

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL**
2 **MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2019 AT 4:00 P.M., PROMISE ROOM, 3330**
3 **SOUTH 1300 EAST, MILLCREEK, UT 84106**
4

5 **Present:** Greg Summerhays-Chair, Kelly Bricker, Sarah Bennett, Kirk Nichols, Brian
6 Hutchinson, Will McCarvill, Matt Kirkegaard, Jan Striefel, Carl Fisher, Mike
7 Maughan, Serena Anderson, Troy Morgan (via telephone), Dan Knopp, Megan
8 Nelson (via telephone), Nathan Rafferty, Del Draper, John Knoblock, Randy
9 Doyle, Michael Braun, Paul Diegel, Annalee Munsey, Pat Shea, Stetson West,
10 Bill Malone, Dave Fields, Don Despain, Kurt Hegmann, Michael Marker,
11 Deputy Director Jesse Dean, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, CWC
12 Attorney Shane Topham
13

14 **Alternates:** Tom Diegel (David Carroll), Wayne Crawford (Pauline Crawford)

15
16 **Excused:** Steve Issowits, Dave Fields, Barbara Cameron, Julia Geisler, Ed Marshall,
17 Executive Director, Ralph Becker
18

19 **A. OPENING**
20

- 21 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
22 **Council.**
23

24 Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays called the meeting to
25 order at 4:09 p.m.
26

- 27 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
28 **Wednesday, March 20, 2019.**
29

30 The minutes were reviewed and modified. A question was raised about the terms of members as
31 noted in the minutes. CWC attorney Shane Topham stated that the interlocal agreement creating the
32 CWC, which is the CWC's base governing document, requires the Stakeholder Council's initial
33 members to be equally appointed to initial terms of either two years or four years.

34 **MOTION:** Annalee Munsey moved to approve the minutes of Wednesday, March 20, 2019. Paul
35 Diegel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the council.
36

37 **B. CWC STAFF REPORT AND DISCUSSION**
38

- 39 **i. CWC Deputy Director Jesse Dean will Provide a Brief Overview of CWC**
40 **Activities in March and April.**
41

42 Deputy Director Jesse Dean stated that all members should be receiving the newsletters, which
43 contain the majority of information about what is happening so that it does not have to be reiterated
44 at each meeting.
45

1 **C. UTA CANYONS BUS SERVICE PRESENTATION**

2
3 **i. Presentation and Discussion by UTA Planning Director Laura Hansen on**
4 **Current UTA Bus Service in the Cottonwood Canyons, Including Ridership**
5 **Number and System Constraints.**
6

7 UTA Planning Director Laura Hanson described the impacts of transit service on ski service ridership.
8 UTA Regional Manager Lorin Simpson was also present to discuss UTA’s historical ridership trends
9 in the Cottonwood Canyons over the past 10 years. Changes made, the impact, and lessons learned
10 were shared. Ridership levels from December to April were compared and showed that ridership
11 from December through April 10 years ago was 187,000 compared to nearly 321,000 this year. An
12 upturn was seen in 2016. Prior to that, there were eight routes serving the canyons during ski season.
13 A change was made in 2016 where the eight routes were condensed to three. In addition, buses
14 traveled up the canyon much more frequently and the number of trips was increased by 30% using
15 essentially the same resources.
16

17 Moving forward the goal was to address future needs. It was noted that frequency and all day service
18 had resulted in greater ridership. The constraints were identified as congestion, the red snake, and
19 parking. Possible solutions were discussed, which would significantly increase the number of seats
20 going up and down the canyon on busy days. It typically takes 40 to 50 minutes per trip but on busy
21 days it may take 1 to 2 hours.
22

23 Mike Maughan commented that the line likely follows fairly accurately with the growth in skier
24 visitation in the canyons as well. Mr. Simpson agreed and stated that there is also a strong correlation
25 with snowfall. Possible options were discussed.
26

