reported that based on the analysis, on peak days, there are 14,000 vehicle trips,  
9 which is 7,000 vehicles in one direction. On normal busy days, there might be 5,000 vehicles up  
10 the canyon instead of 7,000. With 1.8 people per vehicle, that results in 9,000 people up the canyon  
11 per day. Right now, there are buses every half hour. 50 people per bus times two per hour is 100  
12 people per hour. Three hours during the peak period result in 300 people on buses. That means  
13 3.3% of the people are on buses. The document states that the maximum number of buses would  
14 be one every six minutes, which would increase the number from 3.3% on buses to 16% on buses.  
15

16 Chair Richardson discussed carpooling and increasing the number of occupants per vehicle. That  
17 could be part of the solution. He suggested that Mr. Knoblock share his analysis in the public  
18 comment he submits, because it is important for everyone to be aware of how beneficial the buses  
19 can be. Co-Chair Hegmann believed there needs to be incentives considered to increase the  
20 number of occupants per vehicle. For example, a certain number of people in the vehicle could  
21 result in free parking or a discount on a lift ticket. It is important to think about incentives and  
22 potential solutions. While additional buses can be beneficial, it is clear that it is not the only  
23 solution.  
24

25 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Environmental Assessment considers increased population  
26 projections and thus increased skier demand. It could increase to 17,000 vehicle trips per day  
27 compared to the existing 14,000 vehicle trips per day. He noted that inclement weather is what  
28 negatively impacts traffic. It makes sense to focus on optimizing vehicle preparedness. He  
29 expressed support for the work the Transportation System Committee has done to reach out to car  
30 rental agencies. He believes the Committee has been focusing on what is most important.  
31

32 Chair Richardson informed the Committee that there are approximately 100 van trips that take  
33 place. This is not necessarily the solution, but those additional van trips reduce the number of  
34 single-occupancy vehicle trips. In addition, it ensures that more skiers are able to use the bus.  
35 Mr. Knoblock stressed the importance of the vans being winter weather-ready. If the UTA  
36 vanpools used for employees were four-wheel drive with snow tires, that would be beneficial to  
37 all.  
38

## 39 **2. Updates from WBA on Parking Options in the Canyons.**

40

41 Chair Richardson asked for an update from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance on parking options in  
42 the canyons. Ms. Poirier reported that there has not been movement with UDOT or the Forest  
43 Service on that. She offered to share updates with the Transportation System Committee in future.  
44

1      **3. Colorado Traction Law.**

2

3      Chair Richardson reported that the Colorado Department of Transportation (“CDOT”) has a  
4      similar traction law in place and there is a rental car mirror hanger. There is some wonderful  
5      information on the ski resort websites and Ski Utah website related to the traction law and rentals.

6

7      **4. UDOT Sticker Program Updates.**

8

9      Chair Richardson reported that the UDOT sticker program has been heavily promoted.

10

11     **5. Central Wasatch Symposium on January 8-9.**

12

13     The Central Wasatch Symposium will take place on January 8 and 9, 2026. Chair Richardson  
14     encouraged Transportation System Committee Members to purchase their tickets online.

15

16     **2026 MEETING SCHEDULE**

17

18     **1. The Committee will Discuss its Meeting Cadence for 2026.**

19

20     Ms. Kilpack asked if Committee Members are still supportive of the Transportation System  
21     Committee Meeting monthly at 3:30 p.m. on a Monday. There was support expressed for this.

22

23     **2. The January 12, 2026, Meeting will Need to be Rescheduled.**

24

25     Ms. Kilpack reported that the CWC Board Meeting scheduled for January 5, 2026, needed to be  
26     pushed back a week to January 12, 2026. This creates a conflict with the Transportation System  
27     Committee Meeting. She offered to send a poll to Committee Members to choose another date.

28

29     **MEETING RECAP AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

30

31     **1. The Committee will Review Any Action Items that have been Decided Upon for the**  
32     **Next Meeting.**

33

34     The next meeting agenda was not discussed.

35

36     **CLOSING**

37

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

40

41     **MOTION:** Dani Poirier moved to ADJOURN. Mark Baer seconded the motion. The motion  
42     passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

43

44     The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting adjourned at  
45     5:00 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    *December 8, 2025.*

4

5    Teri Forbes

6    Teri Forbes  
7    T Forbes Group  
8    Minutes Secretary

9

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