



2  
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**  
4 **HELD MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2022, AT APPROXIMATELY 3:50 P.M. THE MEETING**  
5 **WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR**  
6 **LOCATION WAS THE MILLCREEK CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS.**

7  
8 **Board Members:** Chair Christopher F. Robinson  
9 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini  
10 Mayor Monica Zoltanski  
11 Mayor Michael Weichers  
12 Mayor Erin Mendenhall  
13 Mayor Dan Knopp  
14 Mayor Roger Bourke  
15 Mayor Nann Worel  
16 Ex-Officio Carlton Christensen  
17 Ex-Officio Annalee Munsey  
18

19 **Staff:** Blake Perez, CWC Executive Director of Policy  
20 Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Executive Director of Administration  
21 Madeline Pettit, Community Engagement Intern  
22 Shane Topham, CWC Legal Counsel  
23

24 **Others:** Josh Van Jura  
25 Bri Bennebose  
26 Carl Fisher  
27 Lance Kovel  
28 David Whittekiend  
29 Evelyn Everton  
30 Barbara Cameron  
31 Ben Kraja  
32 Dennis Goreham  
33 Patrick Nelson  
34 Steve Van Maren  
35 Sally Kaiser  
36 William McCarvill  
37 Angie Bauer-Fellows  
38 Chris McCandless  
39 Michael Marker  
40 Dave Fields  
41 Theresa Heinrich  
42 Patrick Shea

1 Kara John  
2 Mary Young  
3 Todd Young  
4 Amy Salveter  
5 Marian Rice  
6 Abi Holt  
7 Kirk Nichols  
8 Mike DeVries  
9

10 **OPENING**

11  
12 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Open the CWC Board Meeting.**

13  
14 Chair Chris Robinson called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) meeting to order at 3:50 p.m.  
15 He noted that Mayors Roger Bourke, Nann Worel, Erin Mendenhall, and Michael Weichers were  
16 attending the meeting via Zoom. Others were attending in person.  
17

18 **2. (Action) The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the August 1, 2022, Board**  
19 **Meeting.**

20  
21 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to APPROVE the Minutes of the August 1, 2022, Board Meeting.  
22 Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
23

24 **3. Consideration of Resolution 2022-39 - Approving an Ex Officio Commissioner**  
25 **Representing the United States Forest Service.**

26  
27 Chair Robinson reported that Resolution 2022-39 – Approving an Ex Officio Commissioner  
28 Representing the United States Forest Service would be considered by the CWC Board. He asked  
29 CWC Legal Counsel, Shane Topham, to share information about the Resolution. Mr. Topham  
30 explained that the Forest Service asked him to confirm information with the CWC Board. The Forest  
31 Service wanted to ensure that the Board understands that neither the governing documents for the  
32 CWC nor the State Law imposes any managerial or fiduciary duties on the Ex Officio Commissioner  
33 that would be representing the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest. Mr. Topham was asked to  
34 write a letter to the Forest Service outlining his analysis of the issue, stating that the CWC Board had  
35 been informed and that the CWC Board understood the information. If the Resolution was enacted,  
36 his letter to the Forest Service would be deemed delivered.  
37

38 David Whittekiend confirmed that the Forest Service Office of the General Counsel (“OGC”)  
39 reviewed the Resolution and the letter and was comfortable with the language. Mayor Silvestrini  
40 noted that while the role would be advisory, it would be a benefit to the organization.  
41

42 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-39 – Approving an Ex Officio  
43 Commissioner Representing the United States Forest Service. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion.  
44 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
45

1 **UDOT LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON EIS**

2  
3 1. **Josh Van Jura, UDOT’s Project Manager for the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS, will**  
4 **Present the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Preferred Alternative.**  
5

6 Josh Van Jura from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) was present to discuss the  
7 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). Mr. Van Jura was the  
8 Project Manager and would share information about the Final Environmental Impact Statement  
9 (“FEIS”) and the preferred alternative with the Board. Chair Robinson thanked him for attending the  
10 CWC Board Meeting and for his work over the last several months.  
11

12 Mr. Van Jura reported that on August 31, 2022, the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS was  
13 released. This was after approximately four years of study. The process originally began in the spring  
14 of 2018. He believed that many of the CWC Board Members understood what was contained in the  
15 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS, but he wanted to share some high-level information to  
16 ensure that everyone had a base understanding of the information. Mr. Van Jura explained that there  
17 was a handful of cooperating and participating agencies that had been part of the process. For  
18 instance, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), Salt Lake City Public Utilities, and the Forest Service.  
19 Mr. Van Jura thanked those agencies for their work and technical experts.  
20

