

Date: Tuesday July 9th 2019

Start time: 3:04 p.m.

End time: 4:44 p.m.

Present: Brian Hutchinson (CWC Stakeholders Council), Lindsey Nielsen (CWC Staff), John Knoblock (CWC Stakeholders Council), Ed Marshall (CWC Stakeholders Council), Jim Bradley (CWC, Salt Lake County), Bobby Sampson (Salt Lake County), Paul Diegel (CWC Stakeholders Council), Jeff Silvestrini (Millcreek), Rita Lund (Millcreek City), George Vargyas (Wasatch Backcountry Alliance)

A. Opening

- a. Brian Hutchinson opened the meeting and welcomed the subcommittee members as lead of the subcommittee
- b. Mayor Silvestrini gave a background of the concept for a Millcreek Canyon shuttle, and the impetus for the Fehr and Peers feasibility study. Mayor Silvestrini noted that there are processes and permitting that the Forest Service would need to go through if and when the shuttle program happens. Mayor Silvestrini noted that there are a number of possibilities for potential funding sources from Salt Lake County and Millcreek City, other sources, even though money is tight everywhere.
- c. Councilman Jim Bradley has a longtime interest in Millcreek Canyon -- Councilman Bradley worked to implement the toll booth in Millcreek Canyon. Salt Lake County commissioned the Fehr and Peers study that comprehensively evaluates the issues and problems. It's time to take the study and implement it into a pilot program. Thanks to Brian for leading the subcommittee and effort.

B. Introduction of Project Outline

- a. Brian Hutchinson spoke about the structure of the project and subcommittee. Asked Mayor Silvestrini to invite a representative from Skyline High school to attend the July 15th meeting
- b. Mayor Silvestrini noted that Granite School District as a whole would be the appropriate contact and that he and his staff at Millcreek would reach out to folks at Granite school district

C. Background and Purpose

- a. Brian Hutchinson noted that we have to consider what we have right now in terms of the Fehr and Peers study. One of the advantages of a pilot program is that we don't have such a heavy lift as if it weren't a pilot program.
- b. Brian noted that the background for the need for a shuttle study included overcrowding, conflicts between users, and environmental impacts
- c. John Knoblock clarified that the purpose and need is really a problem statement. We need to define our needs and the problem facing the canyon
- d. Ed Marshall noted that the real problem is that there isn't enough parking at surge times that creates a conflict between the drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.

Big water and Little Water parking lots are the main two issues. After that there was some crowding at Church Fork, Rattle Snake Gulch. It's variable.

- e. Brian Hutchinson noted the environmental effects of the commute to Millcreek from other parts of the valley. UTA is considering some alignments from the north that would connect with the Millcreek stop (Park & Ride)
 - f. Mayor Silvestrini noted that folks from all over SLC come to Millcreek canyon to use it. Significant amount of local use.
 - g. UTA is talking about realignment of routes
 - h. Councilman Bradley noted that UTA is making some significant monetary investment by switching the bus fleet natural gas
 - i. John Knoblock said that we won't solve local air pollution by implementing a shuttle in Millcreek Canyon. The main benefit is reducing the interaction between pedestrians and cyclists and reducing the number of cars on the roads.
 - j. Rita Lund noted that in the winter, folks drive up, can't find parking, then end up idling to wait for a spot, impacting air quality
 - k. Ed Marshall strongly agreed with John -- we need to define our scope and goals
 - l. Brian Hutchinson noted that air quality is related
 - m. Mayor Silvestrini noted that the real problem is overcrowding and that air quality improvement is more a marketing tool
 - n. Councilman Bradley -- we need to define the focus and narrow the scope to what's most manageable. Don't know how much time we need to spend determining that there's a problem.
 - o. Bobby Sampson noted that if this blueprint inst the framework for which the subcommittee is going to use, there should be another framework to guide the decisions.
 - p. Councilman Bradley noted that there isn't a better study or plan
- D. Pilot Study Goals
- a. Brian Hutchinson noted that the goals include: enhance the visitor experience, enhance access and mobility; minimize air and water and noise pollution, optimize visitor education,
 - b. Mayor Silvestrini noted that the main goal is reducing crowding in the canyon
 - c. Paul Diegel noted that we should add an experiment to measure the impact of the solution
 - d. Councilman Bradley noted that there may be some value in getting creative with the alternatives -- like the potential for closing the road to all cars save for residential and commercial vehicles
 - e. Mayor Silvestrini -- the wordsmithing needs to be that we are providing an option for the public -- we need to be clear that a shuttle is not a requirement, but an option, and that messaging reflects that
 - f. Brian Hutchinson brought up tolling
 - g. Dell Draper -- you won't get picnickers to use the shuttle. Should the shuttle just be on the weekend? Point of clarification? Doesn;t the shuttle need to start at the bottom off the canyon? Not the top of the canyon?

