



1
2
3 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION MOUNTAIN**
4 **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (“MTS”) SUMMIT HELD FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2020**
5 **AT 12:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A**
6 **PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE**
7 **ORDER DATED MARCH 18, 2020.**

8
9 **Participants:** Annalee Munsey, Aaron London, Lorin Simpson, Helen Peters, Holly Lopez,
10 Douglas Fry, Joan Degiorgio, Megan Anderson, Randy Doyle, Harris Sondak,
11 Nate Furman, Dennis Goreham, Bob Kollar, Chris Cawley, Kim Mayhew,
12 Mark Thurber, Ryan Park, Patrick Nelson, Roger Borgenicht, Theresa
13 Heinrich, Wayne Niederhauser, Bob Pruite, Monica Z____, Chris
14 McCandless, Jeff Robinson, Ed Marshall, Mike Marker, Patrick Shea, Autumn
15 Hu, Caroline Rodriguez, Shawn Marquardt, Laura Briefer, Aaron Deheyzar,
16 Colby Hartman, Jenny Wilson, Kain Katz, Mike Christenson, Dan Knopp,
17 Andy Beerman, Barbara Cameron, David Stein, Carl Fisher, Chris Cushing,
18 Ken Sanders-Smith, Mike Reberg, Newel Jensen, Nathan Rafferty, Sean
19 Thompson, Val Oveson, Abi Holt, Michael Allegra, Marc Calaf, Kayla
20 Kinkead, John Knoblock, Jeff Silvestrini, Del Draper, Allison Aafedt, Bert
21 Granbeg, Max Doilney, Michael Maughan, Bob Paxton, Ellen Birrell, Jim
22 Bradley, Lisa Hartman, Tamara Prue, Chris Robinson, Will McCarvil, Laura
23 Hanson, Josh Brag, Carolyn Keigley, Kenneth Tingley, Lisa Bagley, Myrna
24 Groomer, Robert Sampson, Ned Hacker, Rachel Ridge, Steve Van Maren,
25 Sophia Bellina, Andrew Nielson, Catherine Kanger, Carlton Christensen,
26 Kerry Doane, Bob Katlan, Lauren Vistor, Grant Amana, Sam Floors, Mike
27 Peterson, Robert Douglas, Julianna Christie

28
29 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez,
30 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye
31 Mickelson

32
33 **1. Opening Remarks.**

- 34
35
 - **CWC Chair: Chris Robinson**

36
37 Chair, Chris Robinson shared the opening remarks for the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”)
38 Summit on November 13, 2020. He identified himself as the Chair of the Central Wasatch
39 Commission (“CWC”). He reported that the Summit will run from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Day 1.
40 Day 2 was to take place on November 14, 2020, from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Chair Robinson
41 recognized the hard work of the Commissioners, Ex Officio members, and dedicated staff. He noted

1 that the Summit represents one year’s worth of work. He introduced Dan Knopp, the Mayor of the
2 Town of Brighton and Chair of the CWC Transportation Committee.

3
4 • **CWC Transportation Committee Chair: Mayor Dan Knopp**

5
6 Mayor Knopp welcomed the attendees and thanked all involved in the transportation discussions thus
7 far. He stressed the importance of finding appropriate solutions to transportation issues. Mayor
8 Knopp also noted that egress from the Town of Alta needs to be addressed in the event of a canyon
9 closure as well as transportation between Park City and the canyons. The intention of the MTS
10 Summit is to move a transportation option forward.

11
12 • **Introduction of Julianna.**

13
14 Mayor Knopp introduced the facilitator of the MTS Summit, Julianna Christie who is the Chief
15 Learning Officer and founding partner of Crafted Leadership, LLC. She has spent over 25 years in
16 organizational settings, successfully facilitating critical conversations and offering insights that
17 support leaders in advancing their work. Ms. Christie thanked those she had spoken to prior to the
18 Summit for their time and insight.

19
20 **2. Welcome (Julianna).**

21
22 • **Summit Objectives.**

23
24 The MTS Summit objectives were identified as follows:

- 25
- 26 • Objective #1: To review the CWC’s MTS Draft Alternatives and updates, in the context of
27 overall CWC goals, including learnings from:
 - 28 ○ Design Your Transit online tool.
 - 29 ○ Public comment session.
 - 30 ○ October Stakeholders Council meeting.
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33 • Objective #2: To conduct dialogue among Stakeholders, members of the public, CWC
34 Commissioners, and staff to:
 - 35 ○ Fully understand all elements of the Draft Alternative Modes and Demand
36 Management Strategies.
 - 37 ○ Address questions.
 - 38 ○ Gather feedback.
 - 39 ○ Reach consensus where possible; and
 - 40 ○ Identify a framework for further consensus-building by the CWC Board.

41
42
43 • **Agenda.**

44
45 Ms. Christie reviewed the MTS Summit agenda. The remainder of Day 1 would include the
46 following:

- 47
48 • Discuss Zoom logistics and share ground rules.

- 1 • Presentation by Executive Director, Ralph Becker that will cover the Mountain Accord,
2 current CWC initiatives, and how the CWC will move forward following the MTS Summit.
- 3 • Presentation by CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez regarding the MTS process. He will
4 discuss why the CWC began the process, review objectives, and present an overview of the
5 Draft Alternatives. Mr. Perez will also review what has been discovered from the public
6 comment period, the Design Your Transit Tool, and the October Stakeholders Council
7 Meeting.
- 8 • Presentation by Laura Briefer from Salt Lake City Public Utilities to relate watershed
9 protection objectives to transportation objectives.
- 10 • Work as a group to establish a problem statement. Criteria will be identified to determine
11 how to judge each solution.
 - 12
 - 13 ○ Problem Statement: “In what ways might we explore regional year-round
14 transportation solutions that minimize congestion and improve safety, while
15 addressing environmental concerns and incorporating input from all of you here at the
16 MTS Summit?”
 - 17 ○ Decision-Making Criteria:
 - 18
 - 19 ■ Minimize congestion both in the canyons and adjacent neighborhoods.
 - 20 ■ Provide emergency egress.
 - 21 ■ Address the needs of resort skiers and year-round dispersed recreation users.
 - 22 ■ Consider the needs of property owners, canyon residents, employees, and
23 businesses.
 - 24 ■ Protect the environment, the wilderness, and the watershed; and
 - 25 ■ Include all viewpoints.
- 26
- 27 • Discuss each of the Draft Alternative elements. Mr. Perez will take the lead on presenting the
28 Draft Alternatives and discuss what objectives and attributes each element meets the key
29 details of the plan, elements around the cost and funding, establish pros and cons, and share
30 any other essential information. There will also be clarifying questions as well as a reaction
31 round. For any areas where a consensus is not reached, plans will be discussed to move
32 forward; and
- 33 • Review the agreements and outstanding next steps.
- 34

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

- 36
- 37 • Opening remarks by Mayor Knopp.
- 38 • Review the agenda, problem statement, and criteria as well as the results from Day 1.
- 39 • Detailed discussion of the remaining alternatives.
- 40 • Recap all learnings and discuss next steps; and
- 41 • Closing remarks by Chair Robinson.
- 42
- 43 • **Zoom Logistics.**
- 44

45 Ms. Christie outlined Zoom logistics for MTS Summit participants. She mentioned the following:

- 46
- 47 • Review and practice functions:

- 1 ○ Preference for cameras on; and
- 2 ○ Change profile name to include first and last name as well as the organization
- 3 represented.
- 4
- 5 • There are several Zoom functions the MTS Summit will rely on:
- 6
- 7 ○ Chat window.
- 8 ○ Polling; and
- 9 ○ Hand raising function.
- 10
- 11 • If there are any tech challenges, Ms. Christie asked participants to message or text
- 12 Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen or reach out to the tech consultant, Josh Brag.
- 13

- 14 • **Ground Rules.**
- 15

16 Ms. Christie outlined ground rules for the participants to keep in mind during the Summit:

- 17
- 18 • All viewpoints are welcome.
- 19 • Questions and requests for clarification are welcome.
- 20 • Respectful dialogue and language.
- 21 • Use the blue hand-raising tool to speak. Those with a hand raised will be called on.
- 22 • One speaker at a time.
- 23 • No interruptions.
- 24 • Sensitivity around the length of comments (2-minute shares); and
- 25 • Avoid duplication of comments.
- 26

27 **3. CWC Presentation by Ralph Becker.**

- 28
- 29 • **CWC Updates.**
- 30 ○ **From Mountain Accord to Today – Primary Elements of Agreement.**
- 31
- 32

33 Mr. Becker reported that the CWC was born out of the Mountain Accord. An agreement was reached

34 in 2015 that involved State, federal and local jurisdictions. It was a consensus-based document where

35 some primary objectives were agreed upon including the following:

- 36
- 37 • Land and resource protection; and
- 38 • Transportation solutions.
- 39

40 Mr. Becker noted that the goals related to land and resource protection involved Congressional

41 Legislation that would solidify areas where lands should be further protected and areas where lands

42 should be left open for potential future development. The goals related to transportation solutions

43 were narrowed down but not finalized. It was determined that transportation would not be addressed

44 by allowing more cars into the canyons or adding additional parking areas. Instead, it would be done

45 through transit solutions.

