



1  
2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
4 **COUNCIL JOINT MEETING WITH THE MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE AND**  
5 **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE, HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2026,**  
6 **AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND**  
7 **VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS AT THE CWC OFFICES,**  
8 **LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE STREET,**  
9 **SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

10  
11 **Present:** Danny Richardson, Transportation System Committee Chair  
12 Ed Marshall, Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair  
13 Sally Kaiser, Millcreek Canyon Committee Co-Chair  
14 Eva De Laurentiis  
15 John Knoblock  
16 Roger Borgenicht  
17 Shauna Hart  
18 Del Draper  
19 Dani Poirier  
20 Doug Tolman  
21 Maura Hahnenberger  
22 Dan Zalles  
23

24 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
25 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
26 Will McKay, Communications Director  
27

28 **OPENING**  
29

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

33  
34 Chair Danny Richardson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council  
35 Joint Meeting of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and Transportation System Committee to order  
36 at 3:30 p.m. He welcomed those present from both Stakeholders Council Committees.  
37

1      **2.      Review and Approval of the Minutes of the December 8, 2025, Transportation System**  
2      **Committee Meeting.**

4      Chair Richardson reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the December 8, 2025, Transportation  
5      System Committee Meeting. During that meeting, it was noted that all suggested transit solutions  
6      need to be affordable, accessible, provide equal access, and offer convenience. In addition, there  
7      should be connections to existing transit. He reported that at the December meeting, there was a  
8      presentation from Devin Weder with the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”).  
9      Mr. Weder spoke about the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment (“EA”) and the  
10     public comment period. It was noted that enhanced busing will not single-handedly solve  
11     transportation needs. There were discussions about bus lanes and the environmental impacts. The  
12     limitations of a cog railway were noted as well. UDOT does not believe a gondola has the same  
13     limitations.

14     At the last meeting, it was noted that the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact  
15     Statement (“EIS”) lawsuits had not been worked out. It was also stated that a cog railway would  
16     be needed to meet the Federal standards for railroads. As for S-Curve road improvements, UDOT  
17     has chosen to concentrate on improvements that would benefit the buses. Mr. Weder stated that  
18     UDOT and the U.S. Forest Service would need to coordinate on any road changes. Chair  
19     Richardson reported that the gravel pit plan includes a 1,700-stall parking garage plus road  
20     improvements and alignments. Tolling will improve and encourage carpooling to take place. The  
21     toll booth would be located somewhere between Spruces and Solitude, which was the subject of  
22     discussion.

23     At the last meeting, there was a conversation about a possible canyon transit district. As for the  
24     Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) vanpools, there are approximately 100. Those vanpools take  
25     employees off UTA buses to ensure there are more seats available for visitors. The Transportation  
26     System Committee would like to promote four-wheel drive vans, as most are two-wheel drive.

27     Chair Richardson reported that there has been outreach to the rental car agencies about providing  
28     traction law information. UDOT is working with the police on accurate slide-off reporting, which  
29     will help to address traction law adherence. There were additional Committee discussions about  
30     enhanced busing. He explained that in Big Cottonwood Canyon, if there is a bus every 30 minutes,  
31     this will accommodate approximately 3.3% of the total number of visitors. Enhanced busing is  
32     beneficial, but even at the maximum frequency, the percentage will only increase to 16%.

33     The Transportation System Committee discussed the Pillars for Transportation Solutions  
34     document and whether that is something for the CWC Board to re-examine. At the last meeting,  
35     it was noted that the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance was hoping to meet with the Forest Service  
36     regarding canyon parking and signage. Chair Richardson is not sure whether that has happened.  
37     During the last meeting, it was also noted that Colorado has similar traction laws in place and that  
38     the UDOT sticker program has been receiving widespread promotion and publicity this year.

39     **MOTION:** Dani Poirier moved to APPROVE the Minutes from December 8, 2025. Shauna Hart  
40     seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

1     3.    **Review and Approval of the Minutes of the October 9, 2025, Millcreek Canyon**  
2    **Committee Meeting.**  
3

4    **MOTION:** Del Draper moved to APPROVE the Minutes from October 9, 2025. Sally Kaiser  
5    seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
6

7    **MILLCREEK CANYON SHUTTLE FEASIBILITY STUDY DISCUSSION**  
8

9    1.    **The Committee will Discuss the Final Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study.**  
10

