

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MEETING HELD MONDAY,**  
2 **JUNE 3, 2019 AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL**  
3 **CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD**  
4 **HEIGHTS, UTAH**  
5

6 **Present:** Commissioner Chris McCandless, Commissioner Mike Peterson,  
7 Commissioner Jeff Silvestrini, Commissioner Andy Beerman, Commissioner  
8 Jim Bradley, Commissioner Carlos Braceras, Commissioner Jenny Wilson,  
9 Commissioner Jackie Biskupski  
10

11 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Jesse Dean, Attorney Shane  
12 Topham, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen  
13

14 **Excused:** Commissioner Chris Robinson and Commissioner Harris Sondak  
15

16 **A. OPENING**  
17

- 18 **i. Commissioner Chris McCandless will conduct the meeting as Chair of the**  
19 **Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”).**  
20

21 Chair Chris McCandless called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.  
22

- 23 **ii. The Commission will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of Monday,**  
24 **May 6, 2019.**  
25

26 Commissioner Beerman referenced page 5, line 10 and stated that what appeared in the minutes was  
27 the opposite of what he intended.  
28

29 **MOTION:** Commissioner Silvestrini moved to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2019 Central  
30 Wasatch Commission Meeting, as amended by Commissioner Beerman. The motion was seconded  
31 by Commissioner Bradley. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
32

33 **B. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020.**  
34

- 35 **i. Public Comment will be Taken on the CWC’s Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year**  
36 **2019-20.**  
37

38 Executive Director Ralph Becker reported that over the past several months, the Board established a  
39 Budget Committee who has been working on the CWC budget for this year and going forward. After  
40 several meetings, the group concluded that given the timeline for municipal budgets that for this next  
41 year they will recommend that each jurisdiction continue with the level of commitment made when  
42 they joined the CWC. Over the next year, the Budget Committee will work through a more  
43 sustainable and fixed budgeting process.  
44

45 Commissioner Braceras recalled that a suggestion was made regarding the money brought forward  
46 for the environmental process. The commitment for the ongoing funding would not be available this  
47 year. Mr. Becker explained that the State provided funding going into the Central Wasatch  
48 Commission formation. No money was reflected from the State other than some carryover; however,

1 the \$50,000 per year commitment for the Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Action Plan  
2 (“CCTAP”) was reflected. Commissioner Braceras confirmed that that was consistent with their  
3 position.  
4

5 Commissioner Bradley asked about increased costs and personnel to perform additional  
6 administrative duties. His preference was to approve the request in this budget and have a discussion  
7 on or before the next meeting regarding the timing of the hire and an explanation of what it is.  
8

9 Deputy Director Jesse Dean commented that in previous meetings they discussed the Environmental  
10 Dashboard as being a \$60,000 cost. In addition, there was a \$40,000 increase reflected in the budget,  
11 which was based on due diligence performed for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 which was to be discussed  
12 later in the meeting. Chair McCandless clarified that the cost of Phase 1 is \$60,000 and an additional  
13 \$40,000 for Phase 2.  
14

15 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen explained that the original \$60,000 was provided by the  
16 Brendle Group and was based on an assumption that the team from ESRI would be doing more of the  
17 “heavy lifting” in terms of building out the dashboard and populating the data. That had changed as  
18 the project has progressed. In addition, because there has been such a long hiatus, the data requires  
19 additional care and attention. Staff had been in contact with ESRI and the cost may change by the  
20 time the **ILA** is presented.  
21

22 Chair McCandless opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing  
23 was closed.  
24

25 **C. RESOLUTION 2019-16 APPROVING THE CWC’S PROPOSED BUDGET FOR**  
26 **FISCAL YEAR 2019-2020.**  
27

28 **i. Consideration of Resolution 2019-16 Approving the CWC’s Proposed Budget for**  
29 **Fiscal Year 2019-2020.**  
30

31 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bradley moved to adopt Resolution 2019-16 approving the CWC’s  
32 proposed budget for fiscal year 2019-201 with the proviso that there be more rigorous discussion in  
33 terms of the new staff position and its requirements. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion.  
34 Vote on motion: Commissioner Braceras-Aye, Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-  
35 Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye,  
36 Commissioner Beerman-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Biskupski was not  
37 present for the vote.  
38

39 **D. RESOLUTION 2019-17 AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CWC’S**  
40 **REGISTRATION WITH THE UTAH LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR’S OFFICE AS A**  
41 **LIMITED PURPOSE ENTITY.**  
42

43 **i. Consideration of Resolution 2019-17 Authorizing and Directing the CWC’s**  
44 **Registration with the Lieutenant Governor’s Office as a Limited Purpose Entity**  
45 **by July 1, 2019 as Required by Utah Code Ann. 67-1a-15 and 11-13-203(5).**  
46