21 The project purpose was to substantially improve roadway safety, reliability, and mobility on SR-  
22 210, from Fort Union Boulevard through the Town of Alta, for all users. Mr. Van Jura noted that  
23 UDOT was trying to solve mobility issues caused by the expected population growth in the State by  
24 2050. All five of the transportation alternatives were slower than free-flow traffic speeds but it was  
25 important to remember what UDOT was trying to solve. He shared an example with the CWC Board  
26 and explained that it would take someone 22 minutes to travel from the 7-Eleven at the mouth of Big  
27 Cottonwood Canyon up to Alta. However, in 2050, with population growth accounted for, that same  
28 drive was expected to take 80 to 85 minutes. It would take nearly quadruple the amount of time  
29 approximately 50 days per year during the ski season. 50 days a year was every Friday, Saturday,  
30 Sunday, and holiday period over the ski season. As a result of the merging that happened at the mouth  
31 of the canyon between 9400 South and SR-210, there was a lot of congestion. This caused significant  
32 queuing, which made it difficult to be a resident in one of the nearby neighborhoods.  
33

34 Mr. Van Jura overviewed the proposed transportation alternatives. He explained that there were five  
35 action alternatives and one no-action alternative. All of the alternatives were analyzed as part of the  
36 National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process. There was the enhanced bus alternative with  
37 five-minute service and direct service from two mobility hubs. There was also the enhanced bus and  
38 peak period shoulder lane alternative with five-minute service and buses operating in their dedicated  
39 shoulder. There was the gondola alternative, which would be located at the mouth of the canyon with  
40 two mobility hubs that would be accessed by bus. There was another gondola alternative as well,  
41 which would depart from North Little Cottonwood Road and would have two-minute service. There  
42 was also a cog rail alternative with 15-minute service and a north-side alignment.  
43

44 There were common themes throughout the public comment period. Mr. Van Jura explained that  
45 there were a lot of comments expressing support or a lack of support for certain alternatives. There  
46 was also a general level of support for tolling and a phased implementation approach. He reviewed  
47 some of the revisions that had been made from the Draft EIS to the FEIS. In the bus alternative, the  
48 Snowbird bus stop was now located at Entry 1 where the existing bus stop was. At Alta, the bus stop

1 was now located on the south side of SR-210. There were also revisions to the second gondola option  
2 and the cog rail option. An additional transfer could be seen as a deterrent for transit riders, so the  
3 parking stalls were increased at the base station from 1,500 to 2,500, which would remove the two  
4 mobility hubs at 9400 South and Highland and the Gravel Pit. It would also remove the associated  
5 bus service from those locations. A new one-way access road had also been added. Reducing the  
6 bus service lowered the overall alternative price by approximately \$3.4 million in the winter. It also  
7 reduced the capital costs by approximately \$40 million.

8  
9 On August 31, 2022, UDOT announced that the second gondola alternative, Gondola B, best met the  
10 purpose and need of the project. That was primarily because of the reliability component. Since it  
11 operates on a separate alignment, it was not prone to slide-offs, crashes, or slow-moving vehicles.  
12 The gondola could provide service that was expected to be on time for transit riders. Mr. Van Jura  
13 noted that the travel time between Gondola B and the enhanced bus service was roughly the same.  
14 He further overviewed the Gondola B alternative and explained that it was a 35-person gondola cabin  
15 that arrived every two minutes. The capital cost was \$550 million. There were \$159 million of  
16 commonalities in all of the five alternatives. For instance, the parking structures, tolling, and trailhead  
17 improvements. This included all of the avalanche sheds as well. The travel time would be 55 minutes.

18  
19 Mr. Van Jura reviewed the alternative impacts. He explained that there was a lot of information about  
20 this included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. It included data about noise impacts,  
21 water quality, air quality, and residential impacts. UDOT recognized that the gondola towers would  
22 create a significant visual change. Overall, there was a belief that the gondola would have advantages.  
23 It had lower hard surface levels than many of the other alternatives and would have less of an impact  
24 on the water quality. As for air quality, removing 30% of vehicles from the road would save  
25 approximately 4,000 tons of greenhouse gas per year. The gondola was marginally higher in  
26 greenhouse gas emissions than diesel buses. That information was in the Air Quality chapter.