11   Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair, Ed Marshall, reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee  
12   has been discussing the possibility of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle for some time. The Committee  
13   has been awaiting the final version of the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study, which was  
14   recently released. In his view, it has achieved its purpose, as it shows a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon  
15   is feasible. The study did not include everything that was discussed during Millcreek Canyon  
16   Committee Meetings and did not focus on incentivizing canyon shuttle use.  
17

18   Chair Marshall shared highlights from previous Committee Member discussions. At a past  
19   Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting, John Knoblock stated that in order to incentivize a canyon  
20   shuttle, there should be no fee. On the other hand, Del Draper thought the structure of the shuttle  
21   fee should be looked at and compared to the fee booth cost. Chair Marshall sides more with  
22   Mr. Draper and feels that if a shuttle is incentivized with lower fees, there will be users. He pointed  
23   out that choosing the Millcreek Canyon shuttle will eliminate the need for visitors to find a parking  
24   spot. Finding parking in Millcreek Canyon during peak times is the main issue visitors face.  
25

26   Not everything requested by the Committee was included in the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle  
27   Feasibility Study. Chair Marshall suggested that a small portion of the Joint Meeting discussion  
28   focus on items that were not included but asked that the majority of the discussion focus on next  
29   steps. Mr. Draper noted that many of the comments submitted were not incorporated into the final  
30   version of the study. However, it was meaningful to see that parking on Virginia Way could work.  
31   He thought there should have been more exploration into the alternate parking on the east side of  
32   the freeway. As for how the fee structure could work, there seemed to be some limitations to the  
33   study because of the assumption that the amount of fees collected could not be reduced.  
34

35   Mr. Draper stated that a shuttle must have a balanced fare. People need an incentive to take the  
36   shuttle, because it requires more effort than entering the canyon with a personal vehicle. There  
37   was an interesting panel at the Central Wasatch Symposium where information was shared about  
38   Bonanza Flat. There is a free shuttle, and muzzles are handed out to people who arrive with a dog  
39   and no muzzle. The alternative is to drive to Bonanza Flat and park at a parking meter that charges  
40   a certain amount per hour. The shuttle has been successful. He explained that this is because there  
41   are incentives to use the shuttle and disincentives for those who choose to drive to the area and  
42   park. Mr. Draper hopes similar features will be incorporated into a Millcreek Canyon shuttle.  
43

44   Mr. Knoblock agreed with the comments made about the shuttle. He believes the shuttle needs to  
45   be free to best incentivize use. The Salt Lake County Tourism, Recreation, Culture, and  
46   Convention (“TRCC”) funds are collected each year. It might be possible to request that this

1 shuttle program be funded with a portion of the TRCC funds. Sally Kaiser requested in her  
2 comments that there be consideration of a shuttle in the winter, but that was not considered. She  
3 has concerns about dogs on the shuttle, but likes the Bonanza Flat idea to have extra muzzles.

4  
5 Eva De Laurentiis asked the Millcreek Canyon Committee to share the current costs for parking  
6 and the proposed shuttle cost. Chair Marshall clarified that there is no charge for parking in  
7 Millcreek Canyon, but there is a fee booth in place. The fee is collected when someone exits the  
8 canyon, and it is \$5 per vehicle. An annual pass is \$50 for adults and \$30 for seniors. Something  
9 that Mr. Draper suggested previously was to look at the exit fee and compare it to the proposed  
10 shuttle fee in order to determine an appropriate incentive. Chair Marshall suggested parking fees  
11 and a possible parking reservation system, but that was not within the scope of the shuttle study.

12  
13 Additional discussions were had about the potential shuttle fee. Mr. Knoblock pointed out that the  
14 cost at the fee booth covers an entire vehicle, but a shuttle would have a per-person cost. Chair  
15 Marshall explained that the valid issues that have been mentioned will need to be worked out in  
16 the future. He asked that the remainder of the discussion focus on the future of the shuttle.

17  
18 Chair Marshall read that the CWC has applied to the State Legislature for funding. The funding  
19 request is not only for the normal appropriations, but for the Millcreek Canyon shuttle program.  
20 If this funding comes through, there will be a basis to answer some of the outstanding questions.  
21 He asked CWC Staff how the shuttle might move forward with or without the requested funding.

22  
23 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that next steps are not determined at this time.  
24 Senator Kirk Cullimore sponsored an appropriations request for \$2.4 million on behalf of the  
25 CWC. This covers the regular portfolio of project work in addition to seed funding for a pilot  
26 shuttle program in Millcreek Canyon. The CWC will learn whether this funding request is  
27 successful in approximately one month. From there, work will need to be done with the different  
28 partners. She explained that the partners include the Forest Service, Salt Lake County, and UDOT.  
29 There would be a National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) analysis needed to understand the  
30 impacts, as this could introduce more visitors to the canyon. The pricing structure will need to be  
31 determined as well as details about dogs and bicycles on the canyon shuttle. Ms. Nielsen reported  
32 that there were scenarios in the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study for operation schedules  
33 and plans, but those also need to be formalized. She reiterated that the next steps for the canyon  
34 shuttle are still to be determined, because the CWC is waiting to hear back about funding.

