

1 MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”)
2 TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY,
3 AUGUST 26, 2020 AT 10:30 A.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED
4 ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM
5

6 **Present:** Committee Members:
7

8 Chair Mike Peterson, Mayor of Cottonwood Heights City
9 Mayor Andy Beerman, Co-Chair Park City
10 Mayor Dan Knopp, Town of Brighton
11

12 Others:
13

14 Carl Fisher, Save Our Canyons
15 Dave Fields, Snowbird
16 Mike Allegra, Stanley Railcar Company
17 Randy Doyle
18 Barbara Cameron
19 Chris Cushing
20 Grant Farnsworth, UDOT
21 Helen Peters, Salt Lake County
22 Holly Lopez
23 Kirk Cullimore
24 Kim Mayhew, Solitude
25 Laura Hanson, UTA
26 Laura Briefer, Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities
27 Lorie Fowlke
28 Mike Maughan, Alta Ski Area
29 Patrick Nelson, University of Utah
30 Ryan Dunyon
31 Todd [REDACTED]
32 Ned Hacker, Wasatch Front Regional Council
33 Carlton Christensen, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”)
34

35 CWC Staff:
36

37 Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director
38 Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director
39 Lindsey Nielsen, Communications Director
40 Kaye Mickelson, Office Administrator
41

1 **1. OPENING**

- 2
3 a. **The Goal for this Meeting is for the Transportation Committee to Review, Discuss, and Workshop the Draft MTS Concepts in Preparation for Public Comment Starting on Friday, September 18.**

4
5
6
7 Chair Peterson reported that the draft concepts were reviewed by a Technical Feasibility
8 Evaluation Committee headed by CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez, and other experts. The
9 Transportation Committee was asked to provide additional comments to refine and further develop
10 concepts to prepare for public comments on September 18, 2020.

- 11
12 b. **Commissioner Mike Peterson will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Transportation Committee.**

13
14
15 Chair Peterson called the meeting to order approximately 10:30 a.m.

16
17 **2. MTS TIMELINE/IMPORTANT DATES**

- 18
19 a. **Committee and Participants will Receive and Update on Important Dates for the MTS Process.**

20
21
22 Chair Peterson shared additional timelines related to the Mountain Transportation System
23 (“MTS”) with the Transportation Committee.

- 24
25 b. **Invitation to MTS Panel Discussion (9/18) and MTS Virtual Summit (11/13 and 11/14).**

26
27
28 Chair Peterson reported that on September 18, 2020, there will be a Mountain Transportation Panel
29 discussion. The three goals of the discussion were as follows:

- 30
31 • To further educate the public and stakeholders on the capabilities and tradeoffs of different
32 modes, demand management strategies, and impacts on the watershed;
33 • Share and refine the Mountain Transportation System with the public;
34 • Open for a 30-day public comment period with a Design Your Transit tool.

35
36 Mr. Perez discussed the Design Your Transit tool. He described it as a unique survey tool that
37 assigns a value to objectives for investments in mode and management. He explained that noted
38 that it is a good way to engage the public and allow them to see what a Regional Mountain
39 Transportation System can do. He reported that costs were being refined on the tool. It would not
40 show the full amount, but each user would have a set amount to work with. They would then go
41 through modes and management, make investments, and look at the community benefits.
42 Mr. Perez indicated that he had used this tool in previous planning processes and stated that it
43 would be coupled with a traditional public comment period.

44
45 Chair Peterson reported that on November 13, 2020, from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. and
46 November 14, 2020, from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., there would be a Mountain Transportation

1 System Virtual Summit. The purpose of the Summit was to bring stakeholders together to work
2 through the Mountain Transportation System alternatives and arrive at a consensus on a preferred
3 Mountain Transportation System. Chair Peterson noted that any alternatives would be forwarded
4 to the full CWC Board for formal approval before alternatives are recommended to State
5 Legislators and others in decision-making positions.

6
7 **3. MTS DRAFT CONCEPT REVIEW AND WORKSHOP**

8
9 **a. Blake Perez will Walk Through Draft Concepts of a Regional MTS.**

10
11 Mr. Perez discussed the Technical Feasibility Evaluation Committee that included vendors, mode
12 experts, and planners from the Wasatch Front and Back who looked at the technical feasibility of
13 potential modes and managements. An overview of the presentation was shared. Mr. Perez
14 reported that the goal of the CWC’s Mountain Transportation System Initiative was to refine and
15 develop the transportation principles and initiatives outlined in the Mountain Accord. The
16 objective was to arrive at a proposed comprehensive, year-round transportation system that would
17 include Salt Lake Valley, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, Parley’s Canyon
18 and Millcreek with connections to the Wasatch Back.

