



1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
4 **COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD MONDAY,**
5 **MAY 11, 2026, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND**
6 **VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS AT THE CWC OFFICES**
7 **LOCATED IN THE BRIGHTON BANK BUILDING, 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE**
8 **330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**
9

10 **Present:** Danny Richardson, Chair
11 Mark Baer
12 Doug Tolman
13 Faith Scheffler
14 Roger Borgenicht
15 Dani Porier
16 Sally Kaiser
17 Andrew Gruber
18

19 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
20 Sam Kilpack, Director of Operations
21 Will McKay, Communications Director
22

23 **OPENING**
24

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

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

31 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the March 9, 2026, Meeting.**
32

33 Chair Richardson reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the March 9, 2026, Transportation System
34 Committee Meeting. At the last meeting, there was a discussion about the Millcreek Canyon shuttle.
35 It was also noted that the CWC submitted a public comment in opposition to the proposed gravel pit
36 in Parleys Canyon. There were discussions about signage and parking in the canyons as well. In
37 addition, the Transportation System Committee decided to meet every other month.
38

39 **MOTION:** Roger Borgenicht moved to APPROVE the Minutes from March 9, 2026. Mark Baer
40 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
41

1 **UNIVERSITY OF UTAH ENGINEERING PROJECT**

2
3 1. **Chair Richardson will discuss a Project by University of Utah Engineering Students**
4 **Researching Transportation Options in the Canyons.**
5

6 Chair Richardson shared information about a recent presentation at the University of Utah. There
7 was a senior project done by Civil and Environmental Engineering students with a presentation held
8 in April. The students examined possible transportation solutions and provided cost estimates for
9 snowsheds, roads, and other related items. There was work done with Devin Weder from the Utah
10 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). Chair Richardson reported that there were three groups
11 consisting of the Environmental Group, Intelligent Transportation Systems Group, and Structures
12 Group. Director of Operations, Sam Kilpack, shared presentation photos with members of the
13 Committee.

14
15 The Environmental Group identified the main problems: severe congestion and unreliable travel.
16 Additionally, it was noted that there are safety concerns regarding drivers, transit users, and canyon
17 recreationists. High environmental sensitivity must also be taken into consideration. The goal of the
18 Environmental Group was to share a sustainable, multi-modal solution that improves mobility while
19 minimizing environmental impacts. Their recommended alternative was an intelligent transportation
20 system (“ITS”) and buses. According to the University of Utah students, the ITS and buses would
21 reduce congestion and travel time, improve safety by reducing the number of vehicles on the road,
22 cut emissions by 47% compared to the current conditions, minimize environmental disturbances, and
23 support multi-modal and equitable transportation. The students found that this alternative aligns with
24 the shareholder priorities and offers long-term sustainability.
25

26 The Intelligent Transportation Systems Group focused on support systems, including progressive
27 tolling with varying rates (rates that shift based on the time of day and time of week) and intelligent
28 system integration. The goal is to reduce the number of vehicle trips with a “know before you go”
29 strategy. Cameras located at the Alta and Snowbird parking lots are encouraged so the number of
30 available parking spaces are known before someone enters the canyon. Students shared examples
31 from other areas. Chair Richardson stated that the group suggested parking lot monitors. This would
32 let visitors know how many parking spaces were available in a monitored area. Doug Tolman asked
33 if the \$51,000 cost listed would cover the capital investment, which was confirmed.
34

35 Chair Richardson reported that the Intelligent Transportation Systems Group recommended increased
36 bus operations, specifically Option B in the presentation materials. In addition, there is a
37 recommendation for GPS bus locators and a winter-ready chain policy. This particular group
38 encouraged bus ridership through various incentives, such as bus scheduling and traffic priority. The
39 group also encouraged disincentives, such as tolling. Discussions were had about the tolling
40 statements. Chair Richardson reiterated that examples from other areas were used in this project. The
41 intention is to encourage bus ridership and carpooling. There was a smart tollbooth proposed as well
42 as a flex bus lane. Chair Richardson shared an image with the Committee for reference. He offered
43 to reach out to the department so the full charts can be shared with the Committee.
44

