



9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL MEETING, HELD WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2025, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS MILLCREEK CITY HALL, 1330 EAST CHAMBERS AVENUE, MILLCREEK, UTAH.**

- Present:** Maura Hahnenberger, Chair  
Barbara Cameron  
Craig Williams  
Dan Zalles  
Dani Poirier  
Del Draper  
Dennis Goreham  
Doug Tolman  
Ed Marshall  
Eva De Laurentiis  
Hilary Arens  
John Adams  
John Knoblock  
Jonny Vasic  
Kelly Boardman  
Kim Doyle  
Kurt Hegmann  
Mark Baer  
Morgan Mingle  
Olivia Juarez  
Patrick Morrison  
Roger Borgenicht  
Sally Kaiser  
Sarah Bennett  
Shauna Hart

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

1  
2 **Opening**  
3

4 1. **Chair Maura Hahnenberger will Open the Public Meeting as the Chair of the**  
5 **Stakeholders Council of the Central Wasatch Commission.**  
6

7 In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, John Knoblock called the Central Wasatch Commission  
8 (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present. It was  
9 noted that Chair Maura Hahnenberger is expected to arrive at the meeting shortly.  
10

11 2. **Chair Hahnenberger will Call for a Motion to Approve the Minutes from the October**  
12 **15, 2025, Stakeholders Council Meeting.**  
13

14 **MOTION:** Barbara Cameron moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the October 15, 2025,  
15 Stakeholders Council Meeting. [REDACTED] seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
16 unanimous consent of the Council.  
17

18 **October Meeting Recap**  
19

20 1. **Chair Hahnenberger will Give a Recap of the October 15, 2025, Stakeholders Council**  
21 **Meeting.**  
22

23 The Stakeholders Council Meeting held on October 15, 2025, was not discussed.  
24

25 **2025 Stakeholders Council Retrospective**  
26

27 1. **Council Members will Review the Activities and Accomplishments of the Stakeholders**  
28 **Council in 2025.**  
29

30 Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, reported that there will be a review of the Stakeholders  
31 Council activities and accomplishments from 2025. The Council has achieved a lot over the last year.  
32

33 a. **Self-Guided Historical and Urban Hikes Guide.**  
34

35 The Recreation System Committee created a Self-Guided Historical and Urban Hikes Guide. Barbara  
36 Cameron stated that this was an exciting project for the Committee. It was originally inspired by the  
37 Cottonwood Canyons Foundation, and there were discussions about other self-guided tours in the  
38 area. It was found that there were a lot of historic tours, so a list was created. Ms. Cameron explained  
39 that various historical walking tours were included in the guide as well as trail stewardship  
40 information.  
41

42 The Stakeholders Council reviewed the guide. Ms. Cameron explained that the last page highlights  
43 the trail etiquette information. She reported that there are a lot of different sources included. It was  
44 noted that the Guided Summer Walking Tours in Park City are running between July 1 and September  
45 5, Monday through Friday. It costs \$10 to \$15, with a maximum of 15 people on each tour. That  
46 information will be sent to Ms. Cameron so it can potentially be added to the Self-Guided Historical  
47 and Urban Hikes Guide. She asked that additional suggestions be shared so updates can be made.  
48

1 Mr. Knoblock pointed out that there is a lot of meaningful content that already exists. This guide is  
2 beneficial because it compiles a lot of information in one location. Ms. Cameron stated that the guide  
3 is valley-wide, because there is a desire to encourage healthy and active lifestyles all over the valley.  
4

5 **b. Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study.**  
6

7 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee has been talking about the Millcreek  
8 Canyon Shuttle Feasibility Study for many years. There is now progress being made on that study.  
9

10 Ed Marshall explained that the Millcreek Canyon Committee has been focused on a variety of issues  
11 since its inception. This past year, the primary focus has been on advancing the study of a shuttle  
12 system in Millcreek Canyon. There are a lot of issues associated with the creation of a shuttle system,  
13 including finding parking at the base of the canyon, initial costs, and operating costs. In this case,  
14 there is also a need to reimburse the U.S. Forest Service for fees that would be lost from the fee booth  
15 as a result of the reduced number of drivers. Since users of the shuttle will be recreational users of  
16 the forest, it is important to determine whether there is Forest Service support or opposition.  
17

