



2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**
3 **HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2021, 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 Dan Knopp, Mayor Jenny Wilson, Mayor Mike Peterson, Councilor Marci
9 Houseman, Councilor Jim Bradley, Councilor Max Doilney, Ex Officio
10 Member Carlton Christensen

11
12 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez,
13 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye
14 Mickelson, CWC Legal Counsel Shane Topham

15
16 **Absent:** Mayor Erin Mendenhall

17
18 **Others:** Renee Flanagan, Steve Van Maren, Newell Jensen, Laura Hanson, Bobby
19 Sampson, Carl Fisher, Colby Hartman, Autumn Hu, Victoria Arling, Lisa
20 Hartman, Aaron London, Chris McCandless, John Knoblock, Tom Ward,
21 Allen _____, Shawn Marquardt, Beckee Hotze, Paul Diegel, Marian Rice,
22 Caroline Rodriguez, Dave Fields, Brian Sawyer, Kim Mayhew, Mike Allegra,
23 Adam Simon, Jami Richardson, Lorie Fowlke, Michael Kotoh, Will
24 McCarvill, Richard _____, Laura Briefer, Patrick Nelson, Barbara Cameron,
25 Chad Hudson, Dave Whittekiend, Ed Marshall, Lance Kovel, Manjeet Ranu,
26 Brian Maffly, Jess Kirby, Sarah Bennett, Randy Doyle, Helen Peters, George
27 Vargyas, Doug Fry, Catherine Kanter, Megan Nelson, Igor Baveda, Tara
28 Tannahill

29
30 **OPENING CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION BOARD MEETING**

- 31
32 1. **Commissioner Christopher F. Robinson will Conduct the Meeting as Chair of the Board,**
33 **(the “Board”) of the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”).**

34
35 Chair Chris Robinson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

- 36
37 2. **The Chair will Read the Chair’s Written Determination Regarding an Electronic**
38 **Meeting Anchor Location for this Meeting Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. 52-4-207(4).**

39
40 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which
41 was as follows:

1 'I, as the Chair of the Board of the Central Wasatch Commission hereby determine
2 that conducting council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor
3 location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be
4 present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President of the
5 United States, the Governor of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Health
6 Department have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to the new
7 strain of the Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2. Due to the state of emergency caused by
8 the global pandemic, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under
9 the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the
10 health and safety of those who may be present at the location. According to the
11 information and from State epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an
12 acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the State's health care
13 system.'

14
15 **3. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the January 4, 2021, Board Meeting**
16 **and January 21, 2021, Board Business Education Session Meeting.**

17
18 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to approve the minutes of the January 4, 2021 Board Meeting
19 and January 21, 2021, Board Business Education Session Meeting. Mayor Knopp seconded the
20 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

21
22 **COMMITTEE AND PROJECT REPORTS**

23
24 **1. Executive Committee: No Meeting in January 2021.**

25
26 Chair Robinson reported that no Executive Committee Meeting was held in January 2021.

27
28 **2. Budget/Finance Committee: Minutes of 1/22/2021 Meeting Included in Packet.**

29
30 Chair Robinson reported that the minutes from the January 22, 2021, Budget/Finance Committee
31 Meeting were included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

32
33 **3. Transportation Committee: No Meeting in January 2021.**

34
35 Chair Robinson reported that no Transportation Committee Meeting was held in January 2021.

36
37 **4. Short-Term Project Environmental Dashboard: In Process.**

38
39 Chair Robinson reported that the Environmental Dashboard project was in process.

40
41 **5. Visitor Use Committee: In Process; RFP Listed on State Purchasing/Procurement and**
42 **Distributed 1/21/2021. Proposal Deadline Midnight 2/15/2021.**

43
44 Chair Robinson reported that the Visitor Use Committee has a Request for Proposals ("RFP") in
45 process. The deadline for submissions is February 15, 2021.

1 **6. Stakeholders Council Meeting: Minutes of 1/20/2021 Meeting Included in Packet.**

2
3 Chair Robinson reported that the minutes from the January 20, 2021, Stakeholders Council Meeting
4 were included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

5
6 **NATIONAL FOREST SUPERVISOR**

7
8 **1. Forest Supervisor Dave Whittekiend will Provide and Update on FS Work.**

9
10 Forest Supervisor of the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Dave Whittekiend shared updates on
11 the U.S. Forest Service work. He commented that one of the Salt Lake Ranger District mission
12 statements includes a commitment to honest and open communication with partners, stakeholders,
13 communities, and the public. The goal was to work together to care for the land and serve people.

