 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING HELD MONDAY, JULY 12, 2021, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION**

**Board Members:** Chair Christopher F. Robinson, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Dan Knopp, Mayor Jenny Wilson, Mayor Mike Peterson, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Councilor Marci Houseman, Councilor Jim Bradley, Councilor Max Doilney, Ex Officio Member Carlton Christensen

**Excused:** Mayor Erin Mendenhall

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

**Others:**  Ned Hacker, Gary Jackson, Roger Boergenicht, Lance Kovel, Bobby Sampson, Kara Trevino, Dave Fields, Jordan Smith, Chad Huston, Mike Marker, Bri Bonnesbune, Pat Shea, Chad Smith, Dennis Goreham, Catherine Kanter, Deborah Case, Maura Hahnenberger, John Knoblock, Bekee Hotze, Kelly Boardman, Josh Van Jura, Anna Miller, Gay Lynn Bennion, Patrick Nelson, Casey Hill, Steve Van Maren, Tom Diegel, Vincent Izzo, Annalee Munsey, Helen Peters, Michael Maughan

**OPEN CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**

1. **Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the CWC Board Meeting Plus Commenting on the Electronic Meeting, No Anchor Location, as Noted Above.**

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 Commissioners (the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”), hereby determine that conducting Board 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. Although the overall instance of COVID-19 cases has diminished somewhat over the past several months, the pandemic remains, and the recent rise of more infectious variants of the virus merits continued vigilance to avoid another surge in cases, which could again threaten to overwhelm Utah’s healthcare system.’

1. **(Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the Public Hearing Regarding the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year CWC Budget – June 7, 2021.**

**MOTION:** Councilor Houseman moved to approve the minutes of the Public Hearing Regarding the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year CWC Budget – June 7, 2021. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1. **(Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the June 7, 2021, Board Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Mayor Peterson moved to approve the June 7, 2021, Board Meeting Minutes. Councilor Houseman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1. **(Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the Board Meeting Following the Closed Session of June 7, 2021.**

**MOTION:** Councilor Houseman moved to approve the minutes of the Board Meeting Following the Closed Session – June 7, 2021. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

**COMMITTEE AND PROJECT REPORTS**

1. **Executive Committee: Minutes of the June 21, 2021, Executive Committee Meeting Included in the Packet: Actions Listed Below. Discussion Items as Follows:**

* **Establish November 15, 2021, as CWC Board Retreat Day and Request Councilor Marci Houseman/Mayor Dan Knopp Serve as Partners with Staff in Retreat Agenda Planning and Location. Focus on the Role of the Executive Committee Individuals as Facilitators.**
* **Continue CWC Board and Committee Meetings as Virtual Until After November CWC Board Retreat.**
* **Gantt Chart Updated for Fiscal Year 2021-2022: Discussion/Included in Packet.**

Chair Robinson reported that the Executive Committee Meeting minutes from June 21, 2021, were included in the packet. He explained that the Executive Committee discussed appointments and reappointments to the Stakeholders Council. There was an action item related to those individuals later on in the CWC Board Meeting agenda.

Mayor Mike Peterson explained that there had been a thorough process. The Selection Committee identified different criteria to consider, such as gender, diversity of voice, skills, and abilities as well as the needs of the Stakeholders Council. Mayor Peterson noted that there had been a total of 26 applicants. There were eight Stakeholders Council Member openings and 10 names were identified. He explained that one of the recommended applicants was unable to follow through with the application due to a previous commitment. Resolution 2021-13 included the complete list of names for Stakeholder Council appointments and reappointments.

Chair Robinson noted that the Executive Committee Meeting also included discussions related to the CWC Board Retreat. Councilor Marci Houseman and Mayor Dan Knopp agreed to serve as partners with CWC Staff to plan the CWC Board Retreat. CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez reported that Friday, November 5, 2021, was tentatively scheduled for the retreat. CWC Staff would meet with Councilor Houseman and Mayor Knopp to finalize the time and location.