27  
28 Due to all of the comments received about the impacts on the visual setting, UDOT prepared  
29 additional key observation points to illustrate what the gondola might look like in the canyon. Those  
30 were included in Chapter 17 and Chapter 32 of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. He  
31 shared some of those images with the CWC Board. Though the Gondola B option had the third  
32 highest cost out of the five alternatives, it had the lowest 30-year lifecycle costs due to the reduced  
33 operations and maintenance component. Mr. Van Jura noted that there was the first historic climbing  
34 district in the nation in Little Cottonwood Canyon. There were 70 different climbs over 29 different  
35 areas. As part of that, UDOT wanted to see what the visual impacts would look like from those spots.

36  
37 UDOT did not have the \$550 million needed for the project at the current time. However, there was  
38 a clear understanding that there was a legitimate traffic issue in the canyon. Since it could take several  
39 years to secure funding (Federal, State, private, or a combination) the proposal was to move forward  
40 with phased implementation. The initial plan was to improve and increase the existing bus service  
41 and focus on a mobility hub. The mobility hub would be coordinated so that downtown UTA buses  
42 could service it if UTA chose to do so. This would allow users to take transit to the mobility hub.  
43 Mr. Van Jura reported that it took five minutes to load and unload a bus. The ultimate plan was for a  
44 bus to depart every five minutes during peak hours. In the phased approach, there would likely be  
45 something closer to 10-minute service to start.

46  
47 The sub-alternatives were shared. It seemed that there was a lot of support for tolling, which had  
48 been surprising. Mr. Van Jura noted that occupancy restrictions were being considered as well, but

1 the technology for occupancy restrictions was not currently available. It was close, so once things  
2 started to move forward, it was something that could be considered further. The issue with occupancy  
3 restrictions was the only deviation was for motorcycles and bicycles, per the Code of Federal  
4 Regulations. That meant Alta residents would not be able to drive the canyon by themselves. This  
5 could create problems. As for tolling, it was anticipated that the toll would be in the \$25 to \$30 range.  
6 This would be during peak times and on the peak days of the year. For instance, 7:30 a.m. to  
7 10:30 a.m. Tolling would only be in areas of the upper canyon, at or above Snowbird Entry 1.  
8 Focusing the toll on the largest winter user group should stabilize the traffic flow for all canyon users.  
9

10 Mayor Dan Knopp asked how occupancy restrictions would impact delivery drivers. Mr. Van Jura  
11 noted that there would be some difficulties. There would also be impacts on the residents of Alta that  
12 needed to be considered. Mayor Mendenhall pointed out that without suppliers, there would not be  
13 any operational function for Snowbird or Alta. Mr. Van Jura felt it was important to point out the  
14 problems ahead of time because there were a lot of groups that supported vehicle occupancy  
15 restrictions. This could solve some problems but create other issues at the same time. Mayor Bourke  
16 believed that some exemptions would need to be implemented in that scenario. Service vehicles and  
17 delivery vehicles would be clear exemptions. There would also need to be exemptions for Alta  
18 residents. Mr. Van Jura stated that there were opportunities to change the Code of Federal  
19 Regulations, but that would need to be done through the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”).  
20 He pointed out that there was currently an exemption in place for emergency vehicles.  
21

22 Mr. Van Jura discussed base parking at La Caille. He explained that this was changed from 1,500 to  
23 2,500. The access road from Wasatch Boulevard would have striped bicycle lanes and a multi-use  
24 trail. The multi-use trail would go from the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to the mouth of Little  
25 Cottonwood Canyon. He noted that for Wasatch Boulevard, the five-lane alternative had been  
26 selected. This was two lanes northbound, two lanes southbound, and a center turn lane. If it did not  
27 need to be a center turn lane, it was anticipated that the lane would be a vegetated park strip. The  
28 imbalanced lane would be built until there was a Level of Service E or F. This would preserve the  
29 right-of-way for the second northbound lane and further offset the multi-use trail.  
30

