



2 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) BOARD MEETING**
3 **HELD MONDAY, APRIL 5, 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 Dan Knopp, Mayor Jenny
8 Wilson, Mayor Mike Peterson, Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Councilor Marci
9 Houseman, Councilor Jim Bradley, Ex Officio Member Carlton Christensen

10
11 **Staff:** Executive Director Ralph Becker, Deputy Director Blake Perez,
12 Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye
13 Mickelson, CWC Legal Counsel Shane Topham

14
15 **Absent:** Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Councilor Max Doilney

16
17 **Others:** Julianna Christie, Kris Nicholl, Dave Fields, Cyndi Sharkey, Randy
18 [REDACTED], Laura Briefer, Laura Hanson, Bobby Sampson, Catherine Kanter,
19 Helen Peterson, Steve Van Maren, Dennis Goreham, Lance Kovel, Lynn Pace,
20 Mike Marker, Ned Hacker, Tom Gilman, Tom Herrod, Abi Holt, Alex
21 Schmidt, Colby Hartman, Kelly Bricker, Lisa Hartman, Alexander Cramer,
22 Annalee Munsey, Bob Kollar, Marian Rice, Sarah Bennett, Gary Jackson,
23 Chris Adams, Chris McCandless, Deborah Case, Brian Hutchinson, Michael
24 Maughan, Newel Jensen, Sharon Turner, Eric Wadley, Alexander Crane,
25 Maile [REDACTED], Joey Alsop, Megan Nelson, John Knoblock

26
27 **OPENING CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION BOARD MEETING**

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

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

33
34 The Legislature, pursuant to Section 52-4-207(4), required the Board to make a determination, which
35 was as follows:

36
37 ‘I, as the Chair of the Board of the Central Wasatch Commission hereby determine
38 that conducting council meetings at any time during the next 30 days at an anchor
39 location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be
40 present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President of the
41 United States, the Governor of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor, and the Health
42 Department have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to the new

1 strain of the Coronavirus, SARS-CoV-2. Due to the state of emergency caused by
2 the global pandemic, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under
3 the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the
4 health and safety of those who may be present at the location. According to the
5 information and from State epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an
6 acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the State’s health care
7 system.’
8

9 **2. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the March 1, 2021, Board Meeting.**

10
11 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to approve the minutes of the March 1, 2021 Board Meeting.
12 Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the
13 Board.
14

15 **3. The Board will Consider Approving the Minutes of the March 19, 2021, Commissioners**
16 **MTS Summit Meeting.**

17
18 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2021, Commissioners
19 MTS Summit Meeting. Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
20 unanimous consent of the Board.
21

22 **4. Ratification of Chair Robinson Approval to Proceed to Contract with Consultant:**
23 **Visitor Use Selection Committee Recommendation Resolution 2021-05.**

24
25 Chair Robinson reported that Resolution 2021-05 relates to the ratification of a Visitor Use Study
26 between the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) and Utah State University. He noted that the
27 cost of Phase 1 totaled approximately \$37,325 and had a completion date of November 2021. Chair
28 Robinson pointed out sections from the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement. For instance, Section
29 20(b) specifies that there will be a Joint Board consisting of University and CWC designees. Chair
30 Robinson also identified a section related to confidentiality.
31

32 Mayor Harris Sondak discussed the Visitor Use Study process. The Selection Committee reviewed
33 Request for Proposal (“RFP”) submissions, proposed questions to the applicants, read the answers,
34 and ranked the various proposals individually. The Selection Committee then discussed the
35 submissions, which were scored by staff. Mayor Sondak noted that the initial indirect costs proposed
36 by Utah State University seemed high. The University reduced those costs by approximately \$12,000.
37 The Selection Committee was impressed by the overall level of experience and the background of the
38 various members of the Utah State University team.
39

40 Mayor Jenny Wilson thanked the members of the Selection Committee for their work. She supported
41 the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement but wondered if it would be possible to speak with Utah State
42 University about the timeline. Mayor Wilson felt it would be beneficial to expedite the timeline if it
43 was possible to do so.
44