18 Mr. Marshall explained that after addressing the initial issues, it becomes necessary to focus on other  
19 details, such as how frequently the shuttle should run, how to incentivize people to use the shuttle,  
20 and the cost of ridership. Mr. Marshall mentioned the work done by Mr. Knoblock, Del Draper, and  
21 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen. Mr. Knoblock and Mr. Draper focused on whether there was  
22 parking available at the base of the canyon. It was determined that there is parking along the west  
23 side of I-215. That can be supplemented by additional parking on the east side of I-215.  
24

25 Ms. Nielsen eventually shared a report with the Forest Service to persuade them that a shuttle system  
26 should be adopted in the canyon. The District Ranger at the time was not persuaded. There was  
27 greater emphasis put on a professional study, as that might be more persuasive. Mr. Marshall reported  
28 that there is now a new District Ranger serving in that role. This year, there was a request for an  
29 updated study conducted by Fehr & Peers, who handled the original 2012 study on Millcreek Canyon.  
30 The Millcreek Canyon Committee approved the request for the updated study unanimously and it was  
31 eventually approved by the CWC Board as well. In October 2025, there was a draft version of the  
32 study released. On October 9, 2025, the Millcreek Canyon Committee met to discuss the document.  
33

34 During the Committee discussion on the draft update, Mr. Knoblock felt it was important to  
35 incentivize people to use the shuttle. He wanted to see it be a free system, with the lost revenue to  
36 the Forest Service made up in some other way. Mr. Knoblock also felt the shuttle system should be  
37 year-round rather than summer-only shuttle. Mr. Draper agreed with a lot of the comments made but  
38 had a more nuanced view when it came to the ridership fees. He believed an entry fee study should  
39 be conducted to determine the amount to charge. Mr. Draper also stated that a shuttle system should  
40 not require an expensive National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) study.  
41

42 Mr. Marshall agreed with Mr. Draper on the issue of user fees, as it should be more nuanced, but he  
43 agreed with Mr. Knoblock about the need for a year-round shuttle. He noted that there are many  
44 canyon users in the winter months. Mr. Marshall explained that his main concern with the draft  
45 document is that it seems to focus on the wrong issue. There are no red snakes in Millcreek Canyon,  
46 but there are parking issues in the canyon during peak times. Some examples are Dog Lake and  
47 Rattlesnake Gulch in the summer months and the Winter Gate, Porter Fork, and Rattlesnake Gulch in

1 the winter months. The real issue in the canyon is not traffic congestion, but parking congestion.  
2 Mr. Marshall also felt the study significantly understated the importance of dog walkers in the canyon.

3  
4 The current status is that the Millcreek Canyon Committee is waiting for the final version of the study  
5 to be released. The government partners had a meeting on Monday, but it is not known what was  
6 discussed or decided at that time. There should be more updates to share in the next month.  
7 Mr. Draper added that Tom Diegel put a lot of effort into Millcreek Canyon issues over the last five  
8 years.

9  
10 **c. Letter to Car Rental Agencies Encouraging Traction Law Compliance.**

11  
12 Ms. Kilpack reported that the next item has to do with letters to rental car agencies to encourage  
13 traction law compliance. Kurt Hegmann reported that the Transportation System Committee has been  
14 focused on this issue. There have been some problems with rental cars when there is inclement  
15 weather. The Committee has tried to encourage sticker program compliance from rental car  
16 companies and has asked that information about the traction laws be communicated. A number of  
17 agencies have moved in that direction, but the idea is to encourage all of them to focus on compliance.