31 Avalanche mitigation was reviewed. Mr. Van Jura reported that the proposal was to have three  
32 snowsheds, which totaled approximately 3,200 feet in length. This was for White Pine, Little Pine,  
33 and White Pine Chutes. Based on the last 20 years of data, there were approximately 56 hours per  
34 year with closures over 11 days. The average closure was four hours. By adding snowsheds over  
35 three of the most common slide paths, the intention was to reduce the numbers significantly. He  
36 shared example images with the CWC Board. Trailheads were discussed. Mr. Van Jura explained  
37 that the proposal included improvements to four different trailheads: Gate Buttress, White Pine, Lisa  
38 Falls, and a new trailhead called The Bridge. As part of these improvements, roadside parking within  
39 a quarter mile of the trailheads would be eliminated. This would reduce erosion issues.  
40

41 No winter parking would be permitted above Entry 1. Mr. Van Jura explained that this was the area  
42 where there was roadside parking between Entry 1 and Entry 4 and also around the Wildcat entrance.  
43 This would remove approximately 230 roadside parking stalls. The public comment period for the  
44 UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS ended on October 17, 2022. He noted that 5,000 comments  
45 had been received so far and UDOT was currently reviewing all of them. Comments could be  
46 submitted through the UDOT website, via email, regular mail, text message, or the project hotline.  
47 Once the 45-day comment period was over, all of the comments would be reviewed, additional

1 engineering analysis would be done, and revisions would be made. The goal was to have a Record  
2 of Decision in Winter 2022/2023. It should be ready before the end of the ski season.

3  
4 Mayor Weichers referenced the no-action alternative, where from the 7-Eleven to Alta takes 22  
5 minutes currently but will take 80 to 85 minutes in 2050. He wondered if that was based on a Level A  
6 traffic pattern or a Level of Service F or E, which were the 20 busiest days. Mr. Van Jura explained  
7 that the 80 to 85-minute travel time as predicted was a Level of Service F. That was expected to take  
8 place approximately 50 days per year. Mayor Weichers appreciated Mr. Van Jura and the fact that  
9 UDOT made themselves available. However, he explained that Cottonwood Heights felt discouraged  
10 and disappointed about the 2,500 parking stalls at the La Caille base station. He did not believe that  
11 would alleviate any of the traffic issues on Wasatch Boulevard.

12  
13 Mr. Van Jura explained that the reason Wasatch Boulevard widening was being considered was to  
14 address the PM Peak Traffic southbound. The 2019 data showed that on an average Tuesday at  
15 5:00 p.m., there were 1,100 vehicles per hour whereas a Saturday morning had 800 vehicles per hour,  
16 even during congested times. The mobility hubs would take additional traffic off of Wasatch but  
17 there were more serious traffic issues on a standard weekday PM commute than on a ski weekend.  
18 Mayor Weichers asked about the Level of Service currently for Wasatch Boulevard. He also wanted  
19 to know what the Level of Service would be in 2050. Mr. Van Jura offered to look at the Level of  
20 Service ratings and confirm them at the Cottonwood Heights presentation the next day.

21  
22 Mayor Bourke identified issues with the existing bus service. He also noted that the previous day all  
23 of the Snowbird parking lots were filled and there was roadside parking from White Pine Trailhead  
24 up to Hellgate on both sides. This was a serious problem. The most encouraging aspect of the UDOT  
25 Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS was the fact that there would be a phased approach with different  
26 solutions. This was the only sensible path forward. Mr. Van Jura had stated that the gondola had a  
27 water quality benefit versus some of the other alternatives, but that was not consistent with what had  
28 been shared by Laura Briefer. She was adamant that a gondola would be a detriment to the watershed.

29  
30 Mayor Zoltanski thanked UDOT for their hard work and ability to distill all of the information into  
31 something that is easier to understand. She wondered if the parking structure was proposed to be  
32 done in the first phase. She wanted to understand when that would be constructed. Mr. Van Jura  
33 reported that the mobility hub was anticipated to be constructed at the Gravel Pit in the first phase.  
34 The parking structure at the base of La Caille would be built at a later date. Mayor Zoltanski asked  
35 about the 9400 South and Highland Drive mobility hub. Mr. Van Jura explained that there are 350  
36 existing stalls there currently that were rarely filled. Mayor Zoltanski liked the idea of seeing how  
37 different approaches worked before taking steps toward much larger transportation options. She  
38 commended UDOT for incorporating a phased approach into their plans.

