

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) EXECUTIVE**
2 **COMMITTEE MEETING HELD FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2020 AT 2:30 P.M. VIA ZOOM**

3
4 **Present:** Chair Chris Robinson, Mayor Mike Peterson, Mayor Dan Knopp, Robert
5 Sampson (representing Council Member Jim Bradley), Laura Briefer
6 (representing Mayor Mendenhall), Mike Reberg (representing Mayor Wilson)
7

8 **Staff:** CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez,
9 CWC Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye
10 Mickelson
11

12 **Others:** Julianna Christie, Abi Holt, Tara [REDACTED]
13

14 **1. OPENING**
15

16 CWC Executive Committee Chair, Chris Robinson called the meeting to order via Zoom 2:35 p.m.
17

18 **2. CWS MTS AGENDA REVIEW AND FINALIZE**
19

20 **a. Committee Members will Review and Finalize MTS Summit Agenda.**
21

22 Chair Robinson reported that the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Virtual Summit will take
23 place on November 13 and 14, 2020. The purpose of the Executive Committee Meeting was to
24 discuss and finalize the agenda for the Summit. CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez shared the
25 current version of the Summit agenda with the Executive Committee.
26

27 CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker stated that at the previous CWC Board Meeting, there was a
28 discussion about how to proceed with the Summit. It was suggested that the Summit include
29 proposals from some of the mode experts and proponents of different alternatives. Mr. Becker noted
30 that there had been a lot of discussion about the recommendation, but the Commission had not reached
31 a resolution. Staff and the facilitator of the MTS Virtual Summit, Julianna Christie, spent a lot of
32 time discussing a possible recommendation. There was also correspondence between the
33 Commission Members.
34

35 The recommendation was that staff, in consultation with mode experts, present some of the options
36 and discuss the advantages and consequences of each. This would be an expansion of the original
37 presentation; which Mr. Perez would present at the front end of the Summit. There would also be a
38 short question and answer session about the proposals for clarification. Mr. Becker stated that the
39 reason for this recommendation was to better focus on the objectives of the Summit. The goals were
40 to evaluate where there is consensus, where there is disagreement, and where there are opportunities
41 to explore options further. If too much time was spent on presentations from individual mode experts,
42 it would become difficult to meet the objectives of the Summit.
43

44 Mike Reberg, representing Mayor Wilson, asked if there would be conversations between staff and
45 mode experts prior to the Summit or if staff was asking individual mode experts to submit written
46 materials. Mr. Perez reported that information was received from the LaCaille group and rail
47 information was already included the draft alternatives. Mr. Becker commented that the goal was to

1 get a draft of the presentation out to various mode experts and proponents, receive their feedback, and
2 incorporate their expertise to the extent possible into the staff presentation.

3
4 Mr. Perez reported that the process would allow for clarifying questions. Mode experts, project
5 managers, and transportation professionals in attendance would be available to answer questions.
6 Mr. Reberg noted that Mayor Wilson preferred the suggestion that staff incorporate information into
7 the Summit rather than there being individual mode presentations. Robert Sampson, representing
8 Council Member Bradley, felt the same.

9
10 Chair Robinson stated did not object to the idea of individual mode presentations but did not want to
11 miss the objectives of the Summit due to agenda changes. He thought it made sense for staff to
12 present the information. He wondered if there would be disagreements from Snowbird General
13 Manager, Dave Fields, or Chris McCandless from CW Management about the approach. Mr. Becker
14 noted that this had largely been an internal discussion. Mayor Peterson had spoken to
15 Mr. McCandless over the last several weeks and he seemed open to whatever is best for the CWC.
16 He did not believe there would be an objection or disagreement.

17
18 Mayor Peterson supported Mayor Wilson's position and believed it was best to avoid specific project
19 discussions due to time limitations. He felt that the LaCaille project alone would result in questions
20 regarding implementation and distract from the purpose of the Summit. Mayor Peterson mentioned
21 the importance of addressing environmental and watershed concerns.

22
23 Laura Briefer, representing Mayor Mendenhall, expressed support for Mayor Wilson's position and
24 the approach suggested by staff. She noted that there would be a 10-minute presentation related to
25 watershed but wondered how overarching environmental concerns would be woven into the Summit.
26 Chair Robinson reported that he received an email from Friends of Alta stating that they believed the
27 Commissioners were transportation heavy and environmentally light. He felt it was important to have
28 advocacy for the environmental position.