46

1 The CWC grew out of the Mountain Accord Agreement. It called for the creation of a governmental
2 entity made up of local jurisdictions to help reach consensus about the issues outlined in the Mountain
3 Accord Charter. Mr. Becker reported that the CWC was tasked with carrying out projects initiated
4 during the Mountain Accord process. The Environmental Dashboard work was underway and was
5 scheduled to be completed next year. Work was also underway in Millcreek Canyon. The Mountain
6 Accord also called for visitor use information. Mr. Becker reported that a Visitor Use Study would
7 begin at the start of the new year.

8
9 ○ **Primary CWC Initiatives.**

10
11 The Commission decided to focus on three primary areas this year:

- 12
13 • Legislation.
14 • Special Projects; and
15 • Mountain Transportation System.
16

17 Legislation was introduced in 2016. A hearing was held but no further action was taken. Mr. Becker
18 felt this process highlighted areas where there was agreement and areas where there were outstanding
19 issues to address. Legislation was worked on in 2018 and 2019. Four drafts of the legislation went
20 out for public comment and review. At that time, there was a consideration of land exchange
21 proposals that were called for in the Mountain Accord and the legislation. The U.S. Forest Service
22 review led to a conclusion that the land exchanges were not feasible as proposed. Part of the 2020
23 work was to look at possible alternatives to the land exchanges that could accomplish the same goals.
24 A fifth draft of the legislation was released on November 4, 2020 and is currently open to a 30-day
25 public comment period. This version of the legislation removed the land exchange provisions but
26 retained all other areas of the legislation, such as creating a new Central Wasatch Conservation
27 Recreation Area (“CWCRA”), a new and expanded wilderness area, and the White Pine Watershed
28 Protection area.
29

30 Mr. Becker discussed special projects that the CWC had been involved in. He shared a list of projects
31 that had been funded and worked on. It was noted that the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) helped
32 make improvements to ski bus service. As a result, ski bus use increased by 40% last year. Other
33 special projects included the Environmental Dashboard, Visitor Use Study, Millcreek Public Safety
34 improvements, a Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”) grant that would likely be approved next
35 year and support for the Great American Outdoors Act.
36

37 Mr. Becker reported that the Mountain Transportation System work had been a priority for the CWC.
38

39 ○ **Where CWC Goes from Here.**

40
41 The next steps for the CWC were discussed. Mr. Becker reported that following the MTS Summit,
42 the results will be delivered to the Commission. At the next CWC Board Meeting on December 7,
43 2020, the Commission will begin to discuss the results and come up with a recommendation for what
44 the MTS should be. They will work to see that recommendations are implemented by working with
45 the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) and with both state and congressional leaders.
46 Mr. Becker stated that the intention was to mesh the primary objectives of the Mountain Accord and
47 the Commission together. These objectives would move forward in 2021.
48

1 **4. CWC Presentation by Blake Perez.**

2
3 • **MTS Process.**

4
5 ○ **Why Did CWC Start the MTS Process.**

6
7 Mr. Perez discussed the MTS process and stated that land use and transportation work hand in hand.
8 The intention was to move the National Conservation and Recreation Area (“NCRA”) Act and
9 transportation plans forward together. The Mountain Accord set up transportation principles and
10 directions for further refinement. The CWC was now following through with the MTS process.
11 Mr. Perez noted that there was a need for regional-scale transportation solutions that will provide
12 year-round transit access.

13
14 ○ **Process to Date.**

15
16 The CWC initiated the MTS process by releasing an initial scoping document at the beginning of
17 2020. The draft report covered geographic scope, objectives, and attributes. Public comments were
18 incorporated into the final scoping document. Staff was then directed to prioritize objectives and
19 attributes with feedback from the Stakeholders Council, the Transportation Committee, and CWC
20 Board Members. A tiered approach for the objectives and attributes was developed and agreed upon
21 by all involved.

22
23 Mr. Perez reported that over the summer, there was a Technical Working Group made up of various
24 mode experts, transportation planners, and administrators. Draft Alternatives and Sub Alternatives
25 were developed, and a report was released in September 2020. A 30-day public comment period
26 followed. The CWC hosted the MTS Panel Discussion with several mode experts from bus, rail,
27 aerial, regional planning, and watershed management. The Design Your Transit Tool was also
28 released during this time. The online game gave participants a budget and allowed them to invest in
29 various modes and demand management strategies to reduce traffic congestion, improve emergency
30 egress/ingress, and limit impacts to the watershed.

31
32 Results from the MTS Summit would be brought to the CWC Board for further consideration.

33
34 ○ **Objectives and Attributes.**

35
36 Mr. Perez reported that the MTS initiative has a broad regional scope. He shared the following tiered
37 objectives with the MTS Summit participants:

38
39 • **Tier One:**

- 40
41 ○ Reduce traffic congestion.
42 ○ Increase transit use and incentivize transit; and
43 ○ Protect watershed, wilderness, and visual quality.

44
45 • **Tier Two:**

- 46
47 ○ Emergency egress: “How well do these modes and managements serve as an
48 emergency exit for visitors and residents?” and

- 1 ○ Disincentivizing vehicles.
- 2
- 3 ● Tier Three:
- 4
- 5 ○ Mix of public and private funding.
- 6 ○ Improved trailhead access; and
- 7 ○ Year-round access.
- 8
- 9 ● Tier Four:
- 10
- 11 ○ Provide better ski resort connections.
- 12 ○ Evaluate a Visitor Use Study; and
- 13 ○ Improve access for homeowners.
- 14

15 Mr. Perez shared the following tiered attributes with the MTS Summit participants:

- 16
- 17 ● Move people efficiently to desired locations.
- 18 ● Safety and reliability.
- 19 ● Convenient.
- 20 ● Year-round access.
- 21 ● Adequate frequency,
- 22 ● Reduced air pollution,
- 23 ● Protect water quality.
- 24 ● Protect the quality of recreational opportunity.
- 25 ● Economic and cost-effective.
- 26 ● Equitable access.
- 27 ● Sensitivity to ridgelines.
- 28 ● Affordable and equitable fare structure.
- 29 ● An enhanced experience for Central Wasatch Mountain visitors.
- 30 ● Equality of economic benefit; and
- 31 ● Asset for economic development.
- 32

33 ○ **Overview of Draft Alternatives.**

34

35 Mr. Perez reported that the Draft Alternatives would be shared in more detail during the MTS Summit
 36 for added conversation and clarification. He shared the following overview of the Draft Alternatives
 37 and Sub Alternatives:

- 38
- 39 ● **Alternative #1: Bus-based**
- 40
- 41 ○ Improve Salt Lake Valley bus service and frequency, particularly along the west to east
 42 corridors, to serve more diverse socio-economical communities. This builds off UTA’s 5-
 43 year Service Plan.
- 44 ○ Improve frequency and service on the north and south East Bench transit routes to allow
 45 access closer to households and to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- 46 ○ Support Summit County with the implementation of a Bus Rapid Transit System along
 47 Highway 224.