47 CWC Attorney Shane Topham reported that during the 2018 Legislative Session, the Utah Legislature  
48 enacted a bill requiring the Lieutenant Governor’s Office to create a registry of local government

1 entities such as cities, towns, and counties as well as a registry for limited purpose governmental  
2 entities such as special service districts and interlocal entities such as the Central Wasatch  
3 Commission. The bill also requires the entities to make a filing with the Lieutenant Governor’s Office  
4 before July 1 and provide information specified in the statute. The purpose of the resolution was to  
5 authorize the filing of the informational statement following the statutory requirements.  
6

7 **MOTION:** Commissioner Silvestrini moved to approve Resolution 2019-17 authorizing and  
8 directing staff to file a registration with the Lieutenant Governor’s Office according to the statute.  
9 Commissioner Braceras seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Braceras-Aye,  
10 Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner  
11 Bradley-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Biskupski-Aye, Commissioner  
12 Beerman-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.  
13

14 **E. STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE AND DISCUSSION**

15  
16 **i. Stakeholders Council Chair Greg Summerhays will Provide an Update on the  
17 May Stakeholders Council Meeting and Work Moving Forward.**  
18

19 Mr. Becker reported that the Council has been reviewing a variety of issues. At the last meeting,  
20 much discussion revolved around the issue of visitor and carrying capacity. The discussion was to  
21 be continued along with transportation issues to subsequent meetings. The Chair reaffirmed the role  
22 of the Council and the rules of procedure and decorum under Roberts Rules and the agreement the  
23 Stakeholders Council members agreed to when the Council was established. Chair McCandless  
24 expressed appreciation for the work to each of the members.  
25

26 **F. DISCUSSION AND AMENDMENT TO 2019 STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ANNUAL  
27 MEETING SCHEDULE.**

28  
29 **i. Consideration of Resolution 2019-18 Amending the Regular Meeting Time and  
30 Location for the CWC Stakeholder Council for 2019 to 3:00 p.m. on the Third  
31 Wednesday of Each Month in the Cottonwood Heights City Hall’s “Community  
32 Room”.**  
33

34 Mr. Dean reported that the Stakeholders Council has run out of space at Millcreek City Hall for the  
35 monthly Stakeholders Council Meeting. Commissioner Silvestrini and his staff were thanked for  
36 being so accommodating. Commissioner Peterson had offered to host the meetings in the  
37 Cottonwood Heights Community Room. The meeting schedule would remain the same but meetings  
38 will begin one hour earlier.  
39

40 Commissioner Silvestrini was pleased that the group was attracting such high attendance.  
41 Commissioners Silvestrini and Peterson were thanked for their use of their facilities.  
42

43 **MOTION:** Commissioner Beerman moved to approve Resolution 2019-18. Commissioner Bradley  
44 seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Braceras-Aye, Commissioner Wilson-Aye,  
45 Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner Bradley-Aye, Commissioner  
46 Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Biskupski-Aye, Commissioner Beerman-Aye. The motion passed  
47 unanimously.  
48

1 **G. ENVIRONMENTAL DASHBOARD PROJECT UPDATE AND COUNCIL UPDATE**  
2 **AND DISCUSSION**

3  
4 **i. CWC Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen will Provide an Update on the**  
5 **Proposed Scope, Timeline, and Budget for the Environmental Dashboard.**  
6

7 Ms. Nielsen provided an update of the Environmental Dashboard and stated that a proposal has been  
8 received for the scope of Phase 1 for the work needed to complete the project. The main difference  
9 between the current proposal and what was provided by the Brendle Group several months ago was  
10 that the work necessary to bring the project to completion has been divided into two phases. Phase 1  
11 consists of five separate meetings with each dedicated to affecting the data for each of the five  
12 environmental indicators which were identified as soil, water, air, ecosystems, and wildlife. It will  
13 allow the steering committee, project managers, and the University of Utah to make sure they have  
14 collected the best, most accurate, and current data. The projected cost of the completion of Phase 1  
15 was just over \$42,000. The completion date was estimated as November-December of 2019.  
16

17 Within the proposal was a projected scope for Phase 2 of the project, however, much of the work is  
18 dependent on the outcome of Phase 1 and is subject to change. It is mostly accurate with the caveat  
19 that it will have to be refined and more closely defined after the steering committee meets and the  
20 project managers are able to assess where additional work needs to be done. The projected budget  
21 for the completion of Phase 2 was just over \$50,000. The total for the entire project was expected to  
22 be just under \$100,000.  
23

