



2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**
3 **HELD MONDAY, MARCH 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 Mike Peterson, Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Councilor Marci
9 Houseman, Councilor Jim Bradley, Councilor Max Doilney, Ex-Officio
10 Member Carlton Christensen

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

15
16 **Absent:** Mayor Jenny Wilson

17
18 **Others:** Joe Koenig, Shawn Marquardt, Michael Maughan, Curtis Cawley, Barbara
19 Cameron, Annalee Munsey, Ned Hacker, Vince Izzo (UDOT), Kody Fox,
20 Colby Hartmann, Kim Rhodes, Mary Young, Lynn Pace, Kenneth Larson,
21 Julianna Christie, James Hicks, Heber Valley, Deborah Case, Dennis
22 Goreham, Laura Briefer, Carl Fisher, Brian Hutchinson, Daren Cottle, Dave
23 Fields, Patrick Nelson, Catherine Kanter, Bobby Sampson, Caroline
24 Rodriguez, Onno Weiringa, Patrick Shea, Paul Diegel, Randy ____, Steve
25 Glaser, Steve Van Maren, Tara Tannahill, Tom Ward, Alex Roy, Alex
26 Schmidt, Ann Floor, John Knoblock, Abi Holt, Chad Smith, Tom Diegel,
27 Beckee Hotze, Brian Stillman, Chris Adams, Josh Van Jura (UDOT), Bri
28 Binnebose (UDOT), Frank [REDACTED], Lance Kovel, Mack Baer, Michael Marker,
29 Giles Florence, Marian Rice, Steven Clark

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

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

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

37
38 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which
39 was as follows:

40
41 ‘I, as the Chair of the Board of the Central Wasatch Commission hereby determine
42 that conducting council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor

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

13 **2. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the February 1, 2021, Board**
14 **Meeting. (Action)**

15
16 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to approve the minutes of the February 1, 2021, Board Meeting.
17 Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
18

19 **3. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the February 11, 2021, Board Aerial**
20 **Gondola Education Session Meeting.**

21
22 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to approve the minutes of the February 11, 2021, Board Aerial
23 Gondola Education Session Meeting. Mayor Knopp seconded the motion. The motion passed with
24 the unanimous consent of the Board.
25

26 **COMMITTEE AND PROJECT REPORTS; ACTION ITEMS**

27
28 **1. Executive Committee: No Meeting in February 2021.**

29
30 Chair Robinson reported that no Executive Committee Meeting was held in February 2021.
31

32 **2. Budget/Finance Committee:**

33
34 **a. Minutes of February 18, 2021, Meeting Included in Packet.**

35
36 Chair Robinson noted that there was a minor typo in the Budget/Finance Committee minutes. He
37 believed the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) needed to approve a budget by June 22, 2021.
38 Mayor Jeff Silvestrini confirmed this. He reported that there had been discussions related to
39 membership contributions during the February 19, 2021, Budget/Finance Committee Meeting. The
40 Committee Members also discussed preparing a value proposition for the different membership
41 jurisdictions. It would remind member jurisdictions why their continued membership was
42 worthwhile. Mayor Silvestrini and CWC Executive Director, Ralph Becker would be speaking to the
43 Sandy City Council on March 2, 2021, and additional presentations were also scheduled. Chair
44 Robinson thanked the Budget/Finance Committee for their work.
45

46 **3. Transportation Committee: No Meeting in February 2021.**

47
48 Chair Robinson reported that no Transportation Committee Meeting was held in February 2021.

1
2 **4. Short-Term Projects Committee: Committee Planning Next Meeting.**

3
4 Chair Robinson reported that the Short-Term Projects Committee was planning their next meeting.