- 1 ○ Enhance bus service from Quinn’s Junction to Park City.
- 2 ○ Improve connection frequency between Park City and Salt Lake City to provide transit
- 3 options for visitors and commuters.
- 4 ○ Pursue necessary safety, transit, and parking projects in Millcreek Canyon to implement a
- 5 future shuttle service to the canyon and work collaboratively to reduce user conflicts.
- 6 ○ Reduce on-road parking in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon to
- 7 prevent unsafe conditions and negative impacts on the watershed.
- 8 ○ Year-round local bus service for Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon
- 9 to provide access for recreation and trailheads.
- 10 ○ Variable tolling in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon to flatten the
- 11 curve on demand when people are accessing the canyons.
- 12 ○ Seasonal 10-minute frequency Express Bus service from Big Cottonwood Canyon to
- 13 Solitude and Brighton to offer convenient transit service for ski resort visitors.
- 14 ○ Seasonal 5-minute frequency Express Bus service to Snowbird and Alta from 2 different
- 15 transit hubs.
- 16 ○ Snowsheds to cover Highway 210 from avalanche paths to offer safety and reliability; and
- 17 ○ EIS option for an extended shoulder for Little Cottonwood Canyon to provide priority for
- 18 transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

19

20 • **Alternative #2: Aerial Gondola**

- 21
- 22 ○ Maintains many of the same features from Alternative #1, including Salt Lake Valley,
- 23 Summit County, and Millcreek mobility improvements; Seasonal Express Bus to resorts,
- 24 year-round local buses, variable tolling, limited on-road parking, and paid parking at resorts
- 25 for Big Cottonwood Canyon;
- 26 ○ Includes an aerial gondola from the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon, with an enhanced
- 27 shuttle program to move riders from the Gravel Pit Transit Hub to the Gondola Loading
- 28 Station.
- 29 ○ Year-Round local buses, limited parking, and paid parking at resorts.
- 30 ○ Snowsheds to offer safety and reliability.
- 31 ○ Additional bus shuttle service from 9400 South and Highland Drive; and
- 32 ○ Supplemental information and consideration for a La Caille base station option, which
- 33 would move the loading station further down the road to La Caille.

34

35 • **Alternative #3: Bus/Rail Feature**

- 36
- 37 ○ Maintains many of the same features from Alternative #1, including Salt Lake Valley,
- 38 Summit County, and Millcreek mobility improvements; Seasonal Express Bus to resorts,
- 39 year-round local buses, variable tolling, limited on-road parking, and paid parking at resorts
- 40 for Big Cottonwood Canyon;
- 41 ○ Cog Rail line to run from the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon up to Snowbird and Alta
- 42 ski areas.
- 43 ○ Enhanced rail service coming from the Gravel Pit and 9400 South and Highland Drive; and
- 44 ○ Possible rail alignments for consideration: double track, north of State Road 210, with
- 45 electrified rail and snow shed; single track, starter line, adjacent to the road with diesel-
- 46 electric; Rail/Pedestrian/Bicycle corridor avoiding most avalanche paths.
- 47

1 • **Sub-Alternative A:**

- 2
- 3 ○ Transit/Rail tunnel between Big and Littlewood Canyon; and
 - 4 ○ Transit/Rail tunnel only with approximately 3-mile alignment and a travel time of
 - 5 approximately 10 minutes.
- 6

7 • **Sub-Alternative B:**

- 8
- 9 ○ Base-to-base gondola connection between Alta and Brighton.
 - 10 ○ Approximately 3-mile alignment and a travel time of approximately 15 minutes; and
 - 11 ○ Capacity to move up to 5,000 people.
- 12

13 • **Sub-Alternative C:**

- 14
- 15 ○ Base-to-base gondola connection between Brighton and Park City.
 - 16 ○ Approximately 6-mile alignment and a travel time of approximately 25 minutes; and
 - 17 ○ Capacity to move up to 5,000 people.
- 18

19 Mr. Perez clarified that Sub-alternatives B and C will be base-to-base connections. There will be no
20 mid-mountain or ridgeline drop-offs.

- 21
- 22 ○ **Learnings from “Design Your Transit” Online Tool, Public Comment,**
 - 23 **and October Stakeholders Council Meeting.**
- 24

25 Mr. Perez shared slides related to the Design Your Transit tool, public comment session, and the
26 Stakeholders Council Meeting discussion regarding the Draft Alternatives.

27

28 The Design Your Transit Tool was an online interactive game that allowed users to invest in certain
29 modes and demand management strategies. They were given a set budget and were allowed to invest
30 in modes and strategies to reduce congestion, limit impacts to the watershed, and improve emergency
31 egress and ingress. Mr. Perez shared some of the key findings as follows:

- 32
- 33 • Improved bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure in the tri-canyons was the top investment.
 - 34 • Tolling was a highly invested option in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood
35 Canyon.
 - 36 • Road widening was not a popular investment.
 - 37 • There was a desire for a high-capacity transit option along 9400 South and for regional hubs
38 to serve as transfer points to recreation nodes.
 - 39 • Improved frequency and service on a SLC-PC Connect was a popular investment.
 - 40 • Seasonal express buses to the Big Cottonwood Canyon resorts were a popular investment.
 - 41 • Year-round local buses were a more popular investment in Big Cottonwood Canyon than they
42 were in Little Cottonwood Canyon.
 - 43 • The aerial was the most popular investment for both Cottonwood Canyon connections as well
44 as the Brighton to Park City connection.
 - 45 • There was a preference for high-capacity options, such as aerial or rail, over an enhanced bus
46 option in Little Cottonwood Canyon; and

- 1 • The no-action option was the least invested option for both Big Cottonwood Canyon (3% of
2 all respondents) and Little Cottonwood Canyon (1% of all respondents).
3

4 Mr. Perez shared some of the key findings from the 30-day public comment session as follows:
5

- 6 • The most common comments were in support of bus options.
7 • There were more comments opposing aerial and rail modes than there were those that
8 supported them. However, there were fewer comments in general about those modes.
9 • Most comments opposed connections between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little
10 Cottonwood Canyon as well as between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City.
11 • Variable tolling was commented on favorably. However, there were questions raised
12 regarding implementation and the use of potential revenue.
13 • Broad support for a seasonal express bus in Big Cottonwood Canyon; and
14 • Opposition to any road widening.
15

16 Mr. Perez noted that most of the comments fell into the following two categories:
17

- 18 • Those supportive or opposed to a particular mode or demand management strategy; and
19 • Those that were neither opposed nor supportive but wanted a deeper level of analysis.
20

21 Mr. Perez reported the following key findings from the Stakeholders Council Meeting:
22

- 23 • Many felt it was important to have a regional transit system that connects to the MTS.
24 • Some struggled to select a mode while grappling with associated impacts.
25 • Land management and transportation are tied together.
26 • A clear vision is needed for the Central Wasatch.
27 • Concerns were shared about growing visitation and associations with money, development,
28 and financial profit.
29 • Summer bus service may limit access to dispersed recreation.
30 • There could be a consideration for a combination of the modes; and
31 • Concerns were shared about road conditions. Many felt it was important to have a transit
32 option that was not within the road corridor.
33

34 Ms. Christie noted that there were comments in the Zoom chat box related to specific alternatives.
35 She reported that the Draft Alternatives would be discussed at length during the MTS Summit.
36

37 **5. Presentation by Laura Briefer.** 38

- 39 • **Relating Watershed Protection Objectives to Transportation Objectives.**
40

41 Ms. Briefer discussed watershed protection and transportation objectives. She identified herself as
42 the Director of Salt Lake City's Department of Public Utilities. Public Utilities handles water, sewer,
43 stormwater, and street lighting services for residents in Salt Lake City. Their water service area
44 includes a number of other communities along the East Bench of Salt Lake County as well.
45 Ms. Briefer explained that the watersheds of the Central Wasatch are critical to regional water security
46 in the community. Residents of Salt Lake City are reliant on these water supplies as are canyon
47 residents, ski areas, visitors hosted in the Valley and canyons, as well as the communities of

1 Millcreek, Holladay, Cottonwood Heights, Sandy City, and communities on the Wasatch Back.
2 Ms. Briefer noted that without water from the canyons, water would need to come from somewhere
3 else, which would impact economic prosperity. She reiterated the importance of regional water
4 security.

5
6 Safe Drinking Water Act (“SDWA”) requirements must be met along with the Water Quality Act
7 requirements. These ensure the protection of public health. Federal and State standards include the
8 following:

- 9
- 10 • Standards related to microorganisms.
- 11 • Disinfectant and disinfection byproducts.
- 12 • Inorganic chemicals.
- 13 • Organic chemicals; and
- 14 • Radionuclides.
- 15

16 Ms. Briefer outlined secondary standards that include aesthetic, cosmetic, and technical effects. She
17 also addressed how to meet the standards outlined by the SDWA and Water Quality Act:

- 18
- 19 • Protect water from pollution at its source. This makes the water easier to treat and reduces
20 the risk of a contaminant breakthrough affecting the public water system. In the Wasatch
21 Mountains, this can be done through watershed protection.
- 22 • Treat water, as necessary. A lot of resources are spent to maintain the distribution system
23 (pipelines, reservoirs, and so on). There are treatment plants at the mouth of each of the
24 canyons. Water quality is also strictly monitored; and
- 25 • Communication and accountability to the public. Regular communication to the public about
26 the water quality is required.
- 27

28 The pollution factors and risks in the Central Wasatch mountains were shared. One factor related to
29 hydrology. Ms. Briefer noted that the Central Wasatch mountains have a quick moving system
30 without a lot of storage. For instance, at the Big Cottonwood Treatment Plant, it takes approximately
31 seven hours for the water at the top of the mountain to get to the treatment plant. That means if there
32 were a hazardous material spill in the canyons, there would be little time to react. Ongoing
33 management relates to the ability to ensure that the watersheds are observed and monitored
34 appropriately. Additional risks have to do with microorganisms, sedimentation, organic chemicals,
35 and inorganic chemicals. Many of the risks become heightened when additional development takes
36 place in the watersheds. Increased visitors also lead to wildfire risks. The development of roads and
37 trails can also fill in areas that are important from a wetland perspective.