- h. Ed Marshall -- pic nic sites are rarely the problem. It's the trailheads -- the five main trailheads. Leaving out the picnic sites in the pilot program. This can't completely get rid of cars in the canyon as that would reduce access and mobility in Millcreek Canyon.
- i. Mayor Silvestrini -- eliminating cars entirely is a non-starter. We want to limit the number of cars so that there's always a spot to park.
- j. Del Draper -- we can count the number of cars going up -- problems associated with this. The other way to do this is there's a shuttle as an option and as you see the shuttle dropping off people with cars and dogs, the people who can't park makes a mental note and makes a behaviour change for next time.
- k. Brian Hutchinson noted that communication about parking availability with users before they're in the canyon is key
- l. Paul Diegel noted that behaviour change takes a while, and won;t happen immediately
- m. John Knoblock noted that gathering data within a short time frame
- n. Rita Lund -- you have to make the shuttle attractive some way
- o. Del Draper -- is the shuttle free?
- p. Brian Hutchinson -- flexibility is huge
- q. John Knoblock -- recreation enhancement is a key component in behaviour change
- r. Mayor Silvestrini -- ease of access and convenience, as well as frequency are all the issues. Signage and pricing are both very important
- s. George Vargyas -- what about charging more for a single-occupant car?
- t. Mayor Silvestrini noted that in order for tolling to be a deterrent is for the toll to be a bigger bite -- communicating with the public that the money that is gathered from the toll is going back into the canyon is very important
- u. John Knoblock -- if you reduce the number of cars in the canyon, you reduce the revenue that goes back to manage the canyon
- v. Councilman Bradley -- this is a backburner issue. Communicating why we're doing this is key
- w. George -- what about dogs and bikes?
- x. Mayor Silvestrini -- it does need to be addressed. There may be a need for vehicles specific to each user group
- y. Ed Marshall -- this can be done in phases and scales. As its successful, it can be expanded to include other users like bikes and dogs. At first it could potentially only focus on picnicians and hikers
- z. Brian Hutchinson -- Brian Hutchinson noted that UTA has a significant driver shortage. UTA would entertain contracting with private shuttle companies with bike racks, etc..
- aa. Councilman Bradley -- how does the Monday meeting relate to this meeting
- bb. Brian Hutchinson -- this meeting is prep for the Monday meeting. The folks in attendance will have expertise on funding sources and timeline
- cc. Ed Marshall -- what does the Forest Service think?

- dd. Councilman Bradley -- I get nervous about not moving forward and getting lost in the discussion. We should be able to present on Monday with what we think what looks like a good study. We need something to present
- ee. Ed Marshall -- there is an issue in the upper canyon. My own plan would be a voluntary pilot shuttle program, that stops at the five main trailheads with education and incentives (church fork, elbow fork, porter fork, big water, rattlesnake gulch)
- ff. Brian Hutchinson -- you're talking about a summer shuttle program. UTA has funds that would be available January 1st. So it may make sense to have a winter, spring, and summer shuttle program. So we have to decide if that's appropriate, or if we only want to focus on one season.
- gg. Ed Marshall -- an issue with a winter shuttle often has one or more dogs
- hh. Paul Diegel -- when the parking fills up quickly is on the off-leash dog days -- the odd calendar days
- ii. John Knoblock -- we want to stay as far away from dog days/no dog days as we can
- jj. Del Draper -- do we have the financial and cost information yet?
- kk. Brian -- we can get that information tomorrow from the authors of the study
- ll. Councilman Bradley -- are we paying them? They're doing this for free?
- mm. Del Draper -- a winter shuttle would have to go up to the gate and allow dogs. A Summer shuttle would run every day of the week and stop at various trailheads
- nn. Brian Hutchinson -- don't forget spring
- oo. George -- a two-season pilot program may simplify the program
- pp. Brian Hutchinson -- parents dropping off their kids also has to be addressed in the program
- qq. Paul Diegel -- that causes a huge traffic and safety problem
- rr. Ed Marshall -- I'd like to argue that the boy scouts do not pose a safety and traffic problem
- ss. Paul Diegel -- as a cyclist it does cause an issue. Not so much as a driver.
- tt. Councilman Bradley -- we're zeroing in on one -- which season makes sense for the start, shuttle stops, just to get a reaction from the group on Monday
- uu. George -- keep the scope manageable
- vv. Brian -- one of the reasons for the winter shuttle is that it is small and more manageable. And we can still test a lot of variables. Another reason is marketing and timing for marketing. This is apart of the reason for a January 1st start date.
- ww. Mayor Silvestrini -- we need to talk to the Forest Service because there is a NEPA process that will take some time.
- xx. Councilman Bradley -- they don't own the road, we (Salt Lake County) do. I'm saying let's not do a NEPA process.
- yy. John Knoblock -- the NEPA issue may be moot as the Forest Service is proposing some changes to the process.

