



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”)
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16,
2023 AT 1:00 P.M. AT 41 RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

Present: Mayor Dan Knopp, Chair
Mayor Mike Weichers, Co-Chair
Mayor Monica Zoltanski

Staff: Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration
Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy

Others: Amber Broadaway
Carl Fisher
Mike Doyle
John Knoblock
Tom Ward
Tom Diegel
Ed Parks
Roger Borgenicht
Angie Bauer-Fellows
Pat Shea
Barbara Cameron

OPEN TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING

1. Chair Dan Knopp will Call the Meeting to Order and Welcome Those Present.

Chair Dan Knopp called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m.

2. Committee will Approve Minutes from the January 12, 2023 Meeting.

MOTION: Mayor Weichers moved to APPROVE the Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes from January 12, 2023. Chair Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

1 **BCC MAP PUBLIC SURVEY KEY FINDINGS**

2
3 **1. The Transportation Committee will Receive an Initial Report on Key Findings from**
4 **the Recent BCC MAP Public Survey.**
5

6 Angie Bauer-Fellows from AECOM was present to share information related to the Big
7 Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”). Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that
8 there would be a focused discussion related to two key items. The first had to do with the results
9 of the BCC MAP public survey and the second had to do with draft mobility hub concepts. The
10 BCC MAP public survey was live on the CWC website for approximately one month. It closed
11 on February 10, 2023. A detailed analysis of the responses was still underway, but Ms. Bauer-
12 Fellows was able to share an initial summary of the takeaways. She reiterated that there would be
13 a full analysis of all the responses in the future. The survey focused on some key topic areas. This
14 included winter bus service, year-round bus service, mobility hubs, bicycling, funding, parking,
15 tolling, fees, and fares. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that some of the survey questions were
16 specific to those topics. She acknowledged that the survey did not cover all potential options or
17 recommendations. However, it would be possible for others to be added.
18

19 Ms. Bauer-Fellows reported that approximately 960 responses were received. She reviewed some
20 of the main takeaways. When asked about seasonal express buses and seasonal winter service,
21 respondents were generally supportive. However, there were concerns about traffic, wait times,
22 and service hours. If there was a consistent schedule, frequent headways, and available seating,
23 respondents would be more likely to use the service. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that there were
24 two questions in the survey about year-round bus service and non-winter, non-resort service.
25 Approximately half of the respondents stated that they would use the service if it was available.
26 One-third of respondents stated that they might utilize that kind of service. Overall, there were a
27 lot of "it depends" kind of responses to the survey questions. Ms. Bauer-Fellows pointed out that
28 some survey questions were ranked, some were multiple choice, and some were open-ended.
29 AECOM was taking time to read through the open-ended responses to better understand the
30 nuances.
31

32 An interesting high-level takeaway was that people were generally supportive of a reduction in
33 parking spaces if there was better access to transit using trailheads. Another clear takeaway was
34 that having a clear and consistent schedule for transit was essential. Frequent and reliable transit
35 was needed for respondents to utilize the service. Ms. Bauer-Fellows shared additional takeaways.
36 She reported that the majority would be open to using transit if on-street parking were removed.
37 There was general acknowledgment that the circumstances would vary and it would depend on
38 what transit service is provided, the frequency, and overall convenience. There were similar
39 takeaways with tolling, fees, and fares. In general, the response was that it would depend on the
40 circumstances. Respondents were open to paying for different options, but it would come down
41 to the details. For instance, the exact costs and occupancy limits.
42

43 Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted that there were a few questions related to mobility hubs in the survey.
44 Some focused on location and some focused on the desired amenities. There was a broad range of
45 responses. She explained that some wanted to focus less on mobility hubs at trailheads and simply
46 ensure that there was adequate transit service. Others acknowledged the need for there to be transit

1 system improvements alongside any implemented mobility hubs. Ms. Bauer-Fellows reiterated
2 that the information shared was a rough summary of the public survey data. Moving forward, all
3 of the data would be analyzed and compiled for a detailed Outreach Summary Report. That report
4 would include both general takeaways as well as the actual results. The input received would be
5 pulled into the ongoing BCC MAP development process.
6

