



**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL JOINT MEETING WITH THE MILLCREEK CANYON COMMITTEE AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE, HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2026, 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, Transportation System Committee Chair  
Ed Marshall, Millcreek Canyon Committee Chair  
Sally Kaiser, Millcreek Canyon Committee Co-Chair  
Eva De Laurentiis  
John Knoblock  
Roger Borgenicht  
Shauna Hart  
Del Draper  
Dani Poirier  
Doug Tolman  
Maura Hahnenberger  
Dan Zalles

**Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations  
Will McKay, Communications Director

**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 Joint Meeting of the Millcreek Canyon Committee and Transportation System Committee to order at 3:30 p.m. He welcomed those present from both Stakeholders Council Committees.

1     **2.     Review and Approval of the Minutes of the December 8, 2025, Transportation System**  
2     **Committee Meeting.**  
3

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

15    At the last meeting, it was noted that the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact  
16    Statement (“EIS”) lawsuits had not been worked out. It was also stated that a cog railway would  
17    be needed to meet the Federal standards for railroads. As for S-Curve road improvements, UDOT  
18    has chosen to concentrate on improvements that would benefit the buses. Mr. Weder stated that  
19    UDOT and the U.S. Forest Service would need to coordinate on any road changes. Chair  
20    Richardson reported that the gravel pit plan includes a 1,700-stall parking garage plus road  
21    improvements and alignments. Tolling will improve and encourage carpooling to take place. The  
22    toll booth would be located somewhere between Spruces and Solitude, which was the subject of  
23    discussion.  
24

25    At the last meeting, there was a conversation about a possible canyon transit district. As for the  
26    Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) vanpools, there are approximately 100. Those vanpools take  
27    employees off UTA buses to ensure there are more seats available for visitors. The Transportation  
28    System Committee would like to promote four-wheel drive vans, as most are two-wheel drive.  
29

30    Chair Richardson reported that there has been outreach to the rental car agencies about providing  
31    traction law information. UDOT is working with the police on accurate slide-off reporting, which  
32    will help to address traction law adherence. There were additional Committee discussions about  
33    enhanced busing. He explained that in Big Cottonwood Canyon, if there is a bus every 30 minutes,  
34    this will accommodate approximately 3.3% of the total number of visitors. Enhanced busing is  
35    beneficial, but even at the maximum frequency, the percentage will only increase to 16%.  
36

37    The Transportation System Committee discussed the Pillars for Transportation Solutions  
38    document and whether that is something for the CWC Board to re-examine. At the last meeting,  
39    it was noted that the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance was hoping to meet with the Forest Service  
40    regarding canyon parking and signage. Chair Richardson is not sure whether that has happened.  
41    During the last meeting, it was also noted that Colorado has similar traction laws in place and that  
42    the UDOT sticker program has been receiving widespread promotion and publicity this year.  
43

44    **MOTION:** Dani Poirier moved to APPROVE the Minutes from December 8, 2025. Shauna Hart  
45    seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
46

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 (“CWNCRA”) would afford.

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

## **2026 LEGISLATIVE SESSION DISCUSSION**

### **1. The Committee will Discuss Current Bills Pertinent to Transportation in the Central Wasatch and Potential Action Items.**

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Tolman reported that Granite Construction and Tree Farm, LLC, who have proposed the gravel pit in Parleys Canyon, are suing Salt Lake County for their ban on mines in the FCOZ. The 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.  
44



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: \_\_\_\_\_