 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING HELD MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2021, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED MARCH 18, 2020.**

**Board Members:** Chair Chris Robinson, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Dan Knopp, Mayor Jenny Wilson, Mayor Mike Peterson, Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Councilor Marci Houseman, Councilor Jim Bradley, Ex Officio Member Carlton Christensen

**Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez, Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson, CWC Legal Counsel Shane Topham

**Absent:** Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Councilor Max Doilney

**Others:**  Julianna Christie, Kris Nicholl, Dave Fields, Cyndi Sharkey, Randy \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Laura Briefer, Laura Hanson, Bobby Sampson, Catherine Kanter, Helen Peterson, Steve Van Maren, Dennis Goreham, Lance Kovel, Lynn Pace, Mike Marker, Ned Hacker, Tom Gilman, Tom Herrod, Abi Holt, Alex Schmidt, Colby Hartman, Kelly Bricker, Lisa Hartman, Alexander Cramer, Annalee Munsey, Bob Kollar, Marian Rice, Sarah Bennett, Gary Jackson, Chris Adams, Chris McCandless, Deborah Case, Brian Hutchinson, Michael Maughan, Newel Jensen, Sharon Turner, Eric Wadley, Alexander Crane, Maile \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Joey Alsop, Megan Nelson, John Knoblock

**OPENING CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION BOARD MEETING**

1. **Commissioner Christopher F. Robinson will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Board, (the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”).**

Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which was as follows:

‘I, as the Chair of the Board of the Central Wasatch Commission hereby determine that conducting council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President of the United States, the Governor of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Health Department have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to the new strain of the Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2. Due to the state of emergency caused by the global pandemic, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the location. According to the information and from State epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the State’s health care system.’

1. **The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the March 1, 2021, Board Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to approve the minutes of the March 1, 2021 Board Meeting. Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1. **The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the March 19, 2021, Commissioners MTS Summit Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2021, Commissioners MTS Summit Meeting. Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1. **Ratification of Chair Robinson Approval to Proceed to Contract with Consultant: Visitor Use Selection Committee Recommendation Resolution 2021-05.**

Chair Robinson reported that Resolution 2021-05 relates to the ratification of a Visitor Use Study between the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) and Utah State University. He noted that the cost of Phase 1 totaled approximately $37,325 and had a completion date of November 2021. Chair Robinson pointed out sections from the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement. For instance, Section 20(b) specifies that there will be a Joint Board consisting of University and CWC designees. Chair Robinson also identified a section related to confidentiality.

Mayor Harris Sondak discussed the Visitor Use Study process. The Selection Committee reviewed Request for Proposal (“RFP”) submissions, proposed questions to the applicants, read the answers, and ranked the various proposals individually. The Selection Committee then discussed the submissions, which were scored by staff. Mayor Sondak noted that the initial indirect costs proposed by Utah State University seemed high. The University reduced those costs by approximately $12,000. The Selection Committee was impressed by the overall level of experience and the background of the various members of the Utah State University team.

Mayor Jenny Wilson thanked the members of the Selection Committee for their work. She supported the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement but wondered if it would be possible to speak with Utah State University about the timeline. Mayor Wilson felt it would be beneficial to expedite the timeline if it was possible to do so.

Councilor Bradley asked if the CWC Board would receive periodic updates from Utah State University related to the Visitor Use Study. Deputy Director, Blake Perez reported that the Selection Committee agreed to stay on as a Working Group. They would receive updates from the project team at Utah State University. Members of the Working Group could then communicate those updates to the CWC Board. Executive Director, Ralph Becker noted that the Working Group includes Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Mayor Sondak, and members of the Stakeholders Council. Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson commented that Professor Jordan Smith was appointed to serve as the Utah State University representative.