39  
40 Mayor Zoltanski called on Sandy residents to participate in the public comment period that would  
41 close on October 17, 2022. She asked how important the final comment period was. Mr. Van Jura  
42 explained that nothing was set in stone. The point of the comment period was not for there to be a  
43 vote on the alternative. It was to make sure there was a complete and accurate record where all of the  
44 alternatives had been analyzed. Public input was always part of the process. It was important to  
45 know where the public stood and what the public wanted to see. Certain changes had been made as  
46 a result of public comments previously. Mayor Zoltanski wondered how important it was for the  
47 CWC and local leadership to weigh in during the last phase of comments. Mr. Van Jura stated that it  
48 was incredibly important and was encouraged by UDOT.

1  
2 Mayor Knopp believed the biggest concern from environmental advocates was that 30% more visitors  
3 could be added to the canyon with the high-capacity alternative. He wondered whether tolling would  
4 alleviate that. Mr. Van Jura explained that there was a 30% vehicle reduction goal. Based on a  
5 statistically valid survey, to achieve a 30% vehicle reduction, the toll would need to be \$25 to \$30. If  
6 that did not reduce the numbers enough, the toll could be increased until the user rate was achieved.  
7 It was anticipated that on the busiest days, there could be 2,200 additional people in the canyon. That  
8 methodology was discussed in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS.  
9

10 Mayor Knopp explained that the biggest problem in Cottonwood Heights is when vehicles stop. He  
11 believed the parking structure at the bottom of Little Cottonwood Canyon would solve that problem.  
12 Mayor Knopp asked about the Gravel Pit lot. Mr. Van Jura reported that in phase one, it was  
13 anticipated that additional parking would be added at the Gravel Pit. Mayor Knopp noted that the  
14 owner of the property was not happy about giving up that land and had offered the other side of the  
15 road instead. He felt this was a good solution because the parking structure would be at grade with  
16 Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Van Jura explained that there were two technical problems with the west  
17 side of the valley, which included the aqueduct and the easement that bisected the entire property.  
18 Additionally, the historic mill created issues. That was a historic resource and placing a parking  
19 structure next to it would be considered an adverse effect.  
20

21 Mayor Knopp asked for a rough timeline of the phased approach. Mr. Van Jura explained that it will  
22 depend on when the funding for Phase 1 becomes available. It was anticipated that the Record of  
23 Decision would be released by the end of the ski season. It was unlikely that any State funding would  
24 be received this year based on that timeline. UDOT would look at different ways to procure buses,  
25 develop preliminary designs, work with cities and property owners, and look into tolling. There  
26 needed to be mass transit to implement tolling to maintain access for low-income communities. There  
27 needed to be parking to go along with mass transit. As a result, the three early action items would be  
28 mass transit, parking, and tolling. It would take approximately two years to procure buses. He did  
29 not expect the current labor shortages to remain indefinitely. Ex Officio Carlton Christensen  
30 explained that it would take a year to a year and a half to procure buses.  
31

32 Mayor Knopp asked about the timeline for the gondola. Mr. Van Jura stated that it would depend on  
33 funding. There was something to be said for incremental solutions, such as snowsheds, buses, and so  
34 on. Ideally, beneficial components would continue to be implemented as the growth and demand  
35 increased. He did not have an estimated timeline for the actual construction of a gondola. There were  
36 lower capital costs with the smaller solutions and it made sense to proceed that way.  
37

38 Ex Officio Christensen noted that there was a presumption that UTA would handle additional bus  
39 service. That was not necessarily the case. Mr. Van Jura confirmed this and explained that it was  
40 documented in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS that there could be a private vendor. That  
41 was something that would need to be determined based on the Record of Decision. Mayor Bourke  
42 discussed tolling. \$25 to \$30 for someone who would spend hundreds of dollars on a lift ticket and  
43 ski gear was not that extreme. He did not see that being enough of a disincentive. It would impact  
44 some of the lower-income visitors, but he noted that most skiers seemed to be higher-income.  
45

46 Chair Robinson asked CWC Staff to discuss what the organization could do before the end of the  
47 public comment period. CWC Executive Director of Policy, Blake Perez believed it would be  
48 worthwhile for the CWC to weigh in on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. The last position

1 that the CWC shared was the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Pillars Document. It  
2 included seven values that the Commission had reached a consensus on, which were as follows:

- 3
- 4 • Visitor Use and Capacity;
- 5 • Watershed Protection;
- 6 • Transportation Demand Management, Parking, and Transit Strategies;
- 7 • Integration into the Broader Regional Transportation Network;
- 8 • Year-Round Transit Service; and
- 9 • Long-Term Protection of Critical Areas.