14
15 Mr. Whittekiend reported that since 2018, approximately 75 key projects have taken place across the
16 Salt Lake Ranger District. He noted that the Salt Lake Ranger District includes approximately
17 216,000 acres of land and the tri-canyon area as well as Davis County and the Stansbury Mountain
18 Range. The individual projects were detailed in a slideshow shared by Mr. Whittekiend. He stated
19 that the list did not include special uses, the lands program, or dealing with trespass issues.
20 Mr. Whittekiend reported that the Salt Lake Ranger District works on a five-year program of work.
21 The current list includes approximately 133 projects.

22
23 The Salt Lake Ranger District had visitation on par with Yellowstone National Park. However, they
24 managed with eight permanent full-time staff members and two permanent seasonal staff members.
25 The District also received help from specialists, such as wildlife biologists, botanists, and landscape
26 architects. Mr. Whittekiend commented that there is a large program of work. He shared a slide that
27 identified some of the priority projects, which included:

- 28
29
- 30 • *The Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”).* Mr. Whittekiend stated that this was an important project for the entire forest. The Forest Service is a formal cooperating agency. Specialists are currently looking at the environmental document and providing feedback;
 - 31 • *Shared Stewardship is more of a philosophy than an actual project.* Mr. Whittekiend commented that the goal is to work closely with local communities and plan and prioritize fuel reduction projects. The U.S. Forest Service and the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands worked together to identify threats to watersheds and national forests from wildfire. Projects were planned to start in Lambs Canyon and Parleys Canyon and working north and south to mitigate wildfire risk, improve wildlife habit and protect water quality;
 - 32 • *Millcreek Canyon Federal Lands Access Program (“FLAP”).* Mr. Whittekiend reported that they were working with Federal Highways to improve the road and access in Millcreek. He noted that many people are interested in the project;
 - 33 • *Developed Recreation Sites in Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon.* Mr. Whittekiend stated that forest visitation exceeds 13 million visitors annually with six million in the tri-canyon area. As a result, the recreation sites are in need of updates. The intention was to improve the condition of the sites, improve the overall recreation experience, and add amenities. He shared several sites that the Forest Service was focused on, which included:
 - 34 ○ 17 recreation sites in Big Cottonwood Canyon; and
- 35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

- 10 recreation sites in Little Cottonwood Canyon.
- *Silver Lake Boardwalk*. Mr. Whittekiend was confident that the project to rebuild the Silver Lake Boardwalk will be funded under the Great American Outdoors Act;
- *Bonneville Shoreline Trail*. The project had been a priority for the Forest Service and those on the Wasatch Front for quite some time. It had driven a lot of the Land and Water Conservation Fund work. Mr. Whittekiend stated that they would continue to work with partners to determine the best locations.

Mr. Whittekiend reported that the district has worked hard to develop partnerships and take advantage of all available opportunities. He noted that there was a small staff but a large demand. It took creative and innovative personnel to get work done across the entire Salt Lake Ranger District. Mr. Whittekiend commented that several years ago there was a proposal to charge fees at some sites under the Outdoor Recreation Enhancement Act. That proposal was not well received and had not been considered further. However, Mr. Whittekiend noted that fees had been helpful in other areas and allowed services to be expanded. He added that everyone at the Salt Lake Ranger District worked hard to manage the canyons, provide recreation, and work through various projects.

Mayor Mike Peterson thanked Mr. Whittekiend for his cooperation on the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He noted that it was a high priority for Cottonwood Heights. Mayor Peterson asked about the challenges with off-leash dogs. Mr. Whittekiend reported that the main challenge with off-leash dogs related to conflicts with other recreationists. That was difficult to manage. He also noted that there were issues related to dog waste bags. Often, they were left behind and Forest Service employees had to remove them. Mr. Whittekiend stated that hundreds of pounds of dog waste were removed from the canyons each week. Laura Briefer appreciated the relationship between the Salt Lake Ranger District and the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities. Chair Robinson thanked Mr. Whittekiend for his hard work and thorough presentation.

MOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM RAIL EDUCATION SESSION

1. CWC Board will Have Open Discussion with Representatives from Stadler Rail and UTA Regarding Information and Tradeoffs of Rail Service to Serve in a Regional Mountain Transportation System.