18  
19 Ms. Kilpack explained that the Transportation System Committee drafted a letter and advanced it to  
20 the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. The CWC Board decided to sign the rental car agency  
21 letter. She reported that letters have been sent to the rental car agencies not currently participating in  
22 the sticker program. The hope is that those agencies will choose to focus on traction law compliance.

23  
24 **d. Central Wasatch Dashboard Survey and Enhancements.**

25  
26 Dan Zalles shared information about the Central Wasatch Dashboard survey and enhancements that  
27 the Environment System Committee has been focused on. Last year, there was brainstorming done  
28 on a needs assessment and an early draft of the survey was shared with Council Members. The survey  
29 was conducted and there was an initial set of responses received. There was a desire to receive  
30 additional feedback, so there was more outreach conducted, which included the CWC Youth Council.

31  
32 The findings of the survey were reviewed. Mr. Zalles reported that there were some broad takeaways,  
33 including a desire to see change over time data and more Human Element components. There was a  
34 Storyboarding Workshop that included those responsible for the implementation of proposed changes  
35 to the Central Wasatch Dashboard. There was a lot of feedback provided. Mr. Zalles explained that  
36 there were suggestions related to the presentation of data on the Central Wasatch Dashboard. In  
37 addition, there was a discussion about a GIS map with better-organized data. He pointed out that the  
38 data sets often come from other sources. It is important to make sure the data is useful and  
39 straightforward to understand. There is an educational component that needs to be considered.

40  
41 Work has been done on the suggested improvements to the Central Wasatch Dashboard. The main  
42 focus has been on improving the navigation features. Mr. Zalles reviewed some of the changes that  
43 have been made and what still needs to be done. He explained that the expansion of the Human  
44 Element has been paused. The guide created by the Recreation System Committee will be added to  
45 the Central Wasatch Dashboard. The landing page map still needs a bit more work before it is added,  
46 but it is expected that the map will be on the Central Wasatch Dashboard in January 2026. Mr. Zalles  
47 shared information about the landing page map, which will include the proposed Central Wasatch

1 National Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”) boundaries and clickable icons with  
2 traffic counter locations. He clarified that the landing page will still feature the current icons.

3  
4 **e. Letter to CWC Board Concerning the Proposed Parking Lot at Solitude Resort.**

5  
6 Chair Hahnenberger reported that there was a parking lot proposal from Solitude Mountain Resort.  
7 There were concerns expressed throughout the various subcommittees, because the proposal would  
8 impact all of the different systems. The idea was to create a letter opposing the parking proposal and  
9 move it forward to the CWC Board. Chair Hahnenberger explained that the letter highlighted the  
10 environmental impacts, but there were other items mentioned as well, including backcountry access  
11 and road safety concerns. The letter was brought to the CWC Board for consideration. While the  
12 CWC Board appreciated the letter, it was not moved forward because of other actions happening  
13 simultaneously regarding the feasibility of the parking structure. There were several actions that  
14 would essentially limit the possibility of that parking area being constructed. Even though the CWC  
15 Board did not take action on the letter, it was appreciated and clarified many of the related issues.

16  
17 **f. Visitor Use Baseline Data Gathering Effort.**

18  
19 Mr. Knoblock shared information about the Visitor Use Baseline Data gathering effort that took place  
20 this year. He reported that Dr. Jordan Smith and the team at Utah State University conducted the  
21 Visitor Use Study for the CWC. However, there were some issues, and it was revised to include  
22 recreational data such as the ski resort data. Originally, it followed only the Forest Service process,  
23 which utilized customer surveys at trailheads and campgrounds. That was expanded somewhat to  
24 include the recreational data. The final report still had some holes, and in his view, it is not totally  
25 adequate. He explained that there is a desire to have a better understanding of the canyon users.

26  
27 Mr. Knoblock noted that since the early days of the Mountain Accord, there has been a push for a  
28 visitor capacity study. Visitor capacity is nuanced, because the number of people that can fit in the  
29 ski areas is different than the number of people that can fit in Silver Lake. There are variables to  
30 consider when it comes to capacity. It is possible to work with partners and continue to look into this.

