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**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 2023, AT 1:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM.  THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES LOCATED AT GATEWAY AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE 102, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

**Present:**  Mayor Dan Knopp

Mayor Michael Weichers

Mayor Monica Zoltanski

**Staff:** Blake Perez, Executive Director of Administration

Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director of Policy

**Others:** Angie Bauer-Fellows

Carl Fisher

Ralph Becker

**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 1:05 p.m.

1. **The committee will Approve Minutes from the March 22, 2023 Meeting.**

**MOTION:** Mayor Zoltanski moved to APPROVE the Central Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes from March 22, 2023. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

**FINAL DRAFT BCC MAP REVIEW**

1. **The Transportation Committee will Receive a Briefing on the Final BCC MAP.**

Chair Knopp reported that Angie Bauer-Fellow from AECOM was present to share information about the Final Big Cottonwood Canyon Mobility Action Plan (“BCC MAP”). She noted that this will be her last presentation to the Transportation Committee on the BCC MAP as the AECOM Consultant portion is nearly over. She thanked the CWC, the Transportation Committee, and all involved in the process. She appreciated that the organization is willing to share its expertise and concerns in a productive fashion to address the existing transportation needs.

Ms. Bauer-Fellows reported that the public comment period ended last week. She would provide a summary of some of the key takeaways. Additionally, she would share high-level changes made between the Draft BCC MAP and the Final BCC MAP documents. There would also be next steps shared with the Transportation Committee.

The public comment summary was shared. Ms. Bauer-Fellows reported that the intention of the public comment period was to allow members of the public to review the Draft BCC MAP and provide comments. The document was posted on the CWC website and comments were accepted from March 27, 2023, to April 17, 2023. It was an open-ended comment period and there were no formal questions posed. 45 comments were received in total. A fair number of those comments were in letter format so a lot of substantial input was received. AECOM was working to finalize a memo that would summarize the public comments. It would be available for review and be included as a supporting document to the BCC MAP. The memo would have more details about the actual comments and include the individual comments themselves.

The AECOM team reviewed the comments over the last week and there were a few common themes. Ms. Bauer-Fellows reported that there was a fair amount of support for the BCC MAP effort as well as the types of recommendations provided in the draft document. There was variation in terms of the preferred recommendations but there was a lot of positive feedback about the nature of the recommendations. Notably, there was a lot of support for buses. Ms. Bauer-Fellows acknowledged that the perspective of canyon residents should be considered.

There were not many comments in opposition to specific recommendations or that expressed extreme negativity about the BCC MAP. That being said, there were areas that some respondents felt the BCC MAP was lacking. For instance, active transportation, electric buses, sustainable technology considerations, and further study of carrying capacity. Ms. Bauer-Fellows reiterated that the public comments were being documented in their entirety and would be available as part of the supporting materials. The Final BCC MAP included revisions made as a result of the comments received.

Ms. Bauer-Fellows informed the Committee that some additions and updates had been made to the BCC MAP since the Draft BCC MAP was released. She shared information about the bicycle and pedestrian (active transportation) components. It was important to acknowledge the importance of those modes in the document. From a high-level perspective, the BCC MAP focused on addressing seasonal peak-period congestion and year-round mobility issues, with a focus on shifting vehicle trips to transit and reducing single-occupancy vehicles. That being said, a few alterations were made to the BCC MAP to further address active transportation.

There was some level of assumption that mobility hubs would have pedestrian improvements. As for the specifics, there were concepts included in the BCC MAP document, but those would need to be further defined if any of the recommendations moved forward. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that additional language had been added to the document to acknowledge the need to consider where bicycle and pedestrian improvements could be incorporated. In addition, the document recognized that any mobility hubs that were added or improved would need to be ADA-compliant.

As for the comments related to electric buses and the carrying capacity, those were not laid out as specific recommendations in the BCC MAP. That being said, the comments received did factor into the revised document. For instance, more robust information about implementation details had been provided. Ms. Bauer-Fellows reported that additional details on cost estimates, funding opportunities, the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) process, and jurisdictional actions had been added. The cost estimates were primarily provided in the document as part of the single-page recommendation descriptions. The estimates were high-level and conceptual in nature. All of the estimates listed were expected to be refined in the future.

The BCC MAP intentionally provided different types of options. For example, short-term, mid-term, and long-term options could be pieced together or moved forward independently. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that there was a broad range of cost estimates for individual recommendations. The restriping of the park and ride lot at the mouth of the canyon was the simplest recommendation and had a cost estimate of $30,000. On the other end of the spectrum was the seasonal enhanced bus service, which was closer to $60 million. There was a wide range when looking at the single recommendations. As for all of the recommendations that were laid out in the BCC MAP, the total estimate was between $150 million and $200 million. Ms. Bauer-Fellows stated that there was flexibility and a lot of potential funding tools.

The AECOM team was now presenting the Final BCC MAP to the Transportation Committee and would present the Final BCC MAP to the CWC Board on May 1, 2023. That was the last step for AECOM. Ms. Bauer-Fellows hoped that the document would serve as a jumping-off point. It would be a framework to address transportation needs in Big Cottonwood Canyon.