45 Councilor Bradley asked if the CWC Board would receive periodic updates from Utah State
46 University related to the Visitor Use Study. Deputy Director, Blake Perez reported that the Selection
47 Committee agreed to stay on as a Working Group. They would receive updates from the project team
48 at Utah State University. Members of the Working Group could then communicate those updates to

1 the CWC Board. Executive Director, Ralph Becker noted that the Working Group includes Mayor
2 Jeff Silvestrini, Mayor Sondak, and members of the Stakeholders Council. Office Administrator,
3 Kaye Mickelson commented that Professor Jordan Smith was appointed to serve as the Utah State
4 University representative.

5
6 **MOTION:** Mayor Sondak moved to approve Resolution 2021-05 for a Visitor Use Study Agreement
7 with Utah State University. Councilor Houseman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the
8 unanimous consent of the Board.

9
10 **COMMITTEE AND PROJECT REPORTS**

11
12 **1. Executive Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

13
14 Chair Robinson reported that no Executive Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

15
16 **2. Budget/Finance Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

17
18 Chair Robinson reported that no Budget/Finance Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

19
20 **3. Transportation Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

21
22 Chair Robinson reported that no Transportation Committee Meeting was held in March 2021.

23
24 **4. Short-Term Projects Committee: 2021 Project Funding Update.**

25
26 Councilor Bradley shared updates related to the Short-Term Projects Committee. The Environmental
27 Dashboard was progressing according to plan and projected to be completed in December 2021. He
28 reported that there was a storyboarding session with representatives from the project team and CWC
29 staff. The purpose of the session was to build out the public interface of the Environmental
30 Dashboard. Councilor Bradley looked forward to the outcome.

31
32 There was also an open call in process for short-term projects. The open call would end on April 12,
33 2021. Councilor Bradley reported that there are currently 10 project submissions. CWC staff will
34 review the submissions and present the appropriate projects to the Short-Term Projects Committee
35 on April 27, 2021. Councilor Bradley reported that there is currently \$30,000 budgeted to fund short-
36 term projects for the fiscal year. CWC staff met with KSL NewsRadio and Councilor Bradley was
37 on Park City Television to discuss the open call and invite applications.

38
39 Councilor Bradley overviewed the review process for short-term project applications. CWC staff will
40 look at all applications and send appropriate projects to the U.S. Forest Service for review to ensure
41 that no Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) is needed and the necessary permits are in place.
42 CWC staff will then ask for additional details related to the submitted projects. That information will
43 be reviewed and presented to the CWC Board on May 3, 2021.

44
45 Chair Robinson reported that on March 25, 2021, CWC staff received an email from Salt Lake District
46 Ranger, Bekee Hotze. She indicated that Phase 3 of the Cottonwood Canyons Developed Site
47 Reconstruction and the Silver Lake Boardwalk Replacement projects had been selected for Great
48 American Outdoors Act funding. Ms. Hotze was grateful for the CWC letter of support.

1
2 **5. Legislative/Land Tenure Committee: No Meeting in March 2021.**

3
4 Chair Robinson reported that no Legislative/Land Tenure Committee Meeting was held in March
5 2021.
6

7 **6. Stakeholders Council Information: Opening Call for Applications.**

8
9 Mr. Perez reported that approximately half of the Stakeholders Council initial terms were coming to
10 an end. However, many of the Stakeholders Council Members agreed to serve again in their roles.
11 Mr. Perez explained that when the CWC Stakeholders Council was first formed, membership had
12 been staggered. Anyone who joined the Stakeholders Council now or recommitted to another term
13 would have a four-year term. There were approximately six openings on the Stakeholders Council
14 due to resignations and there would be an open call for applications. The application process will go
15 through the Executive Committee for review. The goal was to have a list of recommended
16 Stakeholders Council Members for the CWC Board to approve in July 2021.
17

