

I-1: Jordan Hamann

Comment I-1-1

The gondolas. I would pay just to take the gondolas themselves, that would be an attraction in its own right: take the Gondolas to summer flowers, fall foliage, spring melt, winter snow. It would be much cooler than most US ideas. And there is so much precedent in the developed world (Switzerland, Austria, Germany, etc.). This would not be a pioneering engineering project but it could be awesome.

Comment I-1-2

The idea to connect Brighton to Park City? Transformative! Clearing the Wasatch Crest without private vehicles could do so much to alleviate congestion and encourage visitors to hit more resorts, significantly helping the recreation economy. Moving more cars into the mountains is a recipe for disaster, whether that be from fires, pollution, air quality, environmental stress, or what have you.

Comment I-1-3

The idea to connect Brighton to Park City? Transformative! Clearing the Wasatch Crest without private vehicles could do so much to alleviate congestion and encourage visitors to hit more resorts, significantly helping the recreation economy. Moving more cars into the mountains is a recipe for disaster, whether that be from fires, pollution, air quality, environmental stress, or what have you.

Comment I-1-4

The idea to connect Brighton to Park City? Transformative! Clearing the Wasatch Crest without private vehicles could do so much to alleviate congestion and encourage visitors to hit more resorts, significantly helping the recreation economy. Moving more cars into the mountains is a recipe for disaster, whether that be from fires, pollution, air quality, environmental stress, or what have you.

I-2: Jake Garfield

Comment I-2-1

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed.

-I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an income-based discount is appropriate for driving in

either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon.

-Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would be a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory.

-Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant.

-A toll booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

Comment I-2-2

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed. -I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an

income-based discount is appropriate for driving in either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon. -Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would b a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should be include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory. -Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant. -A tool booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

Comment I-2-3

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed. -I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an income-based discount is appropriate for driving in either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or

whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon. -Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would b a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should be include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory. -Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant. -A tool booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

Comment I-2-4

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed. -I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an income-based discount is appropriate for driving in either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge

a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon. -Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would b a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should be include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory. -Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant. -A tool booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

Comment I-2-5

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed. -I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an income-based discount is appropriate for driving in either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon. -Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the

canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would be a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory. -Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant. -A toll booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

Comment I-2-6

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed. -I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an income-based discount is appropriate for driving in either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon. -Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then

groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would be a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory. -Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant. -A toll booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

Comment I-2-7

I strongly support the implementation of dynamic tolling in BCC and LCC. Both BCC and LCC are being loved to death, and dynamic tolling would disincentive private vehicle use and better protect canyon resources, particularly the watershed. -I do not support any sort of discount for canyon users based on income. There is no income-based discount to access Millcreek Canyon, or Arches National Park, or to drive up American Fork Canyon, and I do not believe that an income-based discount is appropriate for driving in either LCC or BCC. I do not see how such a program could be administered fairly, and it would be extremely cumbersome for UDOT (or whichever organization ultimately administers a dynamic tolling system in the Cottonwood Canyons) to verify income level of canyon users. Just like a national parks, UDOT should charge a single toll for all vehicle entering the canyon. -Dynamic tolling must charge vehicles per vehicle, NOT on the number of occupants per vehicle. One of the biggest problems in the canyons is the number of vehicles with only one occupant. Tolling based on vehicle will incentivize car-pooling, certainly a positive for the canyons. If tolling is charged per vehicle, then groups traveling in the canyons may squeeze into a single vehicle to avoid paying the toll for 2 or more vehicles. This would be a GOOD THING and should be encouraged. Tolling per occupant

would disproportionately impact immigrants and people of color, many of whom live in larger families or multi-generational households. Tolling per occupant would ultimately be discriminatory, which is why tolling per vehicle is the only fair solution.

-UDOT (or another entity administering dynamic tolling) must offer a season pass for vehicle use in the canyons. This season pass should include access to both LCC and BCC. A season pass would make the tolling system less regressive and provide frequent canyon users with a more affordable option. A season pass would be particularly helpful for immigrants communities, communities of color, and low-income communities, members of whom often drive in the canyons frequently and likely would not be able to afford paying the toll each time they travel in the canyons. The season pass to drive in the canyons should be available to all Utah residents, and not limited to canyon property owners, which would be highly discriminatory. -Dynamic tolling should be administered through a traditional toll booth at the entrance to both LCC and BCC, just as in most national parks. A toll booth would eliminate much of the confusion and complexity that would likely result from a license plate reader or other tolling system. A toll booth would also discourage inappropriate uses of the canyon such as dogs, graffiti, or other elements; canyon users planning to engage in such inappropriate activities would be discouraged from doing so if they needed to first drive through a toll booth and interact with an attendant. -A toll booth should also be built at the top of Guardsman Pass as well as the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon so that canyon users coming from both directions are charged equally.

I-3: Heather Dance

Comment I-3-1

I live east of Wasatch at 7600 south, by the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. My main concern (among many of the environmental impacts of the numbers of people in canyons) is how it will all affect those of us who live right in the path to the canyons. I'm so nervous about having a large "freeway" type road at the bottom of our hill (wasatch blvd). I do not see the need to widen this road. It will impact every aspect of those who live in Cottonwood Heights, and not in a good way. We choose to live in this area for the very reason we were off set from major freeways and highways.

My hope is that a train system be developed and limits/prohibits cars into the canyons. This would clearly make widening wasatch unnecessary. I know UDOT believes this to be a major road way from sandy/draپر, but only 9400s to I-215 has a higher speed limit. Why can this not

stay at 40 mph once the canyon set up is figured out. I know everyone in my neighborhood is doing all they can to fight this major road expansion. If we are indeed trying to go the environmentally friendly route with the canyons, why not with the neighborhoods below the canyons? Our life is greatly impacted by heavy traffic and stalled "parking lots" on Wasatch. Adding to that congestion by adding more lanes seems that our entry and exit into our neighborhood would be impossible at peak hours.

Thank you for taking time to consider these thoughts.
Heather Dance

Comment I-3-2

I live east of Wasatch at 7600 south, by the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. My main concern (among many of the environmental impacts of the numbers of people in canyons) is how it will all affect those of us who live right in the path to the canyons. I'm so nervous about having a large "freeway" type road at the bottom of our hill (wasatch blvd). I do not see the need to widen this road. It will impact every aspect of those who live in Cottonwood Heights, and not in a good way. We choose to live in this area for the very reason we were off set from major freeways and highways.

Comment I-3-3

I live east of Wasatch at 7600 south, by the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. My main concern (among many of the environmental impacts of the numbers of people in canyons) is how it will all affect those of us who live right in the path to the canyons. I'm so nervous about having a large "freeway" type road at the bottom of our hill (wasatch blvd). I do not see the need to widen this road. It will impact every aspect of those who live in Cottonwood Heights, and not in a good way. We choose to live in this area for the very reason we were off set from major freeways and highways.

Comment I-3-4

Comment I-3-5

My hope is that a train system be developed and limits/prohibits cars into the canyons. This would clearly make widening wasatch unnecessary. I know UDOT believes this to be a major road way from sandy/draپر, but only 9400s to I-215 has a higher speed limit. Why can this not stay at 40 mph once the canyon set up is figured out. I know everyone in my neighborhood is doing all they can to fight this major road expansion. If we are indeed trying to go the environmentally friendly route with the canyons, why not with the neighborhoods below the canyons? Our life is greatly impacted by heavy traffic and stalled "parking lots" on Wasatch.

Adding to that congestion by adding more lanes seems that our entry and exit into our neighborhood would be impossible at peak hours.

Comment I-3-6

My hope is that a train system be developed and limits/prohibits cars into the canyons. This would clearly make widening wasatch unnecessary. I know UDOT believes this to be a major road way from sandy/draper, but only 9400s to I-215 has a higher speed limit. Why can this not stay at 40 mph once the canyon set up is figured out. I know everyone in my neighborhood is doing all they can to fight this major road expansion. If we are indeed trying to go the environmentally friendly route with the canyons, why not with the neighborhoods below the canyons? Our life is greatly impacted by heavy traffic and stalled "parking lots" on Wasatch. Adding to that congestion by adding more lanes seems that our entry and exit into our neighborhood would be impossible at peak hours.

I-4: Rob Hankins

Comment I-4-1

A tunnel connection at the top of big and little canyons would be idea as you could then turn the canyons into a 1 way loop effectively making the canyons 2 lanes. If traffic flowed counterclockwise you would enter in Little Cottonwood canyon to access Solitude for example and exit Big Cottonwood. This seems like the least invasive way to accommodate the increased traffic volumes.

A second alternative I would favor is light rail something like trax. Having a train to hop on would be a close second alternative to driving your personal car.

Thank you for considering my input from a citizen of Bluffdale who skis with his family each winter most weekends and spends a lot of time biking and hiking in the summer in our beloved canyons.

Comment I-4-2

A tunnel connection at the top of big and little canyons would be idea as you could then turn the canyons into a 1 way loop effectively making the canyons 2 lanes. If traffic flowed counterclockwise you would enter in Little Cottonwood canyon to access Solitude for example and exit Big Cottonwood. This seems like the least invasive way to accommodate the increased traffic volumes.

Comment I-4-3

A second alternative I would favor is light rail something like trax. Having a train to hop on would be a close second alternative to driving your personal car.

Thank you for considering my input from a citizen of Bluffdale who skis with his family each winter most weekends and spends a lot of time biking and hiking in the summer in our beloved canyons.

I-5: Colby Thompson

Comment I-5-1

I am all for seasonal busses but considering that those seem to be half of the costs I have a proposal as to how we can bring costs down. The simple fact is that the canyons don't need that frequency of bus service year around which is why the bus service is only seasonal. The canyons see their busiest months in the winter. My proposal is that we share buses and costs for the seasonal buses with another seasonal spot in Utah. The national parks in southern Utah. Zions alone goes from a peak of 5-600k monthly visitors in July down to about 100k in January and February. Luckily this is when we need those for the canyons. If we were able to split the costs of procurement and maintenance between the two projects both could benefit. We could either save on the costs or shift those funds to pay for other projects that may be cut due to costs. A fair division would either be 50/50 or ideally something like 60/40 with the national parks service covering the larger portion. The buses would only be needed for the canyons about 4-5 months out of the year so the parks could use them the rest.

Comment I-5-2

Comment I-5-3

I-6: Aaron London

Comment I-6-1

No to aerial interconnect of canyons. No to any gondola or rail system that does not serve dispersed users. No to any plan that sacrifices further viewshed destruction and the uses of climbers, hikers, snowshoers, and backcountry riders at the altar of the resorts.

I-7: Sydney Ure

Comment I-7-1

The busses would work fantastic if you don't allow other traffic during certain days or seasons. Run it similar to the way we access Zion National Park. Everyone parks at the bottom and is bussed to the destination they prefer. Use the big eye sore of the open dirt mine and turn it into a large parking lot. I was born and raised in Utah and grew up skiing, don't destroy our small town canyons.

Comment I-7-2

The busses would work fantastic if you don't allow other traffic during certain days or seasons.

Run it similar to the way we access Zion National Park. Everyone parks at the bottom and is bussed to the destination they prefer. Use the big eye sore of the open dirt mine and turn it into a large parking lot. I was born and raised in Utah and grew up skiing, don't destroy our small town canyons.

Comment I-7-3

The busses would work fantastic if you don't allow other traffic during certain days or seasons.

Run it similar to the way we access Zion National Park. Everyone parks at the bottom and is bussed to the destination they prefer. Use the big eye sore of the open dirt mine and turn it into a large parking lot. I was born and raised in Utah and grew up skiing, don't destroy our small town canyons.

I-8: Tony Defries

Comment I-8-1

CWC

This is great work!

My preference is Aerial trams to Alta and Snowbird and bus to BCC. I also think the link to BCC and LCC and Park City would be the real game changer. I would irreparably change the character of the area. It would be without doubt the best area to ski in the USA and really compete with Europe in terms of scale and quality.

It is unclear who and how this will be paid for. The public (skiers/boarders) are already paying a very high price to ski in Utah and they will go elsewhere if you try and shift this on to them, "we are paying enough. It has to be a long term investment made by the state, the resorts and federally not visitors and skiers/boarders. The lift tickets in Europe are 25% of the cost in the USA, "this can," be right!

The proposals should have been implemented years ago at the time the Mountain Accord was created. You are now behind the curve. The new multi resort passes are already overloading the resorts and infrastructure. The mountains can," cope right now. The genie is already out of the bottle. You do not have time to fiddle around and prevaricate anymore,

Whilst you sort out the long terms solution you need to get something in place to sort out the immediate crisis. The traffic in LCC and BCC is dreadful in winter. Just making people pool (not working) or getting onto busses is not working either. You HAVE to provide car parking in the valley NOW and get some temporary bus service. Your response has been way too slow.

Time is of the essence you must act quickly with a permanent solution and a short term fix

Tony

Comment I-8-2

CWC

This is great work!

My preference is Aerial trams to Alta and Snowbird and bus to BCC. I also think the link to BCC and LCC and Park City would be the real game changer. I would irreparably change the

character of the area. It would be without doubt the best area to ski in the USA and really compete with Europe in terms of scale and quality.

Comment I-8-3

CWC

This is great work!

My preference is Aerial trams to Alta and Snowbird and bus to BCC. I also think the link to BCC and LCC and Park City would be the real game changer. I would irreparably change the character of the area. It would be without doubt the best area to ski in the USA and really compete with Europe in terms of scale and quality.

Comment I-8-4

CWC

This is great work!

My preference is Aerial trams to Alta and Snowbird and bus to BCC. I also think the link to BCC and LCC and Park City would be the real game changer. I would irreparably change the character of the area. It would be without doubt the best area to ski in the USA and really compete with Europe in terms of scale and quality.

Comment I-8-5

It is unclear who and how this will be paid for. The public (skiers/boarders) are already paying a very high price to ski in Utah and they will go elsewhere if you try and shift this on to them. We are paying enough. It has to be a long term investment made by the state, the resorts and federally not visitors and skiers/boarders. The lift tickets in Europe are 25% of the cost in the USA. This can be right!

Comment I-8-6

The proposals should have been implemented years ago at the time the Mountain Accord was created. You are now behind the curve. The new multi resort passes are already overloading the resorts and infrastructure. The mountains can cope right now. The genie is already out of the bottle. You do not have time to fiddle around and prevaricate anymore,

Whilst you sort out the long terms solution you need to get something in place to sort out the immediate crisis. The traffic in LCC and BCC is dreadful in winter. Just making people pool (not working) or getting onto busses is not working either. You HAVE to provide car parking in the valley NOW and get some temporary bus service. Your response has been way too slow.

Comment I-8-7

The proposals should have been implemented years ago at the time the Mountain Accord was created. You are now behind the curve. The new multi resort passes are already overloading the resorts and infrastructure. The mountains can't cope right now. The genie is already out of the bottle. You do not have time to fiddle around and prevaricate anymore,

Whilst you sort out the long terms solution you need to get something in place to sort out the immediate crisis. The traffic in LCC and BCC is dreadful in winter. Just making people pool (not working) or getting onto busses is not working either. You HAVE to provide car parking in the valley NOW and get some temporary bus service. Your response has been way too slow.

I-9: Paul Diegel**Comment I-9-1**

Thanks for your well-thought out MTS report. Three issues immediately come to mind.

1. Overhead transportation from BCC to LCC and/or Summit county has been proposed over and over and has consistently received negative public opinion due to the permanent destruction of the viewshed and wild characteristics of the ridge lines and the lack of feasibility of a ski lift system to address general transportation issues. The purpose of the Mountain Accord process and the CWC is to evaluate development of the Central Wasatch in a holistic sense, not to subsidize the ski resorts. The sub-alternatives describing those options should be removed from consideration.

2. Conspicuously missing is any reference to collaborating with UTA, the Forest Service, and UDOT. Given that the FS and UDOT have withdrawn from the CWC and are showing no sign of cooperating with or acknowledging the CWC, it seems important to me to explain how the alternatives proposed in the draft would be evaluated or acted upon. Are we going to discuss and refine this plan, approve it, and then put the plan on a dusty shelf with all the other prior planning effort results benefits no one. Providing some evidence that the proposal contains actionable and feasible elements would go a long way towards establishing credibility and addressing a growing public need.

3. What is a realistic time frame for implementing these transportation elements and could these elements be implemented in stages? Timing is important. And are there some alternatives better suited to incremental implementation? I think a fatal flaw in the UDOT EIS is the 2050 implementation goal. Any solution set that does not address the problems that exist today and have a realistic chance of having some impact in the next 2-5 years seems inadequate and incomplete.

Paul Diegel

Comment I-9-2

Thanks for your well-thought out MTS report. Three issues immediately come to mind.

1. Overhead transportation from BCC to LCC and/or Summit county has been proposed over and over and has consistently received negative public opinion due to the permanent destruction of the viewshed and wild characteristics of the ridge lines and the lack of feasibility of a ski lift system to address general transportation issues. The purpose of the Mountain Accord process and the CWC is to evaluate development of the Central Wasatch in a holistic sense, not to subsidize the ski resorts. The sub-alternatives describing those options should be removed from consideration.

Comment I-9-3

Thanks for your well-thought out MTS report. Three issues immediately come to mind.

1. Overhead transportation from BCC to LCC and/or Summit county has been proposed over and over and has consistently received negative public opinion due to the permanent destruction of the viewshed and wild characteristics of the ridge lines and the lack of feasibility of a ski lift system to address general transportation issues. The purpose of the Mountain Accord process and the CWC is to evaluate development of the Central Wasatch in a holistic sense, not to subsidize the ski resorts. The sub-alternatives describing those options should be removed from consideration.