24 Ms. Nielsen reported that it has been a few years since the project got underway and the data was  
25 evaluated. The project managers were ensuring that the data is correct. There have also been  
26 personnel changes and they were working to reinvest them in the project at the same level they were  
27 previously. A draft Public Engagement Plan was presented involving presentation given at CWC,  
28 Steering Committee, and Stakeholders Council Meetings. A public open house was also planned for  
29 the first half of 2020. They anticipate having a public comment period on the project in early 2020.  
30

31 Commissioner Braceras asked if the cost would be ongoing or appear in one budget. Ms. Nielsen  
32 stated that it will bring them to the completion of the dashboard as it is currently scoped. It would  
33 not include periodic updates or maintenance costs. Those will be defined when the scope of Phase 2  
34 is more definitively defined. With regard to ongoing costs, Ms. Nielsen stated that working with the  
35 University of Utah allows students to be more heavily involved. Maintenance may be performed by  
36 a doctoral or Ph.D. student, which may keep costs down.  
37

38 Commissioner Wilson asked for a brief overview of the project. Ms. Nielsen explained that the  
39 Environmental Dashboard is a tool that will allow users at the federal, state, county, and city level to  
40 make informed decisions about the Central Wasatch Commission. It will provide a snapshot of the  
41 functioning health of the five environmental indicators that were initially defined by the steering  
42 committee in 2016. The update will allow for present conditions to be updated over time. Anyone  
43 with an internet connection will be able to obtain information. The manner in which it will be reported  
44 to the public had not yet been defined but will be determined in Phase 2.  
45

46 Chair McCandless commented that the Environmental Dashboard is one of the primary tenets of the  
47 Mountain Accord Agreement.  
48

1 Commissioner Beerman was pleased with the proposal and was glad to see it move forward. As part  
2 of the Mountain Accord, all agreed that there is a need to improve air and water quality. As a result,  
3 putting baselines in place will be invaluable as they measure actions going forward.

4  
5 **H. TRANSPORTATION UPDATE AND DISCUSSION.**

6  
7 **i. Short-Term Update: Park City Trails and Open Space Program Manager  
8 Heinrich Deters will Provide a Presentation on Guardsman Pass Transportation  
9 and Trailhead Improvements.**

10  
11 **ii. Long-Term Update:**

12  
13 Mr. Dean commented that moving forward, in conjunction with the CWC agendas for transportation  
14 updates they would like to provide short and long-term updates so that there is greater recognition of  
15 what is taking place on the ground and focus on the CCTAP and other work that is taking place.

16  
17 Park City Trails and Open Space Program Manager Heinrich Deters reviewed the Guardsman Pass  
18 area, which creates angst between the Cottonwoods and the Wasatch Back. He gave an overview of  
19 the properties and the goals set. Mr. Deters reported that the 1,350-acre property was purchased in  
20 June of 2017 from Wells Fargo through the foreclosure process. They selected Utah Open Lands to  
21 hold the conservation easement although the easement had yet to be adopted. They have, however,  
22 gone through several years of monitoring and creating a baseline for what will become the  
23 conservation easement.

24  
25 Mr. Deters stated that they have been working to establish designated areas similar to what are being  
26 worked on in the National Conservation Recreation Area and balancing that with the wilderness area.  
27 The Environmental Dashboard has been through the monitoring and baseline process of the  
28 conservation easement. Consistent with the bond language passed by Park City residents in 2016,  
29 they are also working to balance the public access and recreational components with the  
30 environmental components.

31  
32 Mr. Deters described what has been done on the property including the creation of three distinct areas  
33 consisting of a watershed restoration area, a back-country area, and a front country area. Each has  
34 varying public impacts. The Carrying Capacity Study was described and was difficult due to an  
35 unsustainable and poorly designed trail and a lake that is downhill. The intent was to create a parking  
36 solution that meets the carrying capacity as well as trails, kiosks, maps, restrooms, and trash bins.

37  
38 A map of the property was displayed. The areas shown in yellow were identified as the proposed  
39 trailhead areas. There were four trailheads they were looking to implement. The fifth was optional.  
40 The presentation was specific to summer as the road is closed in the winter months. Important  
41 components of the plan were identified. The property is in Wasatch County and they have requested  
42 that the Wasatch County Council prohibit parking in the right-of-way except for in designated areas.  
43 Maintenance was also addressed as well as enforcement and coordination with adjacent jurisdictions.