**MOTION:** Mayor Sondak moved to approve Resolution 2021-05 for a Visitor Use Study Agreement with Utah State University. Councilor Houseman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

**COMMITTEE AND PROJECT REPORTS**

1. **Executive Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

Chair Robinson reported that no Executive Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

1. **Budget/Finance Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

Chair Robinson reported that no Budget/Finance Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

1. **Transportation Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

Chair Robinson reported that no Transportation Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

1. **Short-Term Projects Committee: 2021 Project Funding Update.**

Councilor Bradley shared updates related to the Short-Term Projects Committee. The Environmental Dashboard was progressing according to plan and projected to be completed in December 2021. He reported that there was a storyboarding session with representatives from the project team and CWC staff. The purpose of the session was to build out the public interface of the Environmental Dashboard. Councilor Bradley looked forward to the outcome.

There was also an open call in process for short-term projects. The open call would end on April 12, 2021. Councilor Bradley reported that there are currently 10 project submissions. CWC staff will review the submissions and present the appropriate projects to the Short-Term Projects Committee on April 27, 2021. Councilor Bradley reported that there is currently $30,000 budgeted to fund short-term projects for the fiscal year. CWC staff met with KSL NewsRadio and Councilor Bradley was on Park City Television to discuss the open call and invite applications.

Councilor Bradley overviewed the review process for short-term project applications. CWC staff will look at all applications and send appropriate projects to the U.S. Forest Service for review to ensure that no Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) is needed and the necessary permits are in place. CWC staff will then ask for additional details related to the submitted projects. That information will be reviewed and presented to the CWC Board on May 3, 2021.

Chair Robinson reported that on March 25, 2021, CWC staff received an email from Salt Lake District Ranger, Bekee Hotze. She indicated that Phase 3 of the Cottonwood Canyons Developed Site Reconstruction and the Silver Lake Boardwalk Replacement projects had been selected for Great American Outdoors Act funding. Ms. Hotze was grateful for the CWC letter of support.

1. **Legislative/Land Tenure Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

Chair Robinson reported that no Legislative/Land Tenure Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

1. **Stakeholders Council Information: Opening Call for Applications.**

Mr. Perez reported that approximately half of the Stakeholders Council initial terms were coming to an end. However, many of the Stakeholders Council Members agreed to serve again in their roles. Mr. Perez explained that when the CWC Stakeholders Council was first formed, membership had been staggered. Anyone who joined the Stakeholders Council now or recommitted to another term would have a four-year term. There were approximately six openings on the Stakeholders Council due to resignations and there would be an open call for applications. The application process will go through the Executive Committee for review. The goal was to have a list of recommended Stakeholders Council Members for the CWC Board to approve in July 2021.

**MTS DISCUSSION**

Chair Robinson discussed the Commissioners Summit held on March 19, 2021. He believed the Summit was productive and filled in knowledge gaps. During the Summit, many Commissioners implied that they felt the best alternative would be enhanced bus. There had also been a staff recommendation for a cog rail system. Chair Robinson overviewed the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) items to be discussed during the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Perez overviewed the documents included in the packet. The first document was the Local Governments for Sustainability (“ICLEI”) Emissions Report. It focused on a comparison of greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions for the Little Cottonwood Canyon transportation alternatives. The first graph shared data related to the annual GHG emissions for 25% of Little Cottonwood Canyon passengers. Mr. Perez noted that electric bus, rail, and gondola all received favorable results. The next graph shared data related to peak hour GHG emissions. Electric bus, rail, and gondola had favorable results. The ICLEI Emissions Report also outlined additional considerations including the following:

* Congestion impacts;
* Changing electricity generation; and
* Impacts on vehicle trips outside the study area.

The last part of the ICLEI Emissions Report focused on various data and assumptions.

Mr. Perez next overviewed the Little Cottonwood Traffic Analysis. Alta Ski Area, with the assistance of Streetlight Data, completed a traffic analysis to determine the percentage of vehicles that entered Little Cottonwood Canyon with Alta or Snowbird being their destination. Different zones or gates were placed at specific locations. The first gate was located at the mouth of the canyon, just above the Park and Ride zone. The second gate was placed just below Snowbird’s entry one. Traffic patterns were summarized on a monthly and annual basis in 2018, 2019, and 2020. The data showed that a high percentage of visitors were headed to Snowbird or Alta.