Comment I-9-4

2. Conspicuously missing is any reference to collaborating with UTA, the Forest Service, and UDOT. Given that the FS and UDOT have withdrawn from the CWC and are showing no sign of cooperating with or acknowledging the CWC, it seems important to me to explain how the alternatives proposed in the draft would be evaluated or acted upon. Are we going to discuss and refine this plan, approve it, and then put the plan on a dusty shelf with all the other prior planning effort results benefits no one. Providing some evidence that the proposal contains actionable and feasible elements would go a long way towards establishing credibility and addressing a growing public need.

Comment I-9-5

3. What is a realistic time frame for implementing these transportation elements and could these elements be implemented in stages? Timing is important. And are there some alternatives better suited to incremental implementation? I think a fatal flaw in the UDOT EIS is the 2050 implementation goal. Any solution set that does not address the problems that exist today and have a realistic chance of having some impact in the next 2-5 years seems inadequate and incomplete.

I-10: JK Scott

Comment I-10-1

All great. Let's do something!!! Implement & fund

I-11: Steve Joyce

Comment I-11-1

While I appreciate continued efforts to connect the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City, I think the immediate focus should be on improving the traffic into Big, Little and Park City separately first. Get more Park and Rides going. Support more buses. Go to a gondola if you can justify it. This is all orders of magnitude more important than trying to let people ski from one resort to another. If you fix the obvious problems, perhaps there will be less demand to drive an hour around I-80 in either direction.

Comment I-11-2

While I appreciate continued efforts to connect the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City,

I think the immediate focus should be on improving the traffic into Big, Little and Park City separately first.

Get more Park and Rides going. Support more buses.

Go to a gondola if you can justify it. This is all orders of magnitude more important than trying to let people ski from one resort to another. If you fix the obvious problems, perhaps there will be less demand to drive an hour around I-80 in either direction.

While gondolas or light rail may be ideal, it certainly seems like the fastest, easiest way to make improvement is to add parking, add buses and limit cars (through limited counts, limited parking or paid parking). Even easier perhaps is to start towing all the cars that park along the roads in the Cottonwoods.

I-12: Peter Corroon

Comment I-12-1

Bus Service in dedicated lane makes most sense financially, operationally and environmentally. Financially, it can be the most affordable option and provide the most incentives to those who would otherwise drive. Creating a dedicated bus lane will incentivize people to take bus rather than sit in traffic. It only has one change point (from car to bus) rather than car to bus to

gondola. Operationally, the bus can make stops along the way to accommodate back-country skiers if needed. It can also double as a lane for emergency vehicles. Environmentally, it will maintain building within its current corridor and not expand into other areas of LCC.

Comment I-12-2

Bus Service in dedicated lane makes most sense financially, operationally and environmentally. Financially, it can be the most affordable option and provide the most incentives to those who would otherwise drive. Creating a dedicated bus lane will incentivize people to take bus rather than sit in traffic. It only has one change point (from car to bus) rather than car to bus to gondola. Operationally, the bus can make stops along the way to accommodate back-country skiers if needed. It can also double as a lane for emergency vehicles. Environmentally, it will maintain building within its current corridor and not expand into other areas of LCC.

I-13: Mitchell Frankel

Comment I-13-1

I support snowsheds as the #1 way to get more people through the canyons on busy days. This will alleviate UDOT control of avalanches. I also support a dedicated up/down third lane that is prioritized for buses and carpool and switches directions morning/evening based on need. I do not support a gondola of any kind as this only supports the resorts. If they want it, they can pay for it. Anything that limits access to public forest, lands, trailheads is out of the question and should NEVER be considered.

Comment I-13-2

I support snowsheds as the #1 way to get more people through the canyons on busy days. This will alleviate UDOT control of avalanches.

Comment I-13-3

I also support a dedicated up/down third lane that is prioritized for buses and carpool and switches directions morning/evening based on need.

Comment I-13-4

I do not support a gondola of any kind as this only supports the resorts. If they want it, they can pay for it. Anything that limits access to public forest, lands, trailheads is out of the question and should NEVER be considered.

I-14: Jackson Hurst

Comment I-14-1

the alternative that I prefer is Sub Alternative C: Gondola BCC-PC and Alternative B: Gondola BCC-LCC because a Gondola System will reduce traffic congestion.

Comment I-14-2

the alternative that I prefer is Sub Alternative C: Gondola BCC-PC and Alternative B: Gondola BCC-LCC because a Gondola System will reduce traffic congestion.

Comment I-14-3

the alternative that I prefer is Sub Alternative C: Gondola BCC-PC and Alternative B: Gondola BCC-LCC because a Gondola System will reduce traffic congestion.

I-15: David Hackbarth

Comment I-15-1

Many of the options presented in this Evaluation are just plain unrealistic and counter to protecting the wilderness area on our door step. Just because expensive and unsightly systems such as gondola and railways can be built to provide unlimited capacity to a very small area....to what benefit....ruination of the wilderness area.

#1. I support the bus options which can be scaled.

#2. I support the snow sheds required for safety.

#3. I don't see any support or statement for advanced Avy control systems! These system would allow clearance of Avy risk at any time and reduced the reliance on artillery.

#4. The gravel pit parking and expansion of 9400 highland make sense.

#5 improvements to the LCC , wSatch Blvd and BCC roadway make sense. Including straightening curves and revers grades that slow traffic.

#6. I support tolling and pay for park8ng at resorts.

#7 Stop wasting time and efforts on totally unrealistic plans such as gondolas trains or Interconnect t gondolas.

Do what can be done sooner than later. Specifcly what can be done immediately with Avy control technology in LCC to avoid the am and overnight road closures. How about some more road plows? This is where the money should be spent.

Comment I-15-2

Many of the options presented in this Evaluation are just plain unrealistic and counter to protecting the wilderness area on our door step. Just because expensive and unsightly systems such as gondola and railways can be built to provide unlimited capacity to a very small area....to what benefit....ruination of the wilderness area.

#1. I support the bus options which can be scaled.

Comment I-15-3

#2. I support the snow sheds required for safety.

Comment I-15-4

#3. I don't see any support or statement for advanced Avy control systems! These system would allow clearance of Avy risk at any time and reduced the reliance on artillery.

Comment I-15-5

#4. The gravel pit parking and expansion of 9400 highland make sense.

#5 improvements to the LCC , wSatch Blvd and BCC roadway make sense. Including straightening curves and revers grades that slow traffic.

Comment I-15-6

#6. I support tolling and pay for park8ng at resorts.

#7 Stop wasting time and efforts on totally unrealistic plans such as gondolas trains or Interconnect t gondolas.

Do what can be done sooner than later. Specificky what can be done immediately with Avy control technology in LCC to avoid the am and overnight road closures. How about some more road plows? This is where the money should be spent.

I-16: jim kanaley

Comment I-16-1

It is a big deal to load and unload skis boots poles etc from cars to buses etc. That is why I will likely always drive up to Alta. If there was a great bus system express to Alta from 9400/Highland, I would consider it if no other transfers to gondola, rail etc were involved. Its just too darn much gear to move around to make a transfer practical. Hope you understand. I am a senior and think younger people would agree. Not sure who is misinforming you that transfers will work. No Way!

Also, will Alta provide nice expanded convenient boot changing rooms if we ride the bus??? Would we have to stop at Snowbird?? These are also issues.

Comment I-16-2

It is a big deal to load and unload skis boots poles etc from cars to buses etc. That is why I will likely always drive up to Alta. If there was a great bus system express to Alta from 9400/Highland, I would consider it if no other transfers to gondola, rail etc were involved. Its just too darn much gear to move around to make a transfer practical. Hope you understand. I

am a senior and think younger people would agree. Not sure who is misinforming you that transfers will work. No Way!

Also, will Alta provide nice expanded convenient boot changing rooms if we ride the bus??? Would we have to stop at Snowbird?? These are also issues.

I-17: Mike Lee

Comment I-17-1

Some great ideas. Prefer train/cog for LCC. BCC to PC gondola is an AWESOME and very much needed addition!

Comment I-17-2

Some great ideas. Prefer train/cog for LCC.

Comment I-17-3

BCC to PC gondola is an AWESOME and very much needed addition!

I-18: Mike Christensen

Comment I-18-1

As a transportation planner, there's a lot I could comment on, but I'll keep it to a couple key points:

1. I strongly support year-round tolling of private vehicles in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons and feel this is something that could and should be implemented sooner rather than later with the revenues generated used to support high-frequency, year-round bus service in both canyons. Rather than placing toll gates at the mouths of the canyons (which would create bottlenecks), I would toll simply by charging people to park in the canyon at Forest Service facilities, ski resorts, and businesses. Private property owners could also opt-in to a permit system for their vehicles and have their driveways patrolled to guard against illegally parked vehicles.

2. In order to effectively move a high volume of people, any high-capacity/fixed guideway transit system (cog railway or gondola) needs to connect to another high-capacity/fixed guideway transit system (TRAX or FrontRunner). Needing to transfer to a bus to shuttle in between limits capacity and adds travel time. In other words, any cog railway or gondola

serving Little Cottonwood Canyon needs to extend beyond the mouth of the canyon and reach TRAX and/or FrontRunner.

3. Regardless of whether a cog railway or gondola is built in Little Cottonwood Canyon, I would like to see some kind of year-round solution connecting Alta and Brighton and also Park City and Brighton. If a gondola is used, I would want it to be base to base without any summit connections that would potentially ruin backcountry skiing. If a tunnel is used, I would want it to be transit and emergency/service vehicles only in order to promote transit usage.

4. In addition to summer bus service in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, I would also like to see summer bus service between Brighton and Park City over Guardsman and Empire Passes.

Comment I-18-2

As a transportation planner, there's a lot I could comment on, but I'll keep it to a couple key points:

1. I strongly support year-round tolling of private vehicles in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons and feel this is something that could and should be implemented sooner rather than later with the revenues generated used to support high-frequency, year-round bus service in both canyons. Rather than placing toll gates at the mouths of the canyons (which would create bottlenecks), I would toll simply by charging people to park in the canyon at Forest Service facilities, ski resorts, and businesses.

Comment I-18-3

As a transportation planner, there's a lot I could comment on, but I'll keep it to a couple key points:

1. I strongly support year-round tolling of private vehicles in both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons and feel this is something that could and should be implemented sooner rather than later with the revenues generated used to support high-frequency, year-round bus service in both canyons. Rather than placing toll gates at the mouths of the canyons (which would create bottlenecks), I would toll simply by charging people to park in the canyon at Forest Service facilities, ski resorts, and businesses.

Comment I-18-4

Private property owners could also opt-in to a permit system for their vehicles and have their driveways patrolled to guard against illegally parked vehicles. Topic: Resident Permit System

Comment I-18-5

2. In order to effectively move a high volume of people, any high-capacity/fixed guideway transit system (cog railway or gondola) needs to connect to another high-capacity/fixed guideway transit system (TRAX or FrontRunner). Needing to transfer to a bus to shuttle in between limits capacity and adds travel time. In other words, any cog railway or gondola serving Little Cottonwood Canyon needs to extend beyond the mouth of the canyon and reach TRAX and/or FrontRunner.

Comment I-18-6

3. Regardless of whether a cog railway or gondola is built in Little Cottonwood Canyon, I would like to see some kind of year-round solution connecting Alta and Brighton. and also Park City and Brighton. If a gondola is used, I would want it to be base to base without any summit connections that would potentially ruin backcountry skiing. If a tunnel is used, I would want it to be transit and emergency/service vehicles only in order to promote transit usage. Topic: Supports Subalpsa

Comment I-18-7

3. Regardless of whether a cog railway or gondola is built in Little Cottonwood Canyon, I would like to see some kind of year-round solution connecting Alta and Brighton. and also Park City and Brighton. If a gondola is used, I would want it to be base to base without any summit connections that would potentially ruin backcountry skiing. If a tunnel is used, I would want it to be transit and emergency/service vehicles only in order to promote transit usage.

Comment I-18-8

3. Regardless of whether a cog railway or gondola is built in Little Cottonwood Canyon, I would like to see some kind of year-round solution connecting Alta and Brighton. and also Park City and Brighton. If a gondola is used, I would want it to be base to base without any summit connections that would potentially ruin backcountry skiing. If a tunnel is used, I would want it to be transit and emergency/service vehicles only in order to promote transit usage.

Comment I-18-9

4. In addition to summer bus service in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, I would also like to see summer bus service between Brighton and Park City over Guardsman and Empire Passes.

I-19: Matt Happe

Comment I-19-1

I would like to see all of the gondola concepts implemented. Base at little with a substation at Tanners flat. Connections between Brighton and park city. Connections between big and little cottonwood. Gondolas will have a fraction of the impact of more busses or a train. The potential capacity of gondolas far exceed busses and having another way to access park city from big cottonwood would reduce 224 traffic.

Our population explosion seems as though it will continue and I would guess 20/21 traffic numbers will be significantly higher than last year.

Thank you

Comment I-19-2

I would like to see all of the gondola concepts implemented. Base at little with a substation at Tanners flat. Connections between Brighton and park city. Connections between big and little cottonwood. Gondolas will have a fraction of the impact of more busses or a train. The potential capacity of gondolas far exceed busses and having another way to access park city from big cottonwood would reduce 224 traffic.

Our population explosion seems as though it will continue and I would guess 20/21 traffic numbers will be significantly higher than last year.

Thank you

Comment I-19-3

I would like to see all of the gondola concepts implemented. Base at little with a substation at Tanners flat. Connections between Brighton and park city. Connections between big and little cottonwood. Gondolas will have a fraction of the impact of more busses or a train. The potential capacity of gondolas far exceed busses and having another way to access park city from big cottonwood would reduce 224 traffic.

Our population explosion seems as though it will continue and I would guess 20/21 traffic numbers will be significantly higher than last year.

Thank you

Comment I-19-4

I would like to see all of the gondola concepts implemented. Base at little with a substation at Tanners flat. Connections between Brighton and park city. Connections between big and little cottonwood. Gondolas will have a fraction of the impact of more busses or a train. The potential capacity of gondolas far exceed busses and having another way to access park city from big cottonwood would reduce 224 traffic.

Our population explosion seems as though it will continue and I would guess 20/21 traffic numbers will be significantly higher than last year.

Thank you

I-20: Lee Bank

Comment I-20-1

Enough with bus solutions that don't work, that won't work!!!

SLC is fast becoming the next "Bay Area I-80" or "Denver I-70" (so bad, that some just won't drive it during ski "rush hours". Hwy 224 is already grid locked on some Saturdays. Solitude will close to parking (after it raised the fee, in future, well above \$20), and LCC is on its way to being a parking lot in the AM.

We need to bite the bullet and implement a "European" solution - tunnel from DV-BCC-LCC, or connecting the resorts (PC-Brighton-Alta). Get the Federal money and do it, please!

Comment I-20-2

Enough with bus solutions that don't work, that won't work!!!

Comment I-20-3

SLC is fast becoming the next "Bay Area I-80" or "Denver I-70" (so bad, that some just won't drive it during ski "rush hours". Hwy 224 is already grid locked on some Saturdays. Solitude will close to parking (after it raised the fee, in future, well above \$20), and LCC is on its way to being a parking lot in the AM.

We need to bite the bullet and implement a "European" solution - tunnel from DV-BCC-LCC, or connecting the resorts (PC-Brighton-Alta). Get the Federal money and do it, please!

Comment I-20-4

SLC is fast becoming the next "Bay Area I-80" or "Denver I-70" (so bad, that some just won't drive it during ski "rush hours". Hwy 224 is already grid locked on some Saturdays. Solitude will close to parking (after it raised the fee, in future, well above \$20), and LCC is on its way to being a parking lot in the AM.

We need to bite the bullet and implement a "European" solution - tunnel from DV-BCC-LCC, or connecting the resorts (PC-Brighton-Alta). Get the Federal money and do it, please!

I-21: Jason Motley**Comment I-21-1**

Hi,

I believe the Draft Alternative 1 or 2 are the best options. Alternative 1 can be implemented relatively quickly because it requires minimal infrastructure investments compared to the gondola. Option 2 would likely be more expensive but by using the air would help to reduce road congestion. Regardless, the chosen option should reduce or eliminate car use, particularly during peak season.

Comment I-21-2

I believe the Draft Alternative 1 or 2 are the best options. Alternative 1 can be implemented relatively quickly because it requires minimal infrastructure investments compared to the gondola.

Comment I-21-3

I believe the Draft Alternative 1 or 2 are the best options. Alternative 1 can be implemented relatively quickly because it requires minimal infrastructure investments compared to the gondola.

Comment I-21-4

Option 2 would likely be more expensive but by using the air would help to reduce road congestion. Regardless, the chosen option should reduce or eliminate car use, particularly during peak season.

I-22: Richard Marriott**Comment I-22-1**

I prefer the La Caille Gondola option. It greatly reduces traffic in the canyon, provides parking away from mouth of canyon, and provides a tourist attraction.

Comment I-22-2

I prefer the La Caille Gondola option. It greatly reduces traffic in the canyon, provides parking away from mouth of canyon, and provides a tourist attraction.

Comment I-22-3

I prefer the La Caille Gondola option. It greatly reduces traffic in the canyon, provides parking away from mouth of canyon, and provides a tourist attraction.

Comment I-22-4

I prefer the La Caille Gondola option. It greatly reduces traffic in the canyon, provides parking away from mouth of canyon, and provides a tourist attraction.

I-23: Alex Sun**Comment I-23-1**

I don't really want to see more widening of the road, nor a gondola. After doing a fair bit of research on this topic, it's come to my attention that the main goal of any of the draft alternatives is to reduce traffic by increasing public transit ridership. It makes sense to try smaller scale methods of increasing transit ridership before we assume that everyone's going to take the bus or the gondola.

Right now the ski bus route is one of the least efficient in the entire Salt Lake Valley (see the uploaded scientific study). I think it's worth it to try tolling/congestion pricing with increased busing without widening the road as a first step. Then, if things don't change, or we find out that so many people want to take the bus, then we can think about other solutions. Let's solve the ridership problem first.

It pays to err on the safe side. If we go too far, build a gondola, and widen the road, there's no reverting the canyon back to what it was before. More incremental steps are in order.