35  
36 Chair Marshall asked if the CWC will continue to take the lead on the Millcreek Canyon shuttle  
37 as far as coordinating the various partners. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. The CWC is the entity  
38 that submitted the funding request. As a result, it would be the CWC that received the funding if  
39 the request is successful. Chair Marshall wanted to know if the Millcreek Canyon Committee, the  
40 Transportation System Committee, and the Stakeholders Council will have a chance to provide  
41 input in the future. Ms. Nielsen confirmed this. There may be additional tasks as well. The  
42 feasibility of shuttle service in the winter months was not within the scope of the study update  
43 conducted, but it is possible that the CWC Board could re-contract with Fehr & Peers and look  
44 into this in the future. There are always opportunities for the Stakeholders Council to ask questions  
45 and submit comments, but there could also be formal opportunities to re-engage with these topics.

1 Dani Poirier asked for additional information about the appropriations amount requested. Ms.  
2 Nielsen reported that in the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study, there were estimates based  
3 on certain operational levels. For instance, shuttle services with headways of 30 minutes and  
4 shuttle services with headways of 15 minutes. Fehr & Peers engaged with a number of shuttle  
5 providers to determine cost projections based on the proposed operational levels. The funding  
6 amount requested was based directly on what was included in the updated version of the feasibility  
7 study. Ms. Nielsen stated that the request was \$2.25 million for the Millcreek Canyon shuttle pilot  
8 program, which was based on 15-minute headways at \$750,000 per year for a three-year program.  
9

10 Chair Marshall wanted to know how the shuttle would move forward if the appropriations request  
11 was not received. Ms. Nielsen was not certain and explained that this would have to be considered  
12 if the shuttle funding is not received. One of the requirements that the Forest Service  
13 communicated to the CWC was that, in order for them to consider the project viable and engage  
14 in an environmental analysis, the organization needed to demonstrate that the funding was  
15 available. If the funding is not received, the CWC will need to look into other options. Chair  
16 Marshall expressed appreciation for the work done by CWC Staff as well as Mr. Draper and  
17 Mr. Knoblock.  
18

19 Mr. Knoblock asked if there has been communication with Salt Lake County to find out if it is  
20 possible to receive funding through the Transportation Sales Tax. Ms. Nielsen has not asked that  
21 specifically and is not certain who is taking over the position previously held by Helen Peters.  
22

23 Ms. Nielsen shared background information about the Millcreek Canyon Committee. It was the  
24 first subcommittee of the Stakeholders Council that was created, and it was originally called the  
25 Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Committee. The idea of a Millcreek Canyon shuttle has been around  
26 since 2019. She thanked all of the Committee Members who have worked tirelessly to move a  
27 shuttle forward. Doug Tolman mentioned the NEPA portion of this project and asked about the  
28 alternatives. Ms. Nielsen explained that she does not know the specifics, but it is projected to be  
29 a Categorical Exclusion. She noted that this is a less involved process than an EA or an EIS.  
30

## 31 **COMMITTEE UPDATES**

32

### 33 **1. The CWC Submitted a Public Comment Regarding the Big Cottonwood Canyon** 34 **Environmental Assessment.**

35

36 Chair Richardson reported that the CWC submitted a public comment on the Big Cottonwood  
37 Canyon EA. Ms. Nielsen explained that the Big Cottonwood Canyon EA was largely aligned with  
38 what the CWC released to the public through the Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan  
39 (“BCC MAP”) in 2023. The submitted comment mentioned this. It also encouraged UDOT, the  
40 Forest Service, and others to recognize that any transportation improvements and actions in the  
41 canyon should be coupled with the long-term and far-reaching environmental protections that the  
42 Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCR”) would afford.  
43

1        2.     **The CWC Submitted a Public Comment Opposing the Proposed Gravel Pit in Parleys**  
2     **Canyon.**  
3