Chair Robinson reported that there were representatives present from Stadler Rail and Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) to discuss rail service. Martin Ritter, Mike Allegra, and Newell Jensen were available to answer questions and present relevant information. Mr. Allegra presented slides related to transportation and rail service. He noted that it is important to focus on a long-term project and a year-round system that supports all public transportation needs. Mr. Allegra commented that the relationship between land and transit was inseparable. He believed that the decisions made about transportation today would be long lasting. Mr. Allegra reported that summer use was beginning to eclipse winter use. As a result, transportation needed to focus on different kinds of trip purposes.

A mountain aerial view of Zermatt, Switzerland was shared with the CWC Board. Mr. Allegra stated that there were approximately 100 cog rail systems in the world and Zermatt was one example. The railroad was known worldwide as an economic driver for Switzerland. Zermatt was also sensitive to the issues that faced the Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) discussions, such as avalanches and water quality. Mr. Allegra also discussed the Pikes Peak cog rail system in Colorado. He noted that Pikes Peak was an older system that was being completely rebuilt. Stacy and Witbeck, Inc. was

1 doing construction work in that area. Those numbers would be used to determine cost estimates that
2 were realistic and conservative. Stadler Rail and Deutsche Bahn were also helping to look at the
3 operating conditions.

4
5 Mr. Allegra shared slides related to key transportation issues, such as reliability, flexibility, water
6 quality, and visual impacts. He noted that a rail system was able to run year-round throughout the
7 day and could be adjusted to meet demand. Whistle stops were also mentioned. Mr. Allegra reported
8 that two different alignments would be shared with the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”)
9 Board. He introduced Mr. Jensen as a former UDOT employee who currently worked for Jacobs
10 Engineering. Mr. Jensen had put together the slides related to alignment and would also discuss costs.

11
12 Mr. Jensen stated that one of the advantages of a rail system up Little Cottonwood Canyon was the
13 ability to seamlessly tie into the transit network in the valley. He reported that several possible
14 connections had been explored, including Fort Union down to 7200 South and the South Jordan
15 FrontRunner station. Mr. Jensen noted that there were pros and cons associated with all possible
16 connections. He commented that there were a lot of potential alignments within the canyon as well.
17 Some had interactions with avalanche paths and others completely avoided the avalanche paths but
18 went into the wilderness area. Mr. Jensen reported that two main options were focused on:

- 19
- 20 • The North Side Alignment; and
- 21 • The South Side Alignment.
- 22

23 Mr. Jensen clarified that the alignments were on the north side of the highway and the south side of
24 the highway. He discussed the North Side Alignment in more detail. It was primarily single-track
25 with passing sidings. The alignment would run immediately adjacent to the highway on the north
26 side of the road. Mr. Jensen noted that the map shown to the CWC Board included different avalanche
27 paths. The alignment would take as much advantage as possible of the existing roadway prism. The
28 alignment was laid out to accommodate two traffic lanes and two shoulders. Any extra width would
29 be used to keep costs down on the rail alignment. He explained that the rail system could take over
30 a lot of the carrying capacity on the highway. As a result, there wouldn’t be as much of a need for
31 those additional passing lanes.

32
33 The South Side Alignment was discussed. Mr. Jensen noted that the alignment would run
34 immediately adjacent to the highway on the south side of the road. It would continue on the south
35 side until just past the 7-Turns area, before the Maybird Gulch Avalanche Path. From there, the
36 alignment would veer off from the highway and move around the Maybird Gulch Avalanche Path.
37 Mr. Jensen reported that in the White Pine area, the alignment would get close to the road and there
38 was a possibility that an avalanche shed would be needed in that particular location. Other than that,
39 the alignment would be relatively free of avalanche sheds. He noted that there were a few different
40 alignment options through Snowbird and into Alta.

41
42 Mr. Jensen reported that Stacy and Whitbeck, Inc. had created cost estimates. Stacy and Whitbeck,
43 Inc. had a recent experience with the Pikes Peak cog railway line in Colorado. Mr. Jensen felt the
44 cost estimates for the North Side Alignment and South Side Alignment were realistic. He noted that
45 the North Side Alignment would have a few avalanche sheds and as a result, would be slightly more
46 expensive than the South Side Alignment, where the vast majority of avalanche paths were avoided.
47 He reported that the costs would be higher if the South Side Alignment was electrified. There were
48 also different costs based on whether the rail alignment went from the mouth of Little Cottonwood

1 Canyon to the 2000 East Park and Ride lot and whether there was a TRAX or FrontRunner
2 connection. Mr. Jensen reported that the cost estimates included in the UDOT Little Cottonwood
3 Canyon EIS for rail were much higher. He noted that there were higher estimates for snowsheds as
4 well as soft costs and roadway costs.