10  
11 It was through those pillars that Mr. Perez had been evaluating the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon  
12 FEIS. Mr. Perez wanted to finalize a draft document, work on it with the Transportation Committee,  
13 obtain approval from the Transportation Committee, and send the document to the CWC Board for  
14 review and input. The goal was to have it ready for the October 17, 2022 submission date.

15  
16 Chair Robinson asked how it would be possible to reach a consensus on a document that would not  
17 be reviewed during a formal CWC Board Meeting. There would likely need to be a special meeting.  
18 CWC Legal Counsel, Shane Topham noted that this was a difficult issue. If the document was  
19 distributed via email and comments were reviewed by CWC Board Members, there would essentially  
20 be a public meeting taking place. Mayor Jeff Silvestrini objected to sending out a draft and sharing  
21 email comments. He believed it would be an open meetings violation to proceed in that way. The  
22 CWC Board needed the opportunity to discuss and deliberate. Chair Robinson agreed.

23  
24 CWC Executive Director of Administration, Lindsey Nielsen noted that there were two weeks to  
25 formulate comments that could be submitted to UDOT. CWC Staff would work with Chair Robinson  
26 and the rest of the CWC Board in whatever way was appropriate. Mr. Perez reported that there was  
27 a tentative Transportation Committee Meeting scheduled for October 10, 2022. There was an  
28 opportunity to have a discussion at a Transportation Committee level at that time. There was also an  
29 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting on October 17, 2022. Chair Robinson stated that the  
30 CWC Board could allow the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee to receive the recommendation from  
31 the Transportation Committee and review the document during the meeting. Alternatively, if  
32 jurisdictions were making their comments, it may not be necessary to submit one from the CWC.

33  
34 Mayor Silvestrini stated that the MTS Pillars Document was a compromise document as there was no  
35 consensus with respect to a recommendation. He was not certain that there would be consensus at  
36 the current time either. Chair Robinson believed the idea would be to reiterate the MTS Pillars  
37 Document in a way that looked specifically at the preferred alternative. He did not want CWC Staff  
38 to spend a lot of time working on a document if it was not something CWC Board Members wanted  
39 to pursue and submit. Mayor Zoltanski believed it was important for the organization to weigh in and  
40 make a statement as a collective. She pointed out that CWC Board Members were not just  
41 representing their individual communities, but the Central Wasatch as a whole.

42  
43 Chair Robinson suggested that the MTS Pillars Document be used as a framework. The CWC Board  
44 could authorize the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee to issue comments to UDOT. Mayor Knopp  
45 felt it was important to submit some kind of statement from the organization. He did not believe  
46 consensus could be reached, but there could be a minority/majority report. He wondered whether  
47 there could be a Special Meeting of the CWC Board for discussion and consideration. Chair Robinson  
48 explained that the minority/majority report was a concept that CWC Staff had discussed previously.



1 He would like to see a motion that authorized the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee to issue a  
2 statement on the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS. There may be two components with  
3 minority and majority reports, but that was still to be determined. Recommendations would be from  
4 CWC Staff, the Transportation Committee, and the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee.  
5

6 Mayor Bourke did not believe it would be possible to reach a consensus on a comment document.  
7 Adding in a minority/majority report was something to consider, but he was not sure it was worth  
8 doing. Mayor Silvestrini stated that it was appropriate to have an Executive/Budget/Audit Committee  
9 review, but there would still need to be a review from the full CWC Board. Chair Robinson noted  
10 that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee was a public meeting and the full CWC Board could be  
11 invited. Alternatively, the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee meeting could be shifted to a Special  
12 Meeting of the CWC Board. Mr. Topham believed the latter was the correct approach.  
13

14 Mayor Mendenhall believed that one of the more interesting aspects of the presentation from UDOT  
15 was the fact that the feedback from organizations, entities, levels of government, and the community  
16 would create an accurate record of the situation. She felt it was the duty of the CWC to put forward  
17 a statement. Though she was not certain it would be possible to reach a consensus, the purpose of the  
18 organization was to stand for something, especially as it related to the major decisions impacting the  
19 Central Wasatch. There could be another CWC Board Meeting to discuss the details.  
20

21 It was determined that the Transportation Committee would meet on October 10, 2022. A full  
22 meeting of the CWC Board would take place on October 17, 2022. CWC Staff would prepare for  
23 that meeting and a statement related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS would be drafted.  
24