27 In response to a question raised about the logistics and the average hourly cost to run a UTA bus,
28 Mr. Simpson explained that the average cost per hour is about \$30. That is the net amount since they
29 receive revenue to offset that cost. He clarified that that is the operational cost. Ms. Hanson stated
30 that on average, there is a national transit database that contains operational costs. She offered to
31 make that information available. She stressed the difference between the cost per hour and the cost
32 per mile.
33

34 Mr. Dean asked how the Stakeholders Council can help going forward for the 2019-2020 season.
35 Ms. Hanson stated that they are actively participating in the Transportation Action Plan process. UTA
36 views itself as a service provider who will deliver the desired service. They are looking at short-term
37 solutions as well. Their biggest limitations are vehicles and operators.
38

39 Ms. Hanson stated that they are in the process of working on a program called UTA Service Choices,
40 which will result in a redesign of the bus network across their entire service area. With respect to the
41 redesign of their ski service, they had a coverage based network where the goal was to cover as large
42 of a geographic area as possible. From the data they found that many people used it but not as many
43 as when they focused on a ridership model that involved more frequent service and a shorter distance.
44 Ms. Hanson stated that they are asking the community up front whether they should prioritize
45 ridership or coverage. They have 18 buses that can be deployed. Special features to help improve
46 bus service were described. Ways to reach a balance between ridership and coverage were discussed.
47

1 Pat Shea asked how the UTA board is selected. Ms. Hanson responded that the board selection
2 process changed recently. During the 2018 Legislative Session, SB 136 was put forward and
3 restructured the governance of UTA. They now have a three-member full-time board. One member
4 represents Davis, Weber, and Box Elder Counties; another member represents Salt Lake County; and
5 a third represents Utah and Tooele Counties. It was noted that the Governor made the appointments.
6 Ms. Hanson reported that they also have a nine-member Local Advisory Board comprised of elected
7 officials.

8
9 Ms. Hanson explained that her team and Mr. Simpson's team worked closely to develop a five-year
10 mobility plan that guides all of their service changes for the next several years. The outcome of the
11 Transportation Action Plan and any feedback from the Service Choices Study will form the
12 development of a hybrid plan, which is adopted and updated every two years.

13
14 Will McCarvill asked if the capacity of the buses meets the demand. Ms. Hanson stated that it depends
15 on the frequency. Mr. Simpson explained that anything is possible with the right service design and
16 the incentive to use it. Chair Summerhays was interested in getting feedback from residents about
17 their opinions on ridership versus coverage.

18
19 Del Draper asked if there was any issue with the Stakeholders Council having access to the data
20 regarding the number of skiers at the resorts. Mr. Dean stated that that would be at the discretion of
21 the ski areas who are represented. Nate Rafferty stated that they released one State-wide number.
22 Beyond that they would have ask the ski areas to release that information. Del Draper wanted
23 information on trends and how many skiers are in the two canyons. He did not think that information
24 should be proprietary. Mr. Maughan suggested that the Forest Service be asked to provide it.

25
26 Del Draper suggested that in terms of ridership versus coverage the Council should put an emphasis
27 on ridership over coverage. Michael Braun pointed out that there is no summer service and wondered
28 what would be required to allow buses throughout the year. Ms. Hanson stated that the main issue is
29 funding. Chair Summerhays asked about demand. Mr. Maughan stated that the demand is mid-
30 December through April 7.

31
32 Brian Hutchinson suggested that information be provided on where people live and their daily trips.
33 He was certain that a huge segment of the population would like to have access to the canyons that
34 are not reflected in the data. Mr. Simpson agreed that there is a portion of the population that is not
35 served well. Ms. Hanson commented that transit does not necessarily have to work perfectly for
36 everyone. For example, she has children that have to be picked up and dropped off at certain places
37 at certain times, which would make it complicated for her to utilize transit.

38
39 John Knoblock suggested they calculate how many people the bus can accommodate and how many
40 buses can travel up the canyon. The possibility of having a transit-only lane may encourage ridership.
41 Mr. Simpson stated that it is constrained by budget and dollars.