7 In addition to summarizing the results in the Outreach Summary Report, AECOM would pull some
8 of those components into the Implementation Plan portion of the final report. Ms. Bauer-Fellows
9 explained that there would be an acknowledgment of public sentiment. Components that made it
10 into the final plan would clearly state whether or not they were part of the public survey. If
11 something was not included in the survey, there would be next steps listed to ensure that public
12 feedback would be received. Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted that there would be next steps listed in the
13 Implementation Plan, such as National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) processes or other
14 environmental processes that would require specific public engagement.
15

16 Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted that there was a lot of support for frequent and reliable transit service as
17 well as general support for mobility hubs. Given the fact that the Wasatch Front Regional Council
18 (“WFRC”) had a public comment period open for the Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”)
19 update, it might be worth recommending that those investments be added to the final version of
20 the RTP. As for the BCC MAP public survey, she reiterated that there would be more formal
21 documentation and analysis of the results. That would be shared with the Committee in the future.
22

23 Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez, reported that there would be a section about
24 the public survey included in the BCC MAP. He also noted that the data from the survey would
25 be presented to the CWC Stakeholders Council on February 27, 2023. There would be some
26 engagement activities and exercises with the Council at that time. A more complete report would
27 be presented to the CWC Board at the March meeting. There would be a finalized report on the
28 public survey shared at that time as well as the outcomes from the Stakeholders Council Meeting.
29

30 **BIG COTTONWOOD CANYON MOBILITY ACTION PLAN MOBILITY HUBS AND** 31 **TRANSIT CENTERS**

32

33 **1. The Transportation Committee will Receive Updates on Mobility Hubs and Provide** 34 **Feedback.** 35

36 In addition to the public survey, AECOM was working on the development of recommendations.
37 For the next four to six weeks, that would be the primary focus of the BCC MAP work. Ms. Bauer-
38 Fellows explained that the mobility hub component had been expedited. During the current
39 Transportation Committee Meeting, some draft concepts for mobility hubs would be shared with
40 the Committee. She reiterated that these were concepts and additional work needed to be done.
41

42 Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that the term mobility hub was used to describe a location that
43 connected multiple modes, including transit. There would likely be slightly different versions of
44 mobility hubs in different locations. However, this was a general term. Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted
45 that AECOM recognized the need for regional connectivity. That being said, the focus currently
46 was on mobility hubs within Big Cottonwood Canyon and at the mouth of the canyon. The

1 information reviewed at the current meeting would not focus on locations or amenities for mobility
2 hubs in the valley. That being said, regional connectivity would be considered further in the future.
3

4 Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted that Ed Parks was the mobility hub lead on the AECOM team. He had
5 been leading that component with additional staff. She asked that he share that information with
6 the Transportation Committee. Mr. Parks explained that the mobility hub concepts were only
7 concepts and were not set in stone. He shared a graph with those present and explained that there
8 was Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4 listed. It went from minimal investment, minimal
9 infrastructure, and minimal amenities to higher investment and higher connectivity. He noted that
10 the typologies were similar to what Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") used in their First/Last Mile
11 Strategies Study. For instance, suburban non-residential, institutional, and regional multi-modal
12 connectors. Some of the costs and timelines were shown, with near-term, medium-term, and long-
13 term. For connectivity, the information looked at connections with pedestrians, bicyclists, and
14 trails. Resort shuttles and extra connectivity would require more investment.
15

16 Mr. Parks reiterated that there were columns that listed Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, and Type 4. He
17 explained that he would work his way across those topologies to see what amenities were
18 recommended per typology. Some of those had been adjusted based on the feedback received.
19 For Type 1, there needed to be an ADA-accessible landing pad, stop sign, schedules and route
20 maps, and a crossing treatment. Working across the different types, there were more and more
21 amenities, such as shelters, bicycle maintenance stands, video surveillance, real-time route
22 information, restrooms, and warming centers. Mr. Parks shared a route map. The intention was
23 to orient those present with the different locations as the hubs were discussed.
24

25 The first mobility hub discussed was at the canyon mouth. Mr. Parks noted that the Gravel Pit was
26 referenced to acknowledge that the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") Little
27 Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") recommended a mobility hub there.
28 Mr. Parks explained that this could impact the BCC MAP in the sense that it could affect service
29 planning and regional connectivity discussions in a later phase. AECOM acknowledged that it
30 could be a new stop and there were some site concerns related to ownership, costs, and operations.
31