45 Additional information from the presentation was shared. The students expressed a desire to build a
46 flex bus lane. Thousands of skiers and snowboarders enter the canyon, but there is no room or desire
47 to expand the canyon road into multiple lanes. There are limited parking stalls at Alta and Snowbird
48 and the bus service is unreliable due to traffic delays and cutbacks. The flex bus solution is one way

1 to address the existing issues. The bus lane would primarily be on the south side of the road until
2 right below Snowbird. The idea is to then have a crossover. From Snowbird to Alta, the bus lane
3 would be located on the north side. The University of Utah students also considered a quick
4 turnaround in Snowbird and Alta so the buses are not fighting with personal vehicle traffic. To
5 prevent lane hopping, there would be a six-inch concrete barrier in the middle of the road. In the
6 summer, it is proposed that the designated bus lane would be used as a bicycle lane.

7
8 The Structures Group recommended avalanche snowsheds to be installed at three of the 64 identified
9 slide paths, including White Pine Chutes 1-4, White Pine, and Little Pine. The student presentation
10 included diagrams and pricing information. There are also soil nail retaining walls proposed to
11 stabilize the hillside. Chair Richardson explained that the student project had detailed and carefully
12 thought-out ideas that focused on potential transportation solutions. The students concluded that the
13 best solution would be controlled and smartly regulated automobile traffic, with an emphasis on the
14 smart use of buses and an overall better bus transit system with a flex bus lane.

15
16 Mark Baer asked how Chair Richardson first heard about the student project and presentation. Chair
17 Richardson reported that John Adams shared information about the Capstone Project at the
18 Stakeholders Council level. Dani Poirier pointed out that Canyon Guard was working with this
19 student group. She encouraged Committee Members to subscribe to the Canyon Guard emails.

20
21 Roger Borgenicht asked if there was a reason the students did not propose the flex bus all the way
22 from the gravel pit. Chair Richardson was not certain. The Transportation System Committee further
23 discussed the recommendations from the University of Utah students. Chair Richardson clarified that
24 there was not a formal presentation made, but the three groups shared information. He offered to
25 reach out and see if it is possible to obtain additional information from the students. Mr. Tolman
26 asked if the report created by the students had been published online at this point. Chair Richardson
27 was not certain, but reiterated that he would reach out for additional details.

28
29 Mr. Tolman appreciated that the Transportation System Committee was informed about the student
30 work. He asked if there is a strategic role the Committee might have in supporting the
31 recommendations. Chair Richardson reported that this information could be included in the
32 Stakeholders Council letter to the CWC Board. Committee Members discussed current conditions in
33 the canyon and what was envisioned by the university students. Mr. Tolman pointed out that many
34 of the items proposed by the students appear to be better versions of the Phase II items identified in
35 the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).

36
37 Chair Richardson asked about a letter from the Stakeholders Council that might be forwarded to the
38 CWC Board. Ms. Kilpack reported that Council Members will vote on the letter at the next
39 Stakeholders Council Meeting. She asked that additional feedback on the letter be submitted.

40 41 **COMMITTEE UPDATES**

42 43 **1. The Committee will Share Updates on Any of the Following Topics:**

44 45 **a. Enhanced Bus Service.**

46
47 Chair Richardson reported that UDOT has mentioned enhanced buses, but he does not know if that
48 means funding Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) or running a separate system. If there was a separate

1 system, there would need to be coordination with UTA. Mr. Tolman understands that UDOT will be
2 running or contracting buses during the winter of 2028/2029 at a modest frequency in both Big
3 Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon, but this is not confirmed.

4
5 Mr. Tolman reported that the Big Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Assessment (“EA”) states that
6 if the proposed action is selected, procuring buses could begin in early 2027 and be completed by
7 2030. Chair Richardson referenced an article that talked about the need for buses in the canyon.

8
9 **b. Shuttle Service from the Transit Hub.**

10
11 There was no new information shared about shuttle service from the transit hub.

12
13 **c. Rideshare.**

14
15 Chair Richardson reported that there are approximately 100 vanpools through UTA. He noted that
16 the rideshare seems to be working well. It is meaningful that there are many different vanpools
17 available. Mr. Borgenicht asked if vanpools were addressed in the University of Utah student project
18 that was discussed earlier, which was denied. He pointed out that it would make sense for vanpools
19 to use the proposed bus lane as long as the vanpool met a minimum number of seats.