During the Executive Committee Meeting, a decision was made to hold virtual CWC meetings until the CWC Board Retreat. Chair Robinson believed that would provide enough time for Board Members to assess the COVID-19 variants and make an informed decision. He overviewed the Gantt Chart and noted that it had been updated. Mr. Perez explained that the chart highlighted the 2021-2022 work timeline. It referenced the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area (“CWNCRA”) Act, Visitor Use Study Phase I and Phase II, and the Environmental Dashboard.

1. **Budget/Finance/Audit Committee: Minutes of the June 14, 2021, and June 23, 2021, BFA Committee Meetings Included in Packet: Recommendations, Actions Listed Below.**

* **Recommendation: Central Wasatch Commission Continues with Phase II Hybrid Proposal in a Phased Approach: Ecological Study and Social Study from Utah State University in the Amount of $288,212.64.**
* **Funding Should Be Split Over Two Fiscal Years (2021-2022 and 2022-2023): A Spreadsheet of Potential Funding Needs per Fiscal Year is Included in the Board Packet and Referenced in Items C and D Below. (7.8.2021 Note: Changes Listed in Option 2 Which Funds Ecological Study/Social Study Separately.**
* **The CWC Board will Engage Its Own Resources for the Ecological Study Aspects of the Phase II Proposal Using State Appropriations Funding (Less Administrative Fee) and $50,000 Returned from Reserves. Makes Available $106,318.58 from CWC for 2021-2022 Fiscal Year. Anticipates an Additional $66,609.01 Needed for Fiscal Year 2021-2022. (See Spreadsheet). (Note: Option 2 Also Included.)**
* **The CWC Board Shall Develop Funding Resources Before Moving Forward with the Social Aspects of the Phase II Proposal. Save Our Canyons, Friends of Alta, Wasatch Mountain Club, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, and Other Jurisdictions to Name a Few. $115,285.06 Anticipated Need for Fiscal Year 2022-2023.**

Chair Robinson reported that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting Minutes were included in the packet. Mayor Jeff Silvestrini explained that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee had been involved in the Visitor Use Study discussions as it was a large expenditure that could represent as much as $288,212.64 over two fiscal years. The Budget/Finance/Audit Committee needed to determine how to pay for the study while also observing the policy that there be an adequate amount of money in reserves to fund the organization for an additional year. Some of the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Members had also participated in the Visitor Use Study Work Group. That group was responsible for reviewing and evaluating what the study proposed to do.

Mayor Silvestrini noted that there had been previous CWC Board discussions about whether the Visitor Use Study should be geared toward the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) or whether the study should be extended to include an entire year of data. The CWC Board gave direction to pursue a year-long study. Mayor Silvestrini explained that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee and the Visitor Use Study Work Group had discussed Phase II of the study extensively. Some felt that the ecological impacts of the Visitor Use Study were more immediate and concerning. The social aspect of the study, which would evaluate how visitors felt about their experience, was perhaps more subjective and could be affected by different variables. For instance, the amount of crowding that people had become accustomed to having the ability to impact the results.

Mayor Silvestrini explained that some in the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee and in the Visitor Use Study Work Group favored the ecological side. There were others that felt the social side was necessary to obtain a complete understanding of the impacts that visitor use had on the canyons. There had been further discussions with Dr. Jordan Smith from Utah State University about whether the ecological and social aspects could be studied separately. Mayor Silvestrini explained that there were certain economies of scale if both aspects were studied together.

There was a Visitor Use Study Memo drafted July 6, 2021, which was included in the packet. Mayor Silvestrini noted that the memo attempted to summarize the discussions. However, some did not believe the memo adequately emphasized the importance of the ecological aspects over the social aspects. The Budget/Finance/Audit Committee recommended that the CWC continue with a hybrid study that would focus on both elements, but additional money would be needed to fund the social aspects. Save Our Canyons had volunteered to do some fundraising, but that was an undetermined amount of money. There had also been discussions about trying to approach some of the other members about additional fundraising efforts.