19
20 Mr. Perez described the difference between the Mountain Transportation System and the
21 Environmental Impact Study (“EIS”). He explained that they are two different processes that fold
22 into one another. The geographic scope of the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) EIS
23 included State Road 210, Wasatch Boulevard, and Little Cottonwood Canyon. The Mountain
24 Transportation System Initiative would encompass the Wasatch Front, the Wasatch Back, and
25 connections between economic and recreation nodes. The intended outcome of the EIS was to
26 reach a final decision on specific construction improvements and transit improvements for State
27 Road 210. The Mountain Transit System, however, was a high-level planning process aimed at
28 building a consensus on recommendations for transportation modes in the Regional Mountain
29 Transportation System. Mr. Perez stated that the final decision-maker for the EIS would be UDOT
30 whereas, for the Mountain Transportation System Initiative, it would be the CWC and member
31 jurisdictions. Mr. Perez noted that the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS was a piece of the puzzle in
32 the larger Mountain Transportation System process.

33
34 The progress and timeline were discussed. Mr. Perez noted that the project began in January 2020
35 with the initial Scoping Document and public comments. In the Spring of 2020, there were
36 approved staff recommendations. In the Summer of 2020, the focus was on the development of
37 alternatives and the finalization of reports. Concepts and alternatives would be released for public
38 comment on September 18, 2020, and the Mountain Transportation System Virtual Summit would
39 take place in November 2020. Mr. Perez noted that there would be a recommendation finalized at
40 the end of the year.

41
42 Mr. Perez shared supporting documents with the Committee, including the Mountain Accord,
43 Scoping Documents, the EIS Draft Alternatives, and the UTA Five-Year Service Plan. He noted
44 that they were foundational documents for the project. Additional studies were also used and
45 incorporated. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker discussed the three primary alternatives
46 Mr. Perez would be presenting. Each alternative would be based on a different mode such as bus,

1 aerial, or rail. He noted that there could be sub-alternatives as well. The information in the
2 alternatives was based largely on technical reviews and feasibility assessments done by the
3 Technical Feasibility Evaluation Committee.

4
5 Mr. Perez reported on the first alternative, which was bus-based. It called for enhanced buses in
6 both Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon and an expanded shoulder in Little
7 Cottonwood Canyon for both transit and pedestrians. There was also a call for improved bus
8 frequency on critical Wasatch Front bus routes, to provide connections to recreational destinations.
9 Mr. Perez reported that the first alternative also included a call for a bus Rapid Transit System
10 between Kimball Junction and Park City as well as enhanced bus service from Quinn’s Junction
11 to Park City and an expanded shoulder for inbound buses. Parking strategies had also been
12 developed. They called for expanded parking along key corridors in the Salt Lake Valley, an
13 implementation of charge parking at all ski resorts, and a reduction of on-road parking adjacent to
14 ski resorts.

15
16 Mr. Perez noted that dynamic tolling was called for in the EIS. He reported that the Mountain
17 Transportation System Initiative called for the same to happen in Big Cottonwood Canyon. He
18 also discussed the gravel pit development and noted that a year-round mixed-use development of
19 a multi-modal mobility hub would be beneficial. Mr. Perez reported that the bus-based alternative
20 called for a transit tunnel between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon to
21 potentially serve bus, shuttle, high occupancy vehicles, or rail transportation. This would allow
22 for the implementation of a year-round local Cottonwood Canyon circulator to connect trailheads
23 and ski resorts. Mr. Perez noted that this alternative would also focus on pursuing Millcreek
24 mobility improvements. He stated that the County and the U.S. Forest Service, in conjunction
25 with other partners, had received a Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant and stated that
26 there were several necessary steps required to potentially put in a shuttle. Those steps included:

- 27
- 28 • Building out transit facilities;
- 29 • Improving parking facilities; and
- 30 • Improving restroom facilities.
- 31

32 Mike Maughan from Alta Ski Area asked if there would be an analysis conducted on each
33 alternative to determine how many people could be transported by the various options. Mr. Perez
34 stated that this was currently being worked on with vendors and planners. He noted that there was
35 also supplemental data being referenced from a PB Study, which was completed in 2017. He
36 stated that there would be concepts on capacity, high and low costs, and impacts on the watershed.
37 Chair Peterson asked if one of the fundamental principles was to remove cars from the canyons.
38 Mr. Perez confirmed this and stated that reducing congestion was a focus of the first alternative.
39 Mr. Becker noted that the Scoping Document was available and included conclusions that had
40 been approved, including the objective to remove and reduce vehicles on the road.