There were next steps outlined for all of the recommendations listed in the BCC MAP. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that some of the more immediate next steps were called out in the document as well. The first recommendation was that the BCC MAP be shared with relevant agencies, departments, and decision-makers. Something that was highlighted in the document was the $150 million appropriated from the last Legislative Session for the Cottonwood Canyons. That appropriation provided some unique opportunities, so it was recommended that there be close coordination with the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) about the availability of those funds, the process, and the timing of their utilization. Ms. Bauer-Fellows acknowledged that there were related efforts with the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) that would feed into some of the transit next steps for Big Cottonwood Canyon. It was necessary to stay connected with UDOT and the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) as far as the appropriations and outcomes of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.

Components that moved forward would likely need to have a project sponsor identified. That could be a local jurisdiction or even the CWC. Ms. Bauer-Fellows clarified that when funds were sought from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) or different Federal funding buckets, there was often a requirement to have some sort of project sponsor. Ms. Bauer-Fellows informed the Committee that the $150 million appropriations would not all be used for Big Cottonwood Canyon. The BCC MAP document recognized that there were some limitations with that particular funding bucket, but noted that there were a lot of other opportunities and potential funding sources.

Immediate project-specific next steps were reviewed. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that a few items in the document were laid out as fairly straightforward opportunities, such as the restriping of the park and ride lot at the mouth of the canyon. There would not need to be additional NEPA or environmental analysis. The cost estimate was also at the low end of the spectrum. Some projects recommended in the BCC MAP could be carried forward fairly quickly and easily with minimal agency involvement. She reiterated the importance of optimizing the opportunity that had been identified thanks to the Legislative funding. There was a lot of coordination needed.

Mayor Monica Zoltanski referenced the appropriations under Senate Bill ("S.B.") 002. Four items that could be funded included bus service, tolling, mobility hubs, and resort bus stops. It was also tied to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS, which meant it was unlikely that anything would move forward for two years or so. She asked about the short-term projects that could be focused on in the meantime. Ms. Bauer-Fellows noted that the BCC MAP acknowledged opportunities for improvements at the Wasatch Boulevard and Fort Union intersection. That was an item that UDOT had looked at conceptually and had included in their Corridor Study. That had been acknowledged in the BCC MAP document because it was something that could progress independent of the transit considerations. It could improve operational conditions at the base of the canyon. In addition, she felt it was worth looking into other options such as the Brighton Resort Mobility Hub.

Mayor Zoltanski felt it was important for Committee Members and Stakeholders to pursue more immediate recommendations. There were things that cities and regional partners could work together to achieve. She referenced the recent ski shuttle that serviced the resorts. Ms. Bauer-Fellows believed it would be worth reaching out to Visit Salt Lake to find out how many users there were, how far the funds went, and so on. That was a key opportunity for public/private partnerships. Mayor Zoltanski acknowledged that Big Cottonwood Canyon was different than Little Cottonwood Canyon in terms of the alignment and the traffic, but the traffic mitigation that had been implemented in Sandy was successful. Residents and resort visitors were supportive of those efforts. Cities could work together to improve traffic management.

Chair Knopp informed those present that the BCC MAP was a first step. He hoped that the document would be a launching point with UDOT so recommendations would be added to their program of work. Executive Director of Administration, Blake Perez reported that some comments had been left in the Zoom chat box. Ralph Becker wrote that it would be helpful to receive more specifics about the bus service improvements. Mr. Perez explained that those details would be included in the final report, which would be posted on the CWC website ahead of the CWC Board Meeting on May 1, 2023. Ms. Bauer-Fellows stated that a lot of the basic bus service assumptions were more or less in line with what was proposed in the CWC Mountain Transportation System Alternatives Report a few years ago. There was also an acknowledgment that some of those assumptions, especially from the service, frequency, and operation side, would likely need to be updated or revisited based on any related enhanced bus outcomes.

Mr. Becker noted that there had been some discussion about having to go through a NEPA process for bus service improvements. He was not aware of bus service improvements in the past requiring anything more than a categorical exclusion. Ms. Bauer-Fellows explained that frequency changes may not require action from the U.S. Forest Service as far as NEPA was concerned. It was assumed in the document that a categorical exclusion would be appropriate.

Mr. Perez stated that the BCC MAP had been presented to the Transportation Committee. If there was support for the document, he asked that there be a recommendation to forward it to the CWC Board. At the May 1, 2023, CWC Board Meeting, Ms. Bauer-Fellows would present the BCC MAP. Chair Knopp thanked Ms. Bauer-Fellows and AECOM for their work. Mayor Zoltanski was supportive of moving the document forward as there had been a public and transparent process. It was ready for the next step, which was presentation and approval by the Board. Mayor Mike Weichers echoed those comments and expressed appreciation for AECOM.

**MOTION:** Mayor Zoltanski moved that the Transportation Committee recommend APPROVAL of the BCC MAP and that the CWC Board receive a briefing on the document. Mayor Weichers seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no further public comments.

**ADJOURN TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

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

**MOTION:** Mayor Weichers moved to ADJOURN. Mayor Zoltanski seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

The Central Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.
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