44  
45 The Guardsman Pass area was being considered and facilities or trailheads would be required to  
46 provide options. It was noted that they have already constructed the new alignment for Bloods Lake  
47 Trail. Once the trailhead is in place, they will look to reclaim that. There were discussions with  
48 Director Adams from Region 2 and other UDOT staff about coordinating those efforts. In addition,

1 they met with Bekee Hotze from the US Forest Service to address private and Forest Service land and  
2 potential options for the placement of additional infrastructure. Mr. Deters reported that part of their  
3 outreach included contact with the Moab Ranger District to understand how they deal with mountain  
4 bike shuttles. From the various entities they learned how to work with shuttle companies, encourage  
5 commercial permitting, and let them assist with social policing in the area.

6  
7 Commissioner Peterson commented on carrying capacity and asked what criteria were used to  
8 determine that. Mr. Deters stated that Wendy Fisher and her staff spent a great deal of time counting  
9 cars and conducting surveys. The standard used was vehicle counts.

10  
11 Chair McCandless asked about enforcement of the conservation easement. Mr. Deters stated that the  
12 conservation easement had not yet been recorded on the property. There were a few aspects they  
13 wanted to ensure are done right such as the definition of the County Road, the widths, and survey  
14 information. Currently, July was targeted for adoption of the easement.

15  
16 Chair McCandless asked about the Conservation Recreation Area associated with the 1,300 acres and  
17 the type of work that has been done. Mr. Deters explained that there are similarities between the  
18 Conservation Recreation Area and the Conservation Easement. Chair McCandless asked who will  
19 maintain the parking lots and restroom. Mr. Deters responded that they recently went through the  
20 budget process in Park City and requested additional park staff for the restrooms. There are also trails  
21 and open space contract services with some of their advocacy groups. The city council set aside  
22 money to make sure it is done.

23  
24 Commissioner Wilson reported that Salt Lake County participated although it was across county lines.  
25 She and Council Member Bradley advocated support for it. Commissioner Wilson was pleased with  
26 the progress and asked about the model and how it fits in with the planning. Mr. Deters stated that  
27 the first step is to create a baseline, which is monitoring. It was through that baseline observation  
28 survey that the baseline was created, which is the carrying capacity. He explained that what they do  
29 on the 1,350 acres is wholly dependent on those in Big Cottonwood. Commissioner Wilson asked if  
30 the carrying capacity was measured in all three areas. Mr. Deters explained that the designated areas  
31 have more to do with the environmental attributes in those areas as a public access point.

32  
33 Commissioner Silvestrini asked what criteria were used to select Utah Open Lands and the resources  
34 for enforcement. Mr. Deters explained that they did their standard Request for Proposals (“RFP”).  
35 His recollection was that Utah Open Lands was the only applicant. Commissioner Beerman stated  
36 that Utah Open Lands was pivotal in the process and fundraising efforts.

37  
38 Commissioner Beerman reported that in 2013 when the entities began working together, the pinnacle  
39 of the discussions dealt with how to protect watersheds in the Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back.  
40 Ironically, Bonanza Flat comes all the way around to Deer Creek and feeds the Wasatch Front. It  
41 does not come to Park City. They were, however, very concerned about the potential for dense  
42 development, the opening of roads, and potential impacts on the community. He was pleased that  
43 they were able to get together and lobby and fundraise. Each of the entities represented played a key  
44 role.

45  
46 Commissioner Bradley commented that Park City, Summit County, and Utah Open Lands were  
47 unbelievably good in terms of securing the land for the right reasons. He was delighted to see the  
48 seriousness and thoroughness in the stewardship of the land.

1  
2           **a.       CCTAP Tolling Task**  
3

- 4                   •       **HDR Transportation Planning Director Jason McGlashan will**  
5                           **Provide a Presentation on the Tolling Task Item for the**  
6                           **Cottonwood Canyons Transportation Action Plan (“CCTAP”).**  
7

8 Frank Pisani identified himself as the Consultant Project Manager for the Transportation Action Plan.  
9 HDR Transportation Planning Director Jason McGlashan was also present to discuss the Tolling  
10 Strategy Study that was to be completed under the scope of the CCTAP. Mr. Pisani reminded the  
11 Board of where they are with respect to the road map for the CCTAP study. The Goals and Needs  
12 Assessment was presented and would be continued through summer. They were about to kick off  
13 their alternative development screening and return next spring with initial recommendations. Every  
14 month they will make presentations on different topics. Tonight they will be addressing the Tolling  
15 Strategy Study.  
16

17 Mr. Pisani explained that the study will cover a number of different topics. They will develop a  
18 Mobility Management Scenario consisting of functions and considerations of how a toll will be  
19 implemented. They will then develop conceptual level revenue forecasts that will involve the  
20 completion of collections and traffic forecasting. They will also release a public survey and address  
21 implementation feasibility.  
22