5
6 **5. Stakeholders Council: The Board will Discuss and Ratify (by voice vote) the**
7 **Composition and Leadership of the Stakeholders Council’s Advisory Committees for**
8 **January 2021-January 2022.**

- 9
10 a. **Visitor Use Committee: Annalee Munsey, Chair.**
11 b. **Trails Committee: John Knoblock, Chair.**
12 c. **Millcreek Canyon Committee: Paul Diegel, Chair.**
13 d. **Preservation Committee: Carl Fisher, Chair.**
14

15 **MOTION:** Councilor Houseman moved to approve the Committee Composition and Leadership of
16 the Stakeholders Council Advisory Committees for January 2021 to January 2022. Mayor
17 Mendenhall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
18

19 **6. Consideration of Resolution 2021-02 Ratifying Extension of Independent Contractor**
20 **Agreement with Crafted Leadership.**

- 21
22 a. **The Board will Discuss and Consider Ratifying Chair Robinson’s Extension of**
23 **the Current Agreement between the CWC and Crafted Leadership (previously**
24 **approved by Resolution 2020-20) Concerning that Provider Acting as the**
25 **Facilitator for the March 19, 2021, Commissioner MTS Summit.**
26

27 Chair Robinson reminded the CWC Board that Julianne Christie helped the CWC in the past with the
28 Mountain Transportation System (“MTS”) Virtual Summit. Her involvement would also be
29 beneficial for the MTS Commissioners Summit scheduled for March 19, 2021. Chair Robinson
30 reported that the associated costs were approximately \$7,350. The contract was included in the packet
31 and was extended under the authority of Chair Robinson.
32

33 **MOTION:** Mayor Silvestrini moved to approve Resolution 2021-02, Ratifying Extension of
34 Independent Contractor Agreement with Crafted Leadership. Councilor Bradley seconded the
35 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.
36

37 **7. Consideration of Resolution 2021-03 Approving the Second Amendment to the**
38 **Interlocal Agreement between the CWC and the University of Utah for the**
39 **Environmental Dashboard.**

- 40
41 a. **The Board will Discuss and Consider Approving the Second Amendment to the**
42 **Previously-Approved Interlocal Agreement between the CWC and the University**
43 **of Utah for the Environmental Dashboard. The Purpose of the Amendment is to**
44 **Formalize the Work Plan for Completion of the Project and to Adopt a Payment**
45 **Schedule.**
46

47 Chair Robinson reported that there was an agreement with the University of Utah related to the
48 Environmental Dashboard. Phase 2 of the Environmental Dashboard was accelerated to move

1 forward toward completion and final approval by December 31, 2021. The total obligation was
2 \$176,308.

3
4 **MOTION:** Mayor Mendenhall moved to approve Resolution 2021-03 Approving the Second
5 Amendment to the Interlocal Agreement between the CWC and the University of Utah for the
6 Environmental Dashboard. Mayor Peterson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
7 unanimous consent of the Board.

8
9 **8. Consideration of Resolution 2021-04 Ratifying and Approving a Consulting Agreement**
10 **with ICLEI for an MTS Emissions Study.**

- 11
12 a. **The Board will Discuss and Consider Ratifying and Approving a Consulting**
13 **Agreement whereunder ICLEI will Conduct a Study Quantifying the**
14 **Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Alternative Modes of the Mountain**
15 **Transportation System Project and Identifying Reduction Potentials for Such**
16 **Alternatives.**

17
18 Chair Robinson reported that the above item related to a Consulting Agreement with ICLEI. An
19 analysis would be done on the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the various MTS modes.
20 The total cost for the study was \$2,150. Chair Robinson asked about the timeline. Mr. Becker
21 commented that ICLEI was aware of the timeline for CWC decision-making related to the MTS.
22 Their intention was to provide a Carbon Emissions Analysis before the March 19, 2021, MTS
23 Commissioners Summit. Mr. Becker reported that ICLEI previously looked at carbon emissions
24 under different circumstances for local governments. They were donating a lot of their own time to
25 the study. The study would provide an analysis of the carbon emissions related to each MTS mode.
26 However, the analysis would not include the Valley in the current timeframe.