41
42 Laura Briefer from Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities discussed the way changes in
43 transportation could potentially impact recreational use and land use. Chair Peterson noted that in
44 previous meetings, protecting the land had been a high priority. Mr. Perez commented that
45 Ms. Briefer and her team had been helpful in the development of the project. He noted there were
46 two things to consider regarding impacts on the watershed:

- 1
- 2 1. Capital infrastructure improvements and how they would work with the hydrology
- 3 of the watershed.
- 4
- 5 2. Delivery of people to the watershed.
- 6

7 Mr. Perez displayed maps regarding the EIS. He noted that the Mountain Transportation System
8 Initiative would build off of those. A request was made to UDOT to expand connections to the
9 tracks closer to I-15. One of the principals of Mountain Accord called for a high-capacity East
10 Bench Transit Line. Mr. Perez noted that after talking to UDOT, the routes may not look exactly
11 like the map shown to the Committee, but there would be several routes that would achieve the
12 same goals. He shared an example of the 220 bus, which would run in 15-minute intervals from
13 downtown. The bus would connect to both Big and Little Cottonwood in addition to other routes.
14 Mr. Perez also reported on the proposed three-mile transit tunnel that would run between Alta and
15 Brighton, at an approximate cost of \$300 to \$700 million.

16
17 The second alternative was discussed. Mr. Perez noted that this is an aerial-based alternative that
18 included a Gondola System. It would be a seasonal service serving the Little Cottonwood Canyon
19 ski resorts. It would include a bus system to deliver riders to the aerial base station. The alternative
20 would call for a seasonal express bus to the resorts in Big Cottonwood Canyon, with a year-round
21 local bus to serve trailheads. There would be a similar parking strategy as Alternative 1. Mr. Perez
22 also noted that the alternative included expanded Valley parking along key corridors that connect
23 to recreation routes, the same Summit County Transit connections, dynamic tolling, gravel pit
24 development, and Millcreek mobility and transit improvements.

25
26 Mr. Perez discussed the aerial connections between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. It would
27 be a base-to-base, Brighton, Solitude, and Alta aerial system. Chair Peterson asked if it would be
28 a transportation connection or a ski connection. Mr. Perez assumed that it would primarily be for
29 recreational trips but could also serve as a connection for ski resort employees. Mr. Becker
30 reported that the aerial connections were being looked at as a transportation matter rather than
31 providing additional recreational access. He felt it was a transportation solution.

32
33 Chair Peterson noted that additional clarity would be beneficial. Mr. Perez stated that it would be
34 a base-to-base system and there would be no drop-off along the ridge. He reported that both the
35 tunnel connection and the aerial would provide emergency egress and ingress. Mr. Becker noted
36 that part of what was explored with the Technical Feasibility Evaluation Committee was whether
37 it was feasible to make base-to-base connections without a drop-off at the ridgelines.

38
39 Mr. Perez displayed a map that was built off of the aerial concept. It called to build off of mobility
40 hubs from 9400 South and Highlight Drive and connected to the TRAX line, similar to the first
41 alternative. Mr. Perez felt this would provide greater regional access closer to I-15 and reduce
42 vehicle miles traveled in the cities of Sandy and Cottonwood Heights. He noted that the hope was
43 to expand Route 4 of the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) to Cottonwood Heights. The maps also
44 showcased express buses to resorts with local buses running year-round.

1 Mr. Perez noted that there had been a request from UTA to build out bus pull-outs to make delivery
2 more efficient. Mr. Perez also presented maps pertaining to the Millcreek mobility improvements.
3 Grant Farnsworth from UDOT noted that it would make the most sense to build off of a current
4 alternative. Mr. Perez noted that the intention was to build off of the aerial alternative.