32 Moving into the mouth of the canyon, there were a few different options. On the left, the existing
33 Big Cottonwood Canyon Park and Ride lot was shown. Changing the angle of the parking lot and
34 the striping would be a minimal investment option. There were approximately 86 parking spots
35 currently. If it were restriped a different way, there would be approximately 150 parking spots.
36 That would increase the capacity slightly and allow additional users to utilize buses or carsharing.
37 On the right, there was an image that represented a parking deck. The option to add a parking deck
38 would be a much higher investment, but it would result in approximately 400 parking spots.
39

40 Mr. Parks clarified that there were tradeoffs for the different options. For example, if the Big
41 Cottonwood Canyon Park and Ride lot was restriped, the capacity would increase, but that would
42 also increase the traffic flow at the traffic light. Those tradeoffs would need to be considered
43 further during the later stages of the project. At the current time, the intention was to look at the
44 potential benefits and challenges for the proposed mobility hub locations. If a parking deck was
45 constructed, that could increase parking capacity, but would have a long timeline and would
46 require a more significant investment. It was important to consider the different tradeoffs.

1
2 Mayor Monia Zoltanski had a question about mobility hubs and parking lots. She wanted to know
3 about the parking lot that was at the base of Big Cottonwood Canyon. There was hotel parking
4 that was available on the weekends. Mayor Zoltanski clarified that there were approximately 80
5 parking spots there available for public use. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that AECOM was not
6 considering that location in terms of a mobility hub, but that area would be considered in the overall
7 recommendations and parking considerations.
8

9 Mr. Parks reviewed the trailheads. There were three different examples: the Reynolds Flat
10 alternative, the Spruces alternative, and the Silver Fork alternative. Critical to any of those would
11 be a collaboration with the U.S. Forest Service. There had been discussions with the Forest Service
12 last week and it was clear that the concepts would need to be worked through so they made sense
13 for all involved. The Reynolds Flat alternative looked at constructing platforms, upgrading the
14 facility, and restriping the parking lot. The Spruces alternative would be similarly upgraded to a
15 Tier 2 facility with platform construction. At the Silver Fork alternative, there would also be an
16 upgrade to a Tier 2 facility, platform construction, and an upgraded crossing. The crossings were
17 added to make sure safety was prioritized. Some of the concerns for those examples included:
18 collaboration with the Forest Service, permitting, and overuse. Mr. Parks reported that restriping
19 and adding platforms would be a lower to medium cost that could be implemented in the short
20 term. Medium-term would add capacity for parking and upgrade ADA accessibility. More
21 expensive and long-term options included restriping, adding platforms, and improving amenities.
22

23 Mayor Knopp asked for additional details about the platforms that were referenced. He wondered
24 whether those were raised areas for riders to exit onto. Mr. Parks clarified that it was a concrete
25 pad for the bus area. This would ensure that boarding was ADA-compliant. The concrete pad
26 would make it possible to easily navigate around the shelter and get onto the bus. Carl Fisher left
27 a comment in the Zoom chat box. He wondered whether the AECOM team had looked into
28 lowering speeds to make pedestrian areas safer in conjunction with reducing private vehicle trips.
29 Mr. Parks explained that speed and vehicle access would be examined during a later phase.
30

31 Mr. Parks noted that there were a few recommendations for the Solitude resort area. The idea was
32 to remove buses from the parking lot and keep them on the main road. It would be possible to
33 upgrade the stop to a Tier 2 facility. That would include stop signs on either side of the road with
34 a pedestrian bridge that would connect to the parking lot at Entry 1. There was another potential
35 location, which was the bypass that was currently an unused old road. That could connect to the
36 main resort area. Additionally, there was a potential location at the second entrance, where the
37 buses could stop on the main road. There would be stops on either side of the pedestrian crossing.
38

39 Mr. Parks explained that after previous discussions, it became clear that the bypasses would not
40 work due to concerns about the creek. For the Moonbeam Lodge alternative, there would be a
41 stop with platforms on either side of the road, a pedestrian crossing, and a pedestrian bridge over
42 the creek that would connect to the parking lot. That alternative seemed to gain the most traction.
43 The Solitude Village alternative did not gain as much traction due to the bend in the sight lines.
44

45 Mayor Knopp wondered if the alternatives showed an actual structure. For instance, a place where
46 riders would exit the bus and utilize lockers and restrooms. Mr. Parks explained that it was not

1 part of the Moonbeam Lodge alternative on the bottom left. The mobility hubs nearest to resorts
2 would not have those kinds of amenities, because the amenities were already at the resorts. It
3 made sense to work with the resort to determine what amenities needed to be added. Amber
4 Broadway thought there was value in looking at both the up-canyon and down-canyon options.
5 Even if only up-canyon use was able to be accommodated, this still meant half the bus trips could
6 be removed from the resort lot. It was not ideal but it was something worth looking into further.