38
39 Ms. Briefer discussed the following strategies used to mitigate water pollution risks:

- 40
- 41 • Land conservation.
- 42 • Public education through programs such as Keep It Pure.
- 43 • Best management practices.
- 44 • Partnerships and collaboration with all jurisdictions involved with the watersheds (Forest
45 Service, Salt Lake County, Town of Alta, and the Town of Brighton).
- 46 • Following regulations; and
- 47 • Water quality monitoring.

1
2 There are two primary ways that transportation alternatives impact watersheds and water resources.
3 They include:

- 4
- 5 • Footprint and construction of transportation alternatives; and
- 6 • Interdependency between transportation, land use, and visitation in the canyons.
- 7

8 Ms. Briefer explained that the footprint and construction of transportation alternatives could lead to
9 erosion and runoff pollution risks. It could also introduce water resource risks if there were
10 encroachments on streams and wetlands. She noted that organic and inorganic chemicals used in
11 construction and maintenance can also cause issues. Tunneling through the mountains could lead to
12 a significant pollution risk and impact hydrology. Ms. Briefer reported that tunneling on the upper
13 end of the canyons could lead to technical issues and disturb the mining legacy in the area.

14
15 The interdependency between transportation, land use, and visitation in the canyons could impact the
16 watersheds and water resources in a number of ways. For example, transportation changes may
17 introduce additional development pressures in the watersheds. Land development frequently
18 coincides with transportation development. Recreation overuse can also exceed the capacity of the
19 environment as well as the agencies tasked with managing recreation impacts.

20
21 Recommendations to protect water resources from unintended consequences of transportation
22 changes were identified as follows:

- 23
- 24 • Pass the NCRA to protect federal lands from development pressures and provide additional
25 management framework.
- 26 • Continue to conserve land for permanent protection.
- 27 • Incorporate environmental and watershed management capacity in the transportation solution;
28 and
- 29 • Limit areas of disturbance. Avoid new corridors or encroachments on streams and wetlands
30 and limit expanses of additional parking lots.
- 31

32 Ms. Christie noted that there was a lot of dialogue taking place in the Zoom chat box. Barbara
33 Cameron asked if Salt Lake City Public Utilities had a canyon wildfire prevention plan. Ms. Briefer
34 noted that this was an important issue. Public Utilities was developing a Wildfire Vulnerability
35 Assessment and Management Plan. It would be specific to the management of wildfire risk. The
36 plan would identify the sub-watersheds within the canyons and look at vegetation, the prevalence of
37 roads, and climate-related issues, to determine the water resource risk if a wildfire were to occur.
38 From that risk analysis, Public Utilities could develop recommendations with respect to better
39 vegetation management, restoration of areas, and monitoring. Ms. Briefer reported that the Unified
40 Fire Authority (“UFA”) had looked at a Community Wildfire Prevention Plan.

41
42 Del Draper wondered what percentage of the water in Salt Lake Valley comes from Big Cottonwood
43 Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Ms. Briefer discussed the Salt Lake City system and stated
44 that Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, Parley’s Canyon, and City Creek Canyon
45 made up 50 to 60 percent of the water supply on an annual basis. Wells contributed approximately
46 10% and the Deer Creek Reservoir contributed approximately 30%. Ms. Briefer noted that the
47 percentages could shift on an annual basis depending on climate, snowfall, and streamflow. Big

1 Cottonwood Canyon contributed between 20-25% of the water supply for the system and Little
2 Cottonwood Canyon contributed 13 to 15%.

3
4 Mayor Mike Peterson asked if the treatment plants at the mouth of the canyons are state of the art.
5 Ms. Briefer reported that the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy operated the plant
6 at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon and Salt Lake City Public Utilities operated the water
7 treatment plants at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon, Parley’s Canyon, and City Creek Canyon.
8 The plants that Public Utilities owns and operates were constructed in the mid-1950s. Ms. Briefer
9 stated that the plants were planned to be rebuilt as part of a 5 to 10-year Capital Improvement Plan.
10 She noted that the treatment process is working well but the rebuild will address issues related to
11 seismic risk and sedimentation basins.

12
13 Ms. Briefer offered to address additional questions either offline or in the Zoom chat box.

14
15 **6. Establish Summit Problem Statement and Criteria (Julianna).**

16
17 • **Group to Frame Summit Problem Statement.**

18
19 Ms. Christie shared the following problem statement:

- 20
21 • In what ways might we explore regional, year-round transportation solutions for the Central
22 Wasatch Mountains region that minimizes congestion, improves safety, and addresses current
23 and future environmental concerns?

24
25 • **Explore Decision-Making Criteria.**

26
27 Ms. Christie shared some of the decision-making criteria with the participants of the MTS Summit.
28 She noted that the list was based on learnings from interviews with Stakeholders and prior
29 conversations with the CWC Board. The criteria would be used as a guidepost for the MTS process:

- 30
31 • Minimize congestion in the adjacent neighborhoods and roadways leading to the mountains.
32 • Protect the watershed for several hundred thousand residents and businesses.
33 • Incentivize transit and disincentivize cars.
34 • Provide emergency egress.
35 • Address the needs of canyon residents, property owners, employees, and businesses.
36 • Protect the environment and wilderness.
37 • Is it safe in mountain conditions?
38 • Consider visual impact.
39 • Is it frequent, convenient, and reliable?
40 • Provide equitable access for all users.
41 • Is it cost-effective (capital, operation and maintenance, and life cycle); and?
42 • Include the viewpoints of all MTS Summit participants.

43
44 Mayor Jenny Wilson commented on congestion and noted that it is not limited to vehicular
45 congestion. She stated that there can be congestion on trails, ski slopes, and in neighborhoods. It was
46 suggested that the following bullet point be added to the decision-making criteria related to this
47 comment:

- 1
- 2 • Minimize congestion as one recreates and utilizes the canyons.
- 3

4 Mark Thurber wanted to see a bullet point related to disincentivizing the use of motorcycles.
5 Ms. Christie felt that the issue of loud single-rider vehicles may be outside the scope of the Summit
6 but made note of the comment.

7

8 Aaron London felt it was troubling to see that the bullet point related to emergency egress was so
9 high on the list. He believed that none of the proposed alternatives would work in a true emergency.
10 Mr. London commented that trying to build a transportation system that would work in an emergency
11 would reduce the wildness of the canyons through urbanization. Ms. Christie noted that the bullet
12 points were not in a prioritized order. She stated that Mr. London's concerns could be addressed
13 further during the Draft Alternatives discussions.

14

15 Mayor Beerman suggested a bullet point that would incorporate Mayor Wilson's comment and
16 address concerns raised by Mr. Thurber. He felt it would tackle congestion and noise issues:

17

- 18 • Preserve the quality of user experience and feel of a natural setting.
- 19

20 Ms. Christie added Mayor Beerman's suggested bullet point to the list of criteria.

21

22 **7. Detailed Discussion of Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies**
23 **(Blake and Julianna).**

24

- 25 • (See Addendum Page for Outline of Transportation Elements).
- 26

27 Mr. Perez addressed a comment from the Zoom chat box from Nate Furman and Patrick Shea. The
28 requested public comments related to the Draft Alternatives. Mr. Perez reported that all the public
29 comments would be posted on the CWC website in addition to comment summary documents.

30

31 Ms. Christie overviewed her plan to address the Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management
32 Strategies. The process would be as follows:

33

- 34 • Cover the Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies one element at a
35 time, with a facilitated discussion, using an Integrative Decision-Making Process.
- 36 • The Integrative Decision-Making Process would include:
 - 37 ○ Dedicated time to clarifying questions.
 - 38 ○ Hand-raising; and
 - 39 ○ No opinions, reactions, or leading questions.
- 40 • After all clarifying questions are covered, there will be a reaction round, which would include:
 - 41 ○ Hand-raising; and
 - 42 ○ Comments that can include:
 - 43 ■ Additional pros and cons.
 - 44 ■ General favor or opposition to the idea; and
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48

1 ▪ Suggestions.