Comment I-23-2

Alex Sun

I don't really want to see more widening of the road: nor a gondola. After doing a fair bit of research on this topic, it's come to my attention that the main goal of any of the draft alternatives is to reduce traffic by increasing public transit ridership. It makes sense to try smaller scale methods of increasing transit ridership before we assume that everyone's going to take the bus or the gondola.

Right now the ski bus route is one of the least efficient in the entire Salt Lake Valley (see the uploaded scientific study).

Comment I-23-3

Alex Sun

I don't really want to see more widening of the road: nor a gondola. After doing a fair bit of research

on this topic, it's come to my attention that the main goal of any of the draft alternatives is to reduce

traffic by increasing public transit ridership. It makes sense to try smaller scale methods of increasing transit ridership before we assume that everyone's going to take the bus or the gondola.

Right now the ski bus route is one of the least efficient in the entire Salt Lake Valley (see the uploaded scientific study).

Comment I-23-4

Alex Sun

I don't really want to see more widening of the road: nor a gondola. After doing a fair bit of research

on this topic, it's come to my attention that the main goal of any of the draft alternatives is to reduce

traffic by increasing public transit ridership. It makes sense to try smaller scale methods of increasing transit ridership before we assume that everyone's going to take the bus or the gondola.

Right now the ski bus route is one of the least efficient in the entire Salt Lake Valley (see the uploaded scientific study).

Comment I-23-5

Alex Sun

I don't really want to see more widening of the road: nor a gondola. After doing a fair bit of research

on this topic, it's come to my attention that the main goal of any of the draft alternatives is to reduce

traffic by increasing public transit ridership. It makes sense to try smaller scale methods of increasing transit ridership before we assume that everyone's going to take the bus or the gondola.

Right now the ski bus route is one of the least efficient in the entire Salt Lake Valley (see the uploaded scientific study).

Comment I-23-6

I think it's worth it to try tolling/congestion pricing with increased

busing without widening the road as a first step. Then, if things don't change: or we find out that so

many people want to take the bus, then we can think about other solutions. Let's solve the ridership

problem first

It pays to err on the safe side. If we go too far: build a gondola, and widen the road, there's no reverting the canyon back to what it was before. More incremental steps are in order.

I-24: Chris Balun

Comment I-24-1

I support the Gondola up LCC, but only in the La Caille option.
Expanded regular year round bus service up BCC, with the "gravel pit" transportation option.
And expanding Wasatch Blvd with additional lanes. I commute on this road and the expansion is needed for commuters alone and well over due for the winter traffic.
Let's the ball rolling!!

Comment I-24-2

I support the Gondola up LCC, but only in the La Caille option.
Expanded regular year round bus service up BCC, with the "gravel pit" transportation option.

Comment I-24-3

And expanding Wasatch Blvd with additional lanes. I commute on this road and the expansion is needed for commuters alone and well over due for the winter traffic.

Let's the ball rolling!!

I-25: Ian Peisner

Comment I-25-1

Alternative one seems like the best option, though I would amend it to include a paved bike trail in Parley's Canyon as well as the possibility of a rail connection in Parley's. Certainly anything involving cross-canyon (or BCC-PC) gondolas/trams/etc. should be avoided at all costs. The impact to communities and wild spaces is simply far too great. I appreciate the consideration given to watershed and habitat health. We need to be sure to remember that we are not the only residents/users of these areas--wildlife, plants, creeks, etc. should be given equal consideration to humans. Thanks for all the hard work!

Comment I-25-2

Alternative one seems like the best option.

Comment I-25-3

though I would amend it to include a paved bike trail in Parley's Canyon as well as the possibility of a rail connection in Parley's. Ped/Bike improvements, Parley's Canyon

Certainly anything involving cross-canyon (or BCC-PC) gondolas/trams/etc. should be avoided at all costs. The impact to communities and wild spaces is simply far too great.

Comment I-25-4

though I would amend it to include a paved bike trail in Parley's Canyon as well as the possibility of a rail connection in Parley's. Ped/Bike improvements, Parley's Canyon.

Comment I-25-5

I appreciate the consideration given to watershed and habitat health. We need to be sure to remember that we are not the only residents/users of these areas--wildlife, plants, creeks, etc. should be given equal consideration to humans. Thanks for all the hard work!

I-26: Ken Whipple

Comment I-26-1

I have worked for Park City for 30 years and on the building and business on main street I skied Alta Brighton Snowbird and solitude when I was a kid I grew up in Salt Lake City so I've seen this problem happening for years. I think the best solution would be to make a transit train go up parleys past the canyons through Park City through the mountain to Brighton and solitude then through the mountain to Alta and Snowbird it would decrease traffic on the roads it would also decrease pollution. Driving up and down parleys and big and little Cottonwood Canyon has gotten very congested buses go the same speed as cars aerial tram would not be able to run all the time and are slow. Feel free to contact me I would be interested in talking more with this

Comment I-26-2

I have worked for Park City for 30 years and on the building and business on main street I skied Alta Brighton Snowbird and solitude when I was a kid I grew up in Salt Lake City so I've seen this problem happening for years. I think the best solution would be to make a transit train go up parleys past the canyons through Park City through the mountain to Brighton and solitude then through the mountain to Alta and Snowbird. It would decrease traffic on the roads it would also decrease pollution. Driving up and down parleys and big and little Cottonwood Canyon has gotten very congested buses go the same speed as cars aerial tram would not be able to run all the time and are slow. Feel free to contact me I would be interested in talking more with this.

I-27: Amy Mills

Comment I-27-1

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-2

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-3

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-4

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-5

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-6

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-7

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-8

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-9

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-10

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-11

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

Comment I-27-12

I favor only upgrading the bus system. Other alternatives, such as trains, gondolas, or tunnels, would be expensive, destructive to wildlife habitat, and would increase the human pressure on our overcrowded Wasatch. We need to put a moratorium on development and advertising.

I-28: Rebecca Heister**Comment I-28-1**

No additional lanes, no trains, no gondola. Buses only, or consider other proposals submitted by Save Our Canyons.

Comment I-28-2

No additional lanes, no trains, no gondola. Buses only, or consider other proposals submitted by Save Our Canyons.

Comment I-28-3

No additional lanes, no trains, no gondola. Buses only, or consider other proposals submitted by Save Our Canyons.

Comment I-28-4

No additional lanes, no trains, no gondola. Buses only, or consider other proposals submitted by Save Our Canyons.

I-29: Brent Ruhkamp**Comment I-29-1**

Reading over the report along with various news reports left me with the following thoughts.

1. Busses are expedient but seem very expensive when overall operating costs are considered. They should not be seen as a singular solution.

Comment I-29-2

2. The dual line cog railway option for LCC seems like the best long-term option. I realize it will change the landscape but I think this can be done artfully.

Comment I-29-3

3. I think the best way to connect PC-BCC-LCC would be tunnels with trains. These would have the least visual impact and not be impacted by weather in the winter. If not then gondolas. 4. The connection between SLC and PC must be dramatically improved. The current bus system does not work for those who work in the service industry that dominates employment in Summit County (I'm the GM of a restaurant and I cannot hire residents of the valley unless they have a car; learned the hard way). Summit County also needs to increase its affordable housing stock. This would eliminate many cars from I80 and help create a more vibrant economy year-around as workers spend their dollars in Summit County instead of in the valley.

Comment I-29-4

3. I think the best way to connect PC-BCC-LCC would be tunnels with trains. These would have the least visual impact and not be impacted by weather in the winter. If not then gondolas. 4. The connection between SLC and PC must be dramatically improved. The current bus system does not work for those who work in the service industry that dominates employment in Summit County (I'm the GM of a restaurant and I cannot hire residents of the valley unless they have a car; learned the hard way). Summit County also needs to increase its affordable housing stock. This would eliminate many cars from I80 and help create a more vibrant economy year-around as workers spend their dollars in Summit County instead of in the valley.

Comment I-29-5

3. I think the best way to connect PC-BCC-LCC would be tunnels with trains. These would have the least visual impact and not be impacted by weather in the winter. If not then gondolas. 4. The connection between SLC and PC must be dramatically improved. The current bus system

does not work for those who work in the service industry that dominates employment in Summit County (I'm the GM of a restaurant and I cannot hire residents of the valley unless they have a car; learned the hard way). Summit County also needs to increase its affordable housing stock. This would eliminate many cars from I80 and help create a more vibrant economy year-around as workers spend their dollars in Summit County instead of in the valley.

Comment I-29-6

3. I think the best way to connect PC-BCC-LCC would be tunnels with trains. These would have the least visual impact and not be impacted by weather in the winter. If not then gondolas. 4. The connection between SLC and PC must be dramatically improved. The current bus system does not work for those who work in the service industry that dominates employment in Summit County (I'm the GM of a restaurant and I cannot hire residents of the valley unless they have a car; learned the hard way). Summit County also needs to increase its affordable housing stock. This would eliminate many cars from I80 and help create a more vibrant economy year-around as workers spend their dollars in Summit County instead of in the valley.

I-30: Brian Stillman

Comment I-30-1

It's so extensive at this point and so many options available as well it's difficult to make a reasonable assessment to give a conclusional (not a real word :o) remark. One thing is for sure decisions need to be made and easements along with land purchases need to be done/acquired A.S.A.P.

Comment I-30-2

Anything done along the base of the Valley Range needs to have a Geological/Seismic Analysis as it's right along the Fault. The bore/tunnels being considered as well need this done A.S.A.P. to determine any feasibility. In short, that's a brief analysis of the options.

I-31: John Keagy

Comment I-31-1

The town of Park City needs to provide access to the Wasatch Front. The snow and the views are much better on the Wasatch Front. Global warming will make the situation worse for Park City skiing. If Park City wants to continue to be a great, global ski destination, it had better provide better access to the Wasatch Front.

I vigorously support an aerial link between PCMR and Brighton. We need to connect the "bed base" to the good skiing. I am a Park City full-time resident and home owner and also an avid back-country skier.

Comment I-31-2

The town of Park City needs to provide access to the Wasatch Front. The snow and the views are much better on the Wasatch Front. Global warming will make the situation worse for Park City skiing. If Park City wants to continue to be a great, global ski destination, it had better provide better access to the Wasatch Front. I vigorously support an aerial link between PCMR and Brighton. We need to connect the "bed base" to the good skiing. I am a Park City full-time resident and home owner and also an avid back-country skier.

I-32: Mckenzie

Comment I-32-1

As a long time resident and a world traveler I have to say I think putting a gondola/train in would be a huge mistake and inconsistent with the culture.

Comment I-32-2

As a long time resident and a world traveler I have to say I think putting a gondola/train in would be a huge mistake and inconsistent with the culture.

Comment I-32-3

People here are not Europeans they are not accustomed to public transportation therefore they will not want to use it. It is very few days a year that actually have really bad traffic- Only a handful.

This seems like inexpensive development that is only focused on the winter months.

For those of us who enjoy the canyon in the summer we would lose a lot of wonderful hiking and biking spots It would be ideal if Snowbird could do the decent thing and cap their mountain.

I-33: Jena Frioux

Comment I-33-1

I am absolutely opposed to a train, extra lane and gondola up the canyon! We Need to protect our watershed and any of these options would widen the road which would compromise the watershed. Not only the watershed is compromised but wild life paths and Corridors. We do

not need to put our canyon, it,Äôs Ecosystem and our water source to accommodate the ski businesses.

Comment I-33-2

I am absolutely opposed to a train, extra lane and gondola up the canyon! We Need to protect our watershed and any of these options would widen the road which would compromise the watershed. Not only the watershed is compromised but wild life paths and Corridors. We do not need to put our canyon, it,Äôs Ecosystem and our water source to accommodate the ski businesses.

Comment I-33-3

I am absolutely opposed to a train, extra lane and gondola up the canyon! We Need to protect our watershed and any of these options would widen the road which would compromise the watershed. Not only the watershed is compromised but wild life paths and Corridors. We do not need to put our canyon, it,Äôs Ecosystem and our water source to accommodate the ski businesses.

Comment I-33-4

A bus system that runs frequently will be sufficient. I strongly encourage you to consider this solution.

I-34: Elizabeth Metcalf

Comment I-34-1

To whom it may concern, Please do not continue to widen the roads in Little Cottonwood canyon. Let's keep the natural beauty intact. Thank you

I-35: Mara Adams

Comment I-35-1

Hi - hoping this is the right place for comments. I,Äôve live in Sandy most of my life and have skied big and little cottonwood canyons most of that time. The bussing is a joke- thebusses them selves aren,Äôt equipped for the canyon. The ride takes FOREVER bc of the drive all the way in to snowbird 2x. It would be soooo easy for the ski resort to have busses drop people right on the road- the resorta are downhill from the road and everyone could ski. The few that can,Äôt could be picked up by resort shuttles (which snowbird already uses). Also, with all this talk of new infrastructure we,Äôre ignoring the massive empty buildings and parking lots just down the road at highland and 9400 so. I would like to see better busses without stops inside the resorts (so it doesn,Äôt take a full hour to ride to Alta), limited car traffic during peak hours

for busses, an improved bus depot at highland and 9400 south and way more frequent busses. Every 30 minutes is too far apart. ParkCity and Jackson both do just fine w this setup and they are actually moving more people around that we are to the cottonwoods. Park City,Ãs busses come every 15 minutes and we prefer to park farther away and ride the bus bc of this frequency. I,Ãd love to see the canyon close to car traffic from 8-10 (except employee carpools and residents?) and just let busses run. Then everyone would have an incentive. I would love to give input on this. It,Ãs frustrating to see massive \$ discussed when the existing Business program hasn,Ãt beEn developed into anything workable. I am an avid skier and a lifetime sandy resident. I actually have ridden the bus lots and have lots of input. As a bus rider you can tell the people running the bus system don,Ãt ever ride the ski route. Mara 801 859-391&

I-36: Brendalyn Baer

Comment I-36-1

I would hate to see our canyon area have trains or gondolas going up and down them all day. I feel like those planning these elaborate ways of transportation have forgotten who we are and are trying to be something more than What Utah is and stands for. We don,Ãt need to change who we are and join the upscale of the world. We do need to help the transportation In the canyon area and buses are the way to go. I love this canyon and by adding a train system or gondola will destroy our beautiful mountains, the views and areas to hike.

Comment I-36-2

I would hate to see our canyon area have trains or gondolas going up and down them all day. I feel like those planning these elaborate ways of transportation have forgotten who we are and are trying to be something more than What Utah is and stands for. We don,Ãt need to change who we are and join the upscale of the world. We do need to help the transportation In the canyon area and buses are the way to go. I love this canyon and by adding a train system or gondola will destroy our beautiful mountains, the views and areas to hike.

Comment I-36-3

I would hate to see our canyon area have trains or gondolas going up and down them all day. I feel like those planning these elaborate ways of transportation have forgotten who we are and are trying to be something more than What Utah is and stands for. We don,Ãt need to change who we are and join the upscale of the world. We do need to help the transportation In the canyon area and buses are the way to go. I love this canyon and by adding a train system or gondola will destroy our beautiful mountains, the views and areas to hike.

I-37: Bob Paxton

Comment I-37-1

Thank you for the zoom meeting for MTS last week. It was good to have professionals from various departments and specialties involved. I would like to see Mike Maughn involved, as the GM of our oldest resort and very experienced in his field. Oftentimes I feel that people involved with the decision making do not comprehend many issues due to lack of personal experience as a competent/regular skier and frequent hiker/user of our canyons. I have been to Zermatt, and as nice as the train or a comparable gondola aerial system, a ski event to these areas takes a few days unless one lives in Zermatt.

There is nothing speedy about driving to a bus garage, unloading your gear, boarding a bus, then boarding train or gondola and arriving at the resort. Zermatt is a city revolving around skiing with sufficient hotel space for the visitors. We still market to many 'local' skiers that may only want to ski 2-4 hours, like myself and most of my associates. I still pay the full price for my season pass but I'm finished early so someone else can then take my place.

Most locals, and I suspect visitors want an expeditious transportation to and from the mountain. Most return to their homes or hotels in the valley.

As growth in Utah increases, resort overcrowding becomes a quality and safety issue. Resorts up BCC and LCC are very small compared to park city area and most other well known resorts. Perhaps geographic growth of the resorts would be in order if we need to accommodate substantial visitor growth. That's easier said than done.

Comment I-37-2

Carolyn Gonot proposed 'tolling' cars that go up the canyon. We know there must be some sort of penalty to get people out of their cars. And, she said the tolls could help pay for the other forms of transit - that those in the car don't want to use. I feel we should allow customers to utilize whatever form of transit they want - public transit there's a fee to pay for the service; private transit the owners pay for the upkeep and we pay the TAXES. In fact skiers likely earn a little more \$ than the average resident(unfortunately) so we probably pay a fair share of the taxes. Tolling will hurt the locals and we are still the backbone of our resorts. I believe Ms. Gonot may understand her UTA business but she seemed completely uninformed and uninvolved with the activity side of the canyons, stating she's been up the canyons a couple of times. Minimal expert advice there, sorry.

Comment I-37-3

And, I believe Blake mentioned that people use their cars as storage of their equipment. We do. Why? Because their's minimal storage at the resorts, certainly much much more would be needed. All the public transit, entering a locker room to get dressed for the day, storing bags

and equipment, probably at a fee, etc. sounds like a lot of wasted time when I can drive up the canyon in 25 - 30 minutes and leave the moment I want.

Comment I-37-4

And, we've learned from Covid-19 that public transit will be a good breeding ground for common colds, coughs, or more. Which public transit system would I be in favor of, after cars,?

Comment I-37-5

Both train and gondola are intriguing, much more than a bus. I would go for the train... comfortable and probably more sanitary. However I would only use it if avalanches prevented cars from driving the canyon, or for the beauty of a trip without skiing or hiking. Gondola offers a smaller footprint, trains more fun. Main problem with a train is rapid transit and physically widening the road/footprint up the canyon which would likely result in landslides. Refer to the widening of a much gentler Provo canyon.

