



2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**  
3 **HELD MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2020 AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED**  
4 **ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE**  
5 **GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED MARCH 18, 2020.**  
6

7 **Board Members:** Chair Chris Robinson, Mayor Harris Sondak, Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Mayor  
8 Andy Beerman, Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Commissioner Jim Bradley, Mayor  
9 Mike Peterson, Park City Councilman Max Doilney (will be replacing Mayor  
10 Beerman as CWC Representative), Mayor Dan Knopp, Commissioner Marci  
11 Houseman, Ex Officio Member Carlton Christensen  
12

13 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez,  
14 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Legal Counsel Shane Topham  
15 Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson  
16

17 **Attendees:** Catherine Kanter, Bobby Sampson, Barbara Cameron, Dave Fields, John  
18 Knoblock, Lorie Fowlke, Randy Doyle, Tamara Prue, Marian Rice, Laura  
19 Briefer, Abi Holt, Carl Fisher, Dennis Goreham, Kyle Maynard, Mike Allegra,  
20 Shawn Marquardt, Helen Peters, Sharon [REDACTED], Julianna Christie, Alex  
21 Schmidt, Caroline Rodriguez, Holly Lopez, Lisa Hartman, Patrick Nelson,  
22 Steve Van Maren, Chris McCandless, Town of Alta  
23

24 **Excused:** Mayor Jenny Wilson  
25

26 **OPENING**  
27

28 **1. Commissioner Christopher F. Robinson will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Board,**  
29 **(the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”).**  
30

31 Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m.  
32

33 Mayor Andy Beerman informed the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Board Members that  
34 this would be his last CWC Meeting. He was stepping down from his role on the Commission and  
35 appointed one of his Council Members, Max Doilney, to take his place. Mayor Beerman commented  
36 that it had been an honor to work with the CWC. He originally became involved when he was a new  
37 Council Member in 2012. Mayor Beerman reported that there had briefly been an organization called  
38 the Wasatch Summit, which morphed into Access Wasatch, the Mountain Accord, and finally, the  
39 CWC. Something that had been consistent throughout the various entities was the effort from all  
40 involved.  
41

1 Mayor Beerman noted that everyone involved loves the Wasatch Mountains and were passionate  
2 about protecting them. He felt that the CWC was on a positive path and expressed confidence in the  
3 leadership and staff. Mayor Beerman acknowledged the efforts of Executive Director Ralph Becker,  
4 CWC Chair Robinson, Laura Briefer, and Carl Fisher.

5  
6 Chair Robinson thanked Mayor Beerman for his commitment and noted that the CWC Board looked  
7 forward to working with Council Member Doilney. Mayor Beerman reported that Council Member  
8 Doilney serves on the Park City Council. Council Member Doilney introduced himself and stated  
9 that he was born in Park City and looked forward to serving on the CWC.

10  
11 **2. The Chair will Read his Written Determination Regarding an Electronic Meeting**  
12 **Anchor Location for this Meeting, Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207(4).**

13  
14 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which  
15 was as follows:

16  
17 'I, as the Chair of the Board of Commissioners, the Board of the Central Wasatch  
18 Commission hereby determine that conducting board meetings at any time during  
19 the next 30 days at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and  
20 safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The World Health  
21 Organization, the President of the United States, the Governor of Utah, the Salt  
22 Lake County Mayor, and the Health Department have all recognized that a global  
23 pandemic exists related to the new strain of the Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2. Due  
24 to the state of emergency caused by the global pandemic, I find that conducting a  
25 meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency  
26 constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present  
27 at the location. According to the information and from State epidemiology experts,  
28 Utah is currently in an acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm  
29 the State's health care system.'

30  
31 **3. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the November 2, 2020, CWC Board**  
32 **Meeting.**

33  
34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bradley moved to approve the minutes of the November 2, 2020, CWC  
35 Board Meeting, as amended. (Clarification from Laura Briefer) Mayor Peterson seconded the motion.  
36 The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

37  
38 **4. Reminder: CWC Board Retreat Scheduled for Monday – December 14, 2020 – 3:00 p.m.**  
39 **to 6:00 p.m. – Retreat to be Facilitated by Councilor Marci Houseman.**

40  
41 Chair Robinson discussed the CWC Board Retreat scheduled to take place on December 14, 2020.  
42 The retreat would run from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. and facilitated by Commissioner Marci Houseman.  
43 It would be similar to the Board Retreat held last November. The CWC Members will chart out a  
44 work plan for the coming year and review the accomplishments and any deficiencies from the present  
45 year.  
46

1 **COMMITTEE MINUTES FOR REVIEW**

- 2  
3 A. **October 19, 2020 – Executive Committee Meeting Minutes.**  
4 B. **November 2, 2020 – Executive Committee Meeting Minutes.**  
5 C. **November 16, 2020 – Executive Committee Meeting Minutes.**  
6

7 Chair Robinson reported that the Executive Committee Meeting minutes from October 19, 2020,  
8 November 2, 2020, and November 16, 2020, were provided to the CWC Board Members for review.  
9 He asked that Commissioners share any questions or concerns. The minutes would be approved at  
10 the next Executive Committee Meeting.