29
30 Ms. Christie reviewed the Mountain Transportation System Virtual Summit agenda. Day 1 would
31 include the following:

- 32
- 33 • Opening remarks from CWC Chair Chris Robinson and Mayor Dan Knopp.
 - 34 • Ms. Christie will share welcoming details including Summit objectives:
 - 35 ○ Review the MTS draft alternatives and updates, including learnings covered from the
 - 36 Design Your Transit tool, public comment, and findings from the October 21, 2020
 - 37 Stakeholders Council Meeting.
 - 38 ○ Conduct dialogue among members of the public, Stakeholders, CWC Commissioners
 - 39 and CWC Staff in order to fully understand all of the draft alternatives, the modes and
 - 40 the demand management strategies, address questions, gather feedback, reach
 - 41 consensus where possible and where consensus is not possible, identify a framework
 - 42 to move forward for further consensus building.
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47 • CWC presentation about the MTS process and the draft alternatives. Review what was
 - 48 discovered from the expert panel, public comment period, and the Design Your Transit tool.

- 1
- 2 • Presentation by Mr. Perez about the MTS process. He will discuss why the CWC began the
- 3 process, review objectives and do an overview of the draft alternatives. The presentation
- 4 would also cover the topic: “Can buses alone solve the transportation issue?”
- 5
- 6 • Presentation by Laura Briefer from Salt Lake City Public Utilities to relate watershed
- 7 protection objectives to transportation objectives.
- 8
- 9 • Work as a group to establish a problem statement. Criteria will be identified in order to
- 10 determine how to judge each solution.
- 11
- 12 ○ Problem Statement: “In what ways might we explore regional year-round
- 13 transportation solutions that minimize congestions and improve safety, while
- 14 addressing environmental concerns and incorporating input from all of you here at the
- 15 Summit?”
- 16
- 17 ○ Decision Making Criteria:
- 18
- 19 ■ Minimize congestion both in the canyons and adjacent neighborhoods.
- 20
- 21 ■ Provide emergency egress.
- 22
- 23 ■ Address the needs of resort skiers and year-round dispersed recreation users.
- 24
- 25 ■ Take into the account the needs of property owners, canyon residents,
- 26 employees, and businesses.
- 27
- 28 ■ Protect the environment, the wilderness, and the watershed; and
- 29
- 30 ■ Include all viewpoints.
- 31
- 32 • Discuss each of the draft alternative elements. Mr. Perez will take the lead on presenting the
- 33 draft alternatives and discuss what objective and attribute each element meets, the key details
- 34 of the plan, elements around the cost and funding, established pros and cons and any other
- 35 essential information. There will also be clarifying questions to start as well as a reaction
- 36 round. For any areas where a consensus is not reached, plans will be discussed in order to
- 37 move forward.
- 38
- 39 • Review the agreements and outstanding next steps.
- 40

41 Ms. Christie shared the outline for Day 2 of the Summit:

- 42
- 43 • Opening remarks by Mayor Knopp.
- 44
- 45 • Review the agenda, problem statement and criteria as well as the results from Day 1.
- 46
- 47 • Detailed discussion of the remaining alternatives.
- 48

- 1 • Recap all learnings and discuss next steps; and
- 2
- 3 • Closing remarks by Chair Robinson.
- 4

5 The Executive Committee Members approved of Ms. Christie’s Problem Statement for the Summit.
6 Mr. Becker commented that any suggestions related to the Problem Statement could be submitted to
7 staff or refined during the Summit. Ms. Christie asked for input from the Executive Committee about
8 the decision-making criteria. Chair Robinson believed resort skiers should be changed to resort
9 visitors. Mr. Perez noted that the decision-making criteria would need to be compared against the
10 attributes and objectives of the MTS. Chair Robinson noted that the criteria section was missing a
11 note about capacity and user experience. Ms. Christie was open to feedback and asked that the
12 Commission Members submit their suggestions.

13
14 Ms. Christie shared the plan addressing all the elements during the draft alternatives’ presentation. It
15 would begin with the Salt Lake Valley Connections then move onto Wasatch Front to Wasatch Back
16 via I-80, Millcreek Canyon and then Big Cottonwood Canyon. The goal was to get through Big
17 Cottonwood Canyon on Friday. However, Ms. Christie noted that it would depend on the length of
18 the discussions. On Saturday, there would be discussions about Little Cottonwood Canyon followed
19 by Cottonwood Canyon Connections and Big Cottonwood Canyon (Brighton) to Park City. There
20 may be times where the order is shifted or paused but the plan would provide structure. Mr. Perez
21 commented that the order was chosen because that was the way things were presented in the CWC
22 draft alternatives and in the Design Your Transit tool. The specific discussion points for each corridor
23 would be presented based on the results of the Design Your Transit tool. Chair Robinson noted that
24 he liked the discussion order.