E. Meeting Timeline

- a. Brian Hutchinson -- How frequently should this group meet? Twice a month? Monthly? In the end, we have some hard dates if we're working backwards from the October 1st deadline of presenting to UTA.
 - b. Councilman Bradley -- which is why we need to give the folks on Monday something to react to
 - c. John Knoblock -- is it better to give them a concrete proposal now? And seeing which entities can chip in funds.
 - d. Councilman Bradley -- we don't need a funding model for Monday.
 - e. John Knoblock -- to the extent that we make it a free shuttle will increase the success. If it's a \$5 ticket price, it's done.
 - f. Mayor Silvestrini -- unless you make the toll price prohibitive
 - g. John Knoblock -- free is the right number for this pilot program. If we can make an incremental incentive by increasing the toll at the toll booth to \$5
 - h. Councilman Bradley -- you don't want to price people out of the experience
 - i. Bobby Sampson -- it has to be punitive to take your car
 - j. John Knoblock -- incremental fee for occupancy numbers in cars
 - k. Ed Marshall - the fee structure can also change depending on peak times. Lower toll on the weekdays and a higher toll on the weekends
 - l. Paul Diegel -- one conclusion is that we will propose a change to the toll structure as it is today
 - m. Brian Hutchinson -- we're also talking about redistributing visitation
 - n. Paul Diegel -- we need to also think about whether we want to increase visitation to the canyon
 - o. Brian Hutchinson -- we also have to consider the potential for implementing a reservation system
 - p. John Knoblock -- is there data from other folks who have run shuttle programs?
 - q. George -- there are variables - a lot depends on the weather. Not enough data from a one-day shuttle day
 - r. Councilman Bradley -- is there a parking problem as much as there is on the weekends? What's the ratio of picnic and parking spots? Is it equal? Do we know where we're going for Monday?
 - s. Paul Diegel -- maybe we need to provide some time for the folks to identify problems for things we haven't thought about during today's meeting.
 - t. Councilman Bradley -- so we need to throw out a real general concept. What will the schedule be for Monday be? So folks will only have the time to identify the nature of the problem, not the solution.
 - u. Brian Hutchinson -- how many days a month do we want to meet? Twice a month?
 - v. Councilman Bradley -- we do need to meet in two weeks
- F. Funding Sources and Deadlines
- a. Brian Hutchinson -- Potential sources for funding support range from the Salt Lake County, UTA, City of Millcreek, the State and Federal sources.

- b. Mayor Silvestrini -- we will be looking at the effect of a shuttle on the revenue from the toll station
- c. Brian Hutchinson --We will make sure that the tolling fee structure is designed to maintain current levels for management and maintenance by Parks & Rec and the Forest Service.
- d. Councilman Bradley -- if the fate of the canyon depends on tolling revenue, we're screwed already
- e. John Knoblock -- when's the Millcreek budget finalized?
- f. Mayor Silvestrini -- we run on the fiscal year, and we adopted the budget back in June
- g. Councilman Bradley -- raising the toll fee is not going to solve our problem
- h. Bobby Sampson -- a proposed increase in the fee would need to be approved by the county council. Any shuttle decision, any fee increase is subject to county council approval. Given the pilot program nature of this, we could get it on the council schedule relatively quickly
- i. Mayor Silvestrini -- we shouldn't write off UTA as a potential funding source
- j. Brian Hutchinson -- Monday's meeting will include a discussion for tolling and shuttle model, seasons for the shuttle with drop-offs (Summer and Winter are the shoulder seasons. Winter drops off at the gate. Summer drops off at five main trailheads. Spring drops off at the gate, Fall), modification to the tolling fee, pilot focuses just on the weekends and holidays, shuttle only in upper canyon, we're testing where the best places for stops are
- k. Mayor Silvestrini -- honing in on specific user group needs is too detailed for this initial pilot program
- l. Ed Marshall - we'll get more information on Monday from these folks on where we need to focus
- m. Mayor Silvestrini -- we need a proposal that we can take to the school district. I can tell you right now that their initial reaction will be no. They'll want insurance, and a promise that there won't be an interference with their uses.
- n. Paul Diegel -- I'd also emphasize that this is a pilot program that we're trying to learn from, and map out the three goals outlined in the Fehr and Peers study
- o. Mayor Silvestrini -- be sure to reference the Fehr and Peers study
- p. Councilman Bradley -- so Monday will be a rollout of what we broadly think
- q. Ed Marshall -- we need to throw out a winter shuttle that stops at three trailheads and a summer shuttle that stops at five trailheads
- r. Mayor Silvestrini -- we also are testing whether this reduces the number of cars in the canyon
- s. The group concluded that the pilot should consider two studies-
 A Winter-Spring (3 stops below the winter gate)
 B Summer-Fall (Maybe 5 stops between the toll booth and Big Water)

G. Community Outreach

H. New Business

I. Adjournment

- a. Mayor Silvestrini motioned to adjourn
- b. Goerge Vargyas seconded
- c. Meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.