5
6 Supplemental data and information related to the EIS were discussed. Mr. Perez noted that he had
7 spoken with the EIS team. They received comments and supplemental information that they were
8 in the process of reviewing. Some of the considerations included the following:

- 9
- 10 • The La Caille aerial station option;
 - 11 • Additional rail cost estimates and alignments;
 - 12 • A Tesla Boring Company Tunnel;
 - 13 • Refined costs and labor
 - 14 • A mobility hub at 9400 South and Highland Drive that would serve as a feeder station to
15 the mouth of a Little Cottonwood Canyon aerial station; and
 - 16 • Snow sheds in the aerial alternative.

17
18 Mr. Perez reported that the EIS was currently being screened to determine if there were any
19 potential blind spots.

20
21 Chair Peterson commented that there was no supplemental data on tolling. He had received
22 questions about how tolling would be applied and wondered if there was any data that could be
23 helpful. Mr. Perez reported that there were tolling studies for Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little
24 Cottonwood Canyon. He stated that all of the alternatives in the EIS called for tolling. The tolling
25 program would need to be refined to the mode and road management investments. Mr. Farnsworth
26 reported that this would be unique from other tolling applications throughout the United States.
27 Rather than being an incentive to use a well-maintained road, tolling in these applications would
28 be a disincentive, as it would encourage users to use different modes of transportation. He noted
29 that a lot of refinement still needed to be done regarding tolling.

30
31 Mr. Perez responded to comments and answered a question from Dave Fields from Snowbird, who
32 asked if a gondola system should be seasonal. Mr. Perez noted that the EIS team was trying to
33 determine how a gondola system would work throughout the year. Mayor Beerman asked how
34 non-winter and winter use numbers would compare. He felt it was important to look at modes that
35 would address year-round needs. Mr. Perez noted the study included recommendations on what a
36 summer transit service could look like. Mr. Becker stated that another dimension in use was related
37 to the spike of visitors due to COVID-19. Chair Peterson reported that he met with UDOT
38 representatives recently and who verified that traffic counts in the last six months had been some
39 of the highest ever. Chair Peterson attributed that to the pandemic and felt it would be the new
40 normal.

41
42 Mr. Perez read a comment from Barbara Cameron who asked if canyon tolling needs to be spent
43 in the corridor where it was generated. Mr. Farnsworth was not familiar with that statute but noted
44 that he could check with UDOT. Mr. Perez commented that he would follow up with the EIS team
45 about how that would work. Carl Fisher from Save Our Canyons commented that key points
46 continued to be ignored in terms of seasonal use.

1
2 Ms. Briefer asked about recreation fees versus tolling. She wondered if tolling was implemented
3 and that revenue could only be applied to the road if that would make it more difficult to raise
4 revenue to support Forest Service recreation needs. Mr. Perez wondered whether elements of the
5 Millcreek recreation fees could be modified to fit the needs of each of the canyons. Chair Peterson
6 reported that he was involved in the Millcreek fee implementation 25 to 30 years earlier. One of
7 the reasons behind the admission fee to the canyon had been to provide funding for improvements
8 at trailheads and pavilions. He believed this question deserved further analysis.
9

10 Mr. Becker discussed the issue of seasonal use. He noted that it had been one of the highest
11 priorities for the Mountain Transportation System at the CWC. Mr. Becker believed that UDOT
12 was looking at the issue differently as their priority was to relieve congestion during peak periods.
13 The CWC would bring a slightly different perspective to transportation compared to UDOT.
14

15 Kim Mayhew from Solitude believed that summer operations of the gondola should be part of the
16 transportation plan. Mr. Perez asked if she believed summer transit should be part of all
17 transportation modes. Ms. Mayhew believed that summer operation of the bus service would be
18 critical. Mr. Perez noted that part of the goal of the Mountain Transportation System was to
19 provide year-round transit options throughout the region. He felt it was a high priority and noted
20 that a local year-round bus option, as well as improved connections from the Salt Lake Valley and
21 the Wasatch Back, would be needed to access recreation nodes.
22

23 Chair Peterson responded to a follow-up question regarding tolling and stated that he felt it would
24 be interesting to determine whether proceeds could be used to fund the mobility hubs. Mr. Perez
25 made note of Chair Peterson’s suggestion.
26

27 **b. Committee will Make Recommended Edits to Draft Concepts.**
28

29 Mr. Perez brought up the following three potential discussion points:
30

- 31 • Connections with Summit County and Park City;
- 32 • Canyon connections and direction on sub-alternatives; and
- 33 • How to incorporate supplemental information from UDOT.
34