Mr. Perez overviewed updated information from Stadler Rail. The Stadler Rail presentation included the south side alignment. They looked at an alignment that skirts the wilderness and went through the wilderness to avoid major avalanche paths. The presentation also provided several potential whistle stops consisting of the following:

* Gate Buttress;
* Lisa Falls;
* Tanners Flat; and
* White Pine.

Estimated costs were overviewed for the north side alignment ($753 million), the south side alignment without snowsheds but with whistle stops ($614 million), the south side and valley alignment ($945 million), and the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) north side alignment ($1.094 billion). Additionally, there was a document included in the packet that overviewed the specific train sets. The Electric Multiple Unit (“EMU”) with battery options would be a mixed operation vehicle that would allow for rack-and-pinion (cog) as well as adhesion operation. There was also information in the document related to seating and the ability to tie into the TRAX network.

Mr. Perez reported that there a meeting was held with UDOT, Stadler Rail, and the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) prior to the Commissioners Summit. UDOT provided a memo related to the southern alignment. The alignment was reviewed, however, UDOT felt that the southern alignment would not fit their purpose and need. It was recommended that the southern alignment no longer be studied or considered. Several reasons for that decision were included in the memo.

The aerial gondola alternative was discussed. CWC staff spoke with Doppelmayr and SE Group about alternative alignments that could lower the tower heights, avoid avalanche powder blasts, and still allow for dispersed recreation stations. Both Doppelmayr and SE Group stated that the alignment reviewed in the alternatives was the preferred alignment.

Mr. Perez shared a map with the CWC Board to show what additional stations along the alternative would do. If additional stations were added, this would add approximately two minutes per station to the overall travel time. Each station would cost approximately $11 million. The height of the towers could be lowered but there would need to be some tradeoffs. For instance, lowered towers would impede the ability for the aerial gondola to deliver service during avalanches and would not necessarily be able to avoid powder blasts. Additionally, if the tower heights were reduced, there would need to be additional smaller towers, so the overall footprint would be expanded.

Mr. Perez discussed enhanced valley transit. He noted that two requests were made to UTA. One related to express buses from multiple hubs throughout the valley and the other related to enhanced valley service to the mouth of the canyons. Mr. Perez overviewed the idea of regional hubs and shared a concept map with locations where the potential hubs could be located including:

* Salt Lake City;
* University of Utah;
* Millcreek;
* Holladay;
* West Valley;
* Murray;
* Fort Union; and
* Sandy.

Each of the locations would have one bus going to one ski resort every 15 minutes. There would be four buses leaving every 15 minutes from the hubs. That would be approximately 2,500 people per hour with this enhanced valley transit service. To deliver that service, 447 buses would be needed. The cost of the buses for the ski season alone would be approximately $83 million and year-round service would be approximately $250 million. Laura Hanson believed those cost estimates included the capital for purchasing the buses in addition to the ongoing operations and maintenance. She added that bus service is easy to scale up or down based on demand. There were numerous possible scenarios to consider with different pros and cons.

Mr. Perez noted that staff also looked at improved valley service to the mouth of the canyons. The idea was to look at the current UTA routes and determine how those routes could be added to, extended, or turned into an express service during certain times of the day. He shared a spreadsheet that outlined the estimated costs to increase the current service.

Mayor Wilson believed an extensive amount of fine tuning would need to be done with each of the transportation modes. She posed several questions to the CWC Board, such as:

* Is 15-minute service really what we are looking for?
* Will we need 15-minute service at all times throughout the season?
* What is the summer demand?
* Where do we see challenges?