18 **MTS DISCUSSION**

19
20 Chair Robinson discussed the Commissioners Summit held on March 19, 2021. He believed the
21 Summit was productive and filled in knowledge gaps. During the Summit, many Commissioners
22 implied that they felt the best alternative would be enhanced bus. There had also been a staff
23 recommendation for a cog rail system. Chair Robinson overviewed the Mountain Transportation
24 System (“MTS”) items to be discussed during the remainder of the meeting.
25

26 Mr. Perez overviewed the documents included in the packet. The first document was the Local
27 Governments for Sustainability (“ICLEI”) Emissions Report. It focused on a comparison of
28 greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions for the Little Cottonwood Canyon transportation alternatives.
29 The first graph shared data related to the annual GHG emissions for 25% of Little Cottonwood
30 Canyon passengers. Mr. Perez noted that electric bus, rail, and gondola all received favorable results.
31 The next graph shared data related to peak hour GHG emissions. Electric bus, rail, and gondola had
32 favorable results. The ICLEI Emissions Report also outlined additional considerations including the
33 following:
34

- 35 • Congestion impacts;
 - 36 • Changing electricity generation; and
 - 37 • Impacts on vehicle trips outside the study area.
- 38

39 The last part of the ICLEI Emissions Report focused on various data and assumptions.

40
41 Mr. Perez next overviewed the Little Cottonwood Traffic Analysis. Alta Ski Area, with the assistance
42 of Streetlight Data, completed a traffic analysis to determine the percentage of vehicles that entered
43 Little Cottonwood Canyon with Alta or Snowbird being their destination. Different zones or gates
44 were placed at specific locations. The first gate was located at the mouth of the canyon, just above
45 the Park and Ride zone. The second gate was placed just below Snowbird’s entry one. Traffic
46 patterns were summarized on a monthly and annual basis in 2018, 2019, and 2020. The data showed
47 that a high percentage of visitors were headed to Snowbird or Alta.
48

1 Mr. Perez overviewed updated information from Stadler Rail. The Stadler Rail presentation included
2 the south side alignment. They looked at an alignment that skirts the wilderness and went through
3 the wilderness to avoid major avalanche paths. The presentation also provided several potential
4 whistle stops consisting of the following:

- 5
- 6 • Gate Buttriss;
- 7 • Lisa Falls;
- 8 • Tanners Flat; and
- 9 • White Pine.

10

11 Estimated costs were overviewed for the north side alignment (\$753 million), the south side alignment
12 without snowsheds but with whistle stops (\$614 million), the south side and valley alignment (\$945
13 million), and the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) north side alignment (\$1.094 billion).
14 Additionally, there was a document included in the packet that overviewed the specific train sets. The
15 Electric Multiple Unit (“EMU”) with battery options would be a mixed operation vehicle that would
16 allow for rack-and-pinion (cog) as well as adhesion operation. There was also information in the
17 document related to seating and the ability to tie into the TRAX network.

18

19 Mr. Perez reported that there a meeting was held with UDOT, Stadler Rail, and the Utah Transit
20 Authority (“UTA”) prior to the Commissioners Summit. UDOT provided a memo related to the
21 southern alignment. The alignment was reviewed, however, UDOT felt that the southern alignment
22 would not fit their purpose and need. It was recommended that the southern alignment no longer be
23 studied or considered. Several reasons for that decision were included in the memo.

24

25 The aerial gondola alternative was discussed. CWC staff spoke with Doppelmayr and SE Group
26 about alternative alignments that could lower the tower heights, avoid avalanche powder blasts, and
27 still allow for dispersed recreation stations. Both Doppelmayr and SE Group stated that the alignment
28 reviewed in the alternatives was the preferred alignment.