11  
12 D. **Land Tenure/Legislation Update.**  
13

14 Mr. Becker reported that a new draft of the legislation was prepared. The land exchange provisions  
15 were removed and associated changes were made. The 30-day public comment period ended on  
16 December 5, 2020. 220 comments were received and staff was currently reviewing them. Once all  
17 public comments have been reviewed, they will be presented to the Board. It was noted that  
18 preparations for the State Legislative Session are underway. Mr. Becker reported that an update on  
19 the new draft was sent out to the legislators who were most actively involved with the CWC. That  
20 update would also be sent to the Commission for review.

21  
22 Mayor Mike Peterson inquired about the proposed legislation that related to the Bonneville Shoreline.  
23 Mr. Becker stated that a bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Romney. That bill was the  
24 subject of a hearing. He had not heard whether there had been further movement on the bill. Mayor  
25 Peterson believed it was important that the Commission be updated on the proposed legislation as it  
26 could impact the CWC in the future. Chair Robinson agreed. Mr. Becker offered to provide a separate  
27 memo and make it available to the Commissioners.  
28

29 E. **October 29, 2020 – Budget/Finance/Audit Committee Meeting Minutes.**  
30 **Mayor Silvestrini Presenting: Review and Verbal Approval to 2020-2021 Fiscal**  
31 **Year Budget Amendment including Scheduling of Public Hearing: 3:30 p.m.**  
32 **January 4, 2021.**  
33

34 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini reported that the last CWC Board Meeting included discussions about the  
35 Environmental Dashboard and Visitor Use Study projects. No action was taken at that time since a  
36 budget amendment requires proper notice. Mayor Silvestrini noted that there were documents in the  
37 Meeting Packet related to the approved budget with details of the amendment. There was also a  
38 memorandum reflecting the discussions at the previous meeting and the budgetary impacts of the  
39 Environmental Dashboard and Visitor Use Study. Mayor Silvestrini noted that there would need to  
40 be a public hearing before action could be taken to approve the budget amendment.

41  
42 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to tentatively approve a budget amendment and set a date for a  
43 public hearing for January 4, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion  
44 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.  
45

46 F. **October 30, 2020 – Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes.**

47  
48 G. **November 13, 14, 2020 – Mountain Transit System Summit Minutes.**

1  
2 **H. December 1, 2020 – Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes.**  
3

4 Chair Robinson reported that the Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes from October 30, 2020,  
5 the Mountain Transit System Summit Minutes from November 13 and November 14, 2020, and the  
6 Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes from December 1, 2020, were given to the CWC Board  
7 Members for review. He asked that the Commissioners share any questions or concerns.  
8

9 **MOUNTAIN TRANSIT SYSTEM – DISCUSSION - THE BOARD WILL RECEIVE**  
10 **REPORT FROM MTS SUMMIT FOR DISCUSSION. FACILITATOR JULIANNA**  
11 **CHRISTIE AVAILABLE FOR COMMENTS.**  
12

13 Chair Robinson reported that there was a Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Expert Panel on  
14 September 18, 2020, and an MTS Summit on November 13 and November 14, 2020. The intention  
15 was to reach a consensus on a transportation system that could be recommended to the Utah  
16 Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) and the public. Chair Robinson noted that the initial goal  
17 of reaching a consensus in December 2020 would not happen. Instead, there were certain objectives  
18 Chair Robinson asked the CWC Board Members to focus on during the current meeting:  
19

- 20 • Reach agreement on the elements needed in the MTS (must-haves, deal-breakers, or values);  
21 and  
22 • Commit to reaching a consensus in the first quarter of 2021.  
23

24 UDOT added additional information and updates to their Draft Alternatives on November 20, 2020  
25 and had a timeline to publish a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) mid-year 2021. Chair  
26 Robinson felt it would be beneficial to provide UDOT with CWC input and consensus decisions in a  
27 timely manner. He suggested that the CWC Board or a subset of members meet more frequently in  
28 2021. The topic would be discussed further at the CWC Board Retreat.  
29