4     Chair Richardson reported that the CWC submitted a public comment expressing opposition to the  
5     proposed gravel pit in Parleys Canyon. Ms. Nielsen stated that the comment essentially reiterated  
6     the 2022 comment. She explained that this is a new permit brought forward by a new LLC, and it  
7     is a smaller permit application. The original permit application was for 22 acres of land to be  
8     mined where this permit application is for 6 acres. However, there was a bill in the last Legislative  
9     Session that essentially allows already permitted operations to continually expand their mining  
10    operations without re-permitting. The public comment called that out and expressed opposition to  
11    the subversion of the public permit process. The CWC commitment to environmental protection  
12    and the balance of the systems was reiterated in the public comment that was submitted.  
13

14    Discussions were had about the proposed mining operation. Chair Marshall wondered where the  
15    mining operation would obtain water, as there is a lot of water needed for dust control and to  
16    address other issues. Mr. Tolman stated that Save Our Canyons argued that the Air Quality Permit  
17    should not be granted until the applicants can show there is local land use permission and water.  
18

19        3.     **The Committee will Share Updates on Parking, Signage, and Other Transportation**  
20     **Plans and Developments in the Canyons (Big Cottonwood, Little Cottonwood,**  
21     **Millcreek, Parleys).**  
22

23     Chair Richardson reported that Wasatch Backcountry Alliance had a meeting with the Forest  
24     Service to discuss signage and parking. Ms. Poirier confirmed that there was a meeting with  
25     UDOT, the Forest Service, and others on Friday. The discussion largely focused on White Pine  
26     parking changes. There is a 100-foot line of sight area where no parking is allowed on either side  
27     of the entrance to the lot. There is a short three to four-car roadside parking allowance before the  
28     avalanche slide path. Something the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance is working on with them is to  
29     address whether that slide path is still a safety concern or if more parking could be allowed. There  
30     is also a desire to discuss what a future public transit stop could look like at White Pine. Ms. Poirier  
31     explained that there was also a discussion about UDOT potentially hosting an interactive parking  
32     map, as there are seven different parking agencies within the Cottonwoods.  
33

34     It was noted that the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance is having similar conversations about the slide  
35     paths in lower Big Cottonwood Canyon that are closed to climbing access. Ms. Poirier confirmed  
36     that the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance was at the meeting, and there was a discussion about the  
37     potential to have a more flexible seasonal avalanche closure sign. Another meeting attendee  
38     discussed the idea of red light and green light parking signs. Rather than Snowbird having signs  
39     that flip to indicate whether there is roadside parking allowed, there could be signs throughout the  
40     canyon that report whether or not the conditions are safe enough to allow roadside parking.  
41

1      **2026 LEGISLATIVE SESSION DISCUSSION**

2

3      **1.      The Committee will Discuss Current Bills Pertinent to Transportation in the Central**

4      **Wasatch and Potential Action Items.**

5

6      Chair Richardson asked for Legislative Session updates from Committee Members. Mr. Tolman  
7      reported that this year, he has allocated a lot of time to tracking the Legislative Session, because  
8      he heard rumors that there would be a few bills related to canyon parking and gravel mine  
9      expansion. However, it has been a relatively quiet Legislative Session so far and it does not seem  
10     like there will be a significant gravel pit bill like there has been in the last few years. It is expected  
11     that there will be a bit of code included in another bill, so he will continue to look out for that.

12

13     Mr. Tolman reported that the State has a Resource Management Plan. It has to be re-approved  
14     each year through the Legislative Session. One of the clauses this year states that there is a desire  
15     to turn Millcreek Canyon into a State Park. That language raises some alarm bells for him. The  
16     Resource Management Plan from the State is what he would describe as a vision board, and it is  
17     what the political figureheads in the State would like to see. The plan does not necessarily ensure  
18     that this will happen. From his research, it does not seem like the partners who would be involved  
19     in a decision like this were informed. Save Our Canyons was the first to communicate this to the  
20     CWC, Salt Lake County, and the U.S. Forest Service, so it doesn't appear the relevant partners  
21     were consulted.

22

23     Save Our Canyons has determined that if there is infringement on the land management authority  
24     for the County or Forest Service, there will be opposition expressed. At the same time, there is  
25     acknowledgement that the State is being asked for funding to start a transit program, and there is  
26     a several-hundred-acre Boy Scouts camp that has been identified by the Millcreek Canyon  
27     Committee as an at-risk parcel. Mr. Tolman is not sure whether the inclusion of Millcreek Canyon  
28     in the Resource Management Plan will result in any changes, but it sounds like the County is now  
29     in conversation with the State. He asked for Committee Member feedback about this language.