29

30 Mr. Perez shared a map with the CWC Board to show what additional stations along the alternative
31 would do. If additional stations were added, this would add approximately two minutes per station
32 to the overall travel time. Each station would cost approximately \$11 million. The height of the
33 towers could be lowered but there would need to be some tradeoffs. For instance, lowered towers
34 would impede the ability for the aerial gondola to deliver service during avalanches and would not
35 necessarily be able to avoid powder blasts. Additionally, if the tower heights were reduced, there
36 would need to be additional smaller towers, so the overall footprint would be expanded.

37

38 Mr. Perez discussed enhanced valley transit. He noted that two requests were made to UTA. One
39 related to express buses from multiple hubs throughout the valley and the other related to enhanced
40 valley service to the mouth of the canyons. Mr. Perez overviewed the idea of regional hubs and
41 shared a concept map with locations where the potential hubs could be located including:

- 42
- 43 • Salt Lake City;
- 44 • University of Utah;
- 45 • Millcreek;
- 46 • Holladay;
- 47 • West Valley;

- 1 • Murray;
- 2 • Fort Union; and
- 3 • Sandy.

4
5 Each of the locations would have one bus going to one ski resort every 15 minutes. There would be
6 four buses leaving every 15 minutes from the hubs. That would be approximately 2,500 people per
7 hour with this enhanced valley transit service. To deliver that service, 447 buses would be needed.
8 The cost of the buses for the ski season alone would be approximately \$83 million and year-round
9 service would be approximately \$250 million. Laura Hanson believed those cost estimates included
10 the capital for purchasing the buses in addition to the ongoing operations and maintenance. She added
11 that bus service is easy to scale up or down based on demand. There were numerous possible
12 scenarios to consider with different pros and cons.

13
14 Mr. Perez noted that staff also looked at improved valley service to the mouth of the canyons. The
15 idea was to look at the current UTA routes and determine how those routes could be added to,
16 extended, or turned into an express service during certain times of the day. He shared a spreadsheet
17 that outlined the estimated costs to increase the current service.

18
19 Mayor Wilson believed an extensive amount of fine tuning would need to be done with each of the
20 transportation modes. She posed several questions to the CWC Board, such as:

- 21
- 22 • Is 15-minute service really what we are looking for?
- 23 • Will we need 15-minute service at all times throughout the season?
- 24 • What is the summer demand?
- 25 • Where do we see challenges?

26
27 Chair Robinson felt that the information shows that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS has a
28 limited purpose and need. The CWC wanted to arrive at an MTS that was broader in scope. Some
29 of the information reviewed by Mr. Perez, such as alternative rail alignments, whistle stops, and
30 enhanced valley transit, transcends the UDOT vision. Chair Robinson commented that it is important
31 to spend time during the current CWC Board Meeting to regroup and determine the best course of
32 action to take.

33
34 Mayor Sondak asked if an aerial gondola system with intermediate stops would have the option to
35 skip those intermediate stops based on time, day, or season. Mr. Perez confirmed this and stated that
36 the gondola cabin doors will not open if they are not programmed to do so.

37
38 Mayor Sondak stated that the south side rail alignment was unsupportable from his point of view. He
39 asked about the north side alignment. It appeared that the north side alignment would stop at
40 Snowbird to avoid having to build snowsheds along State Road 210 under Mount Superior. This
41 would necessitate the use of buses from Snowbird to Alta. He wondered if that was the concept
42 Stadler Rail presented. Mr. Perez explained that Stadler Rail had shown both bus and aerial gondola
43 as possible connections between Snowbird and Alta. A mode transfer would be required under a
44 north side alignment if there was a desire to eliminate snowsheds. Mr. Perez believed the UDOT
45 alternative included a snowshed for the cog rail system between Snowbird and Alta.