30 Chair Robinson introduced MTS Summit facilitator, Julianna Christie. She reported that the MTS  
31 Summit Facilitator’s Report was sent to CWC Board Members prior to the meeting. Ms. Christie  
32 reviewed information from the two-day summit as well as objectives, the problem statement, criteria,  
33 key findings, and recommendations.  
34

35 Ms. Christie overviewed the following MTS Summit objectives with the Commissioners:  
36

- 37 • To review CWC’s MTS Draft Alternatives and updates, in context of overall CWC goals,  
38 including learnings from the Design Your Transit online tool, public comment, and the  
39 October Stakeholders Council meeting;  
40 • To conduct dialogue among Stakeholders, members of the public, CWC Commissioners, and  
41 Staff in order to:  
42  
43 ○ Fully understand all elements of the Draft Alternative Modes and Demand  
44 Management Strategies;  
45 ○ Address questions;  
46 ○ Gather feedback;  
47 ○ Reach consensus where possible; and  
48 ○ Identify framework for further consensus-building by CWC Board.

1  
2 The event took place over Zoom on November 13, 2020, from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., and on  
3 November 14, 2020, from 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. There were 95 to 110 participants in attendance and  
4 69 viewers on Facebook. Ms. Christie overviewed the MTS Summit agenda with the CWC Board.  
5 The Summit agenda included the following:  
6

- 7 • Opening remarks by CWC Chair, Chris Robinson and Transportation Committee Chair,  
8 Mayor Dan Knopp;
- 9 • Review of summit objectives, logistics, and ground rules;
- 10 • Presentations including:
  - 11 ○ Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director, presenting CWC updates:
    - 12 ▪ From Mountain Accord to today - primary elements of the agreement;
    - 13 ▪ Primary CWC initiatives; and
    - 14 ▪ Where CWC goes from here.
  - 15 ○ Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director, presenting MTS Process updates:
    - 16 ▪ Why did CWC start the MTS process?
    - 17 ▪ The process to date;
    - 18 ▪ Objectives and attributes;
    - 19 ▪ Overview of Draft Alternatives; and
    - 20 ▪ Learnings from Design Your Transit online tool, public comment, and October  
21 Stakeholders Council Meeting.
  - 22 ○ Laura Briefer, Director, Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities:
    - 23 ▪ Relating Watershed Protection Objectives to Transportation Objectives.
- 24 • Group discussion of summit problem statement and decision-making criteria;
  - 25 ○ Problem statement: In what ways might we explore regional, year-round  
26 transportation solutions that minimize congestion and improve safety, while  
27 addressing environmental concerns, and incorporating input from all of you here at the  
28 summit?
  - 29 ○ Decision-making criteria (that included input from participants):
    - 30 ▪ Minimizes congestion in the adjacent neighborhoods and in the canyons;
    - 31 ▪ Provides emergency egress;
    - 32 ▪ Addresses the needs of resort visitors and year-round dispersed recreation  
33 users;
    - 34 ▪ Takes into account the needs of canyon residents, property owners, employees,  
35 and businesses;
    - 36 ▪ Protects the environment, wilderness, and watershed;
    - 37 ▪ Preserves the quality of the user experience and feel of a natural setting;
    - 38 ▪ Minimizes congestion as one recreates and utilizes the canyons; and
    - 39 ▪ Includes the viewpoints of summit participants.

- 1
- 2 • Detailed discussion of Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies;
- 3
- 4 ○ Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director presenting and incorporating additional learnings
- 5 and questions;
- 6 ○ For each element, facilitated discussion that included:
- 7
- 8 ■ Clarifying questions;
- 9 ■ Reactions;
- 10 ■ Polling (assessing favor, opposition, need for additional information and in
- 11 some cases, preferences between options);
- 12
- 13 • Closing that included review of learnings throughout the two days.
- 14

15 Ms. Christie felt the MTS Summit was successful as there had been discussions about all of the Draft  
16 Alternatives. A lot of directional feedback also came out of the summit. Ms. Christie noted that the  
17 findings from the summit were discussed in more detail in the MTS Summit Facilitator’s Report.  
18 However, she summarized the following key findings for the CWC Board Members:

- 19
- 20 • Strong support for the following:
- 21
- 22 ○ Salt Lake Valley Connections: Enhanced Current Transit System (78% of MTS
- 23 Summit participants voted “In Favor”);
- 24 ○ Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-80: Improved Frequency of the SLC-PC Connect
- 25 (66% of MTS Summit participants voted “In Favor”);
- 26 ○ Big Cottonwood Canyon: Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (78% of MTS
- 27 Summit participants voted “In Favor”);
- 28 ○ Big Cottonwood Canyon: Year-Round Local Bus (77% of MTS Summit participants
- 29 voted “In Favor”);
- 30 ○ Big Cottonwood Canyon: Seasonal Express Buses to Resorts (74% of MTS Summit
- 31 participants voted “In Favor”);
- 32 ○ Big Cottonwood Canyon: Variable Tolling (72% of MTS Summit participants voted
- 33 “In Favor”);
- 34 ○ Big Cottonwood Canyon: Reduced On-Road Parking (67% of MTS Summit
- 35 participants voted “In Favor”);
- 36 ○ Big Cottonwood Canyon: Paid Parking at Resorts (67% of MTS Summit participants
- 37 voted “In Favor”);
- 38 ○ Little Cottonwood Canyon: Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (82% of MTS
- 39 Summit participants voted “In Favor”); and
- 40 ○ Little Cottonwood Canyon: Year-Round Local Bus (80% of MTS Summit participants
- 41 voted “In Favor”).
- 42
- 43 • Moderate support for the following:
- 44
- 45 ○ Salt Lake Valley Connections: Regional Transit Hubs (56% of MTS Summit
- 46 participants voted “In Favor”);
- 47 ○ Salt Lake Valley Connections: High-Capacity Transit Along 9400 South (53% of MTS
- 48 Summit participants voted “In Favor”); and

- Salt Lake Valley Connections: Year-Round Bus Service from Various Economic Hubs (51% of MTS Summit participants voted “In Favor”).

- Considerable reservations around the following:

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Snow Sheds (35% of MTS Summit participants voted “In Favor” and 44% of MTS Summit participants voted to “Oppose”);
- Cottonwood Canyon Connections: No Action (Preferred by 50% of MTS Summit participants); and
- Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City Connection: No Action (Preferred by 47% of MTS Summit participants).

Ms. Christie noted that the polling numbers were representative of the viewpoints of MTS Summit participants but were not concrete statistics. However, she felt the results were directional in nature. She discussed the findings related to high-capacity modes in Little Cottonwood Canyon, which included enhanced bus, rail, and aerial transportation solutions. The findings were less conclusive, but the discussions helped to clarify a number of unanswered questions, including:

- What is the visitor capacity in the canyons? Is there alignment among decision-makers to prioritize learnings from a Visitor Management Study to inform decisions about a high-capacity mode? From a timing standpoint, is that even an option?
- Is it possible to establish a shared understanding of climate change predictions and how or when those will impact the ski industry? Is there a shared willingness to factor this information into the decision-making process?
- Is there a shared understanding of the relationship between transportation and Federal legislation? Is there sufficient trust in place to take action on transportation next steps while Federal legislation is unfolding within a different timeline? Is it possible to construct a set of agreements to pave the way for the next steps to take place with a sense of trust?
- Is the priority to provide transportation to ski resorts only? Or is the priority to serve dispersed recreation users and choose a mode that makes multiple stops? Is it firmly determined that aerial cannot make stops outside of resorts? Can rail make stops? If so, what are the timing and cost implications?
- There is a strong, shared goal of reducing cars in Little Cottonwood Canyon. How do the various modes support this objective? Is it conceivable or desirable to eliminate cars entirely? How would the different modes support this concept?
- Summit participants exhibited the strongest favor for Enhanced Bus (47% compared to 25% for Aerial and 18% for Rail). Can enhanced buses really solve the demand challenges? What is the likelihood and are there cost and timing implications associated with going electric, thereby avoiding environmental concerns associated with increased buses?

Mr. Becker presented an overview of the CWC transportation work. He reported that the past year had been focused on an MTS. There had been a scoping process to identify the geographic scope as well as the objectives and attributes needed for an MTS. Public comments were received and reviewed. The Commission adopted objectives and attributes that were tiered based on priority. That information had served as the basis for the CWC moving forward as a way to frame what an MTS should attempt to accomplish and achieve.

1 Several months were spent talking to public and private technical experts. Those experts included  
2 representatives and consultants from UDOT, Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”), Cottonwood Heights,  
3 Doppelmayr, SE Group, and Stadler Rail. There had been expert presentations and discussions during  
4 the MTS Expert Panel. The experts explored various transportation modes, potential impacts, and  
5 how those impacts could be addressed or mitigated. There had been a considerable amount of  
6 feedback from both the Commission and members of the public.