Chair Robinson felt that the information shows that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS has a limited purpose and need. The CWC wanted to arrive at an MTS that was broader in scope. Some of the information reviewed by Mr. Perez, such as alternative rail alignments, whistle stops, and enhanced valley transit, transcends the UDOT vision. Chair Robinson commented that it is important to spend time during the current CWC Board Meeting to regroup and determine the best course of action to take.

Mayor Sondak asked if an aerial gondola system with intermediate stops would have the option to skip those intermediate stops based on time, day, or season. Mr. Perez confirmed this and stated that the gondola cabin doors will not open if they are not programmed to do so.

Mayor Sondak stated that the south side rail alignment was unsupportable from his point of view. He asked about the north side alignment. It appeared that the north side alignment would stop at Snowbird to avoid having to build snowsheds along State Road 210 under Mount Superior. This would necessitate the use of buses from Snowbird to Alta. He wondered if that was the concept Stadler Rail presented. Mr. Perez explained that Stadler Rail had shown both bus and aerial gondola as possible connections between Snowbird and Alta. A mode transfer would be required under a north side alignment if there was a desire to eliminate snowsheds. Mr. Perez believed the UDOT alternative included a snowshed for the cog rail system between Snowbird and Alta.

Chair Robinson posed the following questions to the CWC Board:

* Does the CWC want to reach an agreement on a recommendation for an MTS prior to the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS?
* Does the CWC want to wait until the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS and provide comment during the 45-day comment period?

Chair Robinson noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was scheduled for release in June 2021. He wondered if the CWC should recommend enhanced bus as a Phase One recommendation with a Phase Two recommendation that additional time be taken to supplement or enhance the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Another year or so could allow UDOT to expand their purpose and need and to take into account certain things such as federal legislation, federal protections and enhanced valley transit. He felt it would be difficult for the CWC to reach consensus on one transportation alternative, given the constraints and questions that still existed.

Laura Briefer stated that there was nothing that limited the CWC to the formal comment period for the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. She felt it was better to communicate a rational approach sooner rather than later.

Mayor Mike Peterson reported that he tried to take the issue to the Cottonwood Heights City Council for further vetting. He got the sense from City Council that they were not ready to take a position on a transportation alternative. Mayor Peterson felt the same way. He believed there were many questions that still need to be reviewed. However, he understood that enhanced bus will need to be a part of whatever alternative was selected. Mayor Peterson expressed concerns related to Wasatch Boulevard and discussed congestion issues. He was anxious to see some of the results from the Visitor Use Study and felt the study may provide necessary additional information. He was not ready to select one of the five transportation alternatives and would support waiting for UDOT to share their preferred alternative.

Councilor Marci Houseman appreciated the additional information that was shared with Commissioners during the CWC Board Meeting. It emphasized the need for a transportation solution that would both move visitors up the canyon and move visitors to the canyon. Councilor Houseman believed a short-term solution was needed. Sandy City could support buses as a short-term solution, but there were concerns about choosing buses as a long-term solution. Buses would only work as a long-term solution if they were able to pass vehicles in the canyon, which would likely require road widening. Since the main priorities of Sandy City related to protection of the watershed and keeping water safe and healthy, widening the canyon was a concern.

Ex-Officio Member, Carlton Christensen noted that there are not any true short-term solutions. He reported that it will take approximately two years to order buses and hire appropriately. There will also need to be a maintenance facility to store the additional buses. Even a short-term decision would be significant. Ex-Officio Christensen did not believe that a two-phased approach was best. He felt it would be better to look for the right solution from the start because there would need to be a significant investment made regardless.

Mayor Dan Knopp noted that he spoke to UDOT Director, Carlos Braceras, who indicated that UDOT wanted to find a solution and move forward. Mayor Knopp understood that the CWC may need additional time to discuss options and alternatives because they were still not close to a consensus. However, it was possible that UDOT would move forward with or without CWC support.