46
47 Chair Robinson posed the following questions to the CWC Board:

- 1 • Does the CWC want to reach an agreement on a recommendation for an MTS prior to the
2 release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS?
- 3 • Does the CWC want to wait until the release of the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft
4 EIS and provide comment during the 45-day comment period?
5

6 Chair Robinson noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS was scheduled for release
7 in June 2021. He wondered if the CWC should recommend enhanced bus as a Phase One
8 recommendation with a Phase Two recommendation that additional time be taken to supplement or
9 enhance the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. Another year or so could allow UDOT to expand
10 their purpose and need and to take into account certain things such as federal legislation, federal
11 protections and enhanced valley transit. He felt it would be difficult for the CWC to reach consensus
12 on one transportation alternative, given the constraints and questions that still existed.
13

14 Laura Briefer stated that there was nothing that limited the CWC to the formal comment period for
15 the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon Draft EIS. She felt it was better to communicate a rational
16 approach sooner rather than later.
17

18 Mayor Mike Peterson reported that he tried to take the issue to the Cottonwood Heights City Council
19 for further vetting. He got the sense from City Council that they were not ready to take a position on
20 a transportation alternative. Mayor Peterson felt the same way. He believed there were many
21 questions that still need to be reviewed. However, he understood that enhanced bus will need to be a
22 part of whatever alternative was selected. Mayor Peterson expressed concerns related to Wasatch
23 Boulevard and discussed congestion issues. He was anxious to see some of the results from the
24 Visitor Use Study and felt the study may provide necessary additional information. He was not ready
25 to select one of the five transportation alternatives and would support waiting for UDOT to share their
26 preferred alternative.
27

28 Councilor Marci Houseman appreciated the additional information that was shared with
29 Commissioners during the CWC Board Meeting. It emphasized the need for a transportation solution
30 that would both move visitors up the canyon and move visitors to the canyon. Councilor Houseman
31 believed a short-term solution was needed. Sandy City could support buses as a short-term solution,
32 but there were concerns about choosing buses as a long-term solution. Buses would only work as a
33 long-term solution if they were able to pass vehicles in the canyon, which would likely require road
34 widening. Since the main priorities of Sandy City related to protection of the watershed and keeping
35 water safe and healthy, widening the canyon was a concern.
36

37 Ex-Officio Member, Carlton Christensen noted that there are not any true short-term solutions. He
38 reported that it will take approximately two years to order buses and hire appropriately. There will
39 also need to be a maintenance facility to store the additional buses. Even a short-term decision would
40 be significant. Ex-Officio Christensen did not believe that a two-phased approach was best. He felt
41 it would be better to look for the right solution from the start because there would need to be a
42 significant investment made regardless.
43

44 Mayor Dan Knopp noted that he spoke to UDOT Director, Carlos Braceras, who indicated that UDOT
45 wanted to find a solution and move forward. Mayor Knopp understood that the CWC may need
46 additional time to discuss options and alternatives because they were still not close to a consensus.
47 However, it was possible that UDOT would move forward with or without CWC support.
48

1 Mayor Wilson believed the different alternatives would need some level of enhanced bus. She
2 discussed the infrastructure bill and how that might impact decision making. Mayor Wilson was
3 interested in exploring enhanced bus with tolling, carpooling, and road investment. She shared
4 suggestions related to tolling and commented that there were a number of tools that could go along
5 with an enhanced bus system to make it more effective.

6
7 Mayor Knopp commented that it was important to come up with a high-capacity public transportation
8 system to reduce the number of vehicles on the road. He noted that the UDOT Little Cottonwood
9 Canyon EIS does not address summer use and reported that the summer months were becoming as
10 busy as the winter months. It was important to be realistic about the need for year-round service. He
11 discussed the south side rail alignment and stated that it would not require snowsheds, would miss
12 avalanche paths, would work in all weather, and reduce vehicles from the road.

13
14 Councilor Houseman reiterated that Sandy City did not feel buses were the right long-term solution
15 due to potential impacts to the watershed. If Sandy City had to choose between an expanded roadway
16 to make a dedicated bus lane work or another transportation corridor, the city would support a
17 transportation corridor that caused the least amount of disruption to the watershed. She noted that in
18 order to reduce the number of vehicles on the road, there would need to be a change in behavior
19 through incentives and an efficient transportation system that elevated the canyon experience.