27
28 Mayor Harris Sondak asked about purchasing policies. Mr. Becker explained that there were three
29 tiers in the approval process. The lowest tier required his approval for items within the \$500 to \$1,000
30 range. Items between \$1,000 and \$5,000 could be approved by Chair Robinson and Mr. Becker.
31 Greater amounts required CWC Board approval. Mayor Sondak wondered if a request for proposal
32 (“RFP”) was required. Mr. Becker did not believe so. He noted that the combination of the short
33 timeframe and the unique expertise of ICLEI had been decision-making factors. Chair Robinson
34 believed the study would provide beneficial information.

35
36 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to approve Resolution 2021-04 Ratifying and Approving a
37 Consulting Agreement with ICLEI for an MTS Emissions Study. Councilor Houseman seconded the
38 motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

39
40 **UDOT LITTLE COTTONWOOD CANYON IMPACT STATEMENT TEAM**

- 41
42 **1. Josh Van Jura, and UDOT’s EIS Team, will Provide a Brief Update on the EIS and Have**
43 **Dialogue with Board Members Concerning the EIS.**

44
45 Chair Robinson introduced Josh Van Jura from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”).
46 Mr. Van Jura thanked the CWC Board Members for the time they dedicated to reading and discussing
47 the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”). He reported that

1 Vince Izzo and Bri Binnebose from UDOT were also at the meeting. Mr. Van Jura provided slides
2 and a brief presentation related to the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.

3
4 Mr. Van Jura explained that the UDOT project purpose and need was to substantially improve the
5 safety, reliability, and mobility of State Road 210 from Fort Union through the Town of Alta. In
6 2050, UDOT anticipated that the travel time to get up Little Cottonwood Canyon in the 30th busiest
7 hour would take 80 to 85 minutes if no action was taken. There would also be approximately 1,300
8 feet of queueing on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Van Jura clarified that the 30th busiest hour was a
9 common design criterion used in projections. The goal was to achieve stable traffic flow on Wasatch
10 Boulevard and up Little Cottonwood Canyon.

11
12 UDOT was not looking for a 30% traffic reduction. Instead, that figure was the result of the analysis.
13 Mr. Van Jura reported that the average two-lane mountainous road could handle 1,000 to 1,100
14 vehicles per hour. In 2050, the expectation was that there would be roughly 1,500 vehicles per hour.
15 Going from an estimated 1,500 vehicles per hour to 1,000 vehicles per hour would create an
16 approximate 30% reduction. Mr. Van Jura noted that UDOT wanted to try and get 30% of visitors
17 into a transit mode. He overviewed the five alternatives, which included bus, gondola, and cog rail.

- 18
19 • The first bus alternative would have a bus leaving each of the two mobility hubs every five
20 minutes. The bus would travel directly to Alta or directly to Snowbird. There would be a
21 total transit time of 54 minutes, a capital cost of \$339 million, and an operation and
22 maintenance cost of \$10.3 million;
- 23 • The second bus alternative was similar to the first option. However, there would be shoulders
24 added to the existing roadway. During peak hours, buses could utilize the shoulders and pass
25 traffic. There would be a total transit time of 36 minutes, a capital cost of \$486 million, and
26 an operation and maintenance cost of \$8 million. The operation and maintenance costs were
27 lower because the buses have a shorter travel time and, therefore, fewer were needed;
- 28 • The first gondola alternative included a base station in the park and ride. Users would park at
29 one of the two mobility hubs, take the bus to the existing park and ride and board a 3S gondola
30 system. There would be 35 passengers per cabin with a cabin leaving every two minutes.
31 There would be a total transit time of 63 minutes, a capital cost of \$557 million, and an
32 operation and maintenance cost of \$8.3 million;
- 33 • The second gondola alternative included the La Caille Base Station. There would be a parking
34 structure with 1,500 stalls, the gravel pit would have 600 stalls, and 9400 South would have
35 400 stalls for a total of 2,500 stalls. There would be a total transit time of 55 or 59 minutes, a
36 capital cost of \$572 million, and an operation and maintenance cost of \$6.9 million;
- 37 • The cog rail alternative included the La Caille Base Station. There would be a total transit
38 time of 55 or 59 minutes, a capital cost of \$1.09 billion, and an operation and maintenance
39 cost of \$6.3 million.