35 Mayor Beerman liked the proposals in the plan and was actively working with Summit County
36 and UDOT to get the Bus Rapid Transit (“BRT”) on Highway 224. Mayor Beerman noted that
37 they currently have an express bus and were hoping to obtain a Federal Grant to put in dedicated
38 lanes and stations for BRT. He reported that Park City was also working with UDOT on limited
39 bus lane opportunities on Highway 248, which would take place next year during road work and
40 restriping. Park City was not interested in tunnels but remained open to the idea of a transportation-
41 oriented aerial.
42

43 Mayor Knopp discussed transportation. He felt that certain types of transportation modes would
44 become an attraction in and of themselves during the summer season. Additional modes of
45 transportation would also bring more people to the canyon and it was important to plan for that.
46

1 Mr. Fisher commented that he would like to see scenarios or potential outcomes. He noted that
2 with potential visitor increases to the canyons, visitors will need more amenities and infrastructure.
3 He wondered what this would look like. He also believed that the outlined transportation
4 alternatives focus heavily on getting people to and from resorts. 70% of people going into the
5 canyons visit dispersed sites and he felt that many of the transportation modes were oriented
6 toward resort guests rather than meeting all visitor needs.

7
8 Mayor Knoop noted that a concentrated transportation system would provide additional control.
9 He felt that if transportation were left to vehicles, vehicle traffic would continue. However, if
10 there were limitations on transportation modes, this could provide control. Mr. Fisher noted that
11 even with vehicular traffic, it wasn't always possible to obtain a parking spot. He noted that UDOT
12 needs to enforce parking on the road corridor. Chair Peterson noted that the intent was to remove
13 cars from 'No Parking' areas.

14
15 Ms. Briefer agreed with Mr. Fisher and felt that scenarios would be a helpful way to see what the
16 unintended consequences might be. She also discussed concerns regarding whether it would be
17 more difficult to access public lands. Ms. Briefer wondered how potential transportation projects
18 would be financed and who would shoulder the costs. Mr. Perez reported that to obtain public
19 approval, it would be essential to understand what avenues potential tolling revenue could go
20 toward. He also acknowledged Ms. Briefer's written comment regarding the environmental
21 impacts of a canyon tunnel. Mayor Beerman noted that there would be a tremendous cost and
22 regulatory impact. He believed that any discussions as they relate to tunnels would require a
23 meeting with the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and the Department of
24 Environmental Quality ("DEQ").

25
26 Barbara Cameron commented that the U.S. Forest Service had hoped to focus on year-round
27 visitation at ski resorts to take pressure off of dispersed recreation maintenance. She wondered if
28 the Forest Service had been contacted regarding their policy on the focus. Mr. Perez stated that he
29 could follow up to discuss the issue with them. Mr. Becker noted that ongoing discussions and
30 communication had been taking place with the Forest Service as it related to transportation options.

31
32 Mr. Perez asked about a possible presentation of an aerial transit alternative between the
33 Cottonwood Canyons and Park City. He believed it would be beneficial to obtain public comment
34 and wondered whether it should be shown as a sub-alternative. Mayor Beerman commented on
35 resort support for such a project. It was noted that neither Vail nor Alterra had been supportive of
36 a connection. He suggested that it may be beneficial to hear where the resorts stood. Mr. Perez
37 noted that staff wanted public comment and feedback on any possible connections. He was
38 interested in hearing from the public about aerial transit connections that may align with ski resorts.

39
40 Dave Fields from Snowbird noted that Mayor Beerman had summed up the situation nicely. He
41 noted that Snowbird was not opposed to the idea but had not pursued it. Mr. Maughan was open
42 to hearing what the public had to say. He felt that if aerial transportation could significantly reduce
43 vehicular traffic, it should be looked at and evaluated. Chair Peterson suggested including this
44 issue as part of the public comment. Ms. Cameron commented that as a resident of Big
45 Cottonwood Canyon, transportation connections are needed. She felt they were necessary not just

1 for residents but because connections would be needed for emergencies, such as earthquakes or
2 floods. She felt it was a matter of public safety.

3
4 Chair Peterson referenced Mr. Fisher's earlier comments and noted that it was important to be
5 sensitive to unintended consequences once a particular mode of transportation is introduced. He
6 wondered if there would be a way to evaluate that.