- 2
3 • After clarifying questions and reactions, for certain topics, there will be a poll to assess favor
4 versus opposition among the group.

5
6 Ms. Christie overviewed the items and the order that they would be discussed:

- 7
8 • Review by corridor, starting with Salt Lake Valley Connections, Wasatch Front/Wasatch
9 Back via I-80, Millcreek Canyon, Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon,
10 Cottonwood Canyon Connections, and Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City Connections.

11
12 This approach would allow discussions to be handled in geographic order. The order of the elements
13 shown in the addendum page represented the preferences that emerged from the Design Your Transit
14 tool. Ms. Christie noted that this process would allow for thorough discussions, but it would not
15 necessarily be a linear process. Discussions may be paused or revisited as needed.

16
17 Mr. Perez discussed the way that each element would be presented. He noted that the elements had
18 been presented in the Draft Alternatives reports already. However, the MTS Summit would present
19 the basics of each mode and the pros and cons, as evaluated through the attributes and objectives.
20 The presented information would be used as a starting point for discussion.

21
22 **Salt Lake Valley Connections:**

23
24 Mr. Perez outlined the following elements included in the Design Your Transit tool related to Salt
25 Lake Valley Connections:

- 26
27 • Regional transit hubs.
28 • Wasatch Boulevard.
29 • High capacity transit along 9400 South.
30 • Year-round bus service from various economic hubs.
31 • Enhanced current transit system; and
32 • No action.

33
34 Maps of the Salt Lake Valley Connections were shown along with graphs from the Design Your
35 Transit tool. Mr. Perez reported that the median result for the Design Your Transit tool was 320.
36 Anything with a score higher than 320 indicated that it was a highly invested option. All the maps
37 and graphs were available on the CWC website.

38
39 For regional transit hubs, there were two proposed transit centers:

- 40
41 • Gravel Pit; and
42 • 9400 South and Highland Drive.

43
44 The proposed transit centers would serve as transfer locations for motorists and transit users. They
45 could offer both seasonal express and year-round local transit options for Big Cottonwood Canyon
46 and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Implementation for the gravel pit had a tentative timeline of 3 to 5
47 years and implementation for 9400 South and Highland Drive had a tentative timeline of 2 to 4 years.

1 Mr. Perez shared a chart to indicate the number of stalls associated with each of the transit hubs as
2 well as the initial capital costs.

3
4 Pros and cons related to regional transit hubs include:

- 5
6 • Pros:
 - 7
 - 8 ○ Transit hubs could serve as augmented parking spaces.
 - 9 ○ The proposed transit hubs are regional and convenient transit connections. Most
 - 10 people would know where the locations were; and
 - 11 ○ It is a multi-modal connection.
 - 12
- 13 • Cons:
 - 14
 - 15 ○ High capital investment.
 - 16 ○ Concerns related to the quality of the economic benefit.
 - 17 ○ Concerns about year-round utility; and
 - 18 ○ Concerns that a transit hub or parking structure may go unused for half of the year,
 - 19 depending on other strategies and modes implemented in conjunction.
 - 20

21 For Wasatch Boulevard, the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan was been folded into the MTS work.
22 Any alternative must align with the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan and the CWC would defer to
23 Cottonwood Heights decision-making. Mr. Perez noted that this element would be revisited as
24 discussions continued.

25
26 For high capacity transit along 9400 South, the following two proposed concepts were identified:

- 27
- 28 • Bus Rapid Transit (a dedicated roadway for buses, to improve capacity and reliability); and
- 29 • Light Rail (connect to the current FrontRunner and Historic Sandy Station and run along the
- 30 corridor up to the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon).
- 31

32 The high capacity transit options would work as connections to the regional transit system. They
33 would also serve as potential mode options for Little Cottonwood Canyon. The implantation timeline
34 was a minimum of 10 years, but Mr. Perez noted that it could take much longer.

35
36 Pros and cons related to high capacity transit included:

- 37
- 38 • Pros:
 - 39
 - 40 ○ High capacity regional connections.
 - 41 ○ Ability to meet current and future demand; and
 - 42 ○ Ability to reduce traffic congestion.
 - 43
- 44 • Cons:
 - 45
 - 46 ○ High capital investment with the potential for road widening with impacts to
 - 47 accommodate improvement.
 - 48

1 For year-round bus service from various economic hubs, there would be limited bus service from
2 various points in the Salt Lake Valley to destinations in the Cottonwood Canyons. It would include:

- 3
- 4 • Limited morning service (1 to 2 buses from city centers across the Valley to the Cottonwood
5 Canyons); and
- 6 • Limited afternoon and evening return service (1 to 2 buses).
- 7

8 The implementation timeline was approximately 2 to 4 years, depending on funding for additional
9 buses and implementation timelines from UTA.

10
11 Pros and cons related to year-round bus service from various economic hubs included:

- 12
- 13 • Pros:
 - 14
 - 15 ○ Convenience, as it would provide one mode up to the canyons.
 - 16 ○ Reduce automobile travel to the canyons; and
 - 17 ○ Reduce the need for large mobility hubs near the mouth of the canyons.
 - 18
- 19 • Cons:
 - 20
 - 21 ○ May not be economical or cost-efficient.
 - 22 ○ Potential low impacts and low ridership; and
 - 23 ○ May not have the ability to meet current and future demand.
 - 24

25 For an enhanced current transit system, the suggestions include:

- 26
- 27 • 15-minute or better headway.
- 28 • Service earlier in the morning and later in the evenings; and
- 29 • Reliable and predictable weekend service.
- 30

31 This would be a year-round transit service with an immediate implementation timeline. Mr. Perez
32 reported that UTA was currently working to implement these changes. It would focus on current
33 routes as well as the extension of existing routes, such as Route 4 and Route 222. East to west
34 connections would also be improved, including Routes 33, 39, 45, and 72, to serve more diverse
35 socioeconomic communities.

36
37 The pros and cons related to an enhanced current transit system included:

- 38
- 39 • Pros:
 - 40
 - 41 ○ Could be cost-effective.
 - 42 ○ Builds off the current regional transit system.
 - 43 ○ Flexible and serves multiple destinations.
 - 44 ○ Aligns with current UTA short-term plans; and
 - 45 ○ Reduce the need for mobility hubs near the canyons.
 - 46

- 1 • Cons:
- 2
- 3 ○ Less convenient for transfers.
- 4 ○ Additional funding needed for increased service; and
- 5 ○ The potential need for roadway improvements.
- 6

7 For no action, this would leave Salt Lake Valley Connections in their existing condition.

8
9 Pros and cons related to no action included:

- 10
- 11 • Pros:
- 12
- 13 ○ No major capital projects.
- 14
- 15 • Cons:
- 16
- 17 ○ Continued growing traffic congestion impacts; and
- 18 ○ Increased vehicle access.
- 19

20 **Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-80:**

21
22 Mr. Perez outlined the elements included in the Design Your Transit tool related to Wasatch
23 Front/Wasatch Back via I-80 and Summit County Transit Connections. They included:

- 24
- 25 • Improved frequency of the SLC-PC Connect.
- 26 • Express bus from the airport to Park City.
- 27 • Bus Rapid Transit between Kimball Junction and Park City.
- 28 • Enhanced bus service between Quinn’s Junction and Park City.
- 29 • Park City aerial system; and
- 30 • No action.
- 31

32 Maps were shown along with graphs from the Design Your Transit tool. Mr. Perez reported that the
33 median results for the Design Your Transit tool was 320. Anything with a score higher than 320
34 indicated that it was a highly invested option. The enhanced SLC-PC Connect scored well.

35
36 For improved frequency of the SLC-PC Connect, the suggestions include:

- 37
- 38 • Add an earlier run in the winter; and
- 39 • Mid-day service all year.
- 40

41 This could generate additional ridership and be a benefit to commuters and visitors to the area. The
42 implementation timeline was approximately 1 to 3 years.

43
44 Pros and cons related to the improved frequency of the SLC-PC Connect included:

- 45
- 46 • Pros:
- 47

- 1 ○ Improved convenience.
- 2 ○ Improved ski resort connections to the Wasatch Back.
- 3 ○ Improved regional connectivity; and
- 4 ○ Serve multiple users.

5
6 ● Cons:

- 7 ○ Funding is needed for service improvement.