23 Mr. Pisani stated that when tolling is discussed in the Cottonwoods there are often two broad  
24 objectives that motivate them to evaluate a toll. The first is as a tool for travel demand management  
25 and another is a potential form of revenue. Depending on how a toll is implemented, the objectives  
26 can occasionally compete with one another.  
27

28 In response to a question raised, Mr. Pisani explained that the 2,200 figure is based on a typical high  
29 use day consisting of 6,800 cars. A small percentage of visitors are in the identified 36% of vehicles.  
30 The 1-to-1 ratio indicates that 36% of the daily traffic includes single occupants and only represents  
31 18% of the people traveling in the canyon that day. The takeaway was that the focus is on strategy  
32 and implementing a toll to eliminate single occupancy vehicle issues. That, however, can compete  
33 with a potential form of revenue in that it creates a narrow market and user pool to change behavior  
34 on. Mr. Pisani clarified that HOV3 includes vehicles that have three or more occupants.  
35

36 Mr. McGlashan commented on the travel demand management philosophy and what they are trying  
37 to address in terms of changing traveler behavior in the canyons. He stated that this is not a toll road  
38 project where the goal is to balance community mobility goals with revenue creation. In this case,  
39 they are looking at travel demand management and balancing safety goals and safety improvements.  
40 He pointed out that any of the strategies that could be applied could have negative impacts on  
41 businesses and the general economy. All of the policy measures aimed at addressing congestion need  
42 to balance across seasonal toll considerations.  
43

44 Mr. McGlashan stressed that it is critical to understand the elasticity for traffic demand as it relates to  
45 the corridor. Elasticity pertains to economic principles for any consumer good or product that has  
46 sensitivity to price. In this case, the price could include travel time, accessibility, convenience, and  
47 perceived safety. A survey was in the process of being developed that is aimed at benchmarking the

1 value of time and the willingness to pay for travel in the corridor. It was determined that the majority  
2 of travel, in this case, is discretionary so willingness to pay is key to the modeling of various scenarios.  
3 This information will provide data on how to structure specific strategies and how they relate to  
4 parking supply, parking structures, and different transit modes.  
5

6 One of the next steps will involve scenario development where they will look at a wide range of  
7 options. Various transit measures can be applied as well as looking at parking availability, additional  
8 supply, or management thereof using managed lanes with a pricing structure to regulate use. Various  
9 strategies were applied from throughout the country. Next steps were identified including taking the  
10 range of options and completing a report. They will come back to the Board at least two more times  
11 to present progress information going forward.  
12

13 Commissioner Wilson favored the idea of tolling but was concerned about the cost of recreation in  
14 the canyons. She was uncomfortable with the idea of tolling without providing an incentive for mass  
15 transportation. She hoped that at some point they will look at options and a system to direct use rather  
16 than focus on funding alone. She commented that the intent is to use tolling to incentivize behavior.  
17

18 Mr. McGlashan explained that the goal of the first investigation is to understand price sensitivity.  
19 Whether it can influence behavior had yet to be determined. The intent was to influence a behavioral  
20 change to achieve a desirable condition of safety, travel, and comfort. Tolling was identified as one  
21 tool. Having a revenue stream associated with it was of interest to the Board.  
22

23 Commissioner Silvestrini asked about the methodology used to determine the incentive required to  
24 get someone to choose an alternative means of transportation to access the canyon. Mr. Pisani stated  
25 that it would be necessary to bring in their statistician who is helping develop the survey. One of the  
26 methodologies was to get the public feedback and release the survey to a non-biased group of people  
27 along the Wasatch Front and Summit County to provide feedback.  
28

29 Chair McCandless hoped to see more examples and specific details on Millcreek's before and after  
30 plan and whether participation has increased above the population growth in Salt Lake County as a  
31 result of those improvements. He presumed that they can segment the tolling options to a Monday  
32 through Friday toll versus a Saturday, Sunday, and holiday toll. This will encourage visitation on less  
33 busy days. The objective was not to diminish the experience but to guarantee the experience.  
34

35 Commissioner Bradley remarked that when they implemented the toll booth in Millcreek Canyon in  
36 1991, they did so to control access. It also generated revenue, which was put back into the canyon.  
37 Surveying was done prior to that and universally those polled did not object to paying a toll. He  
38 stressed the importance of conveying the message as to why that is important. Commissioner  
39 Peterson was involved in the Millcreek project as well and stated that one of the benefits was the  
40 impact on restroom areas, trailheads, etc. He noted that there were numerous benefits realized as a  
41 result of the fee booth.  
42

43 Mr. Becker described some of the parallels with Pikes Peak where there is major transit.  
44 Mr. McGlashan indicated that it was in operation through the end of 2017. It was determined that the  
45 cost of upgrading it made it not financially viable. It was, however, an attraction and amenity for  
46 many years. Mr. Becker commented that he had heard that there was a push to rebuild it.  
47