7  
8 Draft alternatives were included in the Design Your Transit tool. This exercise was generated as a  
9 way for the public to give comment and prioritize various transportation modes. Several hundred  
10 comments had been received. There had also been a meeting of the Stakeholders Council where  
11 Stakeholders were asked to evaluate the alternatives. The two-day MTS Summit followed.  
12 Mr. Becker noted that the Commission participated incredibly well during the MTS Summit.

13  
14 Since the MTS Summit, staff and the Commission Members had been discussing what an MTS should  
15 look like. Mr. Becker felt that there was not a single solution that would serve all needs and desires  
16 equally. He acknowledged that different people had different priorities. However, all involved had  
17 expressed a passion for the Wasatch Mountains. Mr. Becker believed that not taking action was no  
18 longer an acceptable solution. Mr. Becker discussed the importance of the legislature. He noted that  
19 UDOT was on the path to arrive at a Draft EIS by mid-year in 2021 that would include a preferred  
20 alternative. That gave the CWC a set timeframe to arrive at a locally-based approach that would  
21 potentially influence the UDOT and State decision-making process.

22  
23 Mr. Becker reported that any solution would cost hundreds of millions of dollars over time. He noted  
24 that there were many approaches and opportunities for funding. Once a decision is made, funding  
25 would follow from a number of sources, including public, private, State, and Federal. The financing  
26 would be a critical piece of the puzzle, but the hardest part was making the final decision. Mr. Becker  
27 noted that there were certain conditions the Commission had consistently discussed:

- 28
- 29 • The protection of lands and resources was a priority. There was no way to achieve the kind
- 30 of protection desired without some sort of Federal designations; and
- 31 • The impacts of high-capacity transportation systems need to be addressed. Increased
- 32 visitation was not directly addressed in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.
- 33

34 Mr. Perez shared MTS staff recommendations with the CWC Board Members. The recommendations  
35 were based on various studies as well as the year-long MTS process, which included the evaluations  
36 of objectives and attributes, Design Your Transit tool, public comment, Stakeholders Council  
37 Meeting, and MTS Summit. CWC Staff recommended the following:

- 38
- 39 • Pursue enhanced Valley transit service discussed in MTS Draft Alternatives:
  - 40
  - 41 ○ Improve transit with 15-minutes or better frequency;
  - 42 ○ Service earlier in the morning and later in the evenings;
  - 43 ○ Reliable and predictable weekend service;
  - 44 ○ Year-round transit service.
  - 45 ○ High-capacity or enhanced bus service on the east bench;
  - 46 ○ Enhance the west-east transit connections on various bus routes; and



- Evaluate improving train or bus access from TRAX line to the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon, depending on how the cost and impacts affect canyon entrances, parking, and community impacts.

- Work to extend service of the SLC-PC Connect:

- Include mid-day trips and earlier runs in the winter.

- Recommend continued reduction of user conflicts in Millcreek Canyon and work to implement a future shuttle program.

Mr. Perez noted that there had been a lot of discussion and support related to the work in Summit County for the Bus Rapid Transit (“BRT”) between Kimball Junction and Park City. That would serve as a critical piece in the transportation puzzle. It would also support the enhanced bus service between Quinn’s Junction and Park City. Mr. Perez reported that those projects were underway.

CWC staff recommended the following for Big Cottonwood Canyon. However, further refinement of each of the elements would need to be developed. The elements included:

- Winter express bus to resorts:

- Seasonal direct bus service from the existing TRAX line to Big Cottonwood Canyon ski resorts. Buses would go directly to each ski resort with a minimum of 10-minute headways; and
- Year-round local bus service to serve trailheads, businesses, and communities with a minimum of 15-minute headways.

- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements:

- Continuous bicycle lanes;
- Bicycle amenities; and
- Bicycle racks at trailheads.

- Variable tolling;
- Limited on-road parking;
- Paid parking at resorts; and
- Support smaller transportation hubs adjacent to canyons with increased Valley transit service.

CWC staff recommended the following for Little Cottonwood Canyon. The elements included:

- Year-round local bus service:

- Utilize buses to service the various trailheads, businesses, and communities. This year-round local bus would serve the needs of dispersed recreation users, customers, and residents. These local buses would not serve resorts during the winter.

- Variable tolling; and

- Limited on-road parking.

Mr. Perez noted that any roadway widening in Little Cottonwood Canyon was not supported or recommended. There were no recommendations related to snowsheds at this time. However, snowsheds were included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS alternatives. Snowsheds were viewed favorably in the Design Your Transit tool but at the MTS Summit, most of the participants were against the use of snowsheds.