## 25 COMMITTEE UPDATES AND REPORTS

### 26 27 1. The CWC Executive/Budget/Audit Committee (“EBAC”) Met on August 22nd and 28 September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Meeting Minutes are Included in this Meeting’s Information 29 Packet (the “Packet”). Board Chair Chris Robinson will Lead Board Discussions 30 Concerning the Following: 31

- 32 • The 2022 Board Retreat will Take Place on Thursday, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022, From  
33 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Silver Fork Lodge, with an Optional Hike Beforehand  
34 and Dinner afterward. A Draft Agenda for the Retreat is Included in the Packet.
- 35 • The Proposed Budget Amendment that was the subject of the Public Hearing,  
36 Approval of which will be considered via Board Resolution Later in the Meeting. A  
37 copy of the Proposed Budget Amendment is Included in the Packet.  
38

39 Chair Robinson reported that the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee met on August 22, 2022, and  
40 September 19, 2022. The Meeting Minutes were included in the packet. There was a tentative CWC  
41 Board Retreat scheduled for November 10, 2022. It would take place between 1:00 p.m. and 5:00  
42 p.m. at Silver Fork Lodge. There was an optional hike beforehand and dinner afterward. There was  
43 a draft agenda included in the packet for review. Chair Robinson noted that there had been very  
44 productive CWC Board Retreats in the past. Some of the retreats had been multiple days and others  
45 had been single-day events.  
46

47 The CWC Board Retreat agenda was reviewed. Chair Robinson explained that the retreat would start  
48 at 1:00 p.m. and there would be a Strategic Plan status update, some project visioning, and a

1 presentation from the Stakeholders Council. The intention was to have a four-hour retreat. The  
2 agenda would be refined as the date came closer. It was important to reach a consensus from the  
3 CWC Board Members about whether the date, time, and location worked. Additionally, he asked for  
4 feedback about the proposed draft agenda that had been shared with the CWC Board.

5  
6 Mayor Silvestrini pointed out that there needed to be a discussion about stabilizing the membership  
7 contributions. It was noted that those discussions would take place during the budgeting item on the  
8 agenda. Ex Officio Christensen reported that UTA had a public hearing that night for their budget.  
9 As a result, he may need to leave the CWC Board Retreat before 5:00 p.m. Mr. Perez reported that  
10 CWC Staff had been working on the Strategic Plan Status Update, which the Executive/Budget/Audit  
11 Committee had seen. The CWC Board would review what had been done over the past year as well  
12 as the status of each of the action items outlined in the Strategic Plan. Additionally, CWC Staff had  
13 been working on a 1-3 year visioning project related to Legislation, projects, communication,  
14 outreach, and transportation. That would be provided to the CWC Board ahead of the meeting. He  
15 asked that CWC Board Members weigh in on the Visioning Project document as well. There was  
16 also a desire to discuss issues related to membership contributions and long-term budgeting for the  
17 CWC. Potential options would be provided to the CWC Board ahead of the CWC Board Retreat.

18  
19 **2. The Transportation Committee Met on September 15th and September 21st, 2022.**  
20 **Meeting Minutes are Included in the Meeting Materials Packet.**

- 21  
22 • **Commissioner Knopp will Present the Selected Consultant for Big Cottonwood**  
23 **Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) in Anticipation of the Board Enacting**  
24 **a Resolution Later in This Meeting Approving the CWC’s Entry into an Agreement**  
25 **with the Consultant Selected to Perform the BCC MAP.**

26  
27 The Transportation Committee would meet on October 10, 2022, to discuss the Big Cottonwood  
28 Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”) and UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS comments.  
29 Mayor Knopp explained that at the last Transportation Committee Meeting, the intention had been to  
30 allow members of the public to speak. He felt that had worked out well. There had also been  
31 discussions about the BCC MAP. The recommendation was that AECOM handle the consultant  
32 work. The desire was to find out how to obtain the funding needed to take action and the AECOM  
33 cover letter focused on that. It was important to start moving forward with transportation solutions.  
34 Mayor Zoltanski reported that Sandy had some positive experiences with AECOM in the past. She  
35 was supportive of the Resolution and read a portion of the BCC MAP proposal.

36  
37 **3. The Legislative Committee will Meet in October at a Date to be Announced.**

- 38  
39 • **Welcome Committee Members.**

40  
41 It was noted that the Legislative Committee would meet in October 2022.