8
9
10 For express bus from the airport to Park City, the element had not been recommended during the
11 Draft Alternative development. Feedback from Summit County, Park City, and Stakeholders
12 indicated that the private market (services such as Lyft and Uber) was serving the needs adequately
13 for these connections.

14
15 The pros and cons related to an express bus from the airport to Park City included:

16
17 ● Pros:

- 18 ○ Direct transit services from the airport to Park City; and
- 19 ○ Improved convenience for visitors.

20
21
22 ● Cons:

- 23 ○ Limited availability.
- 24 ○ Current providers are serving the needs; and
- 25 ○ Inter-Summit County Connections for visitors.

26
27
28 For Summit County Transit Connections, the suggestions included:

- 29 ● Bus Rapid Transit between Kimball Junction and Park City.
- 30 ● Enhanced bus service between Quinn’s Junction and Park City.
- 31 ● Park City aerial system; and
- 32 ● No action.

33
34
35 Mr. Perez reported that Summit County and Park City were moving along steadily with their
36 transportation plans. An Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) was underway, and the
37 implementation timeline was approximately 2 to 3 years.

38
39 **Millcreek Canyon:**

40
41 Mr. Perez outlined the elements included in the Design Your Transit tool related to Millcreek Canyon.
42 They included:

- 43 ● Bicycle and pedestrian improvements.
- 44 ● Shuttle; and
- 45 ● No action.

1 Maps were shown along with graphs from the Design Your Transit tool. Mr. Perez reported that the
2 median results for the Design Your Transit tool was 320. Anything with a score higher than 320
3 indicated that it was a highly invested option. Throughout the entire Design Your Transit tool, bicycle
4 and pedestrian improvements in Millcreek Canyon was the most invested option.

5
6 For bicycle and pedestrian improvements, the suggestions included:

- 7
- 8 • Continuous bicycle lanes.
- 9 • Bicycle racks at trailheads.
- 10 • Accommodate all skill types; and
- 11 • Improve pedestrian facilities, including crosswalks and signage.
- 12

13 Mr. Perez reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had been doing great work. He asked Ed
14 Marshall to update the Summit participants on work the Committee had done regarding reduced user
15 conflicts. Mr. Marshall reported that the Millcreek Canyon Committee had undertaken an evaluation
16 to reduce user conflicts and improve public safety in the canyon. The result was a letter that was
17 prepared for the U.S. Forest Service, the County, and the Municipal Services District. The letter was
18 approved a few weeks earlier by the CWC Board and released to the recipients. Representatives from
19 the U.S. Forest Service, County, and Municipal Services District would provide initial feedback at
20 the Millcreek Canyon Committee Meeting on November 23, 2020.

21
22 For the proposed shuttle, the CWC had been working with the U.S. Forest Service, County, and the
23 Millcreek Canyon Committee to identify infrastructure projects that need to be completed prior to the
24 implementation of a shuttle program. The suggestions included:

- 25
- 26 • Expanded restrooms; and
- 27 • Parking and transit facilities.
- 28

29 An estimated pilot program would cost approximately \$160,000 to \$175,000. The implementation
30 timeline was 1 to 5 or more years.

31
32 Pros and cons related to a shuttle included:

- 33
- 34 • Pros:
 - 35
 - 36 ○ Reduce parking congestion, particularly at the top of Millcreek Canyon; and
 - 37 ○ Increase transit use.
 - 38
- 39 • Cons:
 - 40
 - 41 ○ Infrastructure projects.
 - 42 ○ Funding sources are unknown; and
 - 43 ○ Need to determine the most efficient transit approach.
 - 44

45 For no action, this would leave Millcreek Canyon in the existing condition. However, Ms. Christie
46 noted that work was already underway.

- 1 • **After Presentation of Salt Lake Valley Connections: Integrative Decision-Making**
2 **Process.**
3
4 ○ **Clarifying Questions Related to Salt Lake Valley Connections.**
5

6 **Regional Transit Hubs:**

7
8 Participants of the MTS Summit asked clarifying questions related to the regional transit hubs.
9

10 Mr. Thurber asked about parking in the canyons. He noted that it is often difficult to find parking in
11 certain areas and believed it was important to alleviate the current stresses related to parking.
12 Mr. Perez reported that a common concern shared related to on-road parking. He made note of the
13 increased pressures of finding parking in the canyons.
14

15 Will McCarvil noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS specifies that only roughly 30%
16 of people going up the canyon would do so via mass transportation. He felt this was inadequate and
17 wondered what the estimates would look like with the addition of regional transit hubs. Mr. Perez
18 reported that the regional transit hub for the gravel pit had a proposed 3,600 stalls. That would include
19 the necessary stalls for Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. This particular element may not be able
20 to encourage more people to take transit. Chris McCandless added that a lot of the comments related
21 to the UDOT EIS indicated that parking was desired closer to Little Cottonwood Canyon. A regional
22 transit hub would make that available in a timely manner. He also referenced the LaCaille base station
23 concept.
24

25 Carlton Christensen asked if operational costs had been integrated into the charts shown by Mr. Perez.
26 Mr. Perez clarified that neither operation and maintenance costs or lifecycle costs had been included
27 in the charts.
28

29 Mr. Furman reported that someone involved with the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance had spoken to a
30 representative from the gravel pit recently. The person they had spoken to suggested that there were
31 no plans on closing the gravel pit and there were enough materials to work with for 6 to 7 more years.
32 He asked about the degree of confidence the CWC had that the gravel pit would become available.
33 Mr. Perez stated that the entire footprint may not be available immediately, but sections of the gravel
34 pit could be developed for parking and a larger transit center could be built later on. Mayor Peterson
35 added that the City of Cottonwood Heights met with the owner and many concerns needed to be
36 mitigated related to UDOT and access. Construction could continue for another 3 to 5 years but the
37 owners were open to discussions related to future projects. Mayor Peterson stated that the City would
38 continue to work with the CWC, UTA, and UDOT to find common ground.
39

40 Michael Maughan noted that there are 3,600 stalls proposed by Big Cottonwood Canyon and 1,000
41 by Little Cottonwood Canyon. He wondered if consideration was given to the shifting demographic
42 in the Valley. For instance, where skiers were coming from to access the canyons. Mr. Perez stated
43 that those factors had not been taken into consideration.
44

45 Mayor Peterson wondered if UTA was prepared to handle an increased level of transportation if the
46 gravel pit transit hub was built. The 3,600 stalls would mean that a lot of people would leave their
47 cars to get onto some type of transit. Additional buses or modes of transportation could lead to

1 congestion on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Perez noted that no specific modes were suggested alongside
2 the regional transit hub option.

3
4 David Stein asked if UDOT had done an analysis related to the percentage of the population that was
5 coming from the north and south. Mr. Perez reported that a 2017 Parsons Brinckerhoff study showed
6 segments of the Valley that people traveled from. He offered to send the information to Mr. Stein.
7 Mr. Stein wondered about the parking capacity of the four main ski resorts (Brighton, Solitude, Alta,
8 and Snowbird). Mr. Perez stated that were included in the study that he would send to Mr. Stein. A
9 comment was shared in the Zoom chat box related to the ski resort parking numbers. Carl Fisher
10 reported that there were about 6,000 spaces at the resorts, 3,600 spaces on the canyon shoulders, and
11 pullout, 700 at the base, and 2,200 in the Valley on ski bus routes.

12
13 Mayor Knopp wondered if the 3,600 stalls came from the UDOT EIS. He felt it was a large number.
14 Mr. Perez clarified that the number of stalls was intended to accommodate parking for both Big and
15 Little Cottonwood Canyons.

16
17 Rachel Ridge asked if there would be transit stations and stops along the canyon for people that want
18 to access trailheads or mountain bikes. She wondered what capabilities the buses would have for
19 bicycles, skis, and snowboards. Mr. Perez stated that they would come back to that topic of discussion
20 later on in the Summit.

21
22 Andrew Nielson wondered if the timelines mentioned related to the construction schedule or when
23 the structures would be open and operating. Mr. Perez noted that the timelines provided a general
24 idea of when the implementation could begin and end. However, the gravel pit may have a phased
25 approach instead.

26 27 **Wasatch Boulevard:**

28
29 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to Wasatch Boulevard.

30
31 Mr. Christensen wondered if Cottonwood Heights has jurisdiction over Wasatch Boulevard.
32 Mr. Perez stated that the CWC would support Cottonwood Heights from a regional context and help
33 implement some of their goals and visions. Mayor Peterson clarified that Wasatch Boulevard is a
34 UDOT road and the only State Road in Cottonwood Heights. The City would partner with UDOT
35 with respect to the Master Plan, but UDOT would be the ultimate decision-maker.