Mayor Silvestrini reported that that recently, Dr. Smith and some members of the CWC Staff had a meeting where Dr. Smith spoke with representatives from the U.S. Forest Service. Those representatives were looking at visitor use in the canyons. They felt that if both groups studied the social aspects of visitor use at the same time, it may degrade the data. There was a proposal that the Forest Service and Utah State University could work together on that portion. Dr. Smith believed that would save as much as two-thirds of the $89,000 allocated to the social aspect of the study. This collaboration would make the social aspect of the study more affordable.

The Budget/Finance/Audit Committee made a recommendation to pursue a collaboration with the Forest Service on the social aspect of the study. They also recommended that the CWC fund the ecological aspect of the study. However, a more refined proposal would be needed from Utah State University to finalize the costs. Mayor Harris Sondak reported that he was both a member of the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee and the Visitor Use Study Work Group. The motion made during the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting was due to his role as a Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Member and a desire to move the process forward. As a Visitor Use Study Work Group Member, he had issues with potential biases in the social aspect of the study. He also expressed concerns related to the $75,000 cost for the mobile location data.

Mr. Perez made note of the complex discussions that took place. He commented that there was an opportunity for the CWC to partner with the Forest Service on the study. The discussions were timely as the Forest Service would start its Visitor Use Management Study in the fall. Mr. Perez reported that the Mountain Accord mentioned the social, recreational, economic, and ecological aspects of the Central Wasatch. As a result, he felt it was fairly important to consider all of the different components in the Visitor Use Study in order for there to be a complete view. Pat Shea wrote in the Zoom chat box that no one from the ecological side of the discussion had been invited to the latest meeting with Dr. Smith and the Forest Service.

Chair Robinson commented that the cost of the study was $288,212.64 and approximately $89,000 was for the social aspect. If two-thirds of the $89,000 could be saved, that would reduce the total number to roughly $230,000 for CWC expenditures. He wondered if there was a reason not to do that. Mayor Sondak explained that $75,000 of that total was for mobile location data. Mayor Sondak had doubts about the usefulness of that data. The proposed mobile location data would include information from 2019, 2020, and 2021. He was not sure that such a detailed level of data was needed and was also not sure that three years would be a long enough period to showcase trends. Additionally, the pandemic was an outlier year and that information would be included in the data. Mayor Sondak also wondered if there were alternative vendors for the data that would cost less than $75,000. He noted that trail counter data could be more affordably collected and felt the mobile location data would be supplemental and somewhat redundant.

Councilor Houseman had a question about the recommendation to partner with the Forest Service. She wondered what the timeline for the Forest Service and the partnership would look like. Mr. Perez explained that the CWC would be able to partner with the Forest Service in the fall for the social aspect of the study. If the CWC wanted to do an independent study, it was suggested that they wait until after the Forest Service study ended in fall 2022. Dr. Smith wrote in the Zoom chat box that the Forest Service timeline was October 2021 to September 2022.

Mayor Silvestrini did not feel it made sense to wait until after the Forest Service study was complete. Councilor Houseman believed the information they were seeking could be provided through a partnership with the Forest Service. She saw no reason for the CWC to try to do an independent social study and preferred a partnership. Councilor Jim Bradley asked what the partnership would entail. He wanted to know if the Utah State University team would be able to provide input related to the focus of the study or if the contribution was purely financial.

Mayor Sondak commented that he had only heard about the potential collaboration with the Forest Service a few hours before the meeting. Mayor Silvestrini clarified that this was an informational item and not an action item. No decision would be made at the current moment. Dr. Smith agreed that it was a late addition to the discussions. They were still pending the final number of additional survey requirements from the Forest Service, which would ultimately determine the cost savings to the CWC. He noted that this was an opportunity to collect the information that would be needed for the social aspect of the study. However, it was somewhat time-sensitive as the Forest Service only collected the data every five years. The benefit of the collaboration would be cost savings to the CWC while still obtaining the necessary data related to the use estimates in the canyons.