20
21 **d. Millcreek Canyon Shuttle Concept.**

22
23 Ms. Poirier reported that she will have information about the shuttle to share at the next Transportation
24 System Committee Meeting. There will be data about ridership days, recreation types, and passes.
25 The intention is for the winter pilot program to run for at least three years.

26
27 **e. Capacity Study.**

28
29 Chair Richardson believed some of the road capacity numbers that are available come from the
30 Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”). He asked if the WFRC supplies UDOT with certain
31 information. Executive Director of WFRC, Andrew Gruber, introduced himself to the Transportation
32 System Committee. He believed the question was whether WFRC supplies UDOT with the roadway
33 capacity numbers for the canyon roads. It was clarified that WFRC is a planning organization. There
34 are industry rules of thumb that are used to determine the assumed capacity of certain types of transit,
35 roadway, and trail facilities. While those numbers can be utilized in planning decision making, the
36 numbers are not the same as detailed engineering of a particular roadway, trail, or transit facility.
37 Chair Richardson thanked him for providing that clarification.

38
39 It was noted that in the UDOT Little Cottonwood EIS, the goal is based on the 30th-highest hourly
40 traffic volume. The carrying capacity is distilled down to a level of service (“LOS”) grade. In the
41 EIS, there are extensive numbers and charts related to the LOS. It is interesting information to
42 consider. Chair Richardson noted that there is limited information on trails, but that could be because
43 the U.S. Forest Service information was not as easily accessible. He next discussed ski area
44 management and comfortable carrying capacity (“CCC”). As an example, in Park City, the lift
45 capacity was only part of the CCC calculation. Chair Richardson pointed out that in Snowbird and
46 Alta, there is lodging as well as day users. The CCC considers more than lifts.

1 Mr. Tolman reported that at the last CWC Board Meeting, there was a decision made to establish a
2 subcommittee that will focus on a potential capacity study. He asked CWC Staff to share additional
3 information. Ms. Kilpack confirmed that a subcommittee has been formed to determine how a
4 capacity study might happen and what the study might look like. The first meeting is scheduled in
5 June, and it is possible for Transportation System Committee Members to listen in.

6
7 Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that the first meeting is scheduled for June 8, 2026.
8 There were a number of CWC Board Members who expressed interest in participating on the
9 subcommittee, including Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Mayor Roger Bourke, Mayor Monica Zoltanski,
10 and Commissioner Emily Gray. The first meeting in June will set the goals, purpose, and scope.

11
12 Mr. Tolman asked to Mr. Gruber to update the Transportation System Committee about the Regional
13 Transportation Plan draft. Mr. Gruber reported that he spoke to Ms. Nielsen and Mayor Mendenhall
14 recently about the Regional Transportation Plan. Both thought it would be productive to attend a
15 Transportation System Committee Meeting and share information. WFRC leads the development of
16 the Regional Transportation Plan, but it is done in collaboration with cities, counties, UTA, UDOT,
17 community stakeholders, and others. The plan sets out a vision for the transportation system in the
18 Wasatch Front for the next 30 years. This includes roadway, transit, and trail projects all over the
19 region. Recently, there was an updated draft of the plan released for public comment. There have
20 been a lot of comments about Little Cottonwood Canyon, with many of the comments stating that
21 there is no desire to see the gondola alternative move forward.

22
23 Mr. Gruber discussed how the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS relates to the Regional
24 Transportation Plan. The planning process is somewhat general in nature. When a project actually
25 moves forward, there is much more detail determined. He explained that an EIS process involves a
26 lot of analysis and public engagement. Once an EIS is completed, the WFRC, as a metropolitan
27 planning organization, is required to include the results in the Regional Transportation Plan.

28
29 The last time the Regional Transportation Plan was voted on by the organization in 2023, the EIS was
30 included. At that time, there was also a policy statement adopted, which stated that there was support
31 for a phased approach in Little Cottonwood Canyon. There was a lot of public feedback, and UDOT
32 ultimately modified their approach to call for phases. Mr. Gruber explained that the next time the
33 WFRC will take action on the Regional Transportation Plan is in 2027, because this is done every
34 four years. There is a lot of work and engagement that occurs during those four years, but the next
35 vote on the Regional Transportation Plan will not occur until 2027.