20
21 Mayor Erin Mendenhall believed it would better to reach a shared consensus sooner rather than later.
22 She recognized that the Commissioners have different views and priorities but felt that the CWC
23 needs to move fairly quickly. She liked the idea of a short-term solution followed by a long-term
24 solution and expressed support for a two-phased recommendation. Mayor Mendenhall added that the
25 watershed and environment are the primary concerns. She discussed options related to enhanced bus
26 service, for instance, strategic passing opportunities. Mayor Mendenhall also reiterated the
27 importance of reaching a decision related to a second phase recommendation.

28
29 Ms. Briefer shared concerns related to capacity. She commented that the canyons do not have
30 unlimited capacity and overuse could threaten or degrade the water resources and watershed. She
31 discussed the different transportation options and noted that certain issues could be mitigated.
32 However, she would not want to see infrastructure placed into the riparian corridor. Chair Robinson
33 wondered if Ms. Briefer was more comfortable with an enhanced bus solution due to the inherent
34 capacity limitations. Ms. Briefer commented that there was more flexibility to manage and control
35 an enhanced bus system than with a rail or aerial gondola system. She still had a lot of questions
36 about how the economics of those solutions might drive additional use or induce additional
37 development. While she understood there was a transportation problem to solve, there was still a lot
38 of uncertainty with respect to the high-capacity solutions and the natural capacity of the watershed.

39
40 Ex-Officio Christensen believed there was short-term potential for congestion mitigation at the mouth
41 of the canyon. Those mitigation efforts could be added within one or two years. He had never seen
42 a major capital project completed in less than five to seven years. Ex-Officio Christensen commented
43 that the high-capacity systems will likely fall within that sort of timeframe. He expressed concerns
44 about choosing a transportation mode based on the ability to control access.

45
46 Mayor Wilson discussed the goal of removing vehicles from the road. She pointed out that carpooling
47 and full buses will both take vehicles off of the road. If the goal is to remove vehicles, there were
48 many ways to make that happen without building a high-capacity transportation system. Mayor

1 Wilson recognized that with additional growth and demand in the canyons, something more than
2 enhanced bus could become necessary in future. However, she noted that many of the Commissioners
3 seemed to favor some form of a bus system. She suggested that the CWC look at the demand, address
4 visitor use, technology, and other factors before moving forward with a recommendation.
5

6 Mayor Sondak asked about the goal to remove 30% of vehicles from the road. He wondered if that
7 30% represented the number of vehicles on the road currently or the number of vehicles on the road
8 in 20 years. He also wanted to know what the cost would be for a snowshed on State Road 210
9 between Snowbird and Alta. Mayor Sondak believed that Mayor Wilson's suggestion earlier in the
10 meeting about accelerating the Visitor Use Study would be beneficial as it was an important
11 component of the transportation discussions. He discussed how parking capacity often limit the
12 number of visitors in the canyons. Additional transportation systems that do not require parking could
13 increase visitation as a result. He stressed the importance of short-term solutions. There needs to be
14 incentives for people to choose to carpool or take the bus. Mayor Sondak wanted to see some of those
15 issues discussed within the Short-Term Projects Committee.
16

17 Mayor Peterson commented that no action is not a solution. He stated that they needed to find a
18 transportation solution. He referenced Mayor Mendenhall's comments about a two-phased approach
19 to a transportation system and stated that some level of bus service would need to be included in all
20 of the alternatives. Mayor Peterson shared that he was not opposed to a rail or aerial gondola system,
21 but there were still a lot of questions related to cost, impacts to the watershed, and timing. However,
22 he felt that the CWC could reach a consensus that buses would be part of any chosen transportation
23 alternative. Chair Robinson asked for clarification about the statement that buses would be part of
24 any transportation alternative. He wondered if that meant that the CWC should:
25