31  
32 As for the baseline data gathering effort that has been underway, some numbers have been obtained,  
33 but there needs to be documentation to show where the numbers came from. Mr. Knoblock explained  
34 that this will make it possible to gather information in the future and have accurate comparisons.

35  
36 **g. Canyons Trust Fund Concept.**

37  
38 John Adams reported that the Economy System Committee has been working on a list of funding  
39 needs in the canyons. During the canyon funding needs discussion, it was determined that there  
40 should be estimated dollar amounts added to the list. Committee Members decided that it would  
41 make sense to receive feedback from the CWC Board before the work continued. The idea of a  
42 Cottonwood Canyons Trust was considered as a way to dedicate resources back to the canyons and  
43 potentially fund some of the needs identified. Mr. Adams discussed the trust at a recent  
44 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting and there was some positive feedback received. The  
45 Committee Members determined that the idea of a trust would be brought to the full CWC Board.

1 There has not been a discussion about how a trust could be set up. At this point, the focus has been  
2 on why there is a need for one. Mr. Adams stated that he related this proposal to what has been done  
3 with the Great Salt Lake Watershed Enhancement Trust, which was reactionary rather than proactive.  
4

5 Ms. Kilpack thanked Council Members for the work done over the last year. The items discussed are  
6 significant. She appreciates the efforts that have been made by the Stakeholders Council.  
7

### 8 **Stakeholders Council Initiatives Brainstorm**

#### 9 10 1. **Committees of the Stakeholders Council will Discuss Possible Initiatives for the Coming** 11 **Year:**

12  
13 a. **What are the needs of the Central Wasatch that the Stakeholders Council could**  
14 **help meet?**

15  
16 b. **What tools and resources can the Stakeholders Council leverage to meet those**  
17 **needs? Feel free to ask questions of Staff as you discuss.**

18  
19 c. **Looking back at the past year’s accomplishments, the needs of the Central**  
20 **Wasatch, and the scope of the Stakeholders Council’s work, what efforts might**  
21 **be the most productive use of the Stakeholders Council’s time, energy, and**  
22 **resources?**

23  
24 d. **Which Stakeholders Council committee(s) would be the best positioned to lead**  
25 **these efforts?**

26  
27 Chair Hahnenberger explained that there will be approximately 15 minutes allocated for the initiatives  
28 brainstorming discussion. There will be table discussions where Council Members will reflect on the  
29 past accomplishments and consider what the Stakeholders Council can contribute in the year ahead.  
30

31 The 2025 Stakeholders Council Retrospective highlighted the different ways the Council has been  
32 effective. Chair Hahnenberger asked Council Members to think about both reactionary and proactive  
33 actions that can be taken. As an example, the letter written about the proposed Solitude parking lot  
34 was reactionary. On the other hand, the Cottonwood Canyons Trust idea is something proactive. She  
35 acknowledged that Council Members have limited time available, so it is important to think about  
36 where there is a desire to focus efforts in the next year. She stated that it is necessary to prioritize.  
37

38 Mr. Adams asked if there are items that were not accomplished last year that could be focused on in  
39 2026 from a Staff or CWC Board perspective. He noted that there was a decision made to refocus on  
40 the CWNCRRA, but he is not sure whether Stakeholders Council input is needed for that at this point.  
41 Before there is a prioritization discussion, it might be beneficial to know if there is anything specific  
42 from the perspective of Staff or the CWC Board. Ms. Nielsen did not have any suggestions. However,  
43 when it is time for the Council to assist with the CWNCRRA work, that will be communicated.  
44

45 Ms. Kilpack shared information about the initiatives brainstorming discussion process. She reported  
46 that Council Members will be broken out into tables. Approximately 10 minutes will be spent  
47 discussing the first few questions. The tables will be mixed up and the final questions will be  
48 discussed with a different group of Council Members. Online participants will work as one group.

1 Ms. Kilpack suggested that Council Members make notes and capture some of the ideas that are  
2 generated. Council Members broke out into groups to discuss the questions included in the agenda.