36 37 **High Capacity Transit Along 9400 South:**

38
39 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to high capacity transit along 9400 South.

40
41 Steve Van Maren wondered if there would be a new FrontRunner station. Mr. Perez explained that
42 there was a FrontRunner station not far from the Historic Sandy Station. He had seen alignments
43 where the station could connect. Mr. Christensen believed that the closest FrontRunner stations were
44 off of 10500 South in Sandy City and Murray Central. Those stations would not line up with the
45 Historic Sandy Station. Kerry Doane noted that adding a FrontRunner station was a complicated and
46 impactful suggestion.

1 Lorin Simpson answered questions in the Zoom chat box related to an electric bus run up Little
2 Cottonwood Canyon. He stated that comments regarding the success of a recent test were true.
3 However, the test took place in ideal circumstances without snow, long periods of idling, and without
4 chains on tires. Additional testing would be conducted under more realistic circumstances.
5

6 Ms. Briefer noted that high capital investment was listed under the cons for the high capacity transit.
7 She believed it was important to answer questions about who would pay, who would benefit, and how
8 the different alternatives would be financed before putting high capital investment into a pro or con
9 list. Mr. McCarvil commented that eventually, ski areas in the Wasatch would be impacted by global
10 warming, and increased precipitation. He wondered how the capital costs would depreciate if fewer
11 people were out skiing.
12

13 **Year-Round Bus Service from Various Economic Hubs:**

14
15 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to year-round bus service from various
16 economic hubs.
17

18 Mr. McCarvil believed that special buses would be needed to get up the canyons. He wondered if
19 riders would have to change from a regular bus to a mountain capable bus. Mr. Simpson explained
20 that there were unique characteristics of ski buses due to the seating arrangement and tire chains.
21 However, they were not all that different from regular buses. He noted that the bus engines were
22 similar between regular buses and ski buses. Mr. Simpson believed the question was whether buses
23 could run from the Valley into the canyons. He believed this would be difficult but offered to double-
24 check and leave additional information in the Zoom chat box.
25

26 Mr. Fisher asked if there were buses in development that could accomplish the goal of having a Valley
27 bus go into the canyons. Mr. Christensen noted that ski buses were occasionally put into normal
28 service, but they were not as efficient due to limited seating capacity.
29

30 Mr. Perez made note of a comment shared in the Zoom chat box about buses getting stuck due to
31 roadway conditions. Mr. Maughan wondered how to solve the problem of buses getting stuck. He
32 noted that less than 3% of those that come to the Alta Ski Resort use the bus. Mr. Maughan wondered
33 if transportation was meeting the desires of the ski community. Mr. Perez stated that many skiers
34 expressed interest in using transportation options if those options were closer to residential areas and
35 city centers.
36

37 **Enhanced Current Transit System:**

38
39 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to an enhanced current transit system.
40

41 Mr. Perez read a clarifying question left by Mr. McCandless in the Zoom chat box. He wondered
42 what the estimated drive times were from each of the routes to the mobility hubs at the mouths of Big
43 and Little Cottonwood Canyons. Mr. Simpson reported that the current system takes 55 to 70 minutes
44 from one end of the route to another. It was noted that many factors contribute to travel times, such
45 as the number of stops and the convenience of connections. Mr. McCandless felt that multiple stops
46 and transfers would deter people from using transportation up the canyon. Mr. Stein shared maps
47 related to the enhanced current transit system proposals.
48

1 **No Action:**

2
3 No clarifying questions were raised.

4
5 ○ **Reaction Round.**

6
7 **Regional Transit Hubs:**

8
9 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to regional transit hubs.

10
11 Ellen Birrell urged the CWC to move forward with a capacity study to have a better understanding of
12 capacity numbers to aim for. She spoke on behalf of Save Not Pave and suggested that an application
13 that worked in real-time could be used to make suggestions to recreationalists with alternative ways
14 to reach their destination. Ms. Birrell also believed that underground parking options should be
15 explored. She felt that parking at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon would increase demand.
16 It would bring vehicles through the neighborhoods of Granite, Sandy, and Cottonwood Heights. Mr.
17 Perez added increased car demand to the list of cons.

18
19 Ms. Briefer wanted to raise awareness that the gravel pit transit hub location was very close to the
20 Big Cottonwood Treatment Plant that needed to be replaced. She asked that consideration be given
21 to any future use in this area. Ms. Briefer reported that there had been discussions with Cottonwood
22 Heights about collaboration as there would be a high price tag for the new water treatment plant
23 depending on the location and constraints on that location.

24
25 Mr. Perez read a comment from the Zoom chat box from Mr. Fisher. He liked the idea of spreading
26 out parking lots around the Valley rather than a large parking structure at the mouth. Mr. Fisher
27 thought the transit hubs may shift the parking issues in the canyons further onto I-215. He felt that a
28 large transit hub could work if there was a multi-use development with a café or coffee shop to spread
29 out users. However, just the parking structure alone would shift the problem towards roads that
30 already experienced intense commuter traffic.

31
32 **Wasatch Boulevard:**

33
34 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to Wasatch Boulevard.

35
36 Mr. Draper believed there needs to be at least two lanes on Wasatch Boulevard for there to be reliable
37 bus service. He suggested signs that would create a bus lane on busy mornings. Without at least a
38 two-lane road at the mouth of the canyon, it would be difficult for bus service to be reliable and
39 efficient.

40
41 Ms. Birrell reported that she serves as an advocate for UTA funding so they can do more innovative
42 things to meet transit needs. She noted that UDOT wanted to widen the road by 2.7 miles through
43 Cottonwood Heights and Wasatch Boulevard to meet the anticipated levels of traffic for the year
44 2050. They want to build things in the next 5 to 8 years that suit the needs of the future. Mr. Perez
45 noted that many of Ms. Birrell's comments would be discussed later in the MTS Summit.

46
47 Robert Douglas commented in the Zoom chat box that the CWC should not blindly defer to
48 Cottonwood Heights for decision making regarding the Wasatch corridor. He noted that changes

1 were paid for by the taxpayers of the state and not just Cottonwood Heights. Mr. Perez noted that
2 UDOT and Cottonwood Heights were working collaboratively to implement the Wasatch Boulevard
3 Master Plan.

4
5 Ms. Birrell noted that the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan described by Cottonwood Heights was not
6 one of the two UDOT preferred alternatives. UDOT wanted 5 to 7 lanes, so the shoulder lanes could
7 be used for express bus service. Cottonwood Heights was asking for no more than one vehicular
8 private lane in each direction. Mayor Peterson explained that the purpose of the Wasatch Boulevard
9 Master Plan was to ensure that Wasatch Boulevard does not become a highway. Instead, it would
10 remain a boulevard with active transportation, pedestrian sensitivity, and the ability to get people to
11 the canyons appropriately. The Master Plan also included mixed-use development at the gravel pit.
12 Mayor Peterson stated that Cottonwood Heights was continuing to work with UDOT regularly.

13 14 **High Capacity Transit Along 9400 South:**

15
16 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to high capacity transit along 9400
17 South.

18
19 Ms. Birrell reported that the Bus Rapid Transit can run on electricity. She asked Mr. Perez to speak
20 to that. Mr. Perez was not sure that there was an electric Bus Rapid Transit but noted that UTA had
21 seen success with their Bus Rapid Transit in Utah County. It would have the ability to meet higher
22 capacity needs that may be necessary. Mr. Christensen noted that Ogden was looking at electric Bus
23 Rapid Transit buses for an upcoming project. The electric buses would require the ability to charge
24 and would lose some charge going up and down hilly areas. He noted that it was early in the process,
25 but electric vehicles were not out of the question. Carolyn Keigley commented in the Zoom chat box
26 that Summit County was pursuing fully electric express buses on State Road 224.

27
28 Ms. Ridge commented that the current situation with COVID-19 had not been addressed. She
29 wondered how it might affect the future of mass transportation. Mr. Christensen noted that UTA did
30 not anticipate ridership returning to normal for a few years. Mr. Simpson added that the cleaning
31 protocols would likely become permanent as well as the airflow filtration process and an adjustment
32 to fabrics that are easier to clean and sanitize.

33
34 Ms. Ridge asked a follow-up question regarding the 2030 or 2034 Olympics. Mr. Perez noted that if
35 the Olympics are awarded, there may be a wave of enthusiasm to fund and implement some of the
36 transportation projects. Mr. Christensen added that the Olympics will likely help with the
37 prioritization of funds but noted that the transit system will likely be reliant on borrowed buses from
38 other transit agencies in that case. Ms. Ridge felt that the Olympics could be a factor in terms of
39 dispersed parking versus the two regional transit hubs. It was important to look towards future needs.