- 26 • Recommend subtle changes that have an impact now and could be implemented shortly; and
- 27 • Recommend that UDOT implement an enhanced bus system that involves things like
28 additional buses and road widening.
29

30 Mayor Peterson suggested that it may be a combination of both. Some concerns could be mitigated
31 with a few additional buses or tolling. He commented that tolling could incentivize people to leave
32 their vehicles and will raise revenues that could help fund some major capital costs.
33

34 Chair Robinson asked the Commissioners about next steps. He wondered if the CWC Board needs
35 to meet again if staff should put together a bullet point document with the points made during the
36 meeting for further review. Councilor Bradley asked if staff could put together a decision-making
37 matrix that included a list of priorities. For instance, watershed protection, capacity of the canyons,
38 opportunity to recreate and aesthetics. He also suggested that there may need to be additional CWC
39 Board meetings in the next two months to move forward with the transportation discussions.
40

41 Councilor Houseman supported the idea shared by Councilor Bradley. She noted that the Sandy City
42 priorities were presented during the Commissioners Summit and she felt there could be consensus
43 building around shared priorities. She suggested that these priorities could be shared with one another
44 prior to the next CWC Board Meeting. Councilor Houseman stressed the importance of ensuring that
45 all meeting time is as productive as possible.
46

47 Chair Robinson noted that CWC staff previously prepared an evaluation matrix that included values
48 and attributes. However, the matrix could be refined to add priorities. Chair Robinson brought up

1 the possibility of going through the elements included in the evaluation matrix to collectively rate
2 each one. Mr. Becker reported that the evaluation matrix included objectives, attributes, and elements
3 that were important for an MTS. Additionally, the Commission approved a prioritization of the most
4 important elements, which were also included in the evaluation matrix. The value statements
5 reflected in the Mountain Accord work had been included as well. Staff spent an enormous amount
6 of time taking all of that information and scoring each from 1 to 4 as a way to start discussion about
7 how each of the alternatives related to the work of the Commission. Mr. Becker noted that the
8 Commissioners had not yet filled out the evaluation matrix for themselves.

9
10 Chair Robinson wondered whether the evaluation matrix could be scaled down to a dozen key issues
11 or priorities in order to poll Commissioners in real time. Mr. Becker stated that staff could attempt
12 to do this, but noted that in the past, it had been difficult to scale down the issues. He suggested that
13 each Commissioner fill out the evaluation matrix themselves. The results could be tabulated and
14 brought back to the CWC Board for further discussion. Chair Robinson wondered if the
15 Commissioners would be willing to do that. Ex-Officio Christensen felt it would be productive.
16 Councilor Bradley suggested asking each of the Commissioners to identify their top three priorities.

17
18 Councilor Houseman believed the evaluation matrix provided a solid foundation with the scoring.
19 Individual priorities would add additional weight to certain parts of the matrix. She would prefer that
20 the CWC Board use something like the evaluation matrix rather than starting over with something
21 else. Mr. Becker noted that the scoring on the evaluation matrix may differ based on jurisdiction
22 priorities. It was important to look at an MTS from a broader perspective as well as from the
23 perspective of the individual jurisdictions. Mayor Sondak suggested that each Commissioner fill out
24 the evaluation matrix and also provide a list of pros and cons. Chair Robinson liked the suggestion.
25 Mayor Knopp urged the Commissioners to think about each of the transportation modes in 20 years
26 and use that as part of their decision making and scoring.

27
28 Discussions were had regarding a potential date for a future meeting. It was determined that the
29 meeting would be held on April 19, 2021, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

30 31 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

32
33 There was no public comment.

34 35 **COMMISSIONER COMMENT**

36
37 There was no additional Commissioner comment.

38 39 **ADJOURNMENT**

40
41 **MOTION:** Mayor Knopp moved to adjourn. Councilor Bradley seconded the motion. The motion
42 passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

43
44 The Central Wasatch Commission Board Meeting adjourned at 5:50 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, April 5, 2021.*

3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: _____