

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL**
2 **MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2019 AT 4:00 P.M., PROMISE ROOM,**
3 **3330 SOUTH 1300 EAST, MILLCREEK, UT 84106**
4

5 **Present:** Greg Summerhays-Chair, Kirk Nichols, Brian Hutchinson, Barbara Cameron,
6 Jan Striefel, John Thomas (UDOT), Carl Fisher, Ed McCarvill, Mike
7 Maughan, Megan Nelson, Serena Anderson, Troy Morgan, Dan Knopp,
8 Carolyn Wawra, Nathan Rafferty, Dell Draper, John Knoblock, Randy Doyle,
9 Michael Braun, Paul Diegel, Thom Diegel, Annalee Munsey, Stetson West,
10 Bill Malone, Dave Fields, Don Despain, Kurt Hegmann, Michael Marker,
11 Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Jesse Dean,
12 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, CWC Attorney Shane Topham
13

14 **Via Telephone:** Kelly Bricker
15

16 **Excused:** Pat Shea, Matt Kirkegaard, Steve Issowits, Wayne Crawford
17

18 **A. OPENING**
19

- 20 **i. Greg Summerhays will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Stakeholders**
21 **Council.**
22

23 Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Chair Greg Summerhays called the meeting to order at
24 4:01 p.m. and thanked the Stakeholders Council Members for their participation. Millcreek City
25 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini welcomed those present and was pleased to make the room available to the
26 Stakeholders Council. He shared the story behind the name of the Promise Room where the meeting
27 took place. It was based on a program called the Brick Promise that serves as an aid to public schools
28 by providing tutors and after school programs. It also promotes economic well-being and safety. He
29 thanked the council members for their service.
30

- 31 **ii. The Stakeholders Council will Consider Approving the Meeting Minutes of**
32 **Thursday, January 17, 2019.**
33

34 The minutes were reviewed and modified.
35

36 **MOTION:** Michael Braun moved to approve the minutes of Thursday, January 17, 2019, as
37 corrected. Will McCarvill seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of
38 the council.
39

40 **B. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING OPMA, GRAMA**
41

- 42 **i. CWC Counsel Shane Topham will Review Proposed Rules of Procedure for the**
43 **Stakeholders Council.**
44

45 Stakeholders Council Attorney Shane Topham reported that local governmental entities often have
46 advisory bodies. All perform specific functions. For the CWC, the advisory board created is the
47 Stakeholders Council, which is mandated by the interlocal agreement that created the CWC. The
48 proposed Rules of Procedure document was reviewed and discussed in detail.

1
2 Kirk Nichols stated that with the Big Cottonwood Community Council, the county always provided
3 directors insurance. He asked if that would be the case with the Stakeholders Council. Executive
4 Director Ralph Becker stated that this body is advisory in nature so insurance had not been considered.
5 Mr. Topham offered to look into it and report back.

6
7 In response to a question raised by Don Knopp, Mr. Topham explained that a conflict of interest
8 would involve a decision that would impact the member or his employer. Michael Braun commented
9 that the council should maintain a status that is similar to volunteer organizations within government
10 bodies and members should recuse themselves from voting for specific reasons, which were
11 described. Mr. Becker asked Mr. Topham to further describe what constitutes a conflict of interest.
12 Mr. Topham explained that typically it will come down to an economic benefit or special privilege or
13 benefit that accrues to a council member, employer, family member, or friend.

14
15 **ii. Action by Stakeholders Council to Formally Adopt the Rules of Procedure,**
16 **Subject to Ratification by the CWC Board.**

17
18 **MOTION:** Don Knopp moved to table the matter until the new language can be reviewed by the
19 council. Barbara Cameron seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of
20 the Council.

21
22 **C. DISCUSSION REGARDING STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ALTERNATES AND**
23 **ATTENDANCE EXPECTATIONS**

24
25 **i. Greg Summerhays will Lead a Discussion Regarding the Use of Alternates in**
26 **Place of the Formally Selected Stakeholders Council Members; and Discuss**
27 **Expectations for Attendance and Participation.**

28
29 Chair Summerhays encouraged members to be make every effort to attend every meeting. They also
30 have the option of participating via telephone.

31
32 **D. STAFF MONTHLY REPORTS**

33
34 **i. Presentation by CWC Staff and Supporting Jurisdiction Staff Regarding CWC**
35 **Activities, including:**

36
37 **(a) Transportation – John Thomas.**

38
39 John Thomas showed a video of a recent avalanche where two to three feet of snow ended up on the
40 road. He stressed the importance of following the established safety rules and guidelines. He next
41 described how the Alta Wildcat entry was reconfigured to improve efficiency. A survey was
42 distributed with 85 comments having been submitted so far. Most were positive. Currently, there are
43 20-foot movable barriers. Other proposed improvements were described. The possibility of making
44 similar improvements at Solitude was discussed as well as the need for signage and pavement
45 markings.