40
41 Mayor Wilson commented that all the transit options in isolation were not workable and required
42 connectivity. Mr. Becker stated that the Summit involves comprehensive and integrated decision-
43 making. He noted that transportation decisions will not occur in isolation. As the summit continues,
44 discussions would come back to the broader impacts as well as how different modes of transportation-
45 related to one another.

1 **Year-Round Bus Service from Various Economic Hubs:**

2
3 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to year-round bus service from various
4 economic hubs.

5
6 Ms. Birrell commented that buses need to be tailored to meet the needs of skiers. She expressed the
7 importance of express-oriented transit options.

8
9 John Knoblock indicated that there was a difference between summer mobility and winter use. He
10 felt there would be a more dispersed timeframe throughout the day during the summer months,
11 whereas the winter months would be busier in the morning for access to ski resorts. Mr. Knoblock
12 believed there should be a focus on summer use versus winter use.

13
14 **Enhanced Current Transit System:**

15
16 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to no action. No reactions were shared.

17
18 **No Action:**

19
20 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to no action.

21
22 Mr. Shea hoped that people recognize there is a significant depression on the horizon and the ability
23 for government funding outside of government agencies will be severely limited.

24
25 ○ **Polling (Capturing Support, Objections).**

26
27 Ms. Christie discussed the polling tool and noted that decisions are not being made during the MTS
28 Summit, but the polling tool would provide a better understanding of the general viewpoints of each
29 element. Mr. Shea suggested that during the polling portion of the Summit, there be a way to explain
30 why the vote was for or against. Those wishing to comment or explain their decision could enter it
31 into the Zoom chat box. Ms. Christie shared that the options for each polling question would be in
32 favor, opposed, more information needed, and no answer at this time. Those with comments could
33 leave them in the chat box. Staff could capture comments following the MTS Summit and include
34 them with the polling data.

35
36 Ms. Christie opened the poll for questions related to regional transit hubs, high capacity transit along
37 9400 South, year-round bus service from various economic hubs, an enhanced current transit system,
38 and the no-action option. She asked that voting be reserved for Stakeholders and members of the
39 public. No polling was done to address Wasatch Boulevard.

40
41 ○ **Capture Results, and any Framework for Further Evaluation.**

42
43 The results of the polls and Zoom chat box comments related to the Salt Lake Valley Connections
44 were recorded by staff.

1 • **After Presentation of Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-80: Integrative**
2 **Decision-Making Process.**

3
4 ○ **Clarifying Questions Related to Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-80.**

5
6 Ms. Christie asked that all clarifying questions be typed into the Zoom chat box from now on, to
7 speed up transportation discussions.

8
9 **Improved frequency of the SLC-PC Connect:**

10
11 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to the SLC-PC Connect.

12
13 Mr. Shea left a comment in the Zoom chat box asking who would pay for the improvements.
14 Mr. Perez made note of the question.

15
16 Mr. McCarvil asked in the Zoom chat box if buses will pick up from the SLC-PC Connect. Mr. Perez
17 commented that the idea was to enhance the current service. He noted that there were several
18 locations in Salt Lake and Millcreek. He believed that the SLC-PC Connect terminated at Kimball
19 Junction and would eventually terminate at the future Kimball Junction mobility hub.

20
21 **Express Bus from the Airport to Park City:**

22
23 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to an express bus from the airport to Park City.

24
25 Mr. Fisher wondered if the express bus would be non-stop service or if there would be a Cottonwood
26 transfer as well. Mr. Perez made note of the question.

27
28 **Summit County Transit Connections:**

29
30 Participants of the MTS Summit asked clarifying questions related to the Summit County transit
31 connections.

32
33 Mr. Shea wondered who was handling the aerial study. Mayor Beerman reported that a high-level
34 study was conducted by Snow Engineering to look at the feasibility and to ensure that alignments
35 were possible for an aerial system. The study also provided general cost estimates. Mayor Beerman
36 pointed out that the aerial system would go into a future transit hub in the center of town. It was not
37 a complete system at this point. It would need to use a bus system to put people onto an aerial system.
38 He noted that the aerial system was still in a conceptual phase due to geographic challenges, a lack of
39 parking, and an inability to widen the roads. An aerial system was one of the few solutions that would
40 increase volume and get people in the area out of their cars.

41
42 ○ **Reaction Round.**

43
44 **Improved frequency of the SLC-PC Connect:**

45
46 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to SLC-PC Connect. No reactions
47 were shared.

1 **Express Bus from the Airport to Park City:**

2
3 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to express bus from the airport to Park
4 City.

5
6 Mr. Christensen commented that some State laws prohibit a chartered service. The more something
7 looked like a chartered service, the more problematic it would become. Mayor Beerman believed a
8 con that could be added to the pros and cons list was the potential need for a law change.

9
10 Mr. Shea noted that the present private system (services like Lyft and Uber) excludes most low- and
11 middle-income users.

12
13 **Summit County Transit Connections:**

14
15 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to Summit County transit connections.
16 No reactions were shared.

17
18 ○ **Polling (Capturing Support, Objections).**

19
20 Ms. Christie opened the polling tool for questions related to the improved frequency of the SLC-PC
21 Connect. No additional polling was done to address the other elements for Wasatch Front/Wasatch
22 Back via I-80 or Summit County Transit Connections.

23
24 ○ **Capture Results, and any Framework for Further Evaluation.**

25
26 The results of the poll and Zoom chat box comments related to Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-
27 80 were recorded by CWC staff.

28
29 ● **After Presentation of Millcreek Canyon: Integrative Decision-Making Process.**

30
31 ○ **Clarifying Questions Related to Millcreek Canyon.**

32
33 Summit participants asked clarifying questions related to Millcreek Canyon.

34
35 Mr. Marshall clarified that the transit options in Millcreek Canyon are voluntary. Chair Robinson
36 asked if that meant people could still bring their cars into the canyon. Mr. Marshall confirmed that
37 was the case.

38
39 Ms. Briefer asked if a shuttle program would help with pedestrian and bicycle safety. Mr. Perez
40 believed that if some of the parking pinch points were reduced at the top of Millcreek Canyon, it
41 would improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. Ms. Briefer wondered if any of the transit
42 considerations came with the idea of vehicle restriction. Jim Bradley noted that voluntary transit
43 usage could still disincentivize cars through tolls and parking fees. He felt it was possible to
44 discourage vehicle use without eliminating it.

1 ○ **Reaction Round.**

2
3 Ms. Christie opened the reaction round for discussions related to Millcreek Canyon. No reactions
4 were shared.

5
6 ○ **Polling (Capturing Support, Objections).**

7
8 Polling was not conducted for the Millcreek Canyon elements since much of the work was already
9 underway.

10
11 ○ **Capture Results, and any Framework for Further Evaluation.**

12
13 There were no poll results related to Millcreek Canyon.

14
15 **8. Closing (Julianna).**

16
17 • **Review Accomplishments/Agreements Reached.**

18
19 Ms. Christie overviewed what had been covered during Day 1 of the Summit. She noted that Day 2
20 would include discussions related to Big Cottonwood Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, and the
21 Canyon Connections. Ms. Christie felt that the Summit allowed the CWC to collect information and
22 increase knowledge about the transportation elements.

23
24 • **Outline the Plan for Day 2.**

25
26 Ms. Christie noted that day one of the MTS Summit had been largely focused on getting the process
27 underway. She suggested that the Zoom chat box be used for clarifying questions and reaction rounds
28 on the second day to move through the information faster. The agenda for Day 2 of the Summit
29 would include:

- 30
31 • Opening remarks.
32 • Revisit rules, problem statement, and criteria.
33 • Review a summary of day one conclusions and agreements.
34 • Continuation of detailed discussion of Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management
35 strategies.
36 • After the presentation of each element, Integrative Decision-Making Process:
37 ○ Clarifying questions.
38 ○ Reaction round.
39 ○ Polling; and
40 ○ Capture results and any framework for further evaluation.
41
42
43 • Wrap up and review agreements reached.
44 • Discuss next steps; and
45 • Closing remarks.
46

1 • **Thank you.**

2

3 Ms. Christie and Mr. Perez thanked all the MTS Summit participants for their input during Day 1 of
4 the Summit. Chair Robinson thanked Ms. Christie and Mr. Perez and highlighted the importance of
5 the MTS work.

6

7 **ADJOURNMENT**

8

9 The Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Summit adjourned at
10 approximately 4:53 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Board Meeting held Friday, November 13, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____