5
6 Mr. Ritter showed slides related to rail car costs and the different types of rail cars available. A diesel-
7 electric unit was proposed and had a capacity of approximately 250 passengers per train. Mr. Ritter
8 commented that the diesel-electric units could be converted to a battery system in the future. He
9 reported that Stadler Rail had been building cog rail systems for more than 75 years. He believed that
10 cog rail was both flexible and long-lasting. Mr. Ritter added that many different trains could be
11 suitable for application in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Allegra discussed the operating models
12 and stated that a railway line could move 3,000 passengers per hour, running two, three-car trains, at
13 10-minute headways.

14
15 Mr. Allegra shared slides related to the life cycle costs, funding, and financing as well as pros and
16 cons of the different alternatives. He reported that a copy of the presentation slides would be shared
17 with CWC Board Members following the meeting. Mr. Allegra stated that a cog railway system
18 would last for a long time, was safe, environmentally secure, would provide year-round public use,
19 could connect to the rest of the valley, and could easily be expanded or contracted in order to respond
20 to user demand. Chair Robinson thanked Mr. Ritter, Mr. Jensen, and Mr. Allegra for the presentation.

21
22 Mayor Dan Knopp asked about train capacity. He wondered whether the capacity was approximately
23 80 passengers per car with 3 cars per train, which equaled approximately 250 passengers per train.
24 Mr. Jensen confirmed this. Mayor Knopp asked the representatives about the two different modes:
25 diesel-electric and full electric. He noted that the diesel-electric was not compatible with the TRAX
26 system. Discussions were had about the different types of tracks. Mr. Ritter stated that the North
27 Side Alignment had a narrow-gauge track and the South Side Alignment had a standard-gauge track.
28 The standard-gauge could run on the TRAX system based on the width. Mayor Knopp felt it was
29 important to understand how the railway system would tie in with the regional transportation system.

30
31 Chair Robinson read a question from the Zoom chat box. John Knoblock asked for additional
32 information about the capacity calculations. Mr. Ritter explained that on the south side, there were
33 proposed 10-minute headways that would allow there to be 6 trains per hour. Two trains could be
34 coupled together to double the capacity to 3,000 passengers per hour. He stated that this would add
35 one siding track, which was relatively easy to accomplish.

36
37 Mayor Knopp commented that the transportation mode was scalable. Trains could be added as needed
38 to increase capacity. However, he noted that rail was also controllable. The transportation mode was
39 a fairly simple way to control the number of people entering Little Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. Ritter
40 added that trains could run once an hour during the evening or off-peak times and run regularly during
41 the peak hours. It would be relatively easy to scale the services.

42
43 Councilor Marci Houseman wondered what the transfers would look like on a regional level. Mr.
44 Allegra commented that the system was designed to be able to run from the airport, through
45 downtown, along the TRAX line, and then down 9400 South to the ski resorts, if the market and
46 demand was there. He noted that it was inevitable that there would be a transfer at some point. Those
47 transfers would look like they do on the TRAX lines, with cross-platform transfers. Mr. Allegra
48 discussed bus transfers and connectivity to the train.

1
2 Mayor Harris Sondak noted that some of the drawings seemed to go through homes in Alta.
3 Mr. Jensen reported that the alignment was able to squeeze in without impacting any homes. He
4 noted that there may need to be some realignment of accesses into the condo areas. Mayor Sondak
5 commented that it seemed the rail alignment would build on top of Little Cottonwood Creek.
6 Mr. Jensen pointed out that the alignment was adjacent to it and there would be a single bridge
7 crossing over the creek. Mayor Sondak asked about the noise level. Mr. Ritter explained that the
8 train was much quieter than the FrontRunner. It was comparable to the TRAX light rail system.
9

10 Mayor Sondak expressed concerns that rail cars would pass by certain homes every 10-minutes or so.
11 Mr. Allegra noted that would be true if there was a full build-out, where 90% of the traffic in the
12 canyon would be moved via train. In this scenario, the number of cars and buses would be
13 dramatically reduced. Mayor Sondak asked about assumptions made related to climate change and
14 the longevity of skiing in the canyon. Mr. Allegra commented that the market was not limited to
15 skiers. There were many different trip purposes, such as mountain biking, backcountry skiing, and
16 visiting friends or relatives. The advantage of the rail line was that it could run year-round and
17 throughout the day. The use was not designed specifically or exclusively for skiers.
18