High-capacity options were discussed, including bus, rail, and aerial. CWC Staff recommended the elimination of the enhanced bus options as a future high-capacity transit option in Little Cottonwood Canyon. It was recommended that over the next several months, the aerial gondola option and the rail option continue to be evaluated. There was no specific recommendation for a connection between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. However, there may be enough demand between recreation and emergency use to implement a connection. Mr. Perez noted that there had been a lot of discussion related to emergency egress and ingress. There was no recommendation at this time for a base-to-base gondola connection between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City.

An implementation phasing process would be important. The following was the recommended phasing process for the MTS:

- Phase I (1 to 5 years):
  - Detailed planning, design, and funding decisions for an MTS;
  - Service improvements and interim relief (bypass service and on-road bus stops);
  - Improve bus service and order new buses (there is a minimum 2-year purchase time for new buses);
  - Improve and enhance the frequency of Valley service;
  - Tolling (would take approximately 2 years to implement); and
  - Year-round bus service.
- Phase II (5 to 8 years):
  - Little Cottonwood Canyon high-capacity completion (either aerial gondola or cog rail option could be implemented between 5 to 8 years);
  - Millcreek shuttle program;
  - Mobility hubs; and
  - Reduced on-road parking.
- Phase III (10 years):
  - Connection between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Mr. Perez reported that additional information could be found in the MTS Project Summary. Chair Robinson thanked Ms. Christie, Mr. Becker, and Mr. Perez for their presentations.

Ex Officio Member, Carlton Christensen noted that serious discussions were being had with the State related to double-tracking the Frontrunner. It would lead to 15 to 20-minute headways at peak times.

1 Commissioner Christensen noted that the FrontRunner would likely run along the entire Wasatch  
2 Front within the next 10 to 20 years. He felt this would be a potential option for future phases.

3  
4 Mayor Peterson commented that the term, “smaller transportation hubs” needed to be clearly defined  
5 as the word “smaller” may not mean the same thing to everyone. He also noted that the UDOT Little  
6 Cottonwood Canyon EIS primarily focused on Little Cottonwood Canyon and included all of  
7 Wasatch Boulevard. The Staff recommendations had not taken a position or made any reference to  
8 Wasatch Boulevard. Mayor Peterson felt that Wasatch Boulevard was a connector and would be part  
9 of any solution provided for Big Cottonwood Canyon.

10  
11 It was noted that the staff recommendation had eliminated the enhanced bus service from the high-  
12 capacity options. Mr. Perez noted that if there was a real commitment to reduce or eliminate cars in  
13 the canyons, buses would have a difficult time meeting demand. It would be a challenge to deliver  
14 five-minute or less headways, to have enough staff, and to store all of the buses needed. Enhanced  
15 bus service would also have a difficult time improving congestion. Mr. Perez noted that there had  
16 been a lot of discussion around electric buses and that was something to consider in the future. Mr.  
17 Becker reported that Mr. Perez had read studies and reports throughout the year and had taken part in  
18 discussions with UDOT and UTA to fully understand the transit options. The technical conclusion  
19 was that whether it was an electric, diesel, or gas bus, it would be difficult to meet demand with buses  
20 alone. The number of buses needed, the labor, maintenance facilities, and lack of capacity made  
21 buses an impractical high-capacity solution.

22  
23 Chair Robinson noted that the objective of the current CWC Board Meeting was not to rule out any  
24 particular mode. Instead, the goal was to come up with criteria and commit to reaching a consensus  
25 in the first quarter of 2021.

26  
27 Commissioner Houseman asked a clarifying question. She noted that Phase I discussed improved  
28 Valley service and wondered whether that would include partnering with Sandy City. Chair Robinson  
29 noted that there were tradeoffs between having hubs (large parking structures, such as La Caille and  
30 the Gravel Pit) versus connections to existing transit. For example, if the La Caille option was  
31 selected for a gondola or cog rail system, there would need to be strong connections made with TRAX  
32 or buses in order to bring people to La Caille. Otherwise, the parking concerns would simply be  
33 moved elsewhere. If better connections were made to Sandy City and other areas, there would be  
34 more places for users to leave their cars before they arrived at La Caille. This would eliminate the  
35 need for a large parking structure.

36  
37 Mayor Harris Sondak noted that the timeline for a high-capacity option could vary based on the  
38 chosen option. He stated that a gondola could be built relatively quickly compared to something like  
39 a cog rail system. Chair Robinson commented that the five to eight-year timeframe listed in Phase II  
40 was linked to the high-capacity options. He felt it was important to note that some options would  
41 take longer to implement than others.