Thanks for your effort to bring forth ideas. Problems obviously exist with every alternative. I personally feel the simpler the better, the least impact the better, and the early bird catches the worm. And environmentally, we go up the canyons to escape our smog. Any smog in the canyons comes as over spill from the valleys, minimal from car transit. Bob Paxton.
cautiousbob@gmail.com

Comment I-37-6

Both train and gondola are intriguing, much more than a bus. I would go for the train... comfortable and probably more sanitary. However I would only use it if avalanches prevented cars from driving the canyon, or for the beauty of a trip without skiing or hiking. Gondola offers a smaller footprint, trains more fun. Main problem with a train is rapid transit and physically widening the road/footprint up the canyon which would likely result in landslides. Refer to the widening of a much gentler Provo canyon.
Topic: for rail subtopic: avoid avalanche delays

Thanks for your effort to bring forth ideas. Problems obviously exist with every alternative. I personally feel the simpler the better, the least impact the better, and the early bird catches the worm. And environmentally, we go up the canyons to escape our smog. Any smog in the canyons comes as over spill from the valleys, minimal from car transit. Bob Paxton.
cautiousbob@gmail.com

Comment I-37-7

Both train and gondola are intriguing, much more than a bus. I would go for the train... comfortable and probably more sanitary. However I would only use it if avalanches prevented cars from driving the canyon, or for the beauty of a trip without skiing or hiking. Gondola offers a smaller footprint, trains more fun. Main problem with a train is rapid transit and physically

widening the road/footprint up the canyon which would likely result in landslides. Refer to the widening of a much gentler Provo canyon.

Thanks for your effort to bring forth ideas. Problems obviously exist with every alternative. I personally feel the simpler the better, the least impact the better, and the early bird catches the worm. And environmentally, we go up the canyons to escape our smog. Any smog in the canyons comes as over spill from the valleys, minimal from car transit. Bob Paxton.
cautiousbob@gmail.com

Comment I-37-8

Both train and gondola are intriguing, much more than a bus. I would go for the train... comfortable and probably more sanitary. However I would only use it if avalanches prevented cars from driving the canyon, or for the beauty of a trip without skiing or hiking. Gondola offers a smaller footprint, trains more fun. Main problem with a train is rapid transit and physically widening the road/footprint up the canyon which would likely result in landslides. Refer to the widening of a much gentler Provo canyon.

Thanks for your effort to bring forth ideas. Problems obviously exist with every alternative. I personally feel the simpler the better, the least impact the better, and the early bird catches the worm. And environmentally, we go up the canyons to escape our smog. Any smog in the canyons comes as over spill from the valleys, minimal from car transit. Bob Paxton.
cautiousbob@gmail.com

I-38: Kelli Buttars

Comment I-38-1

As a resident living at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon with my family for the last 35 years, I support preserving the canyon and the quality of life for residents invested in the area. I do not see the widening of the road, the gondola or the train option as solutions to the congestion and problems that occur only a few days during the year.

Comment I-38-2

As a resident living at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon with my family for the last 35 years, I support preserving the canyon and the quality of life for residents invested in the area. I do not see the widening of the road, the gondola or the train option as solutions to the congestion and problems that occur only a few days during the year.

Comment I-38-3

I believe more thought should be given to better solutions but in the interim, more attention should be given to promoting bus use, Increasing bus availability and convenience, and marketing bus use.

Comment I-38-4

I say NO to a gondola that potentially creates more parking problems and changes the look of our canyon.

I say NO to widening the road and suffering through years of construction that supports more cars going up the canyon with nowhere for them to park...and potentially increasing need for unsightly parking structures at the base of the canyon. Problems exist with all the proposals. Instead of creating new problems, let's focus on mitigating the problems we already have with better management of the current problems.

I-39: Trina Sheranian**Comment I-39-1**

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-2

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-3

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-4

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-5

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-6

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-7

I am against the train, road widening and gondola options because of the environmental and water shed impact.

Comment I-39-8

I am certain that everyones needs (safety and accessibility) can be met through increased bus access and tolling during peak hours to encourage car pooling and bus use.

Comment I-39-9

I am certain that everyones needs (safety and accessibility) can be met through increased bus access and tolling during peak hours to encourage car pooling and bus use.

Comment I-39-10

I am certain that everyones needs (safety and accessibility) can be met through increased bus access and tolling during peak hours to encourage car pooling and bus use.

Comment I-39-11

I am certain that everyones needs (safety and accessibility) can be met through increased bus access and tolling during peak hours to encourage car pooling and bus use.

Comment I-39-12

I am certain that everyones needs (safety and accessibility) can be met through increased bus access and tolling during peak hours to encourage car pooling and bus use.

Comment I-39-13

I am certain that everyones needs (safety and accessibility) can be met through increased bus access and tolling during peak hours to encourage car pooling and bus use.

Comment I-39-14

Why spend millions of tax payers dollars when there is a really simple fix! In addition, I have researched snow-sheds extensively. It sounds like they often fail or become compromised, which shuts down a road for weeks vs the hours it takes to clear an avalanche. Thank you, Trina

I-40: Jill Gorringer**Comment I-40-1**

Please do not add a train, or gondola up our canyon.

Comment I-40-2

Please do not add a train, or gondola up our canyon.

Comment I-40-3

If you must do something just add additional buses.

Comment I-40-4

You are throwing millions of dollars toward something that isn't an issue. The project will create the problem not solve one.

I-41: Jessica Davies**Comment I-41-1**

I am writing to ask you to please, leave Little Cottonwood largely untouched. I love the idea of buses only, or adding one lane at the most. People go up the canyon because they want to escape city life, and trains, gondolas, etc. will take away from the valuable therapeutic affect the canyon has. Making the canyon more city-like will reduce the 'escape' feel and just make the canyon feel like an expansion of the city. Please don't line developers pockets in the name of 'progress' while taking away and destroying this beautiful natural resource for our children and future generations. Thank you, Jessica Davies

I-42: Emily Smith**Comment I-42-1**

extra busses only. All the other options affect our mountain and trees and watershed too much.

Comment I-42-2

extra busses only. All the other options affect our mountain and trees and watershed too much.

Comment I-42-3

No widening the road.

Comment I-42-4

No train.

Comment I-42-5

No gondola.

I-43: Kelli

Comment I-43-1

NO RAIL UP LCC!

Comment I-43-2

NO ROAD WIDENING!

Comment I-43-3

NO GONDOLA! LEAVE OUR BEAUTIFUL CANYON AS IT IS!

I-44: Jessica Smith

Comment I-44-1

I oppose the train, the extra lanes and the gondola.

Comment I-44-2

I oppose the train, the extra lanes and the gondola.

Comment I-44-3

I oppose the train, the extra lanes and the gondola.

Comment I-44-4

Just add more bus routes.

Comment I-44-5

Your not thinking of the residents or the impact you will be making on other recreational activities you would be diminishing to make this happen. Stop being greedy and start listening to those whose homes and backyards this would affect.

I-45: Kirk Nichols

Comment I-45-1

Thank-you all, Blake, Lindsey, Ralph, Kaye, Quinn for creating and working on the regional Central Wasatch Transportation Plan! This is how the transportation issue should have been dealt with from the beginning - not just a disconnected, isolated, narrow U-DOT Little Cottonwood EIS. A Programmatic EIS would have saved time in the long run. Thanks for doing planning at the functional level. From a note received from the U-DOT Little Cottonwood EIS folks yesterday, I'd say that they are listening a little bit since the train option is mentioned (not say that a train is the final answer, just that they listened, probably to the CWC on including it for study). Kirk p.s. I bumped into Laura Briefer this morning on a run in City Creek, which made me very happy as I had questions on the proposed constitutional amendment about water distribution out of the Wasatch Canyons. Is the CWC also tracking this amendment and accompanying bill? thanks again!

I-46: Mara Adams

Comment I-46-1

I understand that this is the place to comment for canyon transportation. I would like to see improved bus sing instead of simply a lift or even a train. If the bussing was more frequent and had better stops (along the road instead of inside the resort centers) bussing would be quick and easy. Also, it seems crazy that we couldn,Äôt just allow busses only for the 8-10 am hours just to avoid the madness on canyons. Then people would the biggest incentive ever to ride the bus-first up and in the powder! It seems we,Äôre jumping ahead to flashier, more expensive options before even considering what Park City and Jackson hike have already figure out. Frequent busses are the best way to manage skier traffic.

I-47: David Egli

Comment I-47-1

I suggest that a Fronrunner line be constructed running from Tooele through the SLC International Airport along the I-80 corridor through Park City to Heber, tunneled where necessary to avoid transportation interruptions by avalanches. An aerial tram could then transport visitors across the canyons to the other resorts. This would allow travelers to avoid transferring baggage repeatedly through so many modes of transportation and allow much more rapid arrival.

Comment I-47-2

I suggest that a Frontrunner line be constructed running from Tooele through the SLC International Airport along the I-80 corridor through Park City to Heber, tunneled where necessary to avoid transportation interruptions by avalanches. An aerial tram could then transport visitors across the canyons to the other resorts. This would allow travelers to avoid transferring baggage repeatedly through so many modes of transportation and allow much more rapid arrival.

Comment I-47-3

I suggest that a Frontrunner line be constructed running from Tooele through the SLC International Airport along the I-80 corridor through Park City to Heber, tunneled where necessary to avoid transportation interruptions by avalanches. An aerial tram could then transport visitors across the canyons to the other resorts. This would allow travelers to avoid transferring baggage repeatedly through so many modes of transportation and allow much more rapid arrival.

Comment I-47-4

I suggest that a Frontrunner line be constructed running from Tooele through the SLC International Airport along the I-80 corridor through Park City to Heber, tunneled where necessary to avoid transportation interruptions by avalanches. An aerial tram could then transport visitors across the canyons to the other resorts. This would allow travelers to avoid transferring baggage repeatedly through so many modes of transportation and allow much more rapid arrival.

I-48: Mark Russell**Comment I-48-1**

The best long term solution to address the goals of this project would be developing a rail system that would access LCC and in the future could connect to BCC as well as down into the Salt Lake Valley.

Comment I-48-2

The best long term solution to address the goals of this project would be developing a rail system that would access LCC and in the future could connect to BCC as well as down into the Salt Lake Valley.

Comment I-48-3

In conjunction with this rail system there would likely need to be avalanche sheds for the system to pass through to ensure it could continue running in most circumstances.

Comment I-48-4

It would help get cars off the road, while still allowing for access to many different areas for the diverse user group that utilizes these canyons.

In the short term, while the rail system is being designed and constructed, enhanced bussing will be necessary. Ideally bussing will be implemented in concert with the rail plan so that once the rail system is complete you could even stop allowing cars up the canyon and limit access to just bus and rail.

Comment I-48-5

I do not support a gondola in any of the possible locations. Firstly a gondola would have very finite access points and would mainly benefit people going to ski resorts. Other user groups would continue to drive because the gondola doesn't get them to various trailheads or where they are going.

Secondly Gondolas will be much more subject to weather conditions and make the possibility of stranding people on the wrong side without transportation much more likely than other options. Thirdly the problem with a gondola (especially one that would connect PC to the Cottonwoods) is that unless it is running 24/7, it creates the situation where people miss the last cabin, and are stranded without transportation. These people inevitably utilize transit apps or call friends to come and get them negating some of the benefit that the gondola provided in traffic reduction. Finally a gondola connecting PC and the cottonwoods would do little to actually allow people from PC to go ski in the cottonwoods due to time constraints. By the time someone finds parking in Park City, gets their gear, waits in line, (assuming the gondola is from town rather than having to ski to it which adds even more time) and takes the gondola over, they would have time for a few runs before they would need to make their way back to the gondola to get there before it closed so they could return home. Due to this many people coming from PC would still end up driving to the cottonwoods. If there is a strong desire connect PC to BCC ideally it could be part of the rail system, otherwise Gaurdsman Pass road could be expanded and maintained year round.

Comment I-48-6

I do not support a gondola in any of the possible locations. Firstly a gondola would have very finite access points and would mainly benefit people going to ski resorts. Other user groups would continue to drive because the gondola doesn't get them to various trailheads or where they are going.

Secondly Gondolas will be much more subject to weather conditions and make the possibility of stranding people on the wrong side without transportation much more likely than other options. Thirdly the problem with a gondola (especially one that would connect PC to the Cottonwoods) is that unless it is running 24/7, it creates the situation where people miss the last cabin, and are stranded without transportation. These people inevitably utilize transit apps or call friends to come and get them negating some of the benefit that the gondola provided in traffic reduction. Finally a gondola connecting PC and the cottonwoods would do little to actually allow people from PC to go ski in the cottonwoods due to time constraints. By the time someone finds parking in Park City, gets their gear, waits in line, (assuming the gondola is from

town rather than having to ski to it which adds even more time) and takes the gondola over, they would have time for a few runs before they would need to make their way back to the gondola to get there before it closed so they could return home. Due to this many people coming from PC would still end up driving to the cottonwoods. If there is a strong desire connect PC to BCC ideally it could be part of the rail system, otherwise Gaurdsman Pass road could be expanded and maintained year round.

Comment I-48-7

I do not support a gondola in any of the possible locations. Firstly a gondola would have very finite access points and would mainly benefit people going to ski resorts. Other user groups would continue to drive because the gondola doesn't get them to various trailheads or where they are going.

Secondly Gondolas will be much more subject to weather conditions and make the possibility of stranding people on the wrong side without transportation much more likely than other options. Thirdly the problem with a gondola (especially one that would connect PC to the Cottonwoods) is that unless it is running 24/7, it creates the situation where people miss the last cabin, and are stranded without transportation. These people inevitably utilize transit apps or call friends to come and get them negating some of the benefit that the gondola provided in traffic reduction. Finally a gondola connecting PC and the cottonwoods would do little to actually allow people from PC to go ski in the cottonwoods due to time constraints. By the time someone finds parking in Park City, gets their gear, waits in line, (assuming the gondola is from town rather than having to ski to it which adds even more time) and takes the gondola over, they would have time for a few runs before they would need to make their way back to the gondola to get there before it closed so they could return home. Due to this many people coming from PC would still end up driving to the cottonwoods. If there is a strong desire connect PC to BCC ideally it could be part of the rail system, otherwise Gaurdsman Pass road could be expanded and maintained year round.

In Summary, sorry for rambling a bit there, I whole heartedly advocate for a robust rail system to access LCC and later BCC and more of Salt Lake, while that system is being developed we will need to implement enhanced bussing services. I am against any sort of gondola especially a connection of PC to BCC.

Thank you for your time spent on all of this.

I-49: Elliott Parkin

Comment I-49-1

The MTS alternative plans draft is still flawed with too much additional development and the sub alternatives are irrational for the Central Wasatch region's future. MTS Alternative 1 would have been an ideal solution, but there are many faults that need to be addressed.

First, the Millcreek plan points out that there will be unnecessary expansion of parking and other facilities that could affect the ecosystem and recreation.

Comment I-49-2

Also, there are mentions of unneeded adding or creating extensions of lanes for SR 224 and 248.

Comment I-49-3

Additionally, the Enhanced Seasonal Express Buses (EIS Alternative) has even more unnecessary development from implementing more snow sheds and a roadway shoulder expansion for SR210 from N. Little Cottonwood Canyon Rd. to Alta Bypass Rd.

Lastly, the EIS alternatives are very unsustainable and costly for Utah's potential regional economy by supporting solutions, like gondolas, cog rails, snow sheds, and many of these developments benefit only the ski industry.

If CWC truly wants to establish a regional economy, access for eco-tourism, lessen traffic congestion, decrease the impact of environmental destruction then the MTS Alternative 1 solution needs to be improved. The improvements of this solution needs to focus on lessening the construction of unneeded infrastructures, parking, lane extensions, and snow sheds. It requires more input and planning from environmental/conservation and local organizations.

I-50: David Hall

Comment I-50-1

I think improved bus lines and increased frequency along with dynamic tolling and paid parking at the resorts would greatly improve the congestion problems.

Comment I-50-2

There needs to be more space for gear on the buses though. I don't think the buses can be at full capacity when everyone has so much gear they take up the mountain with them, maybe add gear storage under the busses or have a dedicated area on the bus for gear.

I-51: Emily Smith

Comment I-51-1

No train, No extra lanes, No gondola. Please explore Save Our Canyons and the Boring Company, etc proposals.

Comment I-51-2

No train, No extra lanes, No gondola. Please explore Save Our Canyons and the Boring Company,Ãs proposals.

Comment I-51-3

No train, No extra lanes, No gondola. Please explore Save Our Canyons and the Boring Company,Ãs proposals.

Comment I-51-4

No train, No extra lanes, No gondola. Please explore Save Our Canyons and the Boring Company,Ãs proposals.

Comment I-51-5

No train, No extra lanes, No gondola. Please explore Save Our Canyons and the Boring Company,Ãs proposals.

I-52: Dana Holmes**Comment I-52-1**

MTS Draft Alternative 1: The enhanced bus options with the inclusion of the Gravel Pit transfer center would be a great option to serve immediate needs. The use of existing routes and improved bus services - would only be successful with the addition of parking or transit transfer areas. As it stands now, the park and ride areas are always full. This leads to more folks being forced to drive up the canyon. A transit transfer center (with additional parking) would encourage more people would use the buses to access canyons.

Comment I-52-2

MTS Draft Alternative 1: The enhanced bus options with the inclusion of the Gravel Pit transfer center would be a great option to serve immediate needs. The use of existing routes and improved bus services - would only be successful with the addition of parking or transit transfer areas. As it stands now, the park and ride areas are always full. This leads to more folks being forced to drive up the canyon. A transit transfer center (with additional parking) would encourage more people would use the buses to access canyons.

Comment I-52-3

Paid parking at the resorts would also be a necessary addition to incentivize folks to use transit.