19 Mayor Knopp asked about the train ending at The Cliff Lodge. Mr. Allegra noted that it was one
20 option that had been considered. He discussed potential ways to transfer from Snowbird to Alta.
21 Mayor Peterson expressed concerns related to the watershed. He also asked about connections to the
22 proposed La Caille Base Station. Mr. Allegra stressed the importance of the watershed. He was
23 confident that the latest construction techniques would limit impacts to the watershed. Mr. Allegra
24 added that the number of vehicles on the road would be reduced with a rail system in place. That
25 would mean that the runoff from vehicles would also be reduced. The reduction in vehicles would
26 offset the impacts. Mr. Allegra stated that tools, techniques, and engineering solutions could improve
27 water quality in the canyons.
28

29 Mr. Jensen discussed connections to the proposed La Caille Base Station. He reported that the South
30 Side Alignment was on the same side as the parking garage. The North Side Alignment had a
31 proposed pedestrian tunnel to connect the parking area to the platform on the north side. Mr. Allegra
32 commented that whenever a parking lot was put in place, additional traffic would be generated. The
33 goal was to not push the cars further and further away, but ultimately to move passengers towards a
34 transportation mode that didn't require driving. Mayor Peterson made note of work done with Utah
35 Open Lands to acquire approximately 26 acres of land to protect that open space. He expressed
36 concerns about the rail alignment's impact on the conservation easement. Mr. Allegra reported that
37 the idea was to stop short of that land on the east side. He added that the South Side Alignment would
38 not have that issue.
39

40 Ms. Briefer noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS showed the rail alignment on the
41 north side of Little Cottonwood Canyon Road. There was also a large footprint of cut and fill. She
42 wondered whether the North Side Alignment was similar. Mr. Jensen commented that the idea for
43 the North Side Alignment was to allow for two shoulders and two traffic lanes. The rail alignment
44 would be as close as possible to the road but there would be a safety barrier between the highway and
45 the rail line. The idea was that rail could accommodate the majority of passengers and the number of
46 vehicles on the road would be reduced.
47

1 Mr. Jensen stated that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS wanted to preserve the existing
2 capacity of the highway and had a much larger footprint. Ms. Briefer wondered whether how that
3 impacted the capital construction costs. Mr. Jensen reported that their proposed costs were higher
4 than UDOT for retaining walls. However, the excavation costs were lower than UDOT because of
5 the smaller footprint. Mr. Allegra discussed the cost drivers from the UDOT Little Cottonwood
6 Canyon EIS. He noted that their proposal included additional roadway work, significant monies for
7 avalanche sheds for both rail and the roadways as well as a number of soft costs.

8
9 Questions were read from the Zoom chat box. Carl Fisher asked about removing vehicles from the
10 road. He had not seen any real effort to do so. Jess Kirby asked about the capacity of the canyon.
11 Chair Robinson noted that Executive Director, Ralph Becker had answered various questions in the
12 chat. Deputy Director, Blake Perez read a question from Mr. Knoblock. He wondered what the train
13 speeds were and how long it would take from the base to Snowbird or the base to Alta. Mr. Allegra
14 reported that the slowest option was the North Side Alignment and it was 19 minutes from the La
15 Caille Base Station to Snowbird with an additional 5 to 6 minutes to reach Alta. If the train cars were
16 electric or some of the curves were straightened out, the overall travel time would be reduced. The
17 top speed would be the speed of the road. The slowest speed would be approximately 30 miles per
18 hour when the vehicle was in cog mode. Mr. Allegra reported that half the canyon would require the
19 train to run in cog mode and the other half would not.

20
21 Chair Robinson asked about whistle stops. Mr. Allegra noted that whistle stops could be difficult
22 when there was a 30-minute service and it took approximately 25 minutes to get from the base to
23 Alta. However, the speed could be improved by straightening out curves. He added that the
24 acceleration and deceleration rates were much faster with an electrification or battery system. Mr.
25 Allegra shared examples of what possible whistle stops could look like. He commented that while
26 the whistle-stop stations and platforms were simple, they would still be wheelchair accessible.

27
28 The UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS included a cost estimate of approximately \$517 million
29 for a diesel-electric cog rail system with a rail alignment along State Road 210. Once additional
30 elements were added in, such as fire suppression, water line, and water quality containment in the
31 snow sheds, the estimated cost became \$987 million. Chair Robinson asked about the estimated UDOT
32 costs versus the proposed North Side Alignment costs. Mr. Jensen noted that he wasn't certain how
33 UDOT reached an estimated cost of \$240 million for snow sheds. Mr. Allegra believed the \$240
34 million snow sheds proposed by UDOT would accommodate both the train and the road. The \$40
35 million proposed in the North Side Alignment would accommodate the train. He believed that snow
36 sheds for the road should be included in the road budget and not the train budget.