36
37 Mr. Baer asked for additional information about WFRC. Mr. Gruber explained that WFRC is a public
38 agency and a metropolitan planning organization. The intention is to bring together transportation
39 stakeholders to develop the long-range Regional Transportation Plan. It considers community growth
40 and travel demand. WFRC works with various stakeholders to create the Regional Transportation
41 Plan, which then becomes the blueprint for transportation development in the decades to come.
42 Within the plan, needed projects are identified, as well as the projected revenues available to fund the
43 outlined projects. Mr. Gruber explained that their discretion is limited in certain circumstances, such
44 as when there is a federally recognized EIS process.

45
46 Additional discussions were had about the role of the WFRC and the structure that is in place.
47 Mr. Gruber explained that regionally significant transportation projects cannot move forward unless
48 they are included in the metropolitan planning organization's adopted Regional Transportation Plan.

1
2 Ms. Poirier thanked Mr. Gruber for providing clarifying information. There have been a lot of
3 questions in the community since the WFRC is the only voting body that has a gondola component.
4 She acknowledged that there has been some confusion about the upcoming meeting, but there has
5 been communication to clarify that the vote will not take place on that date. Mr. Gruber thanked her
6 for working to address the confusion. He noted that the WFRC previously expressed a desire for
7 Phase I and Phase II to be implemented and evaluated before moving onto Phase III, but there is no
8 criterion in place. He is not certain how UDOT would evaluate the different phases. Chair
9 Richardson thanked Mr. Gruber for attending the Transportation System Committee Meeting.

10
11 **f. Funding Sources Outside UTA.**

12
13 There was no new information shared about funding sources outside of UTA.

14
15 **g. Parking/Traffic Challenges in the Canyons.**

16
17 There was no new information shared about parking and traffic challenges in the canyons.

18
19 **h. Trailhead Access.**

20
21 There was no new information shared about trailhead access.

22
23 **MILLCREEK CANYON ISSUES**

24
25 **1. The Committee will discuss other Transportation Issues Pertinent to Millcreek Canyon.**

26
27 The above item was not discussed.

28
29 **NEW COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP**

30
31 **1. The Committee will discuss the Appointment of a New Chair at the Upcoming June**
32 **Stakeholders Council Meeting.**

33
34 Chair Richardson explained that there needs to be a new Chair appointed to the Transportation System
35 Committee. Ms. Kilpack thanked Chair Richardson for serving two terms in a row. Per the
36 Stakeholders Council rules and procedures, two is the maximum number of consecutive terms that a
37 subcommittee Chair can serve. As a result, there will need to be a new Chair selected. If the new
38 Chair would like to appoint a Co-Chair, a Co-Chair will also need to be selected.

39
40 It was noted that Mr. Baer has expressed an interest in serving as Chair of the Transportation System
41 Committee. Other interested Committee Members can let CWC Staff know. The appointment will
42 be confirmed at the Stakeholders Council Meeting on June 3, 2026. Mr. Baer stated that he is willing
43 to serve as Chair unless there is someone else who would like to take on that role. Committee
44 Members expressed support for Mr. Baer serving as Chair of the Committee.

1 **MEETING RECAP AND NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

2
3 1. **The Committee will review any Action Items that have been Decided Upon for the Next**
4 **Meeting.**

5
6 2. **The Committee will Discuss Topics for the Next Meeting Agenda.**

7
8 Mr. Baer reported that there is interest in modifying the traction law. Before Gay Lynn Bennion
9 became the Mayor of Cottonwood Heights, she proposed amendments to the traction law, which
10 included infraction enforcement. He mentioned the rental car companies and the issues related to
11 traction law compliance. Mr. Baer stated that traction law amendments would make a lot of sense.
12 There can be additional information shared with Committee Members after the meeting.

13
14 Ms. Nielsen thanked Chair Richardson for his time serving as Chair of the Transportation System
15 Committee. Ms. Kilpack took a moment to introduce Faith Scheffler to the committee members.

16
17 **OTHER ITEMS**

18
19 There were no additional items discussed.

20
21 **CLOSING**

22
23 1. **Chair Richardson will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Transportation System**
24 **Committee Meeting.**

25
26 **MOTION:** Danny Richardson moved to ADJOURN. Faith Scheffler seconded the motion. The
27 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

28
29
30 The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Transportation System Committee Meeting held Monday, May 11, 2026.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____