3  
4 After the initiatives brainstorming discussion, several Council Members summarized the comments  
5 made. Chair Hahnenberger shared some of the takeaways from the discussions that she participated  
6 in. There was recognition that the Stakeholders Council does not have the power to move a lot of  
7 items forward. If there is a desire to focus on actions that require cooperation with other  
8 organizations, there need to be stronger relationships in place. There has been frustration when there  
9 are strong ideas, but nothing moves forward. This could be avoided by creating stronger relationships.

10  
11 Sarah Bennett explained that her table had a similar discussion and noted that the Stakeholders  
12 Council has a limited amount of power and resources. There was a comment made about how to  
13 leverage personal resources within the community. In addition, there is a desire to collect more data.  
14 There is frustration that a lot of time is spent on an idea, but action is not taken at the CWC Board  
15 level. The discussion focused on how to prevent that from happening in the future. There needs to  
16 be more outreach to the decision makers to avoid wasting time on an idea there is not support for.

17  
18 Ms. Cameron summarized the group discussions that she participated in. There were Council  
19 Member conversations about finding sources for buses and carpool transportation outside of Utah  
20 Transit Authority (“UTA”). For instance, there could be outreach to private companies and a list  
21 created of the different options that exist. She also stated that there is a need to plant wildflower seeds  
22 instead of only planting grass seeds. Rocky Mountain Power has created bare spots all over, so it  
23 would be possible to plant some wildflower seeds in those locations. There was a suggestion made  
24 for Salt Lake County officials to be involved in the CWC. There is also a need to foster relationships  
25 with Legislators and learn more about the Great Salt Lake Watershed Enhancement Trust.

26  
27 There was discussion about coordination between the different Stakeholders Council subcommittees.  
28 There could be a subcommittee that is focused on raising money, gathering funds, and finding the  
29 resources that are needed to move forward different ideas. Olivia Juarez summarized the discussion  
30 had by the online participants. She reported that there was a discussion about the Stakeholders  
31 Council potentially reorganizing a bit to advance the next round of CWCRA talks. It might be  
32 possible to bring together diverse perspectives from the subcommittees to move this forward in a way  
33 that is additive to the process but is not in the way of the other CWCRA talks that are happening.

34  
35 Chair Hahnenberger reported that CWC Staff will collect the notes that were taken and the different  
36 brainstorming items will be considered. She expressed support for coordination between the  
37 Stakeholders Council subcommittees. This is something that she will follow up on in the future.

### 38 39 **Letter to the Board Regarding Transit in Little Cottonwood Canyon**

#### 40 41 **1. Council Members will Discuss a Letter to the CWC Board Brought by Kurt** 42 **Hegmann Regarding Transit in Little Cottonwood Canyon.**

43  
44 Chair Hahnenberger reported that there is a Stakeholders Council Recommendation to the CWC  
45 Board letter included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It has to do with Little Cottonwood Canyon  
46 transportation solutions. Mr. Hegmann explained that when it comes to transportation in Little  
47 Cottonwood Canyon, there has not been a decision made by the CWC about an appropriate solution.

1 The issue with indecision is that it becomes a decision. The intention of the letter is to push for  
2 enhanced buses in the canyon at the earliest date possible. Some of the language is as follows:

- 3
- 4 • Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Central Wasatch Commission’s Stakeholders Council  
5 does hereby respectfully request that the Central Wasatch Commission:
  - 6 ○ Revisit and reevaluate the “Pillars for Transportation Solutions;”
  - 7 ○ Encourage the immediate implementation of enhanced busing to help mitigate traffic  
8 problems;
  - 9 ○ Oppose the proposed gondola;
  - 10 ○ Reopen analyses and if there is a needed consideration of potential transportation  
11 solutions within Little Cottonwood Canyon beyond enhanced busing, including a  
12 balanced analysis of cog rail considering utilization of the existing, original railbed.
- 13