7
8 Mr. Perez discussed canyon connections. He suggested showing base alternatives and showing
9 each of the connections as a sub-alternative. Mayor Beerman wondered what the next steps would
10 be if options were listed as sub-alternatives. Mr. Perez stated that this was a way to share and
11 present the options to the public. Most of the concepts, such as trailhead service, year-round
12 service, and transit services were agreed upon. The alternatives, such as a tunnel or an aerial mode
13 of transportation would benefit from public feedback as it would help the decision-makers
14 determine whether there needed to be a connection between the canyons and what the most
15 appropriate connection would be.

16
17 Mayor Beerman asked if viability was a part of the discussion. He wondered if it was important
18 to determine preference first. Mr. Perez stated that they were trying to obtain information on
19 viability concerns to present to the public. He noted that the costs and constraints of each
20 alternative would be shared. Mr. Becker reported that as the alternatives had been defined, they
21 had been reviewed by technical experts and advisors. They had looked at issues related to cost,
22 ownership, and practicality. He noted that the goal was to give the public something reasonable
23 to respond to. Chair Peterson noted that it was important for the public to have information to
24 review. Mayor Beerman believed that if more information was made available to the public related
25 to cost and viability, the comments would be better.

26
27 Mr. Perez outlined the concept of alternatives and sub-alternatives. He used the example of Little
28 Cottonwood Canyon. He stated that there would be bus alternatives, which would be
29 Alternative 1, and then aerial alternatives, which would be Alternative 2. The sub-alternatives
30 would mean there would be 1-A or 1-B. 1-A would be bus, transit tunnel while 1-B would be bus,
31 aerial. He noted that the sub-alternatives were not tied to the base transportation mode. Mr. Perez
32 shared another example, where an aerial system would be the main base line up Little Cottonwood
33 Canyon and the sub-alternative would be the connection via tunnel or aerial.

34
35 Mr. Perez discussed supplemental information. He mentioned the importance of being flexible
36 enough to use and include any supplemental information that may come in. Mr. Perez wondered
37 if the following should be presented for public comment:

- 38
39
- 40 • A La Caille Aerial Station option;
 - 41 • Additional rail cost estimates and alignments;
 - 42 • A Tesla Boring Company Tunnel; and
 - 43 • Refined bus costs.

44 Mayor Knopp stated that it was important to be careful that anything put out is as accurate as
45 possible. Chair Peterson noted that there had been a lot of current information related to the La
46 Caille Aerial Station option and the additional rail costs. He felt it was important to include them

1 if the information is correct and consistent. Mayor Beerman felt that the presentation would be
2 incomplete if it did not include or reference the supplemental information.

3
4 Mr. Becker noted that it was important to get the Mountain Transportation System alternatives out
5 so that the public could understand the alternatives and the impacts and consequences of each.
6 Mr. Perez discussed the following next steps:

- 7
- 8 • Refine draft alternatives and consider supplemental information;
- 9 • Develop reports, data, numbers, and narratives about each of the alternatives; and
- 10 • Mountain Transportation Panel Discussion on September 18, 2020, followed by a 30-day
11 public comment period and the Design Your Transit tool.
- 12

13 Mr. Perez noted that the Mountain Transportation System Virtual Summit would take place on
14 November 13, 2020, and November 14, 2020.

15
16 Chair Peterson stated that this process did not have the resources that an EIS from UDOT would
17 have but the amount of effort put into the Mountain Transportation System had been valuable. He
18 thanked everyone for their work and attendance.

19
20 Mr. Fisher identified concerns related to planning exhaustion. He noted that a lot of questions had
21 been raised but there had not been a lot of implementation. He felt that after reviewing the slides,
22 it seemed that jurisdictions did not have the authority to pursue some of the alternatives. He
23 commented that a clearer understanding of how these projects could take place would be beneficial
24 so the public would believe the options were viable and realistic. Mr. Perez noted that there were
25 things that could be done locally and others that would require an EIS. Mr. Fisher was thanked
26 for sharing his concerns.

27
28 **4. ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

29
30 Chair Peterson reported that the leadership of the Transportation Committee would be adjusted.
31 He would be stepping aside as Chair but would remain a member of the Committee. It was
32 proposed that Mayor Knopp take over as Chair. This would be presented to the full CWC Board
33 at an upcoming meeting.

34
35 **5. ADJOURNMENT**

36
37 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mayor Beerman. The
38 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

39
40 The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately
41 11:55 a.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting held Wednesday, August 26, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____