42
43 Mike Maughan asked what percentage of the 380,000 riders used the fare box. Mr. Simpson recalled
44 that about 30% used the fare box versus a pass. It was clarified that 70% are paid for by the ski areas.
45 Ms. Hanson pointed out that it is important to remember that the sponsored pass only covers the fare.

46
47 Brian Hutchinson commented that buses are large and shuttles are more amenable and provide an
48 alternative solution.

1
2 **MOTION:** Brian Hutchinson moved to create a working group to evaluate the liability of a shuttle
3 system that is a public/private partnership that investigates every aspect discussed today as well as a
4 reservation system. Pat Shea seconded the motion.
5

6 Mr. Dean indicated CWC staff met with UTA recently to discuss shuttle service. John Knoblock
7 noted that the shuttle is something that Millcreek 2012 identified a top priority. Jan Striefel asked if
8 there was any information indicating how many people are desired in the canyon at any given time.
9 That seemed to her to be a significant ridership issue. Brian Hutchinson envisioned a 12-passenger
10 bus-type shuttle rather than UTA buses. Kurt Hegmann asked for clarification on the process. Carl
11 Fisher questioned whether it can be included in the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Action Plan
12 (“CCTAP”) and stressed the importance of evaluating the issues holistically as part of a complex
13 system rather. He would support the motion in specifying that they make sure that shuttle buses are
14 part of the plan. Brian Hutchinson was willing to add that to the motion.
15

16 Michael Braun commented that if the Transportation Action Plan is to include larger parking areas
17 and routing stations for buses, then eventually the shuttle system could also be increased. He
18 suggested that shuttles be considered once the more significant questions are answered. John
19 Knoblock agreed but commented that to date they have not seen shuttle service included in the
20 Transportation Action Plan. Carl Fisher suggested that they simply recommend that the notion of
21 private shuttles servicing specific areas be considered as part of the CCTAP.
22

23 **VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.
24

25 Ms. Hanson thanked the Stakeholders Council for their efforts.
26

27 Matt Kirkegaard asked Ms. Hanson if socioeconomic data was taken into account. Ms. Hanson stated
28 that it is and reported that they conduct an onboard survey every five years where they look at origin,
29 destination, and information. The survey is not focused on the canyon and is system-wide.
30

31 **D. COTTONWOOD CANYONS TRANSPORTATION ACTION PLAN UPDATE**
32

33 **i. CCTAP Project Team will Provide an Overview of April 9 Open House.**
34

35 **ii. CCTAP Plan Draft Alternatives Review Exercise.**
36

37 Frank Pisani identified himself as the Consultant Project Lead for the Transportation Action Plan
38 (“TAP”). The intent of this meeting was to continue the discussion of the CCTAP. An Open House
39 was held the previous Tuesday night. He hoped to engage the group about the concepts and
40 alternatives as well as some of the improvements under the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).
41 Various alternatives were discussed.
42

43 Pat Shea asked if a visitor capacity analysis would be conducted. Mr. Pisani explained that as part of
44 the TAP there is no scope to conduct a Visitor Capacity Study, however, they hope to formalize
45 recommendations for projects or studies that can be included at some point in the future. He pointed
46 out that the scope of the project is to identify transportation alternatives. Pat Shea disagreed and
47 stated that it is not just about transportation and includes protecting the watershed so that it continues

1 to supply 30% of the water in Salt Lake County. Mr. Pisani welcomed those comments as they are
2 related to the proposed alternatives.

3
4 Mr. Shea stated with respect to the EIS process, he has seen it become more and more narrow, which
5 is not what the Advisory Committee is about. It is intended to look at the big picture and set forth
6 what is to be done for the future. In his opinion, the recommendations he would make on the highway
7 are irrelevant. Mr. Pisani stated that one of the alternatives is to take no action.

8
9 John Knoblock commented that Mr. Pisani is hired to do a specific job and should be allowed to do
10 it. He pointed out that Mountain Accord started because the traffic to the ski areas is so bad. The
11 focus should be on what can be done to resolve it.