30

31     Chair Marshall asked if this language is part of a bill. Mr. Tolman explained that there is a bill to  
32     approve the Resource Management Plan. The section about Millcreek Canyon becoming a State  
33     Park is within that plan. He clarified that if the Resource Management Plan is approved, this does  
34     not approve Millcreek Canyon as a State Park. That would need to be a separate Legislative act.

35

36     Additional discussions were had about the Resource Management Plan. Mr. Tolman noted that it  
37     is likely the State will want to work with the County and Forest Service. He hopes there will also  
38     be discussions with the CWC, Save Our Canyons, and others. It was asked whether the Boy Scouts  
39     parcel is zoned for residential development. Chair Marshall did not believe so, but explained that  
40     Mr. Knoblock has been looking into specific parcel information. Mr. Knoblock reported that it is  
41     located in the FR-20 Zone, where there can be a private residence on every 20 acres of land.

42

43     Mr. Tolman reported that Granite Construction and Tree Farm, LLC, who have proposed the gravel  
44     pit in Parleys Canyon, are suing Salt Lake County for their ban on mines in the FCOZ. The  
45     discovery period for that lawsuit was extended to the day after the Legislative Session ends.

1      **CENTRAL WASATCH SYMPOSIUM DISCUSSION**

2

3      **1. The Committee will Discuss Takeaways from the Recent Central Wasatch**

4      **Symposium.**

5

6      Chair Richardson reported that the Central Wasatch Symposium took place last month. It was a  
7      wonderful event and there were some meaningful discussions. He thanked everyone who was  
8      involved in the symposium. Mr. Draper thought there was a lot of good information shared. It  
9      was particularly interesting to hear what is happening in Park City as far as transit. In addition, he  
10     enjoyed the keynote address and the comments made about the importance of the mountains.  
11     Mr. Tolman discussed an outcome of the symposium. At the Brighton Town Council Meeting,  
12     there will be a discussion about allocating a small amount of funds to study an extension of the  
13     shuttle.

14

15     Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, thanked all attendees of the Central Wasatch Symposium.  
16     She noted that Maura Hahnenberger volunteered on both days of the symposium. Ms. Nielsen  
17     discussed the preliminary plans for the Central Wasatch Symposium next year. There have been  
18     conversations about potentially bringing the symposium to a location in the Wasatch Back.

19

20      **MEETING RECAP AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

21

22      **1. The Committee will Review Any Action Items that Have Been Decided Upon for the**

23      **Next Meeting.**

24

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

26

27      Chair Richardson asked if there are items for Committee Members to research or discuss at the  
28      next meeting. He noted that there might need to be additional Legislative Session discussions.

29

30      Dan Zalles pointed out that the Millcreek Canyon shuttle process will need to continue to be  
31      tracked. He likes the idea of a free shuttle and mentioned the Bonanza Flat model, which can be  
32      used as an example. Ms. Poirier reported that Wasatch Backcountry Alliance is pivoting their  
33      backcountry shuttle from Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon to Millcreek  
34      this year. That should start in mid-February. This will be a short project held on five Saturdays,  
35      but this makes it possible to collect some data. There was a Short-Term Projects Grant application  
36      submitted recently. She noted that the intention is to run a shuttle throughout the entire winter.

37

38      Chair Marshall reported that a buyer was found for Log Haven and that transaction closed  
39      approximately 10 days ago. The intention was to find someone who would be a good steward of  
40      the land and the business. He explained that Log Haven is dear to the community. Faith Scheffler,  
41      who has been the Banquet and Wedding Manager for over 25 years, is interested in serving on the  
42      Stakeholders Council. It has been a pleasure serving with everyone on the Stakeholders Council  
43      and Millcreek Canyon Committee. He intends to remain until Ms. Scheffler takes over.

1 Ms. Nielsen thanked Chair Marshall for his years of service on the Stakeholders Council. She  
2 reported that he was one of the original Stakeholders added in 2019. CWC Staff also thanked  
3 Chair Marshall for his leadership on the Millcreek Canyon Committee, which he has led twice.  
4

5 **CLOSING**  
6

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

9  
10 **MOTION:** Doug Tolman moved to ADJOURN. Dani Poirier seconded the motion. The motion  
11 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

12  
13 The Central Wasatch Commission Joint Meeting with the Transportation System Committee and  
14 Millcreek Canyon Committee adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

1    *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*  
2    *Central Wasatch Commission Joint Meeting with the Transportation System Committee and*  
3    *Millcreek Canyon Committee held Monday, February 9, 2026.*

4

5    Teri Forbes

6    Teri Forbes  
7    T Forbes Group  
8    Minutes Secretary

9

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