Chair Robinson asked if Utah State University would be conducting both the CWC study and the Forest Service study. Dr. Smith confirmed this. Utah State University was under contract with the Forest Service to begin the survey efforts in October 2021. That was what would lead to cost savings for the CWC. If there was a collaboration with the Forest Service, the survey crews would be responsible for both efforts. Dr. Smith explained that it would simply mean that the survey crews needed to be out for a few additional days in order to obtain the extra data.

Mr. Shea left a comment in the Zoom chat box that suggested the Forest Service move ahead with their study and let the ecological aspect of the CWC study move forward independently. Chair Robinson noted that this was an informational item and no action would be taken on it during the current CWC Board Meeting. There would be further discussions in the future.

1. **Legislative/Land Tenure Committee: Projected Meeting Date for August 2021.**

Chair Robinson reported that the Legislative/Land Tenure Committee will likely meet in August. CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker, explained that the date for the meeting had been set for August 18, 2021, at 10:00 a.m. Notices and further information would be sent out to members shortly.

1. **Stakeholders Council: Scheduled to Meet July 21, 2021: 3:00 p.m. without an Anchor Location.**

* **Mayor Peterson will Provide an Overview of the New Stakeholders Council Member Appointment and Existing Stakeholders Council Member Reappointment Process.**

Chair Robinson reported that the Stakeholders Council would meet on July 21, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. Mayor Peterson previously provided an overview related to the Stakeholders Council Member appointment and reappointment process. It was an action item later on in the CWC Board Meeting.

1. **Transportation Committee: Scheduled to Meet July 21, 2021. At this time, CWC Board Discusses June 25, 2021, UDOT EIS Draft Report, and Time Frame for Response. Mountain Transportation Pillars Document Follow-Up.**

Chair Robinson reported that the Transportation Committee was scheduled to meet on July 21, 2021, to discuss the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS.

**UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

1. **UDOT Staff Member Josh Van Jura will Provide an Overview of UDOT’s Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”).**

UDOT Staff Member, Josh Van Jura, shared an overview of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. He reported that Vincent Izzo and Bri Bonnesbune were also present at the meeting. There would be a 15-minute overview about what was included in the draft and then a question-and-answer session. Mr. Van Jura explained that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was released on June 25, 2021. There were initially 124 concepts that were evaluated through level one and level two screening. Those concepts had been narrowed down to five alternatives.

The alternatives were evaluated based on the purpose and need. The main objectives were to improve safety, mobility, and reliability along SR-210. Safety was a component in everything that UDOT did. In the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS, safety was addressed with avalanche hazard mitigation and trailhead/roadside parking. Each of the five alternatives handled safety equally well due to the avalanche sheds and trailhead parking improvements. Mobility and reliability were determined by the primary alternatives. Mr. Van Jura noted that in the design year 2050, UDOT estimated that it would take 80 to 85 minutes to get from the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to Alta, roughly 50 days per year. He added that the PM peak travel commute southbound on Wasatch Boulevard was a unique mobility goal. There needed to be consistent travel times and reliability.

Mr. Van Jura made note of the five transportation alternatives. There would need to be one single preferred alternative, but at the current stage, there were two preferred alternatives. This would give the public and various agencies the opportunity to focus their review and comment on the different considerations. The two preferred alternatives were:

* Enhanced Bus and Peak Shoulder Period Lanes (would best solve the mobility goal);
* Gondola B from La Caille (would best meet the reliability component).

The enhanced bus alternative was further discussed. Mr. Van Jura explained that it had the best overall mobility of the five alternatives due to the 36-minute seat time. He explained that this number included 12 minutes to pull into the mobility hub, find a parking spot and walk over to the bus platform as well as 24 minutes for the actual bus ride. With this alternative, it would be possible for buses to pass cars in the general-purpose lanes. Mr. Van Jura felt this would motivate users to switch transportation modes in the future. There would be mobility hubs at the Gravel Pit and 9400 South and Highland, with direct service every five minutes. The capital costs would be approximately $510 million with a winter operations and maintenance cost of $11 million per year.

According to the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), there were two main things that influenced people to switch to public transit:

* Speed of service; and
* Frequency of service.