12
13 Kelly Bricker commented that this is one of many aspects that determine the quality of the experience
14 in the canyon. They should identify what alternative will get them closest to that objective. She felt
15 that was what was missing. She commented that recreational experiences based on season, uses, and
16 types of activities are missing. Jan Striefel stated that it is broader than that and is not just recreational
17 experiences and includes ecological experiences as well. Dr. Bricker agreed and stated that ecological
18 capacity and social aspects are also part of it.

19
20 Carl Fisher remarked that NEPA is an amazing tool for disclosing impacts prior to implementation
21 but it is not a planning tool. His feeling was that they are still in a planning phase.

22
23 **MOTION:** Jan Striefel moved to recommend conducting a carrying capacity study for the canyons.
24 Brian Hutchinson seconded the motion.

25
26 Mike Maughan observed that representatives from the Forest Service were not present and will weigh
27 in the most in terms of capacity. Dr. Bricker stated that they will be part of the task force.

28
29 Bill Malone questioned whether there are resources available to conduct the study. Chair
30 Summerhays indicated that that is something that would have to be determined.

31
32 Jesse Dean stated that a definition of carrying capacity will need to be crafted. Pat Shea suggested
33 that the motion also specify that the study be completed before completion of the EIS. Mike Braun
34 indicated that he has served on the Granite Community Council for the last five years and they have
35 provided funding to the Cottonwood Canyons Foundation and other agencies and brought the
36 discussion back to the issue of carrying capacity. He commented that they are already degrading the
37 canyons. The trails are overused, there is graffiti, and people are breaking trees and starting fires in
38 the wrong places. In terms of carrying capacity, this is the United States of America and he does not
39 want to be prohibited from going up the canyon and exploring U.S. Forest Service Land and hike,
40 climb, and bike. Pat Shea remarked that people can be prohibited from going up the canyons to
41 protect public health and safety. As a result, restrictions can be put in place with regard to access.

42
43 Dr. Bricker thought it was a misnomer to state that a capacity study would result in people being
44 prohibited from using the canyons. It should instead identify social, physical, and ecological issues
45 that need attention. As a result, there may be limits on access. She suggested using the studies that
46 have been completed and the portions that are applicable.

1 Carl Fisher was informed by the Superintendent at Zion National Park that the shuttle system led to
2 unprecedented degradation because it was too efficient. They resolved the traffic problem on the road
3 but the riparian degradation increased dramatically. Mr. Fisher was concerned about the same thing
4 occurring with the EIS.

5
6 Brian Hutchinson reported that he spoke with the Superintendent at the Arches who was pushing for
7 a metering mechanism, which he believed to have value.

8
9 Annalee Munsey was not in favor of putting the EIS on hold to conduct a study. Kirk Nichols stated
10 that the purpose is to get people to the trailheads. He explained that the EIS on the road must be done
11 on the connection. Dr. Bricker questioned what metrics should be used to evaluate the concepts. One
12 of the metrics is what was identified as the recreational capacity of the canyons.

13
14 Bill Malone asked for clarification as to whether it was built into the bond. Mr. Nichols wished it
15 were but commented that it may take a lawsuit to accomplish.

16
17 **VOTE:** The motion passed with 16 votes in favor, eight opposed, and 11 abstentions.

18
19 Mr. Pisani reported that the Open House was a success and heavily attended.

20
21 **E. ENVIRONMENT, RECREATION, ECONOMY AND TRANSPORTATION KEY**
22 **ACTIONS OVERVIEW**

23
24 **i. Presentation and Exercise by CWC Deputy Director Jesse Dean on Mountain**
25 **Accord Key Actions.**

26
27 **F. OPEN DISCUSSION**

28
29 The Council next participated in the Scroll Plot activity.

30
31 **G. ADJOURNMENT**

32
33 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to adjourn. Kelly Bricker seconded the motion. The motion
34 passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

35
36 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council meeting adjourned at approximately
37 6:00 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholder Council meeting held Wednesday, April 17, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____