1                   **b.       UDOT Tolling Overview**

- 2
- 3                   •       **UDOT Policy and Legislative Services Director Linda Hull will**  
4                   **Provide an Overview of State Statute Pertaining to the Imposition**  
5                   **and Collection of Tolls.**
- 6

7 UDOT Legislative Services Director Linda Hill addressed tolling statutes and the history of tolling in  
8 Utah. She reported that the legislative history for tolling has existed since 1997. Brian Allen ran a  
9 bill that originally authorized UDOT to establish and operate toll roads. In 2005, there was legislation  
10 introduced as a result of a 2003 and 2004 Legislative Task Force that looked at transportation planning  
11 and alternative funding issues. The Legislature felt that the department should have tools allowing  
12 them to look at tolling as a revenue source and manage demand. The Legislature adopted a bill in  
13 2005 that authorized the Transportation Commission to approve HOT lanes and toll lanes. They did  
14 not have the authorization to convert free roads into toll roads but they were able to establish  
15 something new. That same year, the Legislature also adopted a resolution to perform a Managed  
16 Lane Study. In 2006, Senator Killpack ran a bill authorizing the department to pursue public/private  
17 partnerships for tollways, which remains on the books.

18

19 In 2013, a bill was run that was unrelated to tolling but addressed automatic license plate readers and  
20 defined how governments can use them. It was requested that a provision be added to the bill allowing  
21 automatic license plate readers for tollway purposes. In 2018, Senator Niederhauser ran a bill  
22 affecting tollways with one of the major provisions being to authorize the department to impose  
23 penalties for failure to pay a toll.

24

25 Ms. Hull emphasized what is currently in the code. UDOT has the authority to establish and operate  
26 toll facilities and the Transportation Commission approves tollways, toll lanes, HOT lanes,  
27 public/private and partnership tollways. Information was provided on UDOT designating HOV lanes.  
28 The department can establish an HOV on any State road and the Transportation Commission can  
29 approve overlaying that with a HOT lane. HOV lanes are free but single occupants must pay a toll.  
30 The provisions identified are already in the Code so no changes would be needed. Ms. Hull reported  
31 that the Transportation Commission establishes toll rates.

32

33 With regard to toll collection, UDOT has the authority to collect the tolls and they establish and  
34 administer the penalties for non-payment of tolls. Senator Niederhauser's bill included a provision  
35 wherein a vehicle registration hold can be imposed for unpaid tolls. There are also privacy protections  
36 that are statutorily extended. The toll revenue by code is deposited in a Tollway Special Revenue  
37 Fund with separate accounts for each tollway. The Transportation Commission specifies how the  
38 money is spent. Ms. Hull explained that revenue is to be used for the tollway and related facilities as  
39 well as State transportation systems.

40

41 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Peterson, Ms. Hull stated that currently UDOT  
42 only tolls HOT lanes on I-15.

43

44 Commissioner Biskupski clarified that if a toll is implemented, the Board would not be able to control  
45 how the money is spent. Ms. Hull confirmed that that was the case. Commissioner Biskupski  
46 commented that surveys cannot specify how tolls will benefit the area since that determination is  
47 made by the Transportation Commission.

1  
2 Commissioner Silvestrini remarked that one of the reasons tolling in Millcreek Canyon has been  
3 accepted by the public is due to the commitment that the money collected is reinvested in the canyon  
4 and associated facilities. Ms. Hull explained that there is a provision in the code that toll revenue  
5 must be spent on the facility from which it was collected or on items connected to the tollway.  
6

7 Commissioner Braceras commented that the change was made specifically for the canyons and  
8 broadens how the funds can be used. If they decide to toll the road, they will toll both canyons rather  
9 than just one.  
10

11 Commissioner Wilson remarked that they cannot ignore advancing technology and tools pertaining  
12 to tolling are one element of success the Board was seeking. Commissioner Braceras confirmed that  
13 they are examining how technology can be useful. Pricing can help spread the peak and provide  
14 options. With respect to HOT lanes, people have a choice to pay or not. He stressed that in the  
15 canyons people will need a choice. Commissioner Wilson reiterated that it is a public asset and she  
16 did not want to price people out of utilizing area recreation.  
17