14 Mr. Hegmann shared comments about the rail alternative and the benefit of having multiple exit  
15 points. This is a durable solution and is also the greenest option. He clarified that the letter does not  
16 state that rail should be the chosen option, but it is an appropriate time for sequencing to be mentioned  
17 to the CWC Board. Mr. Adams asked what started this conversation at the Transportation System  
18 Committee level. Mr. Hegmann clarified that there have been discussions about transportation  
19 alternatives for some time. Mr. Adams heard some announcements for Little Cottonwood Canyon  
20 earlier in the day, with 10-to-15-minute headways and bus stops designed to handle more people at  
21 Alta and Snowbird. It seems there are some transportation solutions that are moving forward.

22

23 There was discussion about bus capacity limitations. Mr. Knoblock reported that he did some math  
24 on the buses based on the schedule. Given what UTA has said in the past about bus headways, it  
25 would be possible to move approximately 15% of canyon visitors on buses. This highlights the need  
26 for solutions beyond enhanced buses, which could include carpooling and other solutions.

27

28 Doug Tolman acknowledged the recent announcements made about transportation in Little  
29 Cottonwood Canyon. This might change the tone of the letter that has been proposed by Council  
30 Members. That being said, it is still an interesting idea to reevaluate the “Pillars for Transportation  
31 Solutions” document. He would feel comfortable voting on a resolution that encourages reevaluating  
32 the document. In light of the announcement made by the Utah Department of Transportation  
33 (“UDOT”) and an overall lack of consensus, he is not certain that anything related to a rail initiative  
34 is appropriate at this time. Council Members shared comments about express buses to different areas.

35

36 Chair Hahnenberger mentioned the draft comment for the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental  
37 Assessment (“EA”) and noted that it addresses the pillars. It is something that the CWC Board is  
38 currently working on. She asked CWC Staff to share information about the draft public comment.

39

40 Ms. Nielsen reported that there are two public comment periods open for the Big Cottonwood Canyon  
41 EA. One is with the Forest Service and the other is with UDOT. Both are accepting comments related  
42 to the Big Cottonwood Canyon EA that was released. CWC Staff drafted a comment for the  
43 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee to review at their last meeting. Essentially, the proposed actions  
44 in the EA are consistent with the approved recommendations the CWC released in the Big  
45 Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) in 2023. She created a side-by-side  
46 comparison of the proposed actions in the Big Cottonwood Canyon EA and BCC MAP. This is  
47 accessible on the Utah Public Notice website, but can also be shared with Council Members.

1  
2 Ms. Nielsen reiterated that the proposed actions in the Big Cottonwood Canyon EA are consistent  
3 with the actions in the BCC MAP. As a result, the public comment largely focuses on the  
4 environmental impacts incurred by these needed transportation and transit improvements. She noted  
5 that transportation and transit improvements should be done in tandem with protections to the land  
6 and water resources in the canyons. Ms. Nielsen explained that the comment also mentions the release  
7 of the “Pillars for Transportation Solutions” document. It is possible for Council Members to review  
8 the draft version of the public comment, but there were some edits provided at the  
9 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting, so the public comment will change to include those.  
10 The CWC Board will have a chance to review and vote on the comment on January 12, 2026.

11  
12 Chair Hahnenberger explained that there are a few different options for the letter that has been  
13 presented to the Stakeholders Council. Someone could make a motion to vote on the letter, but in  
14 light of recent events, another option is to pause this discussion and not bring the letter forward for a  
15 vote at this time. She pointed out that it could be brought forward in the future. Mr. Hegmann stated  
16 that he would like to make a motion to forward the letter to the CWC Board for consideration.