Mayor Wilson believed the different alternatives would need some level of enhanced bus. She discussed the infrastructure bill and how that might impact decision making. Mayor Wilson was interested in exploring enhanced bus with tolling, carpooling, and road investment. She shared suggestions related to tolling and commented that there were a number of tools that could go along with an enhanced bus system to make it more effective.

Mayor Knopp commented that it was important to come up with a high-capacity public transportation system to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. He noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS does not address summer use and reported that the summer months were becoming as busy as the winter months. It was important to be realistic about the need for year-round service. He discussed the south side rail alignment and stated that it would not require snowsheds, would miss avalanche paths, would work in all weather, and reduce vehicles from the road.

Councilor Houseman reiterated that Sandy City did not feel buses were the right long-term solution due to potential impacts to the watershed. If Sandy City had to choose between an expanded roadway to make a dedicated bus lane work or another transportation corridor, the city would support a transportation corridor that caused the least amount of disruption to the watershed. She noted that in order to reduce the number of vehicles on the road, there would need to be a change in behavior through incentives and an efficient transportation system that elevated the canyon experience.

Mayor Erin Mendenhall believed it would better to reach a shared consensus sooner rather than later. She recognized that the Commissioners have different views and priorities but felt that the CWC needs to move fairly quickly. She liked the idea of a short-term solution followed by a long-term solution and expressed support for a two-phased recommendation. Mayor Mendenhall added that the watershed and environment are the primary concerns. She discussed options related to enhanced bus service, for instance, strategic passing opportunities. Mayor Mendenhall also reiterated the importance of reaching a decision related to a second phase recommendation.

Ms. Briefer shared concerns related to capacity. She commented that the canyons do not have unlimited capacity and overuse could threaten or degrade the water resources and watershed. She discussed the different transportation options and noted that certain issues could be mitigated. However, she would not want to see infrastructure placed into the riparian corridor. Chair Robinson wondered if Ms. Briefer was more comfortable with an enhanced bus solution due to the inherent capacity limitations. Ms. Briefer commented that there was more flexibility to manage and control an enhanced bus system than with a rail or aerial gondola system. She still had a lot of questions about how the economics of those solutions might drive additional use or induce additional development. While she understood there was a transportation problem to solve, there was still a lot of uncertainty with respect to the high-capacity solutions and the natural capacity of the watershed.

Ex-Officio Christensen believed there was short-term potential for congestion mitigation at the mouth of the canyon. Those mitigation efforts could be added within one or two years. He had never seen a major capital project completed in less than five to seven years. Ex-Officio Christensen commented that the high-capacity systems will likely fall within that sort of timeframe. He expressed concerns about choosing a transportation mode based on the ability to control access.

Mayor Wilson discussed the goal of removing vehicles from the road. She pointed out that carpooling and full buses will both take vehicles off of the road. If the goal is to remove vehicles, there were many ways to make that happen without building a high-capacity transportation system. Mayor Wilson recognized that with additional growth and demand in the canyons, something more than enhanced bus could become necessary in future. However, she noted that many of the Commissioners seemed to favor some form of a bus system. She suggested that the CWC look at the demand, address visitor use, technology, and other factors before moving forward with a recommendation.

Mayor Sondak asked about the goal to remove 30% of vehicles from the road. He wondered if that 30% represented the number of vehicles on the road currently or the number of vehicles on the road in 20 years. He also wanted to know what the cost would be for a snowshed on State Road 210 between Snowbird and Alta. Mayor Sondak believed that Mayor Wilson’s suggestion earlier in the meeting about accelerating the Visitor Use Study would be beneficial as it was an important component of the transportation discussions. He discussed how parking capacity often limit the number of visitors in the canyons. Additional transportation systems that do not require parking could increase visitation as a result. He stressed the importance of short-term solutions. There needs to be incentives for people to choose to carpool or take the bus. Mayor Sondak wanted to see some of those issues discussed within the Short-Term Projects Committee.