37
38 Chair Robinson asked for additional insight on the South Side Alignment. Mr. Jensen reported that
39 the South Side Alignment diverged from the highway where the avalanche hazards were most severe.
40 He shared a map with the CWC Board that outlined the alignment. Chair Robinson wondered what
41 would happen if an avalanche crossed the rail. He also asked how a catenary would hold up to an
42 avalanche. Mr. Jensen clarified that without a catenary in place, the snow would need to be cleared
43 before operations were able to resume. Catenaries were designed to withstand hurricane-force winds,
44 but he noted that the poles and the connections to the wires would need to be hardened. It would not
45 withstand a significant, debris-laden impact from an avalanche. However, with the exception of the
46 White Pine area, the alignment went through a 50-to-75-year return interval area.

1 Discussions were had about the proposed alignments. Mr. Allegra commented that the advantage of
2 the South Side Alignment was that the south side was independent of the road. If the road was closed,
3 there would still be an alternative way to move in and out of the canyon. The biggest issues related
4 to the South Side Alignment had to do with the water and the stream as well as the fact that there was
5 Forest Service land involved. Chair Robinson asked about the Utah Open Lands conservation
6 easement. Mr. Allegra pointed out that the conservation easement was due east of the road. Maps
7 were shared with the CWC Board and were further discussed.

8
9 Chair Robinson asked about the advantages of having one mode. Mr. Ritter stated that the easier a
10 transportation mode was to use, the more likely it was that people would use it. It was user-friendly
11 to have fewer transitions from one mode of transportation to another. The proposed parking areas
12 were discussed. Chair Robinson wondered whether the proposal included any improvements to those
13 park and ride areas. Mr. Allegra clarified that those were included in the cost estimates for the valley
14 alignments and not with the numbers shared for the canyon. Chair Robinson felt it was difficult to
15 compare the costs between the current presentation and the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.
16 He noted that each proposal had different assumptions. For instance, there were different assumptions
17 related to snow sheds and whether or not State Road 210 needed to be built out.

18
19 Catherine Kanter asked that the presentation materials be shared with participants. Mr. Allegra
20 commented that he would send the materials to CWC Staff after the meeting. Chair Robinson thanked
21 the rail representatives for their presentation. He wondered whether they would be able to create a
22 comprehensive cost comparison chart. Mr. Becker noted that UTA may be able to help with some of
23 the cost comparisons. Mr. Allegra stated that he would work on a chart but noted that he may need
24 additional details from UDOT.

25 26 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

27
28 Chair Robinson opened the public comment session.

29
30 *Carl Fisher* commented that at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting, the Stakeholders had voted to
31 create the Wasatch Preservation Committee. He expressed disappointment that the Committee had
32 not been ratified as there was a lot of work to be done in order to identify priority areas for protection
33 within the Central Wasatch. Mr. Fisher hoped the CWC would prioritize the creation of that
34 Committee. Mr. Fisher also reported that he had been trying to access public information through
35 GRAMA requests and FOIA requests from the Forest Service and UDOT. These requests were
36 initially made in August 2020. Both agencies had ignored the requests and attorneys were now
37 involved. He wanted to inform the CWC Board about the matter.

38
39 Chair Robinson commented that the Stakeholders Council recommendation would be addressed at a
40 future CWC Board Meeting.

41
42 There were no further public comments.

43 44 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

45
46 Mr. Perez reported that the next meeting would take place on February 11, 2021. It would be
47 dedicated to the gondola alternative and would run from 10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. Information related to

1 the gondola would be sent out beforehand. Chair Robinson thanked everyone for attending the extra
2 meetings to learn more about the transportation alternatives.

3

4 Mayor Sondak believed the transportation discussions highlighted the complexity of some of the
5 issues. He noted that the Visitor Use Study request for proposal (“RFP”) mentioned an ideal solution.
6 He expressed concern about the use of the word “ideal.” Mr. Becker noted that the language could
7 be modified if another phrase was better suited.

8

9 **ADJOURNMENT**

10

11 **MOTION:** Councilor Houseman moved to adjourn. Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The
12 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

13

14 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at 5:32 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, February 1, 2021.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____