1 **STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL UPDATE AND REPORT.**

2  
3 1. **William McCarvill and Barbara Cameron will Provide an Update on the Activities of**  
4 **the Stakeholders Council.**

5  
6 Patrick Shea noted that the Stakeholders Council would not meet until October 19, 2022. This was  
7 after the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS comment submission date. He did feel that the  
8 Stakeholders Council had a purpose if none of their comments or concerns would be considered.  
9 Chair Robinson noted that Stakeholders Council leadership, William McCarvill, and Barbara  
10 Cameron would participate in the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meeting on October 17, 2022.  
11 Mr. Perez reported that Stakeholders and members of the public were allowed to share comments  
12 related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS at the last Transportation Committee Meeting.  
13 There was also another Transportation Committee Meeting scheduled for October 10, 2022. The  
14 CWC had not known when UDOT would release the alternatives. Due to the timing, there was not a  
15 Stakeholders Council Meeting scheduled before the comment submission date. It was suggested that  
16 an invitation to the Transportation Committee Meeting be sent out to Stakeholders Council Members.  
17

18 Mr. McCarvill reported that the Stakeholders Council was focused on preparations for the next  
19 meeting, which was scheduled for October 19, 2022. He understood that this date was past the  
20 submittal date for the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon FEIS comment period, but Mr. Van Jura  
21 would share information with Stakeholders. This would be a benefit for all of the Stakeholders  
22 Council Members. Additionally, in preparation for the upcoming retreat, a member survey would be  
23 circulated. Ms. Cameron explained that they were excited to share the annual report at the retreat.  
24

25 **ACTION ITEMS**

26  
27 1. **Consideration of Resolution 2022-40 - Amending the CWC’s Budget for FY 2022-23.**

28  
29 Chair Robinson explained that Resolution 2022-40 related to the amendment of the CWC budget for  
30 Fiscal Year 2022/2023. This had been discussed during the public hearing earlier that night.  
31

32 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-40 – Amending the CWC’s  
33 Budget for Fiscal Year 2022/2023. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the  
34 unanimous consent of the Board.  
35

36 2. **Consideration of Resolution 2022-41 - Approving Entry into a Consulting Agreement**  
37 **with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. for the BCC MAP.**

38  
39 Chair Robinson reported that Resolution 2022-41 related to a Consulting Agreement with AECOM  
40 Technical Services, Inc. for the BCC MAP. The agreement was not just with the CWC and AECOM,  
41 but all of the funding partners, including the two ski resorts and the Town of Brighton. He noted that  
42 the contract was being managed by the CWC. He was not sure whether the Resolution had been  
43 written that way to give credit to the contributors or to allow the work product to be proprietary to  
44 those who contributed. Mayor Silvestrini explained that he had encouraged CWC Staff to write the  
45 Resolution in that way. Since the project was being funded by those entities, he felt it was important  
46 that all of the entities had an interest and were party to the contract. Mr. Topham informed the CWC  
47 Board that he did not have a problem with the way the Resolution was written.  
48

1 Mayor Silvestrini stated that the contract contemplated installment payments as the work was  
2 performed. It would be invoiced in that manner. There had been discussions with CWC Staff about  
3 invoicing the contributors on the contract so the CWC had the funds and made the payments. He did  
4 not believe there would be an issue proceeding that way. Mr. Topham noted that everyone that was  
5 a party to the agreement would need to run it through their respective councils for approval. The  
6 CWC would authorize Chair Robinson and Mayor Silvestrini to enter into the agreement, on behalf  
7 of the CWC. The other signatories would need to follow their own approval processes.

8  
9 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-41 – Approving Entry into a  
10 Consulting Agreement with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. for the BCC MAP. Mayor Bourke  
11 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

12  
13 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

14  
15 *Steve Van Maren* enjoyed the last CWC Board Retreat until the lunch break. He asked that the CWC  
16 Board share some food choices so members of the public could have a meal after the Retreat.

17  
18 There were no further comments. Chair Robinson closed the public comment period.

19  
20 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

21  
22 No additional comments were shared.

23  
24 **ADJOURN BOARD MEETING**

25  
26 **1. Chair of the Board Christopher F. Robinson will Close the CWC Board Meeting.**

27  
28 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to ADJOURN the CWC Board Meeting. Mayor Knopp  
29 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

30  
31 The meeting adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Monday, October 3, 2022.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

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