The enhanced bus alternative met speed of service thanks to the 36-minute seat times. The travel times were comparable to that of a private vehicle. Additionally, having a bus run every five minutes would reduce the fear of missing a bus and would meet the frequency of service needs. Mr. Van Jura reported that the enhanced bus alternative had the second-lowest initial costs and the shoulders would also increase safety for bicyclists. Mr. Van Jura highlighted some of the potential impacts, such as:

* Water quality impacts:
  + The impacts would be below all of the established threshold values but would have slightly higher water quality impacts than the gondola.
* Wildlife habitat impacts:
  + The widened road would have an impact on the wildlife habitat.

Additionally, it was important to consider that the 36-minute seat time was calculated based on dry pavement. Those travel times would likely increase when there were extreme weather conditions. While there would be more room for buses and traffic to navigate around accidents or slide-offs, the buses could still be affected by slide-offs and high snowfall rates.

The Gondola B alternative was further discussed. Mr. Van Jura explained that it had a travel time of either 55 minutes or 59 minutes, depending on the parking location. He clarified that 37 minutes of that was gondola time and the remainder was the previously mentioned 12 minutes as well as transfer time. The overall time was approximately 19 minutes longer than the bus alternative. However, because the gondola operated on a separate alignment, it was not prone to delays due to accidents and slide-offs. Mr. Van Jura noted that there was still the potential for lightning holds.

Mr. Van Jura reported that a gondola cabin would hold 35 passengers at a time and a new cabin would arrive every two minutes. For comparison, a bus would hold 42 passengers at a time and a new bus would arrive every five minutes. For the gondola alternative, the capital costs were estimated to be $592 million with a winter operations and maintenance cost of $7.6 million per year. The gondola alternative would have the best reliability because it was not roadway-based. Mr. Van Jura highlighted some of the potential impacts, such as:

* Visual impacts:
  + The towers would be between 50 to 60 meters tall (three would be 70 meters tall).
* Watershed and wildlife impacts:
  + The watershed and wildlife impacts would take place only at tower locations.

The two alternatives were compared. Mr. Van Jura explained that with the bus alternative, there would be 1,500 parking spots at the Gravel Pit and 1,000 parking spots at 9400 South and Highland. With the gondola alternative, there would be 1,500 parking spots at the parking structure, 600 at the Gravel Pit, and 400 at 9400 South and Highland. For Wasatch, the five-lane alternative was chosen. There would be two southbound center turn lanes and one northbound lane. The right-of-way would be preserved. He explained that if a level of service E or F occurred, there would be the capability to build the second northbound lane. Mr. Van Jura discussed snowsheds and explained that UDOT had chosen to go with realigned roads with no berms. There would also be trailhead improvements at:

* White Pine Trailhead;
* Lisa Falls Trailhead;
* Gate Buttress Trailhead;
* Bridge Trailhead.

Parking would be restricted within one-quarter mile of those trailheads. Additionally, they were looking at eliminating parking above Entry 1. That was primarily the roadside parking seen between Entry 1 and Entry 3. Tolling was being considered for all of the transportation alternatives. Mr. Van Jura reported that the public comment period had been extended until September 3, 2021. The public comment period had initially been 45 days but was now 70 days. UDOT felt the extended timeline made sense given the size of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. It was 973 pages without the appendices. He looked forward to receiving comments.

Mr. Van Jura reported that there would be two public hearings. The first one would take place on July 13, 2021, at Butler Middle School from 4:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. There would be opportunities for the public to ask questions, view the presentation, and provide comments. Mr. Van Jura explained that there would be a second public hearing on July 20, 2021, to provide an opportunity for those that did not feel comfortable attending an in-person event. Those that wanted to speak during the virtual meeting would need to pre-register in order to do so. Mr. Van Jura noted that he was prepared to answer questions that CWC Board Members had related to the alternatives.