Comment I-52-4

In addition, Sub alternative B (Aerial Cottonwood Canyons) would be a good addition as ridership and funding is available in the future.

I-53: Laurie O'Connor**Comment I-53-1**

Alternative 1 is the only Alternative that makes sense, and the snow sheds need to be removed from that Alternative. There does not need to be any more construction in either Big or Little Cottonwood Canyons.

Comment I-53-2

No road widening, no snow sheds,

Comment I-53-3

no gondola,

Comment I-53-4

no tunnels,

Comment I-53-5

no trains.

Comment I-53-6

The strain on the WATERSHED is already too great. Get cars off the road by greatly increasing bus service. A gondola is simply a new pinch point--everyone arrives at the gondola station, and has to wait for the gondola to return to take them up the mountain. Huge bottleneck.

Comment I-53-7

The strain on the WATERSHED is already too great. Get cars off the road by greatly increasing bus service. A gondola is simply a new pinch point--everyone arrives at the gondola station, and has to wait for the gondola to return to take them up the mountain. Huge bottleneck.

Comment I-53-8

Increased bus service, and I mean greatly increased bus service during peak times. There should be 4, 5, 6, or more buses headed up the Canyons at the same time during the early morning peak hours. I don't use the bus currently because the early morning bus is jammed to the gills. I can't stand for the whole trip up the Canyon, and so I don't take the bus, and I drive instead. If

you have multiple busses headed up at the same time (or within 5 minutes of each other), I would use the bus, and so would other people. Vehicle use has to be disincentivized.

I-54: Kelli Anderson

Comment I-54-1

NO TRAINS!

Comment I-54-2

NO GONDOLA!

Comment I-54-3

NO ROAD WIDENING!

Comment I-54-4

IMPLEMENT MORE BUSES!

I-55: George McPhetres

Comment I-55-1

My wife and myself live in SLC during the winter and ski at Alta & Snowbird. Often take the ski bus. The proposed 5 min bus interval is not reasonable. Loading on the bus takes several minutes. Stoplights and traffic along the route would further scramble this schedule! Can't help but speculate -- how many on this commission have actually ridden on the bus

I-56: Mary Walton

Comment I-56-1

I think possibly the best solution for Big Cottonwood Canyon is availability of bus transportation- every 15 minutes. That would necessitate good research to see when it is needed; a good parking lot where the gravel pit is, is a good idea.

Comment I-56-2

Toles may work.

Comment I-56-3

As I own my cabin, I would like a pass for myself and my family. I appreciate the work and research that is going into making good decisions. I have never in my long life seen the number of cars in BCC as I have this year. Mary Walton

I-57: Chantal Papillon**Comment I-57-1**

I disagree with the proposed Mountain Transportation System plan because the footprint on Canyons environment will, at the best, remain negative and at the worse increase AND the alternatives proposed, as far as I'm concerned, will not solve the traffic congestion.

The proposed alternatives are thought with a –´ car centric –ª mind. But, in 2020, with the Knowledges that we have now regarding the CO2 emissions and the negative impacts of using cars, we should imagine and create alternatives that reduce or even remove the use of personal car.

The protection of wildness has also to be taken in consideration. Any construction of infrastructure (gondola, roads, snow shed, ...) will have an impact on flora and fauna and will destroy the landscape for ever.

I think that the objective here has to reduce number of cars going up the canyons. To do so, I think a year-round bus/shuttle (Run by renewable energy system) system with strategic drop off points along the canyons would be the best solution. To encourage people to use this system, tolling must be charge for individual cars and fee parking (especially at ski resorts) has to be put in place. To support this plan, transportation from SLC to Cottonwood Heights that is now almost inexistent (along the wasatch corridor) has to be implement. The other transit from main cities in the Salt Lake Valley as to be improved as well.

I hope that at the time of final decision you will think about how you can be part of a real change, a change to protect our precious environment, to protect the beauty of the mountains to allow residents, visitors and next generations to enjoy for a long time.

Comment I-57-2

I disagree with the proposed Mountain Transportation System plan because the footprint on Canyons environment will, at the best, remain negative and at the worse increase AND the alternatives proposed, as far as I'm concerned, will not solve the traffic congestion.

The proposed alternatives are thought with a –‘ car centric –^a mind. But, in 2020, with the Knowledges that we have now regarding the CO2 emissions and the negative impacts of using cars, we should imagine and create alternatives that reduce or even remove the use of personal car.

The protection of wildness has also to be taken in consideration. Any construction of infrastructure (gondola, roads, snow shed, ...) will have an impact on flora and fauna and will destroy the landscape for ever.

I think that the objective here has to reduce number of cars going up the canyons. To do so, I think a year-round bus/shuttle (Run by renewable energy system) system with strategic drop off points along the canyons would be the best solution. To encourage people to use this system, tolling must be charge for individual cars and fee parking (especially at ski resorts) has to be put in place. To support this plan, transportation from SLC to Cottonwood Heights that is now almost inexistent (along the wasatch corridor) has to be implement. The other transit from main cities in the Salt Lake Valley as to be improved as well.

Comment I-57-3

I disagree with the proposed Mountain Transportation System plan because the footprint on Canyons environment will, at the best, remain negative and at the worse increase AND the alternatives proposed, as far as I'm concerned, will not solve the traffic congestion.

The proposed alternatives are thought with a –‘ car centric –^a mind. But, in 2020, with the Knowledges that we have now regarding the CO2 emissions and the negative impacts of using cars, we should imagine and create alternatives that reduce or even remove the use of personal car.

The protection of wildness has also to be taken in consideration. Any construction of infrastructure (gondola, roads, snow shed, ...) will have an impact on flora and fauna and will destroy the landscape for ever.

I think that the objective here has to reduce number of cars going up the canyons. To do so, I think a year-round bus/shuttle (Run by renewable energy system) system with strategic drop off points along the canyons would be the best solution. To encourage people to use this system, tolling must be charge for individual cars and fee parking (especially at ski resorts) has to be put in place. To support this plan, transportation from SLC to Cottonwood Heights that is now almost inexistent (along the wasatch corridor) has to be implement. The other transit from main cities in the Salt Lake Valley as to be improved as well.

Comment I-57-4

I disagree with the proposed Mountain Transportation System plan because the footprint on Canyons environment will, at the best, remain negative and at the worse increase AND the alternatives proposed, as far as I'm concerned, will not solve the traffic congestion.

The proposed alternatives are thought with a –' car centric –^a mind. But, in 2020, with the Knowledges that we have now regarding the CO2 emissions and the negative impacts of using cars, we should imagine and create alternatives that reduce or even remove the use of personal car.

The protection of wildness has also to be taken in consideration. Any construction of infrastructure (gondola, roads, snow shed, ...) will have an impact on flora and fauna and will destroy the landscape for ever.

I think that the objective here has to reduce number of cars going up the canyons. To do so, I think a year-round bus/shuttle (Run by renewable energy system) system with strategic drop off points along the canyons would be the best solution. To encourage people to use this system, tolling must be charge for individual cars and fee parking (especially at ski resorts) has to be put in place. To support this plan, transportation from SLC to Cottonwood Heights that is now almost inexistent (along the wasatch corridor) has to be implement. The other transit from main cities in the Salt Lake Valley as to be improved as well.

Comment I-57-5

I hope that at the time of final decision you will think about how you can be part of a real change, a change to protect our precious environment, to protect the beauty of the mountains to allow residents, visitors and next generations to enjoy for a long time.

I-58: Robert Schnitzler**Comment I-58-1**

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. After reviewing the three draft alternatives, it appears MTS Draft Alternative 1 makes the most sense from an economic standpoint and is similar to the other two with respect to your Objectives and Attributes. Before any of the Sub Alternatives are considered, it would make sense to evaluate if dedicated bus service between the resorts may be a viable and cost effective option.

Comment I-58-2

I don't recall what fuel type the buses currently use, but as buses reach their replacement life cycle every effort should be made to replace them with renewable energy sources.

Comment I-58-3

To address the fact that tolling would create a disproportionate burden on low income canyon users (mostly resort employees) it might make sense to have the resorts themselves purchase passes at a discount for the employee or passes for employees should be free.

These are just a few things that came to my mind. I completely understand the significant challenges faced to improve transportation and appreciate your efforts.

I-59: David Hotchkiss**Comment I-59-1**

As a year round resident of Park City, I would thoroughly embrace improvements to our public transit network. A few of the ideas presented would personally affect myself as well as my friends and family:

1] The proposed aerial connections from Park City to Big Cottonwood as well as Big Cottonwood to Little Cottonwood would heighten the region as a world class destination while reducing recreational vehicle use. Just yesterday I drove to BCC to hike for the day and saw first hand the overwhelming growth of recreational car use on the route. I would love to better utilize the BCC/LCC recreational areas but the impact of driving is visible in the haze over SLC.

Comment I-59-2

As a year round resident of Park City, I would thoroughly embrace improvements to our public transit network. A few of the ideas presented would personally affect myself as well as my friends and family:

1] The proposed aerial connections from Park City to Big Cottonwood as well as Big Cottonwood to Little Cottonwood would heighten the region as a world class destination while reducing recreational vehicle use. Just yesterday I drove to BCC to hike for the day and saw first hand the overwhelming growth of recreational car use on the route. I would love to better utilize the BCC/LCC recreational areas but the impact of driving is visible in the haze over SLC.

Comment I-59-3

2] Improving the PC Connect bus with an extension to the airport is something I have long desired. The current need to make a connection in Salt Lake makes this process too long and unreliable and therefore I continue to drive and park at the airport. Additionally, when visitors come to town they frequently rent a car even though it only goes from the airport to PC and return. This is an inefficient use of resources that would be better served by a bus route.

I-60: Evan Jackson**Comment I-60-1**

As a local resident and public transportation user, I strongly prefer MTS draft alternative 1 (comprehensive/enhanced bussing)

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

Comment I-60-2

As a local resident and public transportation user, I strongly prefer MTS draft alternative 1 (comprehensive/enhanced bussing)

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

Comment I-60-3

As a local resident and public transportation user, I strongly prefer MTS draft alternative 1 (comprehensive/enhanced bussing)

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

Comment I-60-4

As a local resident and public transportation user, I strongly prefer MTS draft alternative 1 (comprehensive/enhanced bussing)

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

Comment I-60-5

Additionally, an unexpected system failure or repair with enhanced bussing will have far less impact than the other alternatives. For example, if the gondola system is rendered inoperable (due to weather or mechanical issues) the entire system is useless and transportation will revert back to square one with long delays and heavy traffic. If a bus fails the rest of the system continues to operate, and another bus can always be rerouted if need be.

Comment I-60-6

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

Comment I-60-7

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

Comment I-60-8

This system is adaptable; i.e. bus frequency can be adjusted according to season and the number of users. The gondola and rail system lack scalability.

I-61: James Thompson

Comment I-61-1

Of the 3 main alternatives, only one has my limited support--which is the one exclusively expanding bus services into the canyons, especially Little Cottonwood, WITHOUT light rail or gondola). However, I'm not supportive of any expanded trailhead parking, since supposedly the goal of all of the alternatives are to reduce the amount of private vehicular traffic in the canyons--so enabling more parking is not a viable answer. Additionally, I don't think the public

taxpayer should have to spend thousands of dollars on the construction and maintenance of snowsheds to supposedly protect the highway during the rare times that an avalanche may block the road. People just have to accept that occasionally that might happen, and may have to live with the canyon being closed for a short while.

Comment I-61-2

Of the 3 main alternatives, only one has my limited support--which is the one exclusively expanding bus services into the canyons, especially Little Cottonwood, WITHOUT light rail or gondola). However, I'm not supportive of any expanded trailhead parking, since supposedly the goal of all of the alternatives are to reduce the amount of private vehicular traffic in the canyons--so enabling more parking is not a viable answer. Additionally, I don't think the public taxpayer should have to spend thousands of dollars on the construction and maintenance of snowsheds to supposedly protect the highway during the rare times that an avalanche may block the road. People just have to accept that occasionally that might happen, and may have to live with the canyon being closed for a short while.

Comment I-61-3

Of the 3 main alternatives, only one has my limited support--which is the one exclusively expanding bus services into the canyons, especially Little Cottonwood, WITHOUT light rail or gondola). However, I'm not supportive of any expanded trailhead parking, since supposedly the goal of all of the alternatives are to reduce the amount of private vehicular traffic in the canyons--so enabling more parking is not a viable answer. Additionally, I don't think the public taxpayer should have to spend thousands of dollars on the construction and maintenance of snowsheds to supposedly protect the highway during the rare times that an avalanche may block the road. People just have to accept that occasionally that might happen, and may have to live with the canyon being closed for a short while.

Comment I-61-4

Of the 3 main alternatives, only one has my limited support--which is the one exclusively expanding bus services into the canyons, especially Little Cottonwood, WITHOUT light rail or gondola). However, I'm not supportive of any expanded trailhead parking, since supposedly the goal of all of the alternatives are to reduce the amount of private vehicular traffic in the canyons--so enabling more parking is not a viable answer. Additionally, I don't think the public taxpayer should have to spend thousands of dollars on the construction and maintenance of snowsheds to supposedly protect the highway during the rare times that an avalanche may block the road. People just have to accept that occasionally that might happen, and may have to live with the canyon being closed for a short while.

Comment I-61-5

Of the 3 main alternatives, only one has my limited support--which is the one exclusively expanding bus services into the canyons, especially Little Cottonwood, WITHOUT light rail or gondola). However, I'm not supportive of any expanded trailhead parking, since supposedly the

goal of all of the alternatives are to reduce the amount of private vehicular traffic in the canyons--so enabling more parking is not a viable answer. Additionally, I don't think the public taxpayer should have to spend thousands of dollars on the construction and maintenance of snowsheds to supposedly protect the highway during the rare times that an avalanche may block the road. People just have to accept that occasionally that might happen, and may have to live with the canyon being closed for a short while.

Comment I-61-6

And speaking of bus service, it should run year-round with some routes designated as express to the ski resorts, while others could stop at existing trailheads.

Comment I-61-7

And speaking of bus service, it should run year-round with some routes designated as express to the ski resorts, while others could stop at existing trailheads.

Comment I-61-8

Finally, I strongly believe that existing road widths should suffice as well--with perhaps some additional guard rails and some added restrooms at popular trailheads. The bottom line is to preserve the fragile landscape as much as possible and to improve access without huge surface disturbing construction, which surely would be necessary to build a light rail line, gondola towers, and snowsheds.

Comment I-61-9

Finally, I strongly believe that existing road widths should suffice as well--with perhaps some additional guard rails and some added restrooms at popular trailheads. The bottom line is to preserve the fragile landscape as much as possible and to improve access without huge surface disturbing construction, which surely would be necessary to build a light rail line, gondola towers, and snowsheds.

Comment I-61-10

Finally, I strongly believe that existing road widths should suffice as well--with perhaps some additional guard rails and some added restrooms at popular trailheads. The bottom line is to preserve the fragile landscape as much as possible and to improve access without huge surface disturbing construction, which surely would be necessary to build a light rail line, gondola towers, and snowsheds.

Comment I-61-11

Finally, I strongly believe that existing road widths should suffice as well--with perhaps some additional guard rails and some added restrooms at popular trailheads. The bottom line is to

preserve the fragile landscape as much as possible and to improve access without huge surface disturbing construction, which surely would be necessary to build a light rail line, gondola towers, and snowsheds.

I-62: Michael Braun

Comment I-62-1

I support MTS Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus) Features. New busses should be electric or NG vehicles.

Comment I-62-2

I oppose a rail cog

Comment I-62-3

or aerial tram system.

Comment I-62-4

I do support some form of tunnel between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Alternative 1 can be added upon in future years as required (Sub-Alternative A).

Comment I-62-5

and/or winter road plowing of Guardsman Pass for emergency egress.

Comment I-62-6

Timing between busses must be decreased to 5 minutes or so during peak ski snow days and on weekends.

I-63: Ron Clegg

Comment I-63-1

2. It seems like one way to prioritize alternatives is based upon a benefit/cost ratio prioritization. Prioritizing which alternatives provide the most "bang for the buck".

Comment I-63-2

Thanks for your efforts to address mountain transportation issues along the westach front and back. I worked on the Mountain Accord project a few years ago so I am somewhat familiar with the issues being addressed.

My comments are as follows:

1. I live in Utah County. How do the alternatives being considered address users who do not live in the Salt Lake Valley?

Topic: Users outside SL Valley

Comment I-63-3

3. How do the various alternatives affect the local street network? I know that at certain times of the year, local streets can be a mess because of canyon access.

Comment I-63-4

4. How much use can our canyons really handle? Maybe we should restrict the number of people who visit the canyons so we don't destroy the very thing we all love about the canyons. As someone has said "maybe we are loving our canyons to death".

Comment I-63-5

5. I did not really understand the tiers, objectives, and attributes. I thought it was confusing.

6. Have all of these alternatives been modeled on the regional travel demand model?

7. I had to smile when I saw the very long list of studies that have been done for these canyons over the years. At some point, you just need to move forward with implementing the alternatives. One source of funding would be to use the money being spent on studies:)

8. You are never going to make everyone happy. You will just have to make the best informed, educated decision you can and move forward.

I-64: TREVOR FINSTAD

Comment I-64-1

For the love of god put snowsheds in LCC

I-65: Julie Hygon**Comment I-65-1**

I think we need to increase the amount and ease of public transportation, if we look to other areas such as Aspen Steamboat and Summit County Colorado there are several places where you pay dearly for the use of your car and have access to free transportation. I have tried to use the SLC-PC connect and it has a very limited schedule. Additionally the other concern I have is that when we do increase our public transportation and are using it, will it stop at trail heads? or is this just going to be so people access ski resorts?

I-66: Karen McCoy**Comment I-66-1**

You cannot have your cake and eat it too. If you put mass transit in aka trains, gondola's, etc you will ELIMINATE wilderness, viewshed and wildlife.