40
41 Mr. Van Jura noted that the cog rail and gondola alternatives previously showed impacts to the Utah
42 Open Lands parcel. That had since been resolved and there were no current impacts to that parcel.
43 Chair Robinson believed there was an estimated \$36 million cost associated with avoidance to that
44 area for the cog rail alternative. Mr. Van Jura confirmed this and reported that there had been some
45 design changes. One of the design changes resulted in the addition of an overpass for the cog rail
46 line. Under the new design, the cog rail went over Wasatch on a structure before touching down
47 again on the east side of the road.

1 Mr. Van Jura discussed the proposed mobility hubs. One was at the gravel pit and the other was at
2 9400 South. There would be 1,500 parking stalls at the gravel pit and 1,000 stalls at 9400 South with
3 some of the alternatives. With the La Caille Base Station alternatives, there would be 600 stalls at
4 the gravel pit and 400 stalls at 9400 South. Mr. Van Jura reported that there was a need to widen
5 Wasatch Boulevard with five of the alternatives. Snowsheds were also included with all of the
6 alternatives, with snowsheds at White Pine, White Pine Chutes, and Little Pine. The cog rail
7 alternative also included additional snowsheds under the Hellgate Superior area.

8
9 UDOT was looking at trailhead parking, potentially reducing roadside parking in the lower canyon
10 and the elimination of winter roadside parking above Entry 1. Mr. Van Jura reported that UDOT was
11 also looking at demand management strategies, such as tolling or single occupancy vehicle
12 reductions. He noted that tolling could take place during busy winter periods but would not occur
13 within the lower canyon. It would only be in areas where there was a viable transportation alternative.
14 Mr. Van Jura outlined the UDOT timeline. There would likely be a Draft EIS with a preferred
15 alternative released in the summer. That Draft EIS would be followed by a public hearing and a 45-
16 day public comment period. Mr. Van Jura stated that the goal was to have a final EIS and Record of
17 Decision by winter 2021-2022.

18
19 Ex-Officio Member Carlton Christensen asked about snowsheds. Mr. Van Jura stated that the
20 snowshed locations were chosen because they were the biggest concerns to the avalanche crew and
21 were most likely to delay operations within the canyon. Mayor Dan Knopp believed that it would be
22 beneficial to get away from snowsheds wherever possible. He mentioned an email he sent to Mr. Van
23 Jura previously related to campground sites. Mr. Van Jura reported that there were issues due to the
24 National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). The campground sites were considered recreation
25 sites. Impacting recreation sites would put it into a 4(f) category. Since there were other alternatives
26 without 4(f) impacts, UDOT chose to focus on ones with lesser impacts.

27
28 Chair Robinson wondered whether some sort of federal legislation could modify the requirements of
29 4(f). He asked if there were additional reasons the alternative was not considered or if it was purely
30 due to those 4(f) impacts. Mr. Van Jura stated that UDOT had to follow current regulations and
31 guidelines. Chair Robinson pointed out that all of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS
32 alternatives included snowsheds. Snowsheds could be expensive, unsightly, and have potential
33 environmental impacts. He asked if snowsheds would still be needed if a transportation alternative,
34 such as a gondola system, removed a higher percentage of vehicles from the road. Mr. Van Jura
35 commented that would be a very different project than the one UDOT was looking into.