1. **Commissioners will Discuss the DEIS.**

Councilor Houseman believed the enhanced bus alternative would only include stops at Alta and Snowbird and would not make additional stops at trailheads or visitation spots. Mr. Van Jura confirmed this. He noted that the CWC had advocated for trailhead stops in the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document. However, the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS included a pick-up location from one of the mobility hubs and a stop at one of the ski resorts. Part of the reason trailhead stops were not included was due to the additional time each stop would take. The goal was to keep travel time as short as possible. Mr. Van Jura reported that on a winter ski day, approximately 80% of the traffic was heading to the ski resorts, based on parking stalls. The use was not the same in the summer but the study was designed around the 30th busiest hour. While trailhead service could happen in the future, it was not within the scope of the Draft EIS.

Mayor Jenny Wilson asked about the process. Once the mode was selected, she wondered whether UDOT would be able to work with stakeholders to refine the choice. Mr. Van Jura explained that once a transportation alternative was selected, any major change would require a reevaluation. He noted that UDOT wanted to work with all of the stakeholders, affected agencies, and affected communities. Mayor Wilson commented that there were certain operational decisions that could not be studied with the limited time and resources UDOT had. Once a mode was selected, certain areas would need to be fine-tuned and she felt it was reasonable that stakeholders had some kind of say. She wondered how much flexibility there would be. Mr. Van Jura shared the example of the micro-mobility hubs. Something like that would require a reevaluation. It was important to share comments and suggestions earlier rather than later to avoid delays with future implementation.

Mr. Becker commented that UDOT would end up with a Record of Decision at some point. There may be elements that the CWC and others believe should be done that were not included in the Record of Decision. Mr. Becker wondered what process UDOT would go through to consider elements that may not be reflected in the Record of Decision. Mr. Van Jura noted that all suggestions would be considered and UDOT would determine whether or not they wanted to proceed with them. It was better to share those comments and concerns now because a reevaluation would delay the ability to solve the transportation issues in Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Mayor Sondak noted that in the Index, there was one entry related to climate change. That entry had to do with construction dust and construction impacts. He wondered whether UDOT had considered the likely climate change over the next 30 years. Mr. Van Jura confirmed that they had. Mr. Izzo explained that there was a memo related to climate change and how climate change could impact the alternatives. A link to that memo was shared in the Zoom chatbox.

Mayor Knopp wondered whether it would be possible for Mr. Van Jura to attend the Transportation Committee Meeting on July 21, 2021, to further discuss the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. Mr. Van Jura noted that he would check his schedule and reach out following the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Knopp asked if the intention was for the gondola to run year-round. Mr. Van Jura reported that the impacts of year-round service had been analyzed. It was possible for it to run year-round but he anticipated that there might be a different fare in the summer compared to the winter.

Mayor Knopp asked for additional information about the road widening that would be included in the expanded bus alternative. Mr. Van Jura noted that there would need to be two 12-foot lanes. The roads would be approximately 54-feet wide in total. Mayor Knopp wondered what would happen if a bus broke down in the peak shoulder lane. Mr. Van Jura explained that it would be a similar situation to when there was a slide-off. A bus would need to merge into the general-purpose lane and merge back into the shoulder lane when it was able to move around the affected area. Mayor Knopp also asked about snowsheds. Mr. Van Jura reported that there would be slightly less than 3,200 feet.

Mayor Knopp wondered what would happen to the existing park and ride lot at the bottom of the canyon. Mr. Van Jura noted that bus service did not run out of that park and ride lot anymore. It was largely functioning as an employee parking lot and filled up early. Mayor Knopp asked whether the bus schedule would run in the summer as well. Mr. Van Jura stated that the schedule could be expanded later under a different environmental document. UDOT was looking at the winter months. Mayor Knopp stressed the importance of the CWC supporting one of the transportation alternatives.

Mayor Peterson asked what discretion there would be when it came to Wasatch Boulevard. For instance, he wondered if there would be design discretion in terms of setting the speed, being sensitive to pedestrians, traffic calming, landscaping, and so on. Mr. Van Jura explained that there was a preliminary alignment but some of the details would still need to be determined. Chapter 2 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS states that they would proceed with the Wasatch Boulevard design in accordance with the aesthetics and goals included in the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan. UDOT would work with Cottonwood Heights to determine landscaping and other design details. He noted that the design speed was something that would be decided outside of UDOT.