46
47 For many, the bigger issue in Big Cottonwood Canyon was at the bottom of the canyon. John Thomas
48 stated that soon they will be addressing Big Cottonwood Canyon. He described what is being done

1 in Little Cottonwood Canyon that might have some application in Big Cottonwood Canyon. Deputy
2 Director Jesse Dean referred to sources of information that describe both the Environmental Impact
3 State (“EIS”) process as well as the Transportation Action Plan, which will focus on Big and Little
4 Cottonwood Canyons.

5
6 Mr. Thomas commented that in the morning hours there are delays with people traveling up the
7 canyons. Traffic concerns were identified. Modeling was done in the area and it was determined that
8 backups that extend to Wasatch Boulevard can be significantly reduced. The effort extends beyond
9 vehicular traffic since one of their goals is to improve transit operations. In the planning study, UTA’s
10 efforts and future expansions will be identified for implementation. He noted that even though they
11 are roadway improvements, they benefit all modes of transportation.

12
13 A free right turn lane was proposed that would provide about 3,500 feet of pavement that would allow
14 cars the opportunity to negotiate, increase speed, and merge. When that was modeled it showed
15 significant improvement. Traffic issues and patterns were discussed. There had been consideration
16 of a High-T intersection at the top over the summer to be implemented in the fall of 2020. The EIS
17 and planning study were expected to be completed in 2021. It was noted that concerns were expressed
18 by the neighbors. Wasatch Resort community members had expressed concern about what is
19 proposed as well as adding another driveway. In addition, the current configuration does not address
20 specific traffic concerns. It was recognized as a conceptual idea with details to be worked through.

21
22 A question was raised with respect to the percentage of traffic coming off of Wasatch Boulevard on
23 a winter day. Mr. Thomas stated that it is typically 60 percent but varies by the day of the week and
24 weekend. It was noted that the Park & Ride at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon gets quite
25 congested by busses who are dropping people off, continuing down the mountain, and rejoining the
26 highway as they exit the Park & Ride area. Traffic patterns were described with the intent being to
27 provide more room for the merge to occur so that vehicles can reach traveling speed and then merge
28 and keep traffic moving.

29
30 Jan Striefel asked about pavement width. John Thomas responded that is additional width.
31 Enforcement is done in the area, which aggravates the situation. Possible enforcement solutions were
32 described. It was estimated to be 3,500 feet from the first intersection to Wasatch Boulevard. Dell
33 Draper’s opinion was that that amount of space was needed to merge. He suggested there be a choke
34 point from the intersection where 9400 South meets Wasatch Boulevard up to the resort. At that
35 point, vehicles have to slow down because two lanes of traffic are being reduced to one. He suggested
36 there be 1,000 feet of additional lane there to see if that helps traffic merge. The possibility of
37 metering the two lanes was discussed.

38
39 With regard to timing, Mr. Thomas stated that the goal was to have a design by the summer, advertise
40 for construction in September or October, and begin construction in the spring of 2020.

41
42 John Thomas reported that there are 22 different segments from the “Y” to the Town of Alta where
43 they know what the speeds are of cars going up and down the canyon. They had never had that
44 information before and can now troubleshoot and determine what is and is not working. This year a
45 great deal was being done on Wasatch Boulevard. The EIS was being looked at as a long-range
46 transportation plan improvement. Work was also underway in the interim since the earliest
47 construction will begin on Wasatch Boulevard is 2021. They have two years to complete the
48 environmental process and two years to complete the Transportation Action Plan (“TAP”).

1
2 Mr. Thomas described sensors that will indicate where someone starts their trip. One question that
3 was raised was how many people are coming from the Park City area to one of the canyons. The
4 technology was described. Variable Message Signs (“VMS”) were described that would be placed
5 in various places as parking lots and in resort buildings to provide travel information in the canyon.
6 A communications app was also envisioned. While there is not a common way to display information,
7 it can be customized to meet the needs of visitors. It was noted that communication is sorely lacking
8 for canyon visitors. The intent is to solve it through various sources.

9
10 An app being developed was described by Snowbird CEO Dave Field that will incentivize carpooling.
11 Users can find rides in their area and earn points and prizes for doing so. To date, there had been
12 2,000 downloads and 450 active users.

13
14 A question was raised as to the potential to increase the refresh rates on cameras in the canyon.
15 Currently, it is every 15 minutes. The hope was that it could be done more frequently.

16
17 A suggestion was made that signs be placed along the road asking motorists not to block side roads.

18
19 The Transportation Action Plan was described. It was reported that work is underway on the Little
20 Cottonwood Canyon EIS Version 2. The first year they had a broader view and focused their efforts
21 on snow sheds, trailhead parking, avalanche mitigation, and Wasatch Boulevard. They have studied
22 various ways to mitigate avalanches. In 2020, Alta will put in another crosswalk and a merge lane
23 on SR-2.

24
25 John Thomas stated that the CWC wants the Stakeholders Council to come up with ideas that can be
26 implemented in the near term. The intent would be for the ideas to be reviewed by the CWC and
27 ready for implementation strategies. As part of the process, the consulting team will have finance
28 and program professionals ready to provide assistance.