18 Chair McCandless requested a copy of a tollway budget. With respect to tolling issues, he was certain  
19 they will have discussions with regard to the CCTAP. He was under the impression that trails can be  
20 improved as a result of being a transportation system. Ms. Hull stated that that could be a topic of  
21 debate since the State Transportation System indicates that the State owns it. Chair McCandless  
22 asked if it was possible to enter into an Interlocal Agreement with UDOT so that the Board can play  
23 a bigger role. Commissioner Braceras stated that their commitment is to keep the Board involved. If  
24 the Board does not recommend advancing it to the Transportation Commission, it likely will not be.  
25 Chair McCandless asked if the tolls collected by each of the canyons will have separate budgets.  
26 Ms. Hull stated that there is the ability to create an account within the Tollway Special Revenue with  
27 sub-accounts created for each toll facility.  
28

29 Paul Gadot commented on tolling and did not think it should be used as a primary revenue source.  
30 He suggested that all tolls remain under the control of the entity that governs the canyons. His  
31 understanding was that the funds may be subdivided and the Transportation Commission will have  
32 that authorization. He suggested the word “may” be changed to “shall” to ensure that the money stays  
33 in the canyons. Mr. Gadot did not want to price people out of the canyon. He suggested there be  
34 exemptions to paying the toll as well such as public employees, those employed by the ski resorts or  
35 the Towns of Alta or Brighton, or persons with a primary residence of record in the canyons. Second  
36 homes would not apply. In addition, persons transiting the canyon during periods where no public  
37 transportation options are available should not be tolled. Those with a handicap parking placard  
38 should also be exempt. Mr. Gadot stated that the Code calls for a Tollway Development Agreement,  
39 which seemed to indicate that a private entity could operate the toll booths. It would also provide for  
40 the revenue to pay the person who is contracted.  
41

42 **I. DISCUSSION AND RESOLUTION EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR CWC**  
43 **DEPUTY DIRECTOR JESSE DEAN.**  
44

45 **i. Consideration of Resolution 2019-19 Expressing Appreciation to Deputy Director**  
46 **Jesse Dean for His Work and Service to the CWC.**  
47

48 Chair McCandless was sad to see Mr. Dean leave his employ with the CWC but hoped they could

1 work together again on other fronts. Commissioner Wilson also expressed appreciation to Mr. Dean  
2 and recognized that a great deal of engagement takes place.

3  
4 **MOTION:** Commissioner Biskupski moved to approve Resolution 2019-19, as written.  
5 Commissioner Silvestrini seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Braceras-Aye,  
6 Commissioner Wilson-Aye, Commissioner Peterson-Aye, Chair McCandless-Aye, Commissioner  
7 Bradley-Aye, Commissioner Silvestrini-Aye, Commissioner Biskupski-Aye, Commissioner  
8 Beerman-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

9  
10 Chair McCandless reported that an Open House was scheduled for the following Wednesday at the  
11 new CWC offices. The primary focus, however, was to celebrate Mr. Dean.

## 12 13 **J. PUBLIC COMMENT**

14  
15 Brian Hutchinson addressed the Millcreek shuttle pilot program and the early action item process for  
16 Little Cottonwood Canyon and Wasatch Boulevard. He explained that the Millcreek Canyon Shuttle  
17 System pilot was spearheaded by CWC Board Members Jeff Silvestrini and Jim Bradley.  
18 Mr. Hutchinson stated that the program is a great project for the CWC Board and Stakeholder Council  
19 and provides an opportunity to implement the directives of Mountain Accord. The associated 2012  
20 Feasibility Study also aligns with the principles of the Mountain Accord and is considered relevant  
21 by all involved. Area businesses would like to promote the shuttle system and are interested in  
22 contributing to the project. There is also support from the County, UTA, Salt Lake County Parks and  
23 Rec Department, the Forest Service, schools, area businesses, and the general public. A study  
24 conducted in 2012 identified solutions as largely transit-based and recommended against parking lot  
25 expansion or road widening. The preference was to improve trailheads, picnic sites, and the roadway.  
26 With the cooperation of Millcreek, Salt Lake County Parks and Rec, the Forest Service, UTA, and  
27 others they can create safe and equitable access to school-age children and the broader public  
28 throughout the Valley.

29  
30 Mr. Hutchinson next addressed early action items up Little Cottonwood Canyon and Wasatch  
31 Boulevard. He noticed a recent modification to the timeline of early action items posted on the CWC  
32 website where certain project evaluations were recently removed or advanced in what was supposed  
33 to be a three-step process. In some cases, action items leapfrog the earlier steps and the process  
34 seemed to lack consistency. He asked that the criteria and authorization process be clarified for  
35 projects that are to advance through stakeholder support improvements, those that are slated to begin,  
36 and those already in progress.