Ex Officio Member Carlton Christensen wondered whether the roads would be extended for road safety if the gondola alternative was chosen. Mr. Van Jura clarified that the road width would stay the same under the gondola option. Deborah Case left a comment in the Zoom chatbox. She asked what would prevent overzealous skiers from illegally utilizing bus lanes. Mr. Van Jura noted that some people would drive on the shoulder, but in general, there had been good compliance elsewhere. Mr. Shea wanted to know why there was not a public comment period after the issuance of the final EIS and before the Record of Decision. Mr. Van Jura commented that ideally, there would be a final EIS and Record of Decision issued at the same time. That was UDOT standard policy and was in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) guidelines.

Chair Robinson asked whether it would be possible to include additional stops on the gondola for the summer season. Mr. Van Jura noted that angle stations were not possible because they would need to touch down. The tower heights were determined in order to avoid powder blasts and increase reliability. The inclusion of angle stations would subject the gondola to avalanche hazards. He felt that trailhead stops would make more sense with buses in that instance.

Chair Robinson wondered how the transportation alternative would be paid for. Some had questioned why taxpayer money would be spent to provide access to two private ski resorts. Mr. Van Jura explained that finding funding for the alternative was outside the scope of the EIS, but all options would be considered. He added that residents along 9400 South and Wasatch Boulevard were heavily affected by the ski resort traffic and queuing. Improved transportation would benefit both ski area users and many local residents.

Discussions were had about tolling. Mr. Van Jura noted that the State had license plate reader legislation and there was also an Express Pass system. The same kind of technology could be used. He believed the most viable option for tolling at the current time would be a combination of license plate readers and the Express Pass pods. Mayor Knopp wondered how that type of system would work with a rental car. Mr. Van Jura explained that the rental company would be billed and the bill would then be forwarded to whoever had rented the vehicle at that time.

Chair Robinson thanked Mr. Van Jura for his presentation and his time. He hoped he would be able to meet with the Transportation Committee at their next meeting. Mr. Van Jura thanked the CWC for their time and the MTS Pillars Document. He appreciated all of their hard work and dedication.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Robinson opened the public comment period.

*John Knoblock* left a public comment in the Zoom chatbox. The Trails Committee looked forward to working with Brighton and the U.S. Forest Service on a Brighton Trails Master Plan in fall 2021. He hoped that funding could be made available in 2022 for a Salt Lake County Trails Master Plan, preferably as part of the Salt Lake County Mayor’s proposed budget in October 2021.

There were no further comments. Chair Robinson closed the public comment period.

**ACTION ITEMS**

1. **The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-09 Approving Entry into the Third Amendment to an Interlocal Agreement with the University of Utah for the Environmental Dashboard. (Note: Resolution Continues to be on Hold while Details are Being Worked Out with the University of Utah and ESRI).**

Chair Robinson wondered whether the note related to Resolution 2021-09 being on hold had been resolved. Mr. Perez reported that the item was still on hold. No action was necessary at the current time. CWC Staff would continue to work with the University of Utah and ESRI.

1. **The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-10 Approving an Agreement with ESRI, Inc. for Environmental Dashboard-Related Services and Acknowledging ESRI’s Donation of $10,700 in License Rights and Technical Support.**

Mayor Sondak asked about the $10,700 donation being referred to in Resolution 2021-10. Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson explained that there was a licensure fee and ESRI had contributed that licensure fee. The quotation attached for approval was for the maintenance fee on the data in the hub. Chair Robinson noted that there was a reference to the acknowledgment of a donation from ESRI for $10,700. He wondered whether the resolution would also authorize the CWC to enter into a contract that would commit to the payment of $10,700. Several Board Members felt that Resolution 2021-10 was unclear. Mayor Peterson asked whether CWC Legal Counsel, Shane Topham could provide additional clarity for the CWC Board.