7
8 Mayor Knopp asked how much traffic there was from Brighton down to Solitude – Entry 1.
9 Ms. Broadway reported that in the morning until 3:00 p.m. that bus was fairly empty. From 3:00
10 p.m. on, Solitude struggled to load everyone onto the buses, because they were so overloaded from
11 Brighton. There were a lot of down-canyon options that could be looked at. Additionally, she
12 noted that there were times when the buses did not need to stop. Ms. Broadway believed that
13 moving the bus to the road with a pedestrian bridge would have a lot of benefits.

14
15 Mr. Parks further reviewed the options for Solitude. The Solitude Village alternative included the
16 addition of a parking deck. The Moonbeam Lodge alternative was referenced. He explained that
17 restriping the parking lot was not the easiest option there, because of the snow. However, there
18 was the potential to construct a parking deck and improve connections. That being said, those
19 improvements would not solve the issue of the narrow bridge over the creek. The bottleneck in
20 the area would always be an issue. Having the stop on the street would be much better for
21 operations in terms of the parking lot. The tradeoffs were reviewed. The benefits included
22 improved operations and ADA accessibility. The challenges were related to crossing safety.

23
24 The Brighton area was reviewed. Mr. Parks explained that there was a loop road shown in red.
25 Going up the canyon, traveling around the loop, and coming back out in a counter-clockwise way
26 meant that a sidewalk would need to be constructed and the first stop would need to be upgraded
27 to a Tier 3 facility. There could be a combined facility with the existing maintenance building and
28 a bus priority loop. That would assist with transit priority and operations. The AECOM team was
29 looking at how to move buses through the loop faster while providing a better experience for all.
30 Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted that the AECOM team was looking into the different options. For
31 instance, whether it would be possible to move the maintenance facility to a different location.
32 Mr. Parks discussed the tradeoffs. The benefits were ADA accessibility and improved user
33 experience. The challenges were related to the right-of-way, the environment, and permitting.

34
35 Mayor Knopp referenced the loop diagram. He noted that it needed to extend down the canyon to
36 Guardsman Pass Road. There was a bottleneck there. If it was possible to move the buses through
37 that bottleneck into their lane, it would improve the bus flow. Mr. Parks noted that the AECOM
38 team had started to look into that. It was something that would be brought to the Transportation
39 Committee during a future round of exhibits. He reiterated that the work was ongoing. Mayor
40 Knopp reported that UDOT was perfecting the right-of-way in the area. At the moment, most of
41 the right-of-way was still owned by the Forest Service. There had been a meeting yesterday and
42 UDOT assured him that the right-of-way would be perfected by late spring 2023.

43
44 It was noted that Mayor Zoltanski had left the Transportation Committee Meeting, but had left a
45 recommendation in the Zoom chat box for consideration. Mr. Perez believed the recommendation
46 was good for a different segment of the BCC MAP in terms of management and carpooling. It

1 had its place but was not necessarily relevant to the current mobility hub discussion. It was noted
2 that the feedback would be provided to Mayor Zoltanski.

3
4 Ms. Bauer-Fellows reviewed the process moving forward. There were rough concepts at the
5 current time, but in the future, the updates would be more comprehensive. Mayor Knopp
6 appreciated the work being done and the information that had been shared during the meeting.

7
8 **WFRC REGION TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMENT PERIOD**

9
10 **1. Chair Knopp will Present a Draft Outline of Key Components for Big Cottonwood**
11 **Canyon to Include in a Memo to WFRC for the RTP Public Comment Period.**

12
13 Mayor Knopp reported that CWC Staff was currently working on a memo that would be submitted
14 to the WFRC as part of the RTP comment period. The comment would be geared toward Big
15 Cottonwood Canyon. There would be a request for funding for seasonal, year-round, and local
16 bus service as well as a request for funding for transit centers. That memo would be ready next
17 week and it would be presented to the CWC Board for approval before being submitted.