42  
43 Chair Robinson discussed a document that summarized the various elements. It included conditions  
44 related to four categories: transportation, environment, recreation, and access/impacts. Chair  
45 Robinson believed there needed to be a requirement to pass land designations. There also needed to  
46 be a management system in place to avoid the overutilization of a high-capacity transit system.

1 Chair Robinson overviewed the conditions related to the four categories:  
2

3 • Transportation:

- 4
- 5 ○ Capacity;
- 6 ○ Reliability;
- 7 ○ Safety;
- 8 ○ Speed to destinations;
- 9 ○ Frequency and headways;
- 10 ○ Convenience and comfort;
- 11 ○ Year-round equal access;
- 12 ○ Equity;
- 13 ○ Regional context;
- 14 ○ Reduce or eliminate vehicles;
- 15 ○ Phasing;
- 16 ○ Life cycle and capital costs;
- 17 ○ Ability to move goods and services;
- 18 ○ Impact on access to different destinations;
- 19 ○ Energy use;
- 20 ○ Fossil fuels;
- 21 ○ Financing (State, Federal and private);
- 22 ○ Tolling;
- 23 ○ Demand management;
- 24 ○ Emergency egress;
- 25 ○ Ski connections;
- 26 ○ Snow removal; and
- 27 ○ Passenger experience.

28

29 • Environment:

- 30
- 31 ○ Watershed impacts;
- 32 ○ Vegetation and wildlife;
- 33 ○ Visual air quality;
- 34 ○ Climate change;
- 35 ○ Energy use;
- 36 ○ Construction;
- 37 ○ Long-term impacts; and
- 38 ○ Avalanche shed needs and impacts.

39

40 • Recreation:

- 41
- 42 ○ Ability to provide for all users during all seasons; and
- 43 ○ Ability to manage impacts on and from users.

44

45 • Access/Impacts:

- 46
- 47 ○ Impacts around the canyons;
- 48 ○ Road congestions;

- 1           ○ Compatibility with neighborhoods at the mouths of the canyons;
- 2           ○ Compliance with jurisdictional plans;
- 3           ○ Ability to access businesses;
- 4           ○ Economic impacts;
- 5           ○ Impacts on community character;
- 6           ○ Mitigation needed;
- 7           ○ State economic results; and
- 8           ○ User experience.

9  
10 Chair Robinson hoped that the CWC Board Members could brainstorm what was lacking, what  
11 needed to be modified, and what needed to be deleted from the list. It could then be used in the first  
12 quarter of the next year to explore the alternatives on a deeper level.

13  
14 Commissioner Christensen wondered whether the MTS needed to have one solution or if it could be  
15 a combination of different modes. Chair Robinson believed several modes could be used. For  
16 instance, if a gondola system was chosen with stops at Snowbird and Alta, there would be a lot of  
17 places in between left without access. Additional modes could be added to create a well-rounded  
18 system. Chair Robinson believed that a multi-faceted solution would be needed.

19  
20 Catherine Kanter did not feel that anything was missing from the list. She felt it would be a useful  
21 tool as the potential alternatives were explored. Ms. Kanter asked whether the goal was to have the  
22 CWC Board Members agree on a final list and prioritize the attributes or whether the goal was to use  
23 the list for analysis and come back to deliberate. Chair Robinson didn't believe that the list was set  
24 in stone and should be used as a guidepost. He asked whether the CWC Board Members wanted the  
25 Transportation Committee to go through the list, rank the items, and score them. Alternatively, the  
26 entire CWC Board could participate in the process. Chair Robinson believed it would be beneficial  
27 for the full CWC Board to be involved.

28  
29 Commissioner Houseman commented that there had already been a process where objectives and  
30 attributes were discussed and approved. She wondered how this list was different. Chair Robinson  
31 clarified that this list was more informed. He added that it would be beneficial to read through the  
32 UDOT Alternative Report from June 8, 2020, and November 20, 2020. The alternatives could be  
33 explored further using the items on the updated list.

34  
35 Chair Robinson reported that according to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS, each of the  
36 modes would remove approximately 1,000 cars from the road. This would leave approximately 2,500  
37 cars. Chair Robinson noted that there would still be a lot of people using vehicles instead of transit.  
38 He brought up questions about how scalable the different transportation modes would be in the future  
39 and the effectiveness of long-term solutions. Chair Robinson expressed concerns related to parking.

40  
41 Mayor Erin Mendenhall suggested an item to add to the list: consideration of whether or not the  
42 alternative would induce development pressures in the canyon. Chair Robinson thought the  
43 suggestion was good and should be added to the list.