Mr. Topham explained that he had prepared the resolution based on the information he received. He noted that the approval could be deferred to a future meeting. Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen commented that in the quote, there was a start date of May 2022 and an end date of May 2023. This was for a year of the licensure fee and the tech support. The resolution also thanked ESRI for their donation for the first year of the licensure fee and tech support free of charge.

Further discussions were had about the wording in the resolution. Mayor Knopp believed the contract stated that the CWC was contracting for Environmental Dashboard-related services and ESRI was donating the first year. Mayor Wilson noted that the resolution seemed to obligate the CWC for future years and wanted to ensure that the Budget/Finance/Audit Committee was aware of that. She wondered whether it might be better to wait until the next CWC Board Meeting to vote on the item.

Mr. Becker clarified that this was a two-part process. ESRI was donating the software and services for the year but the CWC was also committing to extend those services for the following year. Ms. Mickelson believed the resolution language needed additional clarity. Chair Robinson suggested that Resolution 2021-10 be postponed to the next meeting in order for the resolution to be clarified.

1. **The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-13 Approving the Reappointment or Appointment of Various Individuals to the Stakeholders Council.**

Chair Robinson reported that the next action item related to the reappointment and appointment of various individuals to the Stakeholders Council. Some had two-year terms and some had four-year terms in order to stagger membership. The names listed in Resolution 2021-13 were as follows:

* Reappointment (four-year terms):
  + Annalee Munsey;
  + Carl Fisher;
  + Dave Fields;
  + Don Despain;
  + John Knoblock;
  + Kirk Nichols;
  + Megan Nelson;
  + Michael Marker;
  + Nate Furman;
  + Paul Diegel;
  + Sarah Bennett;
  + Tom Diegel; and
  + Pat Shea.
* Appointments (mixture of two and four-year terms):
  + Erin Bragg;
  + Alex Porpora;
  + Mike Christensen;
  + Kelly Boardman;
  + Maura Hahnenberger;
  + Roger Borgenicht;
  + Dennis Goreham; and
  + Hilary Lambert.

The term expiry dates were also listed in the resolution. Mr. Perez noted that there were two misspellings in Resolution 2021-13. Both Dennis Goreham and Del Draper had their names spelled incorrectly in the document. Those names would be corrected.

Discussions were had about the staggered terms. Mr. Topham commented that everyone being reappointed would have a four-year term. The new appointments were evenly divided between two-year and four-year terms in order to stagger the term expiry dates. Chair Robinson felt it was important to get the staggering right. He wondered why there were Stakeholders Council Members listed in the resolution that were not being appointed or reappointed. Mr. Topham explained that the term expiry dates restated all memberships and terms. Ms. Nielsen shared a detailed spreadsheet with the CWC Board that included all of the Stakeholders Council Member terms.

**MOTION:** Mayor Peterson moved to adopt Resolution 2021-13 Approving the Reappointment or Appointment of Various Individuals to the Stakeholders Council, as amended. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1. **The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-14 Approving Entry into a Second Amendment to the Independent Contractor Agreement with Casey Hill of Red Hill Strategies for Governmental Affairs Consulting for Fiscal Year 2021-2022.**

Chair Robinson reported that Resolution 2021-14 was for a $40,000 contract, paid monthly, for Casey Hill of Red Hill Strategies. Additional information was included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Ms. Mickelson noted that the item was budgeted and approved in the 2021-2022 fiscal year budget.

**MOTION:** Mayor Wilson moved to adopt Resolution 2021-14 Approving Entry into a Second Amendment to the Independent Contractor Agreement with Casey Hill of Red Hill Strategies for Governmental Affairs Consulting for Fiscal Year 2021-2022. Councilor Houseman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

1. **The Board will Consider Resolution 2021-15 Reappointing an Ex Officio Commissioner to Represent Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) Beginning July 1, 2021, and Ending June 30, 2022.**

**MOTION:** Mayor Sondak moved to adopt Resolution 2021-15 Reappointing an Ex Officio Commissioner to Represent UTA Beginning July 1, 2021, and Ending June 30, 2022. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

**ADJOURN BOARD MEETING**

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:46 p.m.
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