29
30 Jesse Dean mentioned that in terms of the short-term items, there will be a process in place so that
31 the decisions made in 2019 do not preclude larger-scale transportation improvements. Mr. Becker
32 explained that some are relatively small structural improvements while others are larger.
33 Consideration should be given to whether the proposed improvements are compatible with a longer-
34 range decision about the correct mix of modes to access the canyons.

35
36 It was noted that when the legislature approved the funding and the Utah Transportation Commission
37 allocated the \$100 million, \$66 million was allocated to Little Cottonwood Canyon. In addition,
38 Wasatch Boulevard had been in the long-range plan. Big Cottonwood Canyon will have to be
39 financed and program consultants will help find the funding. The intent would be to implement the
40 plans and not just conduct another study. Mr. Dean stated that the intent was to prioritize the list
41 based on the best use and the costs.

42
43 Traffic circulation issues were discussed. In response to a question raised, Mr. Dean stated that staff
44 would be distributing a survey for High-T intersections. He encouraged the Council Members to
45 solicit additional input.

46
47 With regard to the EIS, it will formally begin early March with a Notice of Intent to be printed in *The*
48 *Federal Register*. The public comment period will commence with an open house to be held on

1 April 9 combined with a TAP. Comments were welcome at udot.gov/littlecottonwoodeis.com and
2 on social meeting.

3
4 Appreciation was expressed to Snowbird for working on the Rideshare campaign. It was also
5 suggested that informational signs be posted indicating the time it would take under the current
6 weather and road conditions to get to one of the ski resorts. It was reported that last year UTA
7 increased ridership by 30%. This year they increased it by 40%, which equates to 700 people. On a
8 typical Saturday, 5,000 cars travel up Little Cottonwood Canyon, which equates to approximately
9 15,000 people. The intent would be to implement a transit program and work with all of the parties
10 involved.

11
12 A question was raised about whether the High-T survey will include Solitude. Mr. Dean stated that
13 it will focus only on Little Cottonwood Canyon.

14
15 **(b) State Legislation – Ralph Becker.**

16
17 Mr. Becker updated the council members on the federal and state legislation. In November, the CWC
18 arrived at a proposed bill after three drafts and public comment recommending the congressional
19 delegation move forward. They took the recommended action and are now incorporating the changes
20 and doing a cleanup of other elements of the federal legislation so that it is ready when the
21 congressional delegation picks it up and introduces a bill to be considered in this congressional
22 session. That was moving forward under the Central Wasatch Commission’s work to which they
23 devoted the majority of their time.

24
25 The state legislature had shown great interest in their work. There have been at least two bills
26 introduced this session that could affect the work of the CWC relating specifically to public lands.
27 They have been actively engaged in discussions. A resolution was also being introduced by Senator
28 Cullimore asking the legislature and governor to support the work of the Central Wasatch
29 Commission. The bills were identified as HB 78, which would require any designations or proposals
30 that affect public lands be approved before being proposed for federal action. The other was SJR 17,
31 which would call for the development of a state-wide public lands plan in an effort to influence the
32 federal government on public lands decisions.

33
34 **E. PRESENTATION AND GROUP EXERCISE SETTING STAKEHOLDERS**
35 **COUNCIL MEMBER PRIORITIES FOR CENTRAL WASATCH**

36
37 **i. Presentation and Discussion Led by UDOT Project Manager John Thomas on**
38 **the Use of Decision Lens and Group Decision Making.**

39
40 **ii. Decision Lens Exercise by Stakeholders Council.**

41
42 John Thomas described the process used by UDOT to set priorities. He stressed the importance of
43 getting the criteria right. The candidates were next identified. One of the advantages of the process
44 was to provide the opportunity for people to be informed about the various perspectives and ideas.
45 The responses submitted are categorized in the process. Ultimately, participants understand the
46 various positions, ideas, and concepts about what can be achieved. How the results are utilized were
47 next discussed. Mr. Thomas commented that it is a very good tool should the council wish to use it.
48

1 Mr. Dean indicated that the bulk of the March meeting will be spent reviewing the criteria. In
2 preparation, the council members would need to be able to process what truly matters to them.
3 Following the April meeting, they can pursue projects based on the criteria.

4
5 **F. OTHER STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL DISCUSSION**

6
7 It was suggested that transit solutions be tested this season. Available resources were described.
8 Mr. Becker commented that they are 10 years' behind in terms of addressing many important issues.
9 In order to effectively decide how to move forward, they need the involvement of other entities
10 including UTA among. Their input would be sought as decisions are made. Although the intent was
11 to move quickly, they also need to act in an informed manner. Laura Hansen was identified as the
12 Planner for UTA who is assigned to the project.

13
14 **G. ADJOURNMENT**

15
16 The Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Meeting adjourned at approximately
17 6:06 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholder Council Meeting held Wednesday, February 20, 2019.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____