18
19 Mr. Perez reiterated that the focus of the CWC comment would be on a lot of the work from the
20 BCC MAP and the work that had been done during the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”)
21 process. The comment would encourage increased funding for UTA’s core route so there would
22 be better regional connectivity. Mayor Knopp pointed out that Big Cottonwood Canyon was not
23 on the WFRC program of work currently. The intention was to highlight the needs there. Big
24 Cottonwood Canyon experienced a lot of use and it was important to find ways to manage that.

25
26 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

27
28 *John Knoblock* asked if data was available related to Big Cottonwood Canyon. For example, how
29 many people were heading up the canyon each season, the percentage of single-occupant vehicles,
30 and how many people could be moved using the existing UTA buses. Mayor Knopp reported that
31 there were car counts, but he was not sure that those could completely be counted, because the cars
32 were counted both ways. The biggest day in Big Cottonwood Canyon last year was 9,000 vehicles,
33 which was a lot. The bus maximum was 70 people per bus. Mr. Knoblock felt it was important
34 to look at the data further to refine the recommendations. The transportation system needed to be
35 able to solve the problems before mobility hubs were chosen.

36
37 Mr. Perez noted that UTA went from 35-foot buses to 40-foot buses recently. Despite that, he
38 thought the 70-person maximum seemed high. Mayor Knopp clarified that the 70-person
39 maximum had been reported to him yesterday. It seemed that there was a commitment from UTA
40 that the 40-foot buses would run in the canyons from here on out. Mayor Knopp noted that even
41 with transportation limitations, it was important to start somewhere and get cars off the road.

42
43 *Carl Fisher* shared a comment about the parking at Solitude. He reported that Solitude knowingly
44 impacted their existing parking decades ago as part of a tradeoff. It seemed that some agreements
45 from the past would be undone through the BCC MAP process. There had been informed decisions
46 made, and it seemed that the context was removed to build more within the natural environment.

1 Mayor Knopp explained that it was necessary to manage the current use. His goal was to address
2 the existing issues. Mr. Fisher felt the use should remain within the confines of the infrastructure
3 that had been agreed to. Ms. Broadaway wanted to see the agreements that had been made in
4 writing as she had not seen anything about that during her time at Solitude.
5

6 There was discussion of the Forest Plan. Mr. Fisher noted that it said no more parking was
7 permitted in the canyons. There was a Record of Decision (“ROD”) for the Solitude 2001 Master
8 Development Plan that discussed parking as well. That agreement was documented in a ROD
9 issued by the Forest Service. Ms. Broadaway clarified that updates had since been submitted to
10 the Master Development Plan. Additionally, the way that Master Development Plans were handled
11 by the Forest Service had changed over the years. She understood his point of view and concerns.
12 That being said, no one at the Transportation Committee Meeting had asked AECOM to do
13 anything other than vet possible options. Mayor Knopp noted that he was interested in public
14 transportation efforts. The intention was to limit parking in the canyon. He did not want there to
15 be more parking taking place in the canyons and instead wanted to see more transit use.
16

17 *Ms. Broadaway* noted that AECOM had explored various options. The options looked good, but
18 it was important to figure out the best fit and determine what could be funded. Mayor Knopp
19 believed that the BCC MAP approach made sense and it would be possible to receive funding.
20

21 *Mike Doyle* had previously expressed concerns about keeping people out of bus lanes. If there
22 could be two lanes, that would be ideal. A lot of backups occurred when people were moving in
23 and out of the parking lot and around the circle. In terms of emergency vehicles, it was always
24 possible to get those vehicles to the circle, but sometimes that blocked traffic. If there was a
25 secondary lane for buses and emergency vehicles, it would improve the overall conditions.
26

27 *Barbara Cameron* was impressed that there was a desire to get transit to the resorts. That was
28 where the Forest Service had asked transit to be centered. She felt the BCC MAP was moving
29 forward in a positive direction. She looked forward to future BCC MAP updates.
30

31 **ADJOURN MEETING**

32 33 **1. Following a Motion and Affirmative Vote, Chair Knopp will Close the Meeting.**

34
35 **MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to ADJOURN the Transportation Committee Meeting. Chair
36 Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
37

38 The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting held Thursday, February 16, 2023.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____

10