36
37 Mayor Harris Sondak asked about reliability. Mr. Izzo commented that there were several different
38 aspects of reliability, such as travel time and consistency of service. He added that snowsheds
39 impacted reliability because of the way that avalanches affected the road. In order for buses to have
40 reliability, there would need to be snowsheds. Mayor Sondak asked how travel time estimates would
41 be impacted by weather. Mr. Izzo stated that weather played a role and would be considered in terms
42 of the overall level of reliability. The estimated travel times were based on dry conditions.

43
44 Mayor Mike Peterson noted that the CWC was looking at a larger geographic area with the MTS. He
45 commented that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS focused strictly on Little Cottonwood
46 Canyon but he wondered if there would be unintended consequences for Big Cottonwood Canyon.
47 Mr. Van Jura noted that there may be tolling implemented within Big Cottonwood Canyon to avoid
48 shifting transportation issues elsewhere. In order to do that, there would need to be some sort of low-

1 cost transportation alternative to users. However, that was not something UDOT was currently
2 looking at as a department.

3
4 Laura Briefer discussed the potential for a cog rail system near the Quarry Trail. She reported that
5 this was within the riparian corridor of Little Cottonwood Creek and was also very close to the stream.
6 She expressed concerns about transportation infrastructure so close to the stream and felt it would be
7 risky from a water supply perspective or flood control perspective. Chair Robinson noted that rail
8 experts were advocating for a southern alignment. He wondered if UDOT would consider other
9 alignments for rail. Mr. Van Jura believed the southern alignment proposal was adjacent to the creek
10 for a good portion of the alignment. As a result, UDOT had not analyzed the impacts. Ms. Briefer
11 noted that the southern alignment was also within a designated riparian corridor area where the Forest
12 Plan had limitations. Mr. Izzo stated that the Riparian Habitat Conservation Area was a 300-foot
13 buffer on either side of the creek. There were rules and regulations related to that.

14
15 Catherine Kanter commented on the southern alignment. In addition to riparian concerns, she noted
16 that it would also impact the people that live at the base of that canyon. Ms. Kanter brought up
17 concerns related to parking. The UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS had parking structures that
18 planned to handle a 30% reduction in vehicles from the road. Removing more than that would require
19 additional places to park. Chair Robinson agreed with her comments and discussed Mr. Becker's
20 recent work with Utah Transit Authority ("UTA"). Mr. Becker reported that UTA was doing an
21 analysis and were looking at connections to the mouth of the canyon. That information would be
22 ready for the March 19, 2021, MTS Commissioners Summit.

23
24 Mayor Erin Mendenhall asked Mr. Van Jura how he saw the CWC process fitting in with the UDOT
25 process. Mr. Van Jura explained that the CWC was a participating agency in the UDOT Little
26 Cottonwood Canyon EIS process and represented many affected communities. He believed that input
27 from the CWC was invaluable. It was important to hear from stakeholders to understand concerns
28 and preferences. He thanked the CWC for all of their work thus far. Mr. Van Jura noted that the
29 UDOT proposal was for a 30% reduction of vehicles from the road. Higher percentages would be a
30 very different project than what was being proposed. Mayor Mendenhall commented that
31 representatives across the CWC had environmental concerns that went beyond the scope of the EIS.

32
33 Ex-Officio Member Christensen asked if UTA would continue seasonal bus service with the various
34 transportation scenarios. Mr. Van Jura believed that during peak hours, UTA carried approximately
35 300 people per hour. UDOT anticipated that those users would transition into whatever new
36 transportation alternative was adopted. Those numbers had been accounted for in that capacity.

37
38 Chair Robinson asked about the height of the towers for the gondola alternative. Mr. Van Jura
39 reported that the majority of the towers are 50 to 70 meters tall. The height was needed to stay away
40 from the excessive lateral winds associated with powder blasts. Councilor Houseman appreciated the
41 discussions and the clarification about why UDOT was looking at a 30% vehicle reduction. Chair
42 Robinson read a comment from the Zoom chatbox. Salt Lake District Ranger, Beckee Hotze stated
43 that in addition to the area south of the highway being within the Riparian Habitat Conservation Area,
44 some of the lands in the lower canyon south of the highway were purchased with Land and Water
45 Conservation Funds ("LCWF"). Those needed to be avoided by UDOT under 4(f) or 6(f) by the
46 Federal Highway Association ("FHWA").

1 **MOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM COMMISSIONERS SUMMIT PREP**

2
3 1. **The Board will Discuss Preparations for the Friday, March 19 MTS Commissioners**
4 **Summit.**

5
6 CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez reported that the MTS Commissioners Summit will take place
7 on March 19, 2021, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. At that time, there will be an updated draft
8 evaluation matrix, an updated staff recommendations report, and one-page documents with direct
9 quotes from mode experts. There will also be an attachment with all of the MTS work done to date.
10

11 2. **The Board will Review Previous Reports and Recommendations.**

12
13 Mr. Perez presented the work related to the MTS. The MTS process began over one year ago with
14 the initial scoping process and public comment period. The CWC then moved to the attributes and
15 objectives of an MTS based on the information gathered during the scoping process and public
16 comment period. Alternative plans and reports were developed during summer 2020 and the MTS
17 Draft Alternatives, Design Your Transit Tool, and Expert Panel took place in fall 2020. The
18 Stakeholders Council MTS Summit took place in November 2020. It was a two-day event where the
19 alternatives were presented and discussed. In December 2020, there were consultant
20 recommendations as well as CWC staff recommendations. The CWC Board then decided to schedule
21 Board Education Sessions on each of the modes and alternatives.
22

23 Mr. Perez outlined relevant reports, including the scoping report, attributes and objectives, consultant
24 recommendations, and CWC staff recommendations. One-page mode recaps with links and essential
25 information had been distributed as well as the draft evaluation matrix.
26

27 3. **The Board will Review the Draft Evaluation Matrix.**

28
29 Mr. Perez overviewed the Draft Evaluation Matrix. He explained that the matrix was built using the
30 attributes and objectives from the scoping process. Conditions and factors discussed during the
31 December 2020 CWC Board Meeting were also included. Everything was then tied to the values
32 outlined during the Mountain Accord process. The UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS
33 alternatives were evaluated and how those alternatives fit into a more regional MTS were also
34 evaluated. Each value was assigned a score between 0 and 3:
35

- 36 • 0 – does not meet expectations;
- 37 • 1 – good;
- 38 • 2 – better; and
- 39 • 3 – best.

40

41 Each value had two scores consisting of an EIS score and an MTS score. If there was a change in
42 score between the EIS and the MTS, it was highlighted in red. There was a cumulative score for both
43 the EIS score and MTS score at the bottom. Mr. Perez shared the evaluation matrix with the CWC
44 Board Members. He noted that CWC staff spent many hours discussing the pros and cons associated
45 with the various transportation modes. The Draft Evaluation Matrix was not a recommendation but
46 an initial evaluation. Mr. Perez asked for CWC feedback over the next few weeks leading up to the
47 MTS Commissioners Summit on March 19, 2021.
48

1 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

2
3 Chair Robinson opened the public comment session.

4
5 *Pat Shea* commented that there were important financial questions to address. For instance, if tolling
6 is associated with the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS, there would need to be a plan about
7 where that money would be spent and who had authority over that funding.

8
9 *John Knoblock* thanked everyone involved with the CWC for their service and for approving the
10 CWC Stakeholders Council Committees. He commented that the Trails Committee intended to work
11 on various planning efforts, including the U.S. Forest Service Trail Inventory, Salt Lake City
12 Watershed Management Plan, and others. Mr. Knoblock stated that certain trail projects could not
13 move forward until a Trails Master Plan is completed. Unfortunately, the Forest Service did not have
14 the budget to complete a full Trails Master Plan on their Forest Service lands. They also did not have
15 jurisdiction over all of the lands within CWC jurisdiction.

16
17 Mr. Knoblock reported that he had spoken to Martin Jensen with Salt Lake County Parks and
18 Recreation. He felt strongly that they should be the lead agency completing a Salt Lake County
19 Natural Surface Trails Master Plan. However, Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation did not have
20 the funding in the current year budget due to COVID-19 issues. Mr. Jensen would seek funding in
21 June through a mid-year budget review. John hoped that Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation
22 would be able to find the \$80,000 to \$100,000 to start the Natural Surface Trails Master Plan in the
23 third quarter of the year.

24
25 *Brian Hutchison* commented that the UDOT purpose and need was narrow. He wondered if the CWC
26 felt a responsibility to widen the scope of the UDOT Little Cottonwood EIS. Mr. Hutchinson also
27 wondered if more than 30% of vehicles should be reduced in the canyon. He was interested in access
28 equity, efficiency, safety, connectivity, and the carbon footprint of the entire transportation system.
29 Chair Robinson noted that the CWC would continue to encourage UDOT to broaden its scope.

30
31 *Brian Stillman* asked how the data related to vehicles in the canyon had been collected. He also
32 stressed the importance of providing parking that is located closer to the canyons so that traffic can
33 coordinate with the buses. Chair Robinson noted that all of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon
34 EIS alternatives included parking plans at the mouth of the canyon.

35
36 *Deborah Case* commented that the gondola would take approximately 30% of vehicle traffic from
37 the road and leave 70% on the road. There was currently 100% of traffic on the road without any
38 snowsheds. She wondered why snowsheds were now needed. Mr. Van Jura noted that UDOT was
39 looking at traffic growth over the next 30 years. Ms. Case wondered if this meant that traffic on the
40 road would be constant because growth would be constant. Mr. Van Jura confirmed this. Chair
41 Robinson commented that snowsheds were shown in the alternatives because there was an assumption
42 that there would be a lot of cars on the road and the road would be unreliable without them.

43
44 CWC Communications Director, Lindsey Nielsen read questions from the Zoom chatbox.

45
46 *Paul Diegel* wondered if all non-resort use would be closed during elevated avalanche conditions
47 without the installation of snowsheds. Mr. Van Jura explained that UDOT closed backcountry access
48 at certain timeframes prior to artillery missions. This was done independent of snowsheds, but

1 snowsheds would reduce the number of artillery missions that needed to be performed. As a result,
2 it should also reduce the number of hours that dispersed recreation hard closures were required.

3
4 There were no further public comments.

5
6 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

7
8 Mayor Sondak commented that the total number of people in the canyon needed to be considered.
9 He discussed the importance of the Visitor Use Study. Mayor Sondak noted that the CWC was
10 spending a large amount of effort, time, and resources on the MTS work without really knowing how
11 UDOT would incorporate their feedback. He referenced Chair Robinson's earlier comment that the
12 CWC had a broader scope but no authority. Chair Robinson noted that the CWC has an important
13 voice and was a cooperating agency.

14
15 Councilor Jim Bradley expressed concerns about the value that was placed on the conditions and
16 factors that made up the evaluation matrix and scoring system. He felt it was important to think about
17 what was important and what the CWC was trying to achieve. Chair Robinson stated that the
18 evaluation matrix was a tool for evaluation but not more than that. Councilor Houseman explained
19 her view of the matrix and commented that some criteria would be more important than others.

20
21 Mayor Peterson shared concerns related to Wasatch Boulevard. As the alternatives were explored, it
22 was important to think about how the road was handled as far as expansion and improvements.

23
24 **ADJOURNMENT**

25
26 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to adjourn. Mayor Mendenhall seconded the motion. The motion
27 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

28
29 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at 5:33 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, March 1, 2021.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____