17  
18 Mr. Hegmann made a motion to forward the Little Cottonwood Canyon Transportation Solutions  
19 letter to the CWC Board for consideration. The motion was seconded. Council Members discussed  
20 the motion and the letter. Mr. Knoblock questions some of the assertions in the letter. He would hate  
21 to have information that was factually incorrect in a letter that was forwarded to the CWC Board. He  
22 wanted to know if there was data to prove the following language: “...a cog rail solution, if needed,  
23 has the largest carrying capacity, fastest un/loading abilities, best potential for whistle stops for  
24 dispersed recreation, and potentially seamless tie-in to the airport to produce the optimal potential to  
25 reduce the need for rental cars.” Mr. Hegmann reported that for the gondola, there have been  
26 comments made about the capacity to move 5,000 or 6,000 people per hour, but most of the models  
27 out there are closer to 1,500 or 2,000. Mr. Knoblock stated that a gondola has continuous loading, so  
28 he is unsure whether the statement about the cog rail solution is accurate. There was discussion about  
29 capacity and different areas in the world that have either a rail solution or aerial solution in place.

30  
31 Mr. Knoblock explained that he would be more comfortable with a letter that acknowledged that a lot  
32 of time has passed since the “Pillars for Transportation Solutions” document was written. There has  
33 been work done by agencies and there has been significant discussion from members of the public.  
34 It now makes sense to revise the document. Mr. Marshall believed it was important to ask the CWC  
35 Board to revise the document. One way to oppose the gondola is to propose an alternative.

36  
37 Council Members further discussed the different transit alternatives and the letter that has been  
38 presented. Chair Hahnenberger explained that if there is a need to have additional discussion or to  
39 consider edits to the letter, it would make sense to table this item and bring it back at a future meeting.  
40 Mr. Marshall pointed out that the next meeting is several months away and there is a motion that has  
41 been made and seconded. As a result, it is appropriate to take a vote on the letter. Mr. Draper asked  
42 if there was an amendment made to remove the language related to the cog rail alternative. This was  
43 denied. Currently, the motion is to vote on the letter as it has been drafted and presented.

44  
45 Mr. Tolman shared some clarification for those who are not on the Transportation System Committee.  
46 The idea of letter was discussed at the Committee level and a motion was made to make a  
47 recommendation to the Stakeholders Council. However, after that motion was made, the letter was  
48 not reviewed by the Transportation System Committee. After reading the letter, he is not comfortable

1 with all of the language. He would like the letter to be returned to the Transportation System  
2 Committee so the language can be finalized before it is brought to the Stakeholders Council for a  
3 vote. Mr. Tolman understands that a motion has been made, but feels that context is necessary.

4  
5 Mr. Hegmann reported that the letter was drafted based on the CWC Staff notes that were taken during  
6 the Transportation System Committee Meeting. Mr. Knoblock asked if it would be possible to tweak  
7 the language and handle the approval process offline since there is a lot of time between Stakeholders  
8 Council Meetings. Ms. Kilpack explained that it is possible to schedule an emergency meeting to  
9 further discuss this before the CWC Board Meeting that will take place on January 12, 2026.

10  
11 Mr. Tolman mentioned the UDOT changes that were announced. As far as the letter is concerned, he  
12 suggested that there be more time taken to build consensus before something is voted on by the  
13 Council. Mr. Tolman made a motion to return the Little Cottonwood Canyon Transportation  
14 Solutions Letter to the Transportation System Committee for further review. Shauna Hart seconded  
15 the motion. There was discussion about the motion before a vote was taken. Ms. Niesen informed  
16 Council Members that it is possible to attend the next Transportation System Committee Meeting and  
17 provide input.

18  
19 **2. (Action) Council Members will Vote on Whether to Present the Letter to the**  
20 **CWC Board.**

21  
22 **MOTION:** Doug Tolman moved to TABLE the Little Cottonwood Canyon Transportation Solutions  
23 Letter and RETURN it to the Transportation System Committee for further review. Shauna Hart  
24 seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Barbara Cameron – No; Craig Williams – No; Dani Poirier –  
25 Yes; Del Draper – Yes; Dennis Goreham – No; Doug Tolman – Yes; Ed Marshall – No; John Adams  
26 – Yes; John Knoblock – Yes; Jonny Vasic – Yes; Kelly Boardman – Yes; Kim Doyle – No; Kurt  
27 Hegmann – No; Mark Baer – No; Maura Hahnenberger – Yes; Olivia Juarez – Yes; Patrick Morrison  
28 – Abstain; Roger Borgenicht – Yes; Sally Kaiser – Yes; Sarah Bennett – Yes; Shauna Hart – Yes.  
29 The motion passed with a vote of 13 in favor, seven opposed, and one abstention.