Mayor Peterson commented that no action is not a solution. He stated that they needed to find a transportation solution. He referenced Mayor Mendenhall’s comments about a two-phased approach to a transportation system and stated that some level of bus service would need to be included in all of the alternatives. Mayor Peterson shared that he was not opposed to a rail or aerial gondola system, but there were still a lot of questions related to cost, impacts to the watershed, and timing. However, he felt that the CWC could reach a consensus that buses would be part of any chosen transportation alternative. Chair Robinson asked for clarification about the statement that buses would be part of any transportation alternative. He wondered if that meant that the CWC should:

* Recommend subtle changes that have an impact now and could be implemented shortly; and
* Recommend that UDOT implement an enhanced bus system that involves things like additional buses and road widening.

Mayor Peterson suggested that it may be a combination of both. Some concerns could be mitigated with a few additional buses or tolling. He commented that tolling could incentivize people to leave their vehicles and will raise revenues that could help fund some major capital costs.

Chair Robinson asked the Commissioners about next steps. He wondered if the CWC Board needs to meet again if staff should put together a bullet point document with the points made during the meeting for further review. Councilor Bradley asked if staff could put together a decision-making matrix that included a list of priorities. For instance, watershed protection, capacity of the canyons, opportunity to recreate and aesthetics. He also suggested that there may need to be additional CWC Board meetings in the next two months to move forward with the transportation discussions.

Councilor Houseman supported the idea shared by Councilor Bradley. She noted that the Sandy City priorities were presented during the Commissioners Summit and she felt there could be consensus building around shared priorities. She suggested that these priorities could be shared with one another prior to the next CWC Board Meeting. Councilor Houseman stressed the importance of ensuring that all meeting time is as productive as possible.

Chair Robinson noted that CWC staff previously prepared an evaluation matrix that included values and attributes. However, the matrix could be refined to add priorities. Chair Robinson brought up the possibility of going through the elements included in the evaluation matrix to collectively rate each one. Mr. Becker reported that the evaluation matrix included objectives, attributes, and elements that were important for an MTS. Additionally, the Commission approved a prioritization of the most important elements, which were also included in the evaluation matrix. The value statements reflected in the Mountain Accord work had been included as well. Staff spent an enormous amount of time taking all of that information and scoring each from 1 to 4 as a way to start discussion about how each of the alternatives related to the work of the Commission. Mr. Becker noted that the Commissioners had not yet filled out the evaluation matrix for themselves.

Chair Robinson wondered whether the evaluation matrix could be scaled down to a dozen key issues or priorities in order to poll Commissioners in real time. Mr. Becker stated that staff could attempt to do this, but noted that in the past, it had been difficult to scale down the issues. He suggested that each Commissioner fill out the evaluation matrix themselves. The results could be tabulated and brought back to the CWC Board for further discussion. Chair Robinson wondered if the Commissioners would be willing to do that. Ex-Officio Christensen felt it would be productive. Councilor Bradley suggested asking each of the Commissioners to identify their top three priorities.

Councilor Houseman believed the evaluation matrix provided a solid foundation with the scoring. Individual priorities would add additional weight to certain parts of the matrix. She would prefer that the CWC Board use something like the evaluation matrix rather than starting over with something else. Mr. Becker noted that the scoring on the evaluation matrix may differ based on jurisdiction priorities. It was important to look at an MTS from a broader perspective as well as from the perspective of the individual jurisdictions. Mayor Sondak suggested that each Commissioner fill out the evaluation matrix and also provide a list of pros and cons. Chair Robinson liked the suggestion. Mayor Knopp urged the Commissioners to think about each of the transportation modes in 20 years and use that as part of their decision making and scoring.

Discussions were had regarding a potential date for a future meeting. It was determined that the meeting would be held on April 19, 2021, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

There was no additional Commissioner comment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to adjourn. Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.
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