44  
45 Commissioner Houseman asked about evaluating the modes. Chair Robinson stated that the list could  
46 be prioritized but there may be differing opinions about how to prioritize the list. He felt there would  
47 need to be trade-offs and compromises. Mr. Becker added that a lot of effort had been put into the

1 objectives and attributes earlier in the year. What was different from the current list was that it had  
2 been fleshed out with the additional information learned throughout the process.

3  
4 Chair Robinson commented that UDOT was looking to take less than a third of people off of the roads  
5 and put them onto transit. Mayor Knopp noted that the gondola and cog rail systems could add more  
6 cars or trains to increase ridership. However, that came down to engineering. Mayor Knopp believed  
7 that the CWC needed to focus on a preferred mode. With aerial or rail, the number of users could be  
8 pre-determined and there would be a system of control in place. Chair Robinson agreed but noted  
9 that there were parking requirements to consider. He felt that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon  
10 EIS was narrow and noted that it didn't deal with summer visitation. Chair Robinson stated that these  
11 were the kinds of discussions that needed to be had in January when the transportation modes were  
12 being evaluated. The current task was to refine the items on the list.

13  
14 Mayor Beerman felt the list was good and asked that it be distributed to the CWC Board Members.  
15 He noted that the phasing mentioned in the Staff Recommendations may be the best place to start. It  
16 would help to focus priorities moving forward. Chair Robinson agreed and noted that there were  
17 many recommendations that were independent from the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. They  
18 could lead to short-term solutions. He noted that the reason Little Cottonwood Canyon tended to take  
19 up a lot of discussion time was because it was the most controversial in terms of transit solutions. It  
20 would also impact Big Cottonwood Canyon.

21  
22 Ms. Kanter believed the main questions being posed were:

- 23  
24 • Would a matrix structure that enables the CWC to more effectively and efficiently perform a  
25 cost-benefit analysis of the various alternatives be useful?  
26 • What would that look like?  
27

28 Ms. Kanter believed it would be beneficial to start with the objectives and attributes that had already  
29 been completed. Anything that was missing, either from the new list or from Commissioner  
30 suggestions, could be added. Chair Robinson reported that the way the list would be used and the  
31 work plan for the next year would be discussed further during the Board Retreat. He asked CWC  
32 Board Members whether they liked the idea of the list and were willing to devote additional time in  
33 the first quarter to an MTS consensus. Mayor Knopp believed the CWC needed to determine a  
34 preferred transportation system or UDOT would make the final decision. There was a tight timeline.  
35

36 Chair Robinson acknowledged that the CWC Board Members had busy schedules. He asked that  
37 they raise their hands to demonstrate a willingness to dedicate time in the first quarter to work on the  
38 MTS. He suggested two meetings per month instead of one. All of the Commissioners raised their  
39 hands. Mayor Silvestrini appreciated the time commitment from all of the Commissioners. He noted  
40 that it would be a disservice not to follow through with a recommendation after all of the hard work  
41 that had gone into potential transportation solutions.

42  
43 Commissioner Christensen suggested that between meetings, staff could solicit comments about  
44 particular topics from Commissioners. The meetings would then be focused on finding consensus  
45 among the various viewpoints rather than on the introduction of various viewpoints. Commissioner  
46 Houseman liked the suggestion and felt it would maximize the time spent together.  
47

1 Mr. Becker asked that any comments related to the list be submitted to Staff. He noted that Mayor  
2 Mendenhall's suggestion would be added to the list and a copy would be distributed to the CWC  
3 Board Members. Chair Robinson welcomed all additional input.

4  
5 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

6  
7 *John Knoblock* addressed Mayor Peterson's question related to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He  
8 had heard that the Bonneville Shoreline Trail was on a list of possible offset bills that could be  
9 included in a package of lands bills for consideration before Congress ends. However, it was  
10 uncertain whether that would move forward.

11  
12 *Mr. Fisher* expressed appreciation for everything Mayor Beerman had done for the Central Wasatch  
13 Commission. He welcomed Councilman Doilney to the CWC Board.

14  
15 There were no additional public comments.

16  
17 **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

18  
19 Mayor Peterson thanked Mr. Perez and Ms. Christie for their work during the MTS Summit. He felt  
20 there was a lot of information that could facilitate the process moving forward. Chair Robinson  
21 acknowledged the hard work of everyone involved.

22  
23 **ADJOURNMENT**

24  
25 **MOTION:** Mayor Mendenhall moved to adjourn. Mayor Silvestrini seconded the motion. The  
26 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

27  
28 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:35 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 Monday, December 7, 2020.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_