30  
31 Chair Hahnenberger reported that based on the vote, the letter will return to the Transportation System  
32 Committee. As previously stated, it is possible to provide additional input to the Committee.

33  
34 **Council Administration**

35  
36 **1. Stakeholders May Switch or Join Additional System Committees:**

37  
38 **a. Millcreek Canyon Committee.**

39  
40 There were no additional requests to join the Millcreek Canyon Committee.

41  
42 **b. Environment System Committee.**

43  
44 There were no additional requests to join the Environment System Committee.

1           c.       **Transportation System Committee.**

2  
3                   i.       **Shauna Hart.**

4  
5 It was noted that Ms. Hart will officially join the Transportation System Committee.

6  
7           d.       **Recreation System Committee.**

8  
9 There were no additional requests to join the Recreation System Committee.

10  
11          e.       **Economy System Committee.**

12  
13                   i.       **Scott Hotaling.**

14  
15 It was noted that Scott Hotaling is not present at the Stakeholders Council Meeting, but previously  
16 expressed interest in joining the Economy System Committee. There were no other additions made.

17  
18 **Next Steps**

19  
20 **1.       **The Council will Review any Interim Action Items and System Committee Work to be****  
21 **done after this meeting.**

22  
23 Chair Hahnenberger asked that items from the initiatives brainstorming discussion be brought to the  
24 Stakeholders Council subcommittees. She offered to look into coordination between the different  
25 subcommittees. That could involve a meeting of the subcommittee Chairs or something similar.

26  
27 **Staff Announcements**

28  
29 **1.       **The Central Wasatch Symposium is on January 8 and 9, 2026.****

30  
31 Ms. Kilpack reported that the Central Wasatch Symposium will be held on January 8 and 9, 2026. It  
32 will take place in Millcreek City Hall. She encouraged Council Members to attend the event.

33  
34 **2.       **New CWC Staff.****

35  
36 There is a new member of CWC Staff. The new Communications Director is Will McKay.  
37 Mr. McKay reported that he is originally from Iowa but completed his undergrad in Colorado. He  
38 moved to Utah to work with Utah Mountain Adventures, which he did until 2023. After that, he  
39 transitioned to the Utah Division of Emergency Management. Mr. McKay previously served on the  
40 Board of the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance and is now working as CWC Staff as the  
41 Communications Director.

42  
43 **3.       **CWC Youth Council Announcements.****

44  
45 Mr. McKay shared information about the CWC Youth Council. He reported that there will be a shift  
46 to officer roles, and there have been discussions about pursuing a Youth Symposium. In 2026, there  
47 will be discussions about the development of a plan for a west side shuttle. He explained that this  
48 shuttle would take people from the west side of the valley to the mountains. This is something that

1 could potentially be implemented in 2027. There is a lot of work happening at the CWC Youth  
2 Council level. Ms. Nielsen reported that the CWC Youth Council is beneficial and creates  
3 opportunities for members to meet the leaders of different jurisdictions and work on specific projects.

4  
5 **4. The Next Stakeholders Council Meeting will be on March 4, 2026.**

6  
7 It was reported that the next Stakeholders Council Meeting will take place on March 4, 2026.

8  
9 **Stakeholders Open Comment**

10  
11 There were no additional comments.

12  
13 **Closing**

14  
15 **1. Chair Hahnenberger will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Stakeholders' Council**  
16 **Meeting.**

17  
18 **MOTION:** [REDACTED] moved to ADJOURN the Stakeholders Council Meeting. [REDACTED]  
19 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

20  
21 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting held on Wednesday, December 17, 2025.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_