37  
38 John Knoblock, a Millcreek resident, informed the Board that local ranger Bekee Hotze asked Mayor  
39 Young, Woody Noxin, himself, and Sarah Bennett to help formulate a Friends of Salt Lake Ranger  
40 District. Mr. Knoblock reported that it is not intended to take away from any other organizations  
41 including the CWC. It is intended to serve as a vehicle for communication, education, and  
42 coordination of the users of the Ranger District Plans in coordination with the 25 various  
43 organizations that Ranger Hotze deals with. The CWC area does not completely match and overlay  
44 the Ranger District, which extends into Davis County and to Stansbury Island and does not include  
45 areas near Park City. With regard to trails, Mr. Knoblock hoped they would not have to wait for the  
46 other master plans to be completed before pushing projects through.

1 Del Draper reported that he serves on the Stakeholders Council and is a lifelong cabin owner at the  
2 top of Little Cottonwood Canyon. He is a skier and spends a great deal of time riding up and down  
3 Little Cottonwood Canyon. He observed that the road is functional the majority of the time. Issues  
4 arise during peak periods when the road is constrained. Even on those days, traffic in the canyon  
5 flows fairly well once you are in the canyon. It can take one hour or more to travel from the 7-Eleven  
6 at the Mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to Little Cottonwood Canyon but once you enter, the traffic  
7 slowly merges and picks up speed. Mr. Draper believed that adding a third lane or putting more  
8 blacktop in the canyon should not be the first solution. He was pleased to hear the tolling discussion  
9 as it was not something they had discussed as a Stakeholders Council. Mr. Draper was concerned  
10 about UDOT considering putting down more blacktop without looking at other options. He noted  
11 that when caught in a traffic jam between Bengal Boulevard and the Mouth of Little Cottonwood  
12 Canyon, buses are there too. He suggested there be a way for buses to get ahead. The UDOT plan  
13 includes a proposal for a four-lane road the entire way up but no proposal to give priority to buses.  
14 There was discussion of providing a wide shoulder for buses to drive on as a possible solution. He  
15 recommended that non-traditional solutions be considered.

16  
17 Carl Fisher thanked the Board for prioritizing and funding the Environmental Dashboard. He was  
18 confident that it will be a critical tool. He enjoyed the conversation about tolling and stated that a  
19 survey was done in 2015 on various aspects of the canyon including tolling and transportation. That  
20 data was available for review. It was broken down by season to differentiate the summer and ski  
21 seasons and to better understand the trends and differences. In the process, they interviewed 8,000 to  
22 9,000 people over a one-year period. They partnered with the resorts to distribute the survey as well.  
23 Mr. Fisher referenced a pie chart displayed previously and estimated that there are 4,500 stalls in the  
24 canyon. The pie chart shows that 18% of the visitors are taking over 50% of the available parking.  
25 To goal was not to build more parking. The solution seemed to be to get more people out of cars and  
26 onto mass transit. Mr. Fisher commented on the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact  
27 Statement and the CCTAP and did not understand how the two projects work together.

28  
29 **K. COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

30  
31 Commissioner Silvestrini reported that he and Commissioner Bradley met with Brian [REDACTED] about  
32 implementing a pilot transportation project to serve Millcreek Canyon. He also spoke to Bekee Hotze  
33 and her staff about their intention to avoid permitting and EIS issues with the Forest Service. He  
34 found that UTA has surplus vans but no drivers. He spoke previously with Mayor McAdams about  
35 Millcreek and Salt Lake County contributing to offer an incentive and put out an RFP for a private  
36 operator to run the vans and figure out how best to serve the public. They potentially may engage the  
37 Granite School District who has three schools in close proximity to Millcreek Canyon with available  
38 parking lots on weekends and during the summer months. The intent was to take action with respect  
39 to transportation that the CWC could sponsor to address some of the issues. Commissioner Silvestrini  
40 commented that Millcreek Canyon is a resource but there are challenges associated with using it. His  
41 intent was to come up with a proposal and present it to the Board at a future meeting.

42  
43 Chair McCandless reported that the previous Tuesday, Sandy City approved a resolution of support  
44 for the CWC with a 5-to-1 vote. There was also discussion about funding capabilities. He agreed to  
45 forward a copy of the resolution to the Board members.

46  
47 Commissioner Silvestrini stated that a similar resolution was to be addressed at the June 10 Millcreek  
48 City Council Meeting.

1  
2 Commissioner Peterson reported that over the last two years the city of Cottonwood Heights has been  
3 developing a formal Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan in coordination with John Thomas from UDOT.  
4 The plan was expected to be finalized within the next 60 to 90 days. Because of its location between  
5 both canyons, Wasatch Boulevard impacts the city of Cottonwood Heights as much, if not more, than  
6 any other municipality. He agreed to make a presentation at the appropriate time.  
7

8 **L. ADJOURNMENT**  
9

10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wilson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Peterson seconded the motion.  
11 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
12

13 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Meeting held Monday, June 3, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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