25
26 Mayor Peterson believed Wasatch Boulevard was a corridor and felt it had been excluded. He stated
27 that if there were going to be transportation hubs on 9400 South as well as LaCaille and the gravel pit
28 development, the Wasatch Boulevard corridor should be a high priority. Mr. Perez clarified that the
29 Wasatch Boulevard corridor was not included in the Design Your Transit tool because there is already
30 a Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan. Even though Wasatch Boulevard is not specifically addressed in
31 the draft alternatives, it related to some of the objectives that were laid out.

32
33 Chair Robinson asked if it would be possible to add Wasatch Boulevard as a corridor and have a few
34 bullet points underneath. Mr. Perez commented that he could evaluate whether that could be done.
35 He noted that it would likely be related to how the various transportation alternatives would impact
36 Wasatch Boulevard. Mayor Peterson felt that the alternatives, such as buses, would have a
37 tremendous impact on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Perez shared that the Tier 4 objectives mentioned
38 impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. Wasatch Boulevard could be brought up during those
39 discussions. Mayor Peterson stated that transportation modes would impact more than just the
40 adjacent neighborhoods. There could be issues related to congestion, public safety, and ingress/egress
41 to the canyons.

42
43 Mr. Becker believed that transportation alternatives would have a dramatic impact on Wasatch
44 Boulevard as well as on Cottonwood Heights. He suggested addressing Wasatch Boulevard during
45 discussions about Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, and the Salt Lake Valley
46 Connections. The potential impact on Wasatch Boulevard could be included in the bullet points
47 related to two or three of the different corridors.

1 Mayor Peterson did not want Wasatch Boulevard to be forgotten. He felt it was important to include
2 it on the Summit agenda somewhere. Mr. Perez suggested that Wasatch Boulevard be mentioned
3 during the discussions on Tier 4 objectives. Mayor Peterson noted that transportation alternatives
4 would impact more than residents. It would also impact those visiting nearby cities and ski resorts.
5 Mr. Becker stated that Wasatch Boulevard would be highlighted during the Summit presentation.
6

7 Ms. Christie confirmed that there would be clarifying questions and reaction rounds on both days of
8 the Summit. She would also do her best to ensure that any questions asked do not contain a bias.
9 Mayor Knopp was excited about the Summit and felt it was time to move the process forward. He
10 believed the mode experts should be involved at some point so that the specific proposals could be
11 better understood. He agreed, however, with the decision for staff to discuss the modes during the
12 Summit presentation.
13

14 Mr. Sampson wondered if there should be a statement in the objectives that discussed what the
15 Commission will do once a transportation decision has been made. Ms. Christie liked the addition
16 and felt it would add useful context. Mr. Sampson noted that the word “consensus” was used a lot.
17 He asked if there would be a decision or vote during the Summit. Mr. Sampson stated that Council
18 Member Bradley expressed concerns that a consensus would indicate that the Commission would be
19 making the ultimate decision during the two-day Summit. Mr. Becker stated that he would discuss
20 what had been done with the MTS so far as well as what would be done with the results of the Summit
21 discussions. He believed the goal was to reach a consensus and to determine where there was
22 agreement and where there was not. This would allow the Commission to discuss the issues further
23 and determine how to proceed.
24

25 Mayor Peterson reported that the Transportation Committee had a goal of reaching a recommendation
26 for the MTS. He felt there needed to be clarification about where the Summit would fit into that goal.
27 Chair Robinson believed it was important to look towards next steps. If there was consensus on a
28 particular mode, a decision would need to be made to either adopt the mode or find out how to fold it
29 into existing processes. Mr. Sampson wondered how a chosen alternative would be shared and
30 implemented. Mr. Sampson reported that he and Council Member Bradley spoke with Mr. Perez
31 earlier in the day. They asked what would happen if the preferred solution did not fit well with the
32 Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). Chair
33 Robinson felt those were good questions. He believed it was important to discuss how the Summit
34 results would be folded into the larger process. Mr. Becker stated that he could cover some of that in
35 his 10-minute presentation.
36

37 The Executive Committee expressed appreciation for the effort that had been put into the summit
38 preparations. Chair Robinson asked Mr. Becker to send out the problem statement, decision-making
39 criteria, and the objectives for the Commissioners to look over.
40

41 **3. ADJOURNMENT.**

42
43 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to adjourn. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion. The motion
44 passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
45

46 The Central Wasatch Commission Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Executive Committee Meeting held Friday, November 6, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____