Comment I-66-2

You cannot have your cake and eat it too. If you put mass transit in aka trains, gondola's, etc you will ELIMINATE wilderness, viewshed and wildlife.

Comment I-66-3

You cannot have your cake and eat it too. If you put mass transit in aka trains, gondola's, etc you will ELIMINATE wilderness, viewshed and wildlife.

Comment I-66-4

You cannot have your cake and eat it too. If you put mass transit in aka trains, gondola's, etc you will ELIMINATE wilderness, viewshed and wildlife.

Comment I-66-5

I still wonder why our tax dollars are paying for transportation to resorts. Boy, it sure would be nice if the State of Utah paid expenses for my customers to shoe them in the door.

I'm sure the resorts are all about money but if they had a clue they should look at their entire experience. Why would you want so many people on the hill at the same time. To me it is a safety issue and the experience. I guess quantity is more important than quality. More houses, more people, more money....greed surrounds us.

If you really want to protect watershed - which is important to the entire valley not just the elite that can afford to ski, limit the number of folks to our canyons. Have more busses available. Quit catering to the resorts.

Comment I-66-6

I still wonder why our tax dollars are paying for transportation to resorts. Boy, it sure would be nice if the State of Utah paid expenses for my customers to shoe them in the door.

I'm sure the resorts are all about money but if they had a clue they should look at their entire experience. Why would you want so many people on the hill at the same time. To me it is a safety issue and the experience. I guess quantity is more important than quality. More houses, more people, more money....greed surrounds us.

If you really want to protect watershed - which is important to the entire valley not just the elite that can afford to ski, limit the number of folks to our canyons. Have more busses available. Quit catering to the resorts.

I-67: Jan Striefel

Comment I-67-1

I have reviewed the alternatives and believe that Alternative #1 is the least impacting to the watershed and the canyon environment, the most reasonable in terms of its adaptability to changes that are inevitable, and the least costly to implement with the same positive results.

Comment I-67-2

I have reviewed the alternatives and believe that Alternative #1 is the least impacting to the watershed and the canyon environment, the most reasonable in terms of its adaptability to changes that are inevitable, and the least costly to implement with the same positive results.

Comment I-67-3

I have reviewed the alternatives and believe that Alternative #1 is the least impacting to the watershed and the canyon environment, the most reasonable in terms of its adaptability to changes that are inevitable, and the least costly to implement with the same positive results.

Comment I-67-4

I have reviewed the alternatives and believe that Alternative #1 is the least impacting to the watershed and the canyon environment, the most reasonable in terms of its adaptability to changes that are inevitable, and the least costly to implement with the same positive results.

Comment I-67-5

The aerial and rail options are the least flexible and the most damaging of options, while the bus option provides for a broad spectrum of actions and methods to address traffic and congestion while leaving room for modifications as time presents new information and recreation behavior. Tunnels, trams, etc. between canyons are also too costly in terms of funds, environmental damage, and unknown consequences. I firmly oppose any aerial or rail option.

Comment I-67-6

The aerial and rail options are the least flexible and the most damaging of options, while the bus option provides for a broad spectrum of actions and methods to address traffic and congestion while leaving room for modifications as time presents new information and recreation behavior. Tunnels, trams, etc. between canyons are also too costly in terms of funds, environmental damage, and unknown consequences. I firmly oppose any aerial or rail option.

Comment I-67-7

The aerial and rail options are the least flexible and the most damaging of options, while the bus option provides for a broad spectrum of actions and methods to address traffic and congestion while leaving room for modifications as time presents new information and recreation behavior. Tunnels, trams, etc. between canyons are also too costly in terms of funds, environmental damage, and unknown consequences. I firmly oppose any aerial or rail option.

Comment I-67-8

The aerial and rail options are the least flexible and the most damaging of options, while the bus option provides for a broad spectrum of actions and methods to address traffic and congestion while leaving room for modifications as time presents new information and recreation behavior. Tunnels, trams, etc. between canyons are also too costly in terms of funds, environmental damage, and unknown consequences. I firmly oppose any aerial or rail option.

Comment I-67-9

The aerial and rail options are the least flexible and the most damaging of options, while the bus option provides for a broad spectrum of actions and methods to address traffic and congestion while leaving room for modifications as time presents new information and recreation behavior. Tunnels, trams, etc. between canyons are also too costly in terms of funds, environmental damage, and unknown consequences. I firmly oppose any aerial or rail option.

Comment I-67-10

The aerial and rail options are the least flexible and the most damaging of options, while the bus option provides for a broad spectrum of actions and methods to address traffic and congestion while leaving room for modifications as time presents new information and

recreation behavior. Tunnels, trams, etc. between canyons are also too costly in terms of funds, environmental damage, and unknown consequences. I firmly oppose any aerial or rail option.

I-68: Colin Gregersen

Comment I-68-1

Thank you for taking comments.

1. I do not support any transportation solution UNTIL a requirement for a carrying capacity study is added to it. The Central Wasatch, logically, cannot sustain the volumes of people many of these proposals would accommodate.

Comment I-68-2

2. I do not support a train.

Comment I-68-3

3. I do not support a gondola.

Comment I-68-4

4. I do not support interconnect between canyons and/or park city.

Comment I-68-5

5. I support improved bus use ONLY with a corresponding DECREASE in private automobiles.

Comment I-68-6

6. I support snow sheds.

Comment I-68-7

7. I support increasing trailhead parking, particularly at White/Red Pine. These drainages have more carrying capacity than the parking lot allows for.

Comment I-68-8

8. None of the proposals provide enough detail to make informed decisions.

9. Improving transportation will not improve congestion. See #1 above. If CWC supports moving 5,000 people per hour by gondola, combined with 2,500-5,000 people per hour on the road, then the congestion will be shifted to the ski areas. While the profits for the ski areas may likely be improved, the user experience (in the form of hours' long lift lines) will be significantly degraded.

Comment I-68-9

10. See #9 above and consider the impacts to our watershed.

I-69: Austin Bourret

Comment I-69-1

1. I do not support any transportation solution UNTIL a requirement for a carrying capacity study is added to it. The Central Wasatch, logically, cannot sustain the volumes of people many of these proposals would accommodate.

Comment I-69-2

2. I do not support a train.

Comment I-69-3

3. I do not support a gondola.

Comment I-69-4

4. I do not support interconnect between canyons and/or park city.

Comment I-69-5

5. I support improved bus use ONLY with a corresponding DECREASE in private automobiles.

Comment I-69-6

6. I support snow sheds.

Comment I-69-7

7. I support increasing trailhead parking, particularly at White/Red Pine. These drainages have more carrying capacity than the parking lot allows for.

Comment I-69-8

8. None of the proposals provide enough detail to make informed decisions.

9. Improving transportation will not improve congestion. See #1 above. If CWC supports moving 5,000 people per hour by gondola, combined with 2,500-5,000 people per hour on the road, then the congestion will be shifted to the ski areas. While the profits for the ski areas may likely be improved, the user experience (in the form of hours' long lift lines) will be significantly degraded.

Comment I-69-9

10. See #9 above and consider the impacts to our watershed.

I-70: Victoria Richards

Comment I-70-1

Thank you for taking comments!

1. I do not support any transportation solution UNTIL a requirement for a carrying capacity study is added to it. The Central Wasatch, logically, cannot sustain the volumes of people many of these proposals would accommodate.

Comment I-70-2

2. I do not support a train.

Comment I-70-3

3. I do not support interconnect between canyons and/or park city.

Comment I-70-4

4. I support improved bus use ONLY with a corresponding DECREASE in private automobiles.

Comment I-70-5

5. I support increasing trailhead parking, particularly at White/Red Pine. These drainages have more carrying capacity than the parking lot allows for.

Comment I-70-6

6. None of the proposals provide enough detail to make informed decisions.

7. Improving transportation will not improve congestion. See #1 above. If CWC supports moving 5,000 people per hour by gondola, combined with 2,500-5,000 people per hour on the road, then the congestion will be shifted to the ski areas. While the profits for the ski areas may likely be improved, the user experience (in the form of hours' long lift lines) will be significantly degraded.

I-71: Nathan Pettit

Comment I-71-1

Improved year round bus service should be the first step in building incremental improvements for the canyons.

Comment I-71-2

The tunnel from Little to Big Cottonwood Canyon should also connect under Guardsman Pass to Park City so people could move between the 3 resort clusters quickly.

Comment I-71-3

Ideally this would be rail to improve the capacity, but could be configured for emergency vehicle access as well. This tunnel would have connections to the various buses from Phase I. Eventually a future phase would connect the rail tunnel to Salt Lake either via Little Cottonwood Canyon or Parley's.

For the rail, go electric with a double decker product like Stadler is currently building for CalTrain. This will allow for increased capacity and reduced emissions. And would allow for integration with the Frontrunner system so people from Ogden or Provo could have a one seat ride to the mountains.

Comment I-71-4

Ideally this would be rail to improve the capacity, but could be configured for emergency vehicle access as well. This tunnel would have connections to the various buses from Phase I. Eventually a future phase would connect the rail tunnel to Salt Lake either via Little Cottonwood Canyon or Parley's.

For the rail, go electric with a double decker product like Stadler is currently building for CalTrain. This will allow for increased capacity and reduced emissions. And would allow for integration with the Frontrunner system so people from Ogden or Provo could have a one seat ride to the mountains.

I-72: Heather Mendiola

Comment I-72-1

I do not support a tram in Little Cottonwood Canyon or connecting the canyons. We need a solution that supports all users in the canyons not just those who use the ski resorts.

Comment I-72-2

I do not support a tram in Little Cottonwood Canyon or connecting the canyons. We need a solution that supports all users in the canyons not just those who use the ski resorts.

Comment I-72-3

Most of the solutions are based on increasing the quantity of people not quality of experiences. If there is too much snow to open the canyons skiers should not be in the canyons as the resorts will not be open due to avalanche concerns and the backcountry would be too dangerous. So a tram will not be necessary. We need to look at how to increase the quality of the experiences in the canyon and I have seen better solutions than those given by the Central Wasatch Commission who seems to be doing the bidding of Alta and Snowbird at tax payers expense.

I-73: Doug Brockmeyer**Comment I-73-1**

After reviewing all the proposals, I strongly support alternative 1.

Comment I-73-2

Typically, I access the Cottonwood canyons 20-30 times per year, with a backcountry trailhead my primary destination approximately 80% of the time. I use a variety of trailheads to access the side canyons, and any plan to improve transportation has to take that into account, especially since backcountry usage is on the rise. Therefore, I feel that an enhanced bus service that assists in efficiently transporting skiers to the resorts is by far the most cost-effective, least intrusive/impactful approach to the canyon transportation problem and will best take pressure off overall car volume.

I-74: Stan Rosenzweig**Comment I-74-1**

I appreciate all the time and effort of commission members and other stakeholders to date. At this point, I believe each of the alternatives have merit and I would support any of them, separately, or in combination. After so many years of study and discussion, it would be nice to actually implement a solution. Thanks, again.

Comment I-74-2

I appreciate all the time and effort of commission members and other stakeholders to date. At this point, I believe each of the alternatives have merit and I would support any of them,

separately, or in combination. After so many years of study and discussion, it would be nice to actually implement a solution. Thanks, again.

Comment I-74-3

I appreciate all the time and effort of commission members and other stakeholders to date. At this point, I believe each of the alternatives have merit and I would support any of them, separately, or in combination. After so many years of study and discussion, it would be nice to actually implement a solution. Thanks, again.

Comment I-74-4

I appreciate all the time and effort of commission members and other stakeholders to date. At this point, I believe each of the alternatives have merit and I would support any of them, separately, or in combination. After so many years of study and discussion, it would be nice to actually implement a solution. Thanks, again.

Comment I-74-5

I appreciate all the time and effort of commission members and other stakeholders to date. At this point, I believe each of the alternatives have merit and I would support any of them, separately, or in combination. After so many years of study and discussion, it would be nice to actually implement a solution. Thanks, again.

Comment I-74-6

I appreciate all the time and effort of commission members and other stakeholders to date. At this point, I believe each of the alternatives have merit and I would support any of them, separately, or in combination. After so many years of study and discussion, it would be nice to actually implement a solution. Thanks, again.

I-75: Suzanne Stensaas

Comment I-75-1

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-2

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently

to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-3

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-4

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-5

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-6

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-7

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only

E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-8

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-9

I favor option 1 with none of the subalternatives. All solutions should include reducing traffic along the East bench from the U of U all the way to Draper with transit all days and frequently to connect with canyon transit. This same transit can connect east bench residents to transit stops at the mouth of all 3 canyons, Millcreek, BCC and LCC. WE need N-S connections not only E-W connections. Transit involving Park City and environs should include BRT into SLC daily and frequently to reduce east bench congestion and pollution.

Comment I-75-10

Plans to have no personal vehicle parking within 1/2 mile of the bus stop is really bad. I hike with seniors (70-85) weekly and we cannot walk 1/2 mile along a state highway to go hiking. We carpool at a park and rides and drive to the trailhead. At least the bus should be required to stop and let people off at each and every major and minor trailhead in the canyons with a buzzer cord to pull, as in the old buses of our youth. Similarly we should be able to flag a bus to return. Covid has demonstrated how important our canyons are to our daily well being and sanity. They are being used more than ever and this is the perfect time to take into account all the uses that do not involve the resorts. The resorts should not rule the plan. All bus stops should have shelters. Waiting along the road in February for even 15 minutes would be dangerous to our health. People living on the East bench should not have to go to Highland and 9400 S to get transit. We need to be able to park by LCC or BCC. The park and rides here are inadequate as is 6400 S.

Comment I-75-11

I am not in favor of widening SR 210 except perhaps where a turn out for bus stop is needed.

Comment I-75-12

The Gondola solution is ugly. Having to make a change from car to bus and then to gondola carrying all your ski gear is not enticing and i think will fail. It is like changing subways trying to go to the airport with lots of luggage! You have to make it convenient. Parking at the gravel pit and all park and rides must be free and expanded. The fare must be cheap.

Comment I-75-13

The Gondola solution is ugly. Having to make a change from car to bus and then to gondola carrying all your ski gear is not enticing and i think will fail. It is like changing subways trying to go to the airport with lots of luggage! You have to make it convenient. Parking at the gravel pit and all park and rides must be free and expanded. The fare must be cheap.

Comment I-75-14

The Gondola solution is ugly. Having to make a change from car to bus and then to gondola carrying all your ski gear is not enticing and i think will fail. It is like changing subways trying to go to the airport with lots of luggage! You have to make it convenient. Parking at the gravel pit and all park and rides must be free and expanded. The fare must be cheap.

Comment I-75-15

The Gondola solution is ugly. Having to make a change from car to bus and then to gondola carrying all your ski gear is not enticing and i think will fail. It is like changing subways trying to go to the airport with lots of luggage! You have to make it convenient. Parking at the gravel pit and all park and rides must be free and expanded. The fare must be cheap.

Comment I-75-16

What the long document does not do it for each alternative state the legitimate environmental positive and negatives with regard to wildlife, carbon, particulates, watershed, human impact, etc.

Right now every trailhead should have year round toilets that are open and serviced to protect our watershed. this is cheap compared to all the other proposals.

Comment I-75-17

What the long document does not do it for each alternative state the legitimate environmental positive and negatives with regard to wildlife, carbon, particulates, watershed, human impact, etc.

Right now every trailhead should have year round toilets that are open and serviced to protect our watershed. this is cheap compared to all the other proposals.

I-76: AJ Anderson**Comment I-76-1**

I do not want the extra lane (designated shoulder lane), train, or gondola.

Comment I-76-2

I do not want the extra lane (designated shoulder lane), train, or gondola.

Comment I-76-3

I do not want the extra lane (designated shoulder lane), train, or gondola.

Comment I-76-4

Increased bus service with no additional shoulder lane capacity would be acceptable.

Comment I-76-5

I prefer Save Our Canyons' proposal or the Cottonwood Express proposal.

Comment I-76-6

I prefer Save Our Canyons' proposal or the Cottonwood Express proposal.

I-77: Megan Anderson**Comment I-77-1**

I hate the idea of a train, extra lane or gondola.

Comment I-77-2

I hate the idea of a train, extra lane or gondola.

Comment I-77-3

I hate the idea of a train, extra lane or gondola.

Comment I-77-4

Consider instead the Cottonwoods Express or Save our Canyons' proposal. Those options are far better.

Of the options you have increased bus service with no additional shoulder lane is best.

I-78: C Clark**Comment I-78-1**

Please offer increased bus transportation in the Canyons, without widening roads. Some buses could go express to the resorts, while other buses should have intermediary stops for snowshoers and backcountry skiers.

Comment I-78-2

No expansion of the resorts. Leave plenty of unmolested terrain for quiet, peaceful backcountry recreation. That is the beauty of the Wasatch!

Comment I-78-3

Require substantial fees for entering the Canyons in a private car and for parking in the Canyons.

Comment I-78-4

Require substantial fees for entering the Canyons in a private car and for parking in the Canyons.

Comment I-78-5

No aerial or rail transportation and no tunnel. Those detract from the ambiance. The mountains are magical now, but once they become overrun with all these transportation fixtures, they'll be more like a downtown amusement park than like a wonderful peaceful retreat. Keep it simple.

Comment I-78-6

No aerial or rail transportation and no tunnel. Those detract from the ambiance. The mountains are magical now, but once they become overrun with all these transportation fixtures, they'll be more like a downtown amusement park than like a wonderful peaceful retreat. Keep it simple.

Comment I-78-7

No aerial or rail transportation and no tunnel. Those detract from the ambiance. The mountains are magical now, but once they become overrun with all these transportation fixtures, they'll be more like a downtown amusement park than like a wonderful peaceful retreat. Keep it simple.

Comment I-78-8

No canyon interconnects.

Comment I-78-9

Do provide good bus service from SLC and surrounding towns to a hub for boarding the Canyon buses.

Comment I-78-10

Also, please provide express bus to Park City. A shuttle in Millcreek Canyon would also be helpful.

Comment I-78-11

Also, please provide express bus to Park City. A shuttle in Millcreek Canyon would also be helpful.

I-79: Taylor Ensign

Comment I-79-1

I would like additional bus routes added only.

Comment I-79-2

Please do not extend lanes or add a rail or gondola to our beautiful canyon.

Comment I-79-3

Please do not extend lanes or add a rail or gondola to our beautiful canyon.

I-80: Kenzie Foulger

Comment I-80-1

I am against the extra lane, train, or gondola. I am an avid rock climber, hiker, and have family that live in the canyon. I would hate to see the trails I love, the climbs I love, and my family's home be destroyed for convenience sake.

Comment I-80-2

I am against the extra lane, train, or gondola. I am an avid rock climber, hiker, and have family that live in the canyon. I would hate to see the trails I love, the climbs I love, and my family's home be destroyed for convenience sake.

Comment I-80-3

I am against the extra lane, train, or gondola. I am an avid rock climber, hiker, and have family that live in the canyon. I would hate to see the trails I love, the climbs I love, and my family's home be destroyed for convenience sake.

Comment I-80-4

Increased bus service with no additional lane should work. Driving up the canyon with the current lanes has worked for the past 25 years I've lived here. I don't see any reason why it needs to change.

Comment I-80-5

Please consider Save Our Canyons' proposal or the Cottonwood Express proposal.

Comment I-80-6

Please consider Save Our Canyons' proposal or the Cottonwood Express proposal.

I-81: Edward DiRosa**Comment I-81-1**

After reviewing the CWC MTS Alternatives report, it is very clear to me that many aspects have been evaluated. Of most interest to me is the LCC corridor of this study. It appears quite obvious that the gondola system is the only clear, cost effective, safe, and environmentally friendly long term solution for the transportation problems that are only getting worse.

Comment I-81-2

After reviewing the CWC MTS Alternatives report, it is very clear to me that many aspects have been evaluated. Of most interest to me is the LCC corridor of this study. It appears quite obvious that the gondola system is the only clear, cost effective, safe, and environmentally friendly long term solution for the transportation problems that are only getting worse.

Comment I-81-3

After reviewing the CWC MTS Alternatives report, it is very clear to me that many aspects have been evaluated. Of most interest to me is the LCC corridor of this study. It appears quite obvious that the gondola system is the only clear, cost effective, safe, and environmentally friendly long term solution for the transportation problems that are only getting worse.

Comment I-81-4

After reviewing the CWC MTS Alternatives report, it is very clear to me that many aspects have been evaluated. Of most interest to me is the LCC corridor of this study. It appears quite

obvious that the gondola system is the only clear, cost effective, safe, and environmentally friendly long term solution for the transportation problems that are only getting worse.

Comment I-81-5

I am glad to see updated capacity numbers because 1000 pphpd are very dated and inaccurate numbers. It is also a nice option that the system is very scalable.

Comment I-81-6

It could be run at reduced capacity during the summer and shoulder seasons if necessary. That would allow it to become the backbone for recreational, employee, and residential travel in LCC.

Comment I-81-7

I am glad to see updated capacity numbers because 1000 pphpd are very dated and inaccurate numbers. It is also a nice option that the system is very scalable.

I-82: Emily Phippen

Comment I-82-1

I do NOT want the extra lane (designated shoulder lane), train or gondola.

Comment I-82-2

I do NOT want the extra lane (designated shoulder lane), train or gondola.

Comment I-82-3

I do NOT want the extra lane (designated shoulder lane), train or gondola.

I-83: Christian Evulich

Comment I-83-1

The BCC/PC gondola idea seems poorly thought out and like a giant waste of money. The best use of this type of infrastructure (and only way to get an ROI) is for recreational uses that would allow skiing from the ridge lines and facilitating inter resort skiing connectivity. However that is specifically precluded in the proposal. The proposed uses of the gondola connection are workers, commuters and recreation. Where are workers and commuters going to park on the park city side? There already isn't enough parking for skiers let alone the incremental number of cars this would add. Aside from that, what commuter would actually drive to this gondola's park city base, ride the gondola, then get from the BCC gondola's base at Brighton, take

whatever mode of proposed transportation ends up being implemented for the BCC, then once down the BCC finding an additional mode of transportation to their place of employment. Conversely who would do that in reverse to get to PC? That seems unbelievably time consuming and cumbersome. The recreational use in the proposal seems I'll conceived as well. I suspect the amount of people who want to use a gondola connection like this without being able to ski from the ridge lines is very small and can in no way justify the CapEx required to build the gondola connection or fund its ongoing OpEx. Include skiing from the ridge lines in the proposal and utilization and ROI would most certainly go up.

Comment I-83-2

The BCC/PC gondola idea seems poorly thought out and like a giant waste of money.

The best use of this type of infrastructure (and only way to get an ROI) is for recreational uses that would allow skiing from the ridge lines and facilitating inter resort skiing connectivity. However that is specifically precluded in the proposal. The proposed uses of the gondola connection are workers, commuters and recreation. Where are workers and commuters going to park on the park city side? There already isn't enough parking for skiers let alone the incremental number of cars this would add. Aside from that, what commuter would actually drive to this gondola's park city base, ride the gondola, then get from the BCC gondola's base at Brighton, take whatever mode of proposed transportation ends up being implemented for the BCC, then once down the BCC finding an additional mode of transportation to their place of employment. Conversely who would do that in reverse to get to PC? That seems unbelievably time consuming and cumbersome. The recreational use in the proposal seems I'll conceived as well. I suspect the amount of people who want to use a gondola connection like this without being able to ski from the ridge lines is very small and can in no way justify the CapEx required to build the gondola connection or fund its ongoing OpEx. Include skiing from the ridge lines in the proposal and utilization and ROI would most certainly go up.

I-84: Konrad Brynda

Comment I-84-1

Dear Mr. Becker,

After going through the Mountain Transportation System Objectives, Attributes, and Scope Comment Report, I concluded that one of the transportation systems which I have been developing over the past few years would be an ideal fit for the proposed infrastructure improvement.

The proposed system, which is a variant of PRT ,Äi public rapid transit ,Äi is composed of a dedicated network of overhead tracks and/or underground tubes, along which autonomous, electric-powered pods carrying from 4 to 15 people (depending on configuration) travel at planned speeds of up to 80 MPH. Such a system, with pods similar in size to Doppelmayr/Garaventa,Äôs 3S system and offering up to double its throughput (10,Äô800

PAX/h with 15-passenger pods at 5-second spacing), allows for passengers to make rapid, on-demand journeys from any one to any other stop on the network, providing a viable alternative to cars, while being much faster and comfortable than busses, trains or other mass transportation vehicles. The tracks, which must not carry power if the pods are fitted out with battery packs, are conceived with cost optimisation in mind and seamlessly adapt to literally any kind of landscape.

Comment I-84-2

While the idea remains at an early development stage, it relies on existing, readily available technology, and the principal partners with whom the project could be carried out are already present in the Salt Lake Valley ,Äi Doppelmayr (overhead track sections) or Stadler (pods, including automation and motors), while The Boring Company (tunnels / underground track sections) has also already been queried about a possible cooperation

Attached is a list of points, taken from the Objectives, Attributes, and Scope Comment Report ,Äi Attributes Staff Recommendations, in which my proposal responds to the problems and needs of the Salt Lake Valley communities and to the requirements for the new Mountain Transportation System:

Could the implementation of [such] a PRT system be discussed with the committee and brought up at the upcoming MTS Summit in November?

I believe it offers a very promising and innovative solution which not only can drastically improve the transportation network of the region, but also create subsequent opportunities for economic growth and tighter cooperation between locally-established companies belonging to the transportation sector. From my personal perspective as the founder of ,ÄúEero,Äù ,Äi my San Francisco-based transportation design start-up ,Äi Salt Lake Valley could become the headquarters pertaining to the PRT system. Eero is a fresh initiative which was born out of the wish to popularise sensible solutions to transportation matters, many of them inspired by personal experiences while living in Europe (Switzerland/Poland/Scotland) and in the US (California).

It would be great to hear your and other interested parties,Ä feedback on this idea. Please also do not hesitate to reach out to me if I can be of help in providing further insight into the possibilities and solutions offered by the implementation of an efficient and scalable personal rapid transit network.

Thank you for taking the time to read my e-mail and I very much look forward to more exchanges in the context of the CWC MTS initiative.

With kindest regards,
Konrad Brynda

I-85: Jim Collinson

Comment I-85-1

Hello,

> My name is Jim Collinson. My family and I have lived in LCC for 30 years, and I have worked here as a ski patrolman, avalanche forecaster, rescuer, and dog handler for 40.

> The most terrifying moments of my life have been performing avalanche road rescues in the canyon, especially at night. And I've been involved in many.

> To address safety concerns and traffic congestion I feel that both a minimum of snow sheds AND a gondola are necessary.

> Snow sheds under the earliest and most frequent running slide paths will mitigate but not eliminate rescues.

> If we do not move the public in a safer manner there will be catastrophes involving many people; a high capacity gondola is necessary.

Comment I-85-2

Hello,

> My name is Jim Collinson. My family and I have lived in LCC for 30 years, and I have worked here as a ski patrolman, avalanche forecaster, rescuer, and dog handler for 40.

> The most terrifying moments of my life have been performing avalanche road rescues in the canyon, especially at night. And I've been involved in many.

> To address safety concerns and traffic congestion I feel that both a minimum of snow sheds AND a gondola are necessary.

> Snow sheds under the earliest and most frequent running slide paths will mitigate but not eliminate rescues.

> If we do not move the public in a safer manner there will be catastrophes involving many people; a high capacity gondola is necessary.

Comment I-85-3

Hello,

> My name is Jim Collinson. My family and I have lived in LCC for 30 years, and I have worked here as a ski patrolman, avalanche forecaster, rescuer, and dog handler for 40.

> The most terrifying moments of my life have been performing avalanche road rescues in the canyon, especially at night. And I've been involved in many.

> To address safety concerns and traffic congestion I feel that both a minimum of snow sheds AND a gondola are necessary.

> Snow sheds under the earliest and most frequent running slide paths will mitigate but not eliminate rescues.

> If we do not move the public in a safer manner there will be catastrophes involving many people; a high capacity gondola is necessary.

Comment I-85-4

Hello,

> My name is Jim Collinson. My family and I have lived in LCC for 30 years, and I have worked here as a ski patrolman, avalanche forecaster, rescuer, and dog handler for 40.

> The most terrifying moments of my life have been performing avalanche road rescues in the canyon, especially at night. And I've been involved in many.

> To address safety concerns and traffic congestion I feel that both a minimum of snow sheds AND a gondola are necessary.

> Snow sheds under the earliest and most frequent running slide paths will mitigate but not eliminate rescues.

> If we do not move the public in a safer manner there will be catastrophes involving many people; a high capacity gondola is necessary.

Comment I-85-5

> Avalanches and snowstorms will not affect the ability to move people and goods safely and quickly.

> The current UDOT gondola proposal does not fit the bill at 1,050 people per hour with parking at the gravel pit and does not have my support, but the gondolaworks proposal appears to.

> If it can truly move 4,000+ people an hour and park them at the base terminal, it is a no brainer for many, not just me.

>

> If one must choose between gondola and snow sheds, my vote is for gondola first with snow shed plans for the near future.

Comment I-85-6

> Avalanches and snowstorms will not affect the ability to move people and goods safely and quickly.

> The current UDOT gondola proposal does not fit the bill at 1,050 people per hour with parking at the gravel pit and does not have my support, but the gondolaworks proposal appears to.

> If it can truly move 4,000+ people an hour and park them at the base terminal, it is a no brainer for many, not just me.

>

> If one must choose between gondola and snow sheds, my vote is for gondola first with snow shed plans for the near future.

Comment I-85-7

> White Pine Chutes #s 1 + 2 are the earliest runners, usually.

> They enjoy a steep hillside above which I assume would make construction costs much less than Little Pine or White Pine.

> I suggest starting small with one shed covering both WP #1 + 2.

Comment I-85-8

> As an aside, if one believes in climate change there will be no snow in Summit County or the temps to make it in say 20 years.

> Yet most of our hotels, condos, eateries, etc., are located there.

- > We need to spin bull wheels not bald tires to get these guests to upper BCC and LCC where the last islands of snow will be.
- > So, I am in full support of the idea of connecting Park City with upper BCC and LCC via a gondola in the future.
- > Thank you for accepting input on a solution to a very real set of problems for us here in LCC,
- > Jim Collinson

Comment I-85-9

- > As an aside, if one believes in climate change there will be no snow in Summit County or the temps to make it in say 20 years.
- > Yet most of our hotels, condos, eateries, etc., are located there.
- > We need to spin bull wheels not bald tires to get these guests to upper BCC and LCC where the last islands of snow will be.
- > So, I am in full support of the idea of connecting Park City with upper BCC and LCC via a gondola in the future.
- > Thank you for accepting input on a solution to a very real set of problems for us here in LCC,
- > Jim Collinson

Comment I-85-10

- > As an aside, if one believes in climate change there will be no snow in Summit County or the temps to make it in say 20 years.
- > Yet most of our hotels, condos, eateries, etc., are located there.
- > We need to spin bull wheels not bald tires to get these guests to upper BCC and LCC where the last islands of snow will be.
- > So, I am in full support of the idea of connecting Park City with upper BCC and LCC via a gondola in the future.
- > Thank you for accepting input on a solution to a very real set of problems for us here in LCC,
- > Jim Collinson

I-86: John Knoblock

Comment I-86-1

CWC Staff-

Thank you for your tireless efforts to implement the Mountain Accord. Solving the traffic problems in the Central Wasatch is a very high priority. You have done a great job in analyzing and writing the CWC Transportation Alternatives report given the complexity of this moving target issue. Please don't let my many comments dissuade you or make you feel that I don't support you and your work. Below is an overview of my feelings followed by a page by page review of the report.

Carefully identifying a problem is the most important step in solving it. In the case of CWC Mountain Transportation, there are many aspects of our mountain transportation problems and different people see different issues and priorities. From my perspective, the most important transportation problem in the Central Wasatch is morning and afternoon traffic jams due to resort skiers in the winter.

Another is the day-long heavy flow of traffic and full trailhead parking lots in the summer and fall. While this traffic degrades the outdoor lifestyle for local residents, it also seriously detracts from the vacation experience of visitors to our area. Tourism to our area is an important influx of outside money, which is important to our local economy.

In the winter, too many vehicles on the road slow down traffic and that is exacerbated by winter weather issues such as vehicle accidents, bad winter drivers, inadequate vehicles and tires, avalanches, poor visibility, and slick or snow-covered roads. To me, any proposed solution that continues to use vehicles on the road without reducing the traffic load by more than 50% will not solve the winter traffic jam problems. Putting 25% of the people onto packed standing room buses on a curvy mountain road that may get stuck in slow traffic or by a closed road is not a viable solution. While the cost analysis is important, the more important issue is if the proposed solution will actually solve the problem.

In the summer, use is spread out over a longer duration during the day and the road conditions are generally good. That makes a bus or van transit solution more viable, but the winter solution is the key driver. Crowded trailheads are an irritant but not as critical of a problem. And yes, taking over half an hour to exit Millcreek canyon yesterday was an irritant.

p. 11- The FLAP Grant has not yet been awarded

p. 13- CWC continues to use the UTA bus capacity number of 42 people per bus. This is erroneous in my opinion because the buses only seat 23. Standing in a crowded bus on a curving mountain road is unappealing and not comfortable for most potential riders. This is a serious fatal flaw in this analysis. What is the bus capacity per hour if only seated passengers are included in the analysis?

Comment I-86-2

p. 13- While I've seen buses with bike racks that carry several bikes, I would like to see more analysis on bike capacity for UTA bus canyon service. How many bikes can a UTA bus accommodate?

Comment I-86-3

p. 13- The draft alternatives states 168 people per hour can be delivered up BCC by bus with 15 minute headways. Calculating seated passengers only, that is $4 \times 23 = 92$ passengers per hour. That is nowhere near the needed capacity to significantly reduce car traffic up the canyon. How many people travel up the canyon in summer by car per hour now?

p. 13- The stated bus capacity assumes that the canyon traffic is free flowing. We all know that this is an erroneous assumption when traffic is slowed due to: a blue sky powder day, a traffic accident on the road, the road is icy or snow covered, or visibility is impaired due to fog or snow. There are many days when traffic comes to a crawl and it takes an hour or two to go up or down the canyon. Increased bus service and snow sheds will not eliminate this problem. How do you account for the traffic and weather induced reduced mobility in your analysis? This is a fatal flaw for all road-based transportation alternatives.

Comment I-86-4

p. 14- The draft alternatives states 500 people per hour can be delivered up BCC by bus with 10 minute headways. For all passengers to be seated, that is 6 buses per hour $\times$ 23 seated passengers for each of two resorts = 276 passengers per hour. That is unfortunately an insignificant fraction of the 6,000 (?) people traveling up to the BCC ski resorts. How many people travel up BCC to ski on a busy day?

p. 14- How much diesel fuel will be burned and what are the resulting emissions from 10 minute headway buses to each resort? Will this pollution be generated by empty buses circling even when the ski resorts are not busy?

Comment I-86-5

p. 14- An important issue that could be added to the report is BCC road improvement. There are several critical sections of the BCC road that routinely cause winter road backups, such as the narrow curve at the power plant and the 'S curve'. Reengineering these few dangerous constriction points may help bus transit provide adequate capacity. (The BCC road is not generally as steep and curvy as LCC.)

Comment I-86-6

pp. 15-16- Yes to dynamic tolling, reduced roadside parking, and paid parking at ski resorts.

Comment I-86-7

pp. 15-16- Yes to dynamic tolling, reduced roadside parking, and paid parking at ski resorts.

Comment I-86-8

pp. 15-16- Yes to dynamic tolling, reduced roadside parking, and paid parking at ski resorts.

Comment I-86-9

p.19- The draft alternatives states 168 people per hour can be delivered up LCC by bus with 15 minute headways. Calculating seated passengers only, that is $4 \times 23 = 92$ passengers per hour. That is nowhere near the needed capacity to significantly reduce car traffic up the canyon. How many people travel up the canyon in summer by car per hour now?

p. 20- For a Tolling Gantry, why do you estimate annual operating costs to be 30% of the capital cost? And why do you list a lifecycle cost of \$55M? Do you not expect that a toll booth will generate positive revenue?

Comment I-86-10

p. 21- The enhanced seasonal bus at 5 minute headways capacity is stated as approximately 1,008 people per hour. Again, this is misleading as it assumes a full standing room capacity of 42, with only 23 passengers seated. It is also misleading because the buses will be stuck in the same traffic as all of the cars. The stated bus capacity assumes that the canyon traffic is free flowing. We all know that this is an erroneous assumption when traffic is slowed due to: a blue sky powder day, a traffic accident on the road, the road is icy or snow covered, or visibility is impaired due to fog or snow. There are many days when traffic comes to a crawl and it takes an hour or two to go up or down the canyon. Increased bus service and snow sheds will not eliminate this problem. How do you account for the traffic and weather induced reduced mobility in your analysis? This is a fatal flaw for all road-based transportation alternatives.

p. 22- The \$22M for the extended shoulder seems overly optimistic. Please give more details on this, as a breakdown lane is still needed and sometimes cyclists are seen riding up the canyon in winter. Has a detailed engineering analysis of essentially adding an entirely new lane up the canyon been completed? Please make this available for public review.

Comment I-86-11

p. 22- Will a lane for buses alongside a car travel lane work in adverse driving conditions? In my experience, sections of the road that are two lanes in one direction become only a single lane whenever the road is snow covered. This is a fatal flaw for the theory that you can have a shoulder bus lane along side a car lane so that the buses can bypass traffic; in my opinion, this will not work. The road becomes one lane when snow covered.

Comment I-86-12

p. 22- When there is a spin out, traffic accident, or car stuck in the road (due to many reasons such as bad tires, mechanical breakdown, poor driving skills, etc.), the extra lane will not be available for buses. And of course, when the road is closed due to an accident, the bus and road capacity is zero. This analysis is overly optimistic in my opinion.

p. 22- Is the S3 gondola "capacity" actually only 1,000 people per hour? Per the manufacturer, the 3S gondola capacity is 4,000 people per hour. Isn't the 1,000 people per hour only the LCC EIS anticipated ridership? The capacity as stated is misleading in my opinion. Yes, getting people to the gondola is key, but that is on more level city streets rather than a snowy curvy mountain road requiring specialized buses.

Comment I-86-13

p. 22- A key concept to a gondola (or train) is that the local year-round bus service in the canyon is NOT required. Most of the summer and fall traffic in LCC goes to Snowbird and Alta resorts. While White Pine use is significant, it is a small fraction of the total use. Additionally, a new trail directly from Snowbird up to the upper switchback of the Whitepine Trail can make access from Snowbird an attractive alternative to the existing lower Whitepine Trail. (If bus service was done in parallel with a gondola, it would not need to go past White Pine.) How is the year-round bus service calculated into the enhance bus capital and O&M costs for the gondola option?

p. 22- What is the impact to the watershed of a 3S gondola compared to cars and buses? Please include oil leaks, brake pad wear, and tire wear in the analysis. Also, consider in the analysis the impact of cars, buses, or trains on wildlife accident deaths. No moose was ever killed by a gondola going overhead!

Comment I-86-14

p. 23- Please provide more detail on how a rail solution can transport 1,000 people per hour (and up to 10,000!). How many trains, how many tracks, the potential layout of tracks, how many rail cars, and people per car, etc? Please make this analysis available for public review.

Comment I-86-15

p. 23- Why doesn't the table of costs for the various rail options include the necessary enhance bus capital and O&M costs that are included in the aerial analysis? Won't that would add roughly \$300M to the lifecycle cost.

p. 23- The concept of whistle stops seems like a selling point that would not be realized. Do the capital costs for train include the required whistle-stop train stations? Do the transit times include time for whistle-stop departures and loading? How many of these stops are in the analysis?

Comment I-86-16

p. 23- Are the trains that would be used powered by diesel fuel? How will trains in the canyon impact air quality and noise in the canyon? Please provide an analysis.

Comment I-86-17

p. 23- Will snow on the tracks slow down train service? I've waited for hours on the Amtrak over Donner Pass due to snow clearing operations!

Comment I-86-18

p. 23- What is the acreage ground footprint of train tracks compared to 3S gondola lift towers in the canyon?

While the qualitative pictures comparing the options is interesting, it looks very subjective and misleading. Just to pick one example, how can the gondola not be scored dark green for adequate frequency and reducing air and water pollution?

Comment I-86-19

That's all for now! Thank you for your time and efforts. Just think of a quiet gondola gracefully floating over the trees with passengers oo'ing and awe'ing over the amazing views of cliffs, mountains, and wildlife below. Go ride the free Telluride transportation gondola!

I-87: Jeanette Arnold**Comment I-87-1**

I prefer cog rail and gondola.

I love these mountains and want to use them but also protect as much as we can.

Thank you.

Comment I-87-2

I prefer cog rail and gondola.

I love these mountains and want to use them but also protect as much as we can.

Thank you.

I-88: Victoria Schmidt**Comment I-88-1**

I appreciate the many hours of effort you have put into trying to alleviate the congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon. I would like to leave a few concerns.

One. Are we only talking about ski traffic and if so shouldn't the money and solutions come from the ski resorts. In the bay area big employers such as Apple struggled to get their many employees thru traffic and to their facilities but came up with their own shuttle service.

Comment I-88-2

If we are talking about year-round use i.e. hiking and biking then I wonder how much LCC use could be diverted by developing the many other canyons surrounding Salt Lake City. It would be wonderful to have more destinations instead of exceeding the natural capacity of one over loved canyon. Develop and advertise the many other wonderful mountain areas.

Comment I-88-3

Two. I live along the congested route to Little Cottonwood Canyon and have had many opportunities to observe the predominantly one person per car backups. It is hard to get people out of their cars as long as the resorts oppose any limits or fees. Have you considered bus only traffic up the canyon for at least the first hour before the resorts open? You could get a lot of people up the mountain and that would be a huge incentive to those vying for the fresh powder to use the bus. This would greatly reduce the morning congestion on weekends and big powder days. No extra lanes needed. Families or others with special needs who might drive up after the bus hour would win as well because they would drive their private cars up with far less congestion.

Comment I-88-4

Two. I live along the congested route to Little Cottonwood Canyon and have had many opportunities to observe the predominantly one person per car backups. It is hard to get people out of their cars as long as the resorts oppose any limits or fees. Have you considered bus only traffic up the canyon for at least the first hour before the resorts open? You could get a lot of people up the mountain and that would be a huge incentive to those vying for the fresh powder to use the bus. This would greatly reduce the morning congestion on weekends and big powder days. No extra lanes needed. Families or others with special needs who might drive up after the bus hour would win as well because they would drive their private cars up with far less congestion.

Comment I-88-5

Two. I live along the congested route to Little Cottonwood Canyon and have had many opportunities to observe the predominantly one person per car backups. It is hard to get people out of their cars as long as the resorts oppose any limits or fees. Have you considered bus only traffic up the canyon for at least the first hour before the resorts open? You could get a lot of people up the mountain and that would be a huge incentive to those vying for the fresh powder to use the bus. This would greatly reduce the morning congestion on weekends and big powder days. No extra lanes needed. Families or others with special needs who might drive up after the bus hour would win as well because they would drive their private cars up with far less congestion.

Comment I-88-6

Three. I oppose enlarging the parking footprint at the mouth of either canyon (the new high rise at the mouth of BCC is a travesty showing us what we really don't want) bus hubs and parking should be in commercial areas directly serviced by existing thoroughfares. I support a hub at the gravel pit and at the 9400s/2000e sites.

Comment I-88-7

Three. I oppose enlarging the parking footprint at the mouth of either canyon (the new high rise at the mouth of BCC is a travesty showing us what we really don't want) bus hubs and parking should be in commercial areas directly serviced by existing thoroughfares. I support a hub at the gravel pit and at the 9400s/2000e sites.

Comment I-88-8

Fourth. I do not support proposals such as la caille's gondola proposal which would pack people along Wasatch Blvd. and not relieve congestion for anyone along 9/10ths of your problem route. Let's cut traffic before it gets to the canyons. Let's not create new commercial areas as the entrance to our forest lands, let the canyons natural and innate beauty be what people first see.

Victoria Schmidt
801-915-3752
Cottonwood Heights, Ut

Comment I-88-9

Fourth. I do not support proposals such as la caille's gondola proposal which would pack people along Wasatch Blvd. and not relieve congestion for anyone along 9/10ths of your problem route. Let's cut traffic before it gets to the canyons. Let's not create new commercial areas as the entrance to our forest lands, let the canyons natural and innate beauty be what people first see.

Victoria Schmidt
801-915-3752
Cottonwood Heights, Ut

Comment I-88-10

Fourth. I do not support proposals such as la caille's gondola proposal which would pack people along Wasatch Blvd. and not relieve congestion for anyone along 9/10ths of your

problem route. Let's cut traffic before it gets to the canyons. Let's not create new commercial areas as the entrance to our forest lands, let the canyons natural and innate beauty be what people first see.

Victoria Schmidt
801-915-3752
Cottonwood Heights, Ut

I-89: Robert Flemming

Comment I-89-1

Most of the items in the long list of possible actions are good and definitely should be done. BUT, The only real long-term solution is a gondola such as the 8 passenger gondolas at Snow Basin Ski Resort. Think BIB BIG BIG !!!

Thanks, Bob Flemming

I-90: Kim Rhodes

Comment I-90-1

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to submit my comments and concerns about the Mountain Transportation System Alternatives. Generally speaking, it is clear that the main priority of the Alternatives is to serve the resorts in the winter season, with the exception of improved bus access to Millcreek Canyon. More consideration needs to be given to the diverse set of user groups in both Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC) and Big Cottonwood Canyon (BCC) for year-round recreation.

Several comments regarding the Mountain Transportation Alternatives follow.

In BCC, my main concern with the proposed transportation alternatives lies in the dynamic tolling option to incentivize the use of public transit. While I agree that this could be a way to decrease traffic in the canyon during peak times, dynamic tolling will ultimately decrease access for those that cannot afford it. Although it is stated within the document that a discounted price

can be offered to those who need it, I have several questions which the document does not address:

,óè How will people have access to this information?

,óè What will be the requirements for a discounted rate?

,óè What is the process of getting a discounted rate (i.e. what information will people need to provide)?

,óè Have any studies been done to gauge the willingness to pay for access to the canyon during peak and non-peak periods?

Comment I-90-2

Additionally, instead of focusing the rapid bus on winter sport user groups (to serve ski resorts), please strongly consider a rapid bus option during other seasons and particularly how this service can be reliable so that people will use it. Personally, I have taken the bus in the city several times and have had issues with reliability. If you are going to take away someone's ability to drive into the canyon to recreate by either increased tolls or banning vehicles, you need to make the alternatives just as convenient or people will stop using their public lands.

Comment I-90-3

Additionally, instead of focusing the rapid bus on winter sport user groups (to serve ski resorts), please strongly consider a rapid bus option during other seasons and particularly how this service can be reliable so that people will use it. Personally, I have taken the bus in the city several times and have had issues with reliability. If you are going to take away someone's ability to drive into the canyon to recreate by either increased tolls or banning vehicles, you need to make the alternatives just as convenient or people will stop using their public lands.

Comment I-90-4

I have several concerns regarding all of the proposed transportation alternatives in LCC, with the exception of increased bus service without road widening. Again, these alternatives seem to mainly serve a single user group and resorts/wintertime resort access, while LCC is used by a variety of groups throughout the year. Beginning with Draft Alternative 1: Comprehensive Bus:

- As stated above, people will not use the bus unless it is as convenient as driving or unless the toll is higher than their willingness to pay to recreate in the canyon. I have the same concerns and questions about tolling as are listed above.

- I am in full support of the comprehensive bus option, with frequent and reliable bussing during non-winter seasons and without widening SR210. With widening the road, more consideration needs to be given to the recreation areas on the north side of the canyon, in particular many popular climbing areas that are less than 30 feet from the roadway.

- During non-winter months, the ski buses need to be retrofitted to serve more than just cyclists, as described in the document. Other user groups include hikers, backpackers,

Comment I-90-5

and climbers, all with different types of gear. If getting gear on and off of a bus is not convenient, people will be less likely to choose to use the bus.

- This option would ruin the viewshed in LCC and only serves the ski resorts. With a gondola, there are no options for stops at trailheads as there would be in Draft Alternatives 1 and 3. Furthermore, the gondola would only run during the winter, only serving one user group, even though several user groups make use of the resorts during

other seasons.

,óè I believe that no consideration has been given with regard to the gondola infrastructure and recreation areas within the canyon. I have several questions regarding where and how this infrastructure would be placed with regards to trails and climbing areas. More information on the proposed placement of this infrastructure needs to be provided and strong consideration of existing recreation areas needs to be given.

Draft Alternative 3: Rail/Bus

,óè I have major concerns with this option, in particular the rail alignment. The same issue as stated in Alternative 1 exists with the proposed alignment north of SR210 and the proximity of recreation areas to the roadway.

,óè As they are described in the document, it is unclear how the other two options for rail alignment would impact recreation areas. More information needs to be provided.

,óè I believe that while this option may have the ability to serve a diverse set of user groups, the focus still rests on the ski resorts and wintertime access, and overlooks the needs of other non-winter groups.

Comment I-90-6

,óè I,Äm in favor of snowsheds wherever necessary in LCC, as long as the impact of the infrastructure on recreation areas is considered and it is found that it does not jeopardize access for all user groups.

Comment I-90-7

,óè Regarding tolling: even people that live in the canyons should be required to pay something, possibly an annual rate, since they likely will be using the roads most often.

,óè Please do not connect the Cottonwoods to Park City via gondola or tunnel. Not only are these options expensive, the only ones who will benefit are (again) the ski resorts and it will put unnecessary pressure on the environment/watershed.

Comment I-90-8

,óè Please do not connect the Cottonwoods to one another via gondola (Sub Alternative B) or tunnel (Sub Alternative A). More consideration needs to be given to the watershed in Sub Alternative B. The hydrological impacts of the tunnel coupled with the high capital costs, as identified in the document, should be enough reason to remove this as an option.

Comment I-90-9

,óè Please do not connect the Cottonwoods to one another via gondola (Sub Alternative B) or tunnel (Sub Alternative A). More consideration needs to be given to the watershed in Sub Alternative B. The hydrological impacts of the tunnel coupled with the high capital costs, as identified in the document, should be enough reason to remove this as an option.

I appreciate your time and the opportunity to participate in this process via public comment.
Sincerely,

I-91: William Brass

Comment I-91-1

Alternative 1 seems the most cost effective

Comment I-91-2

however, I would advocate for alternative two, but only if the bus service would remain in effect for stops along the canyon road for backcountry skiers, snowshoers, hikers, etc., to disembark.

I-92: Christian Johnson

Comment I-92-1

I support MTS Draft Alternative 1.

Comment I-92-2

The snow sheds are necessary as our last winter (19/20) illustrated.

Comment I-92-3

More frequent and destination specific (direct to an individual ski resort and buses dedicated to trailheads) buses would get used as long as it is faster than driving. The dedicated lane in LCC would accomplish this along with tolling and charged parking.

Comment I-92-4

More frequent and destination specific (direct to an individual ski resort and buses dedicated to trailheads) buses would get used as long as it is faster than driving. The dedicated lane in LCC would accomplish this along with tolling and charged parking.

Comment I-92-5

More frequent and destination specific (direct to an individual ski resort and buses dedicated to trailheads) buses would get used as long as it is faster than driving. The dedicated lane in LCC would accomplish this along with tolling and charged parking.

Comment I-92-6

More frequent and destination specific (direct to an individual ski resort and buses dedicated to trailheads) buses would get used as long as it is faster than driving. The dedicated lane in LCC would accomplish this along with tolling and charged parking.

Comment I-92-7

Parking at trailheads needs a major improvement and I did not see this addressed in the report.

I-93: Judith Voye**Comment I-93-1**

I think an emphasis on frequent bus transportation and a separate/priority bus lane.

I-94: Kate Park**Comment I-94-1**

Our Beloved Wasatch Mountains are being loved to death. As a life time resident who is an avid hiker and skier I have witnessed expansive growth. The carrying capacity of our canyons is limited. Ideally a cap on visitors daily would be great. The alternative though is for bus transport. No gondola whatsoever.

Comment I-94-2

Our Beloved Wasatch Mountains are being loved to death. As a life time resident who is an avid hiker and skier I have witnessed expansive growth. The carrying capacity of our canyons is limited. Ideally a cap on visitors daily would be great. The alternative though is for bus transport. No gondola whatsoever.

Comment I-94-3

Our Beloved Wasatch Mountains are being loved to death. As a life time resident who is an avid hiker and skier I have witnessed expansive growth. The carrying capacity of our canyons is limited. Ideally a cap on visitors daily would be great. The alternative though is for bus transport. No gondola whatsoever.

Comment I-94-4

More parking for people coming from the north part of the city, the parking lot at 64th is not adequate.

Comment I-94-5

The resorts need to put a limit on ski passes sold. The overflow of parking is dangerous. There are just too many people in the canyons. I vote for the bus. ~ Kate Park

I-95: Travis Scott**Comment I-95-1**

Overall the plan looks interesting and there appears to be some good varied options for meeting the new burdens of using our canyons enjoying them. My only real comment is opposition to any sort of toll or ridership fee for Utah residents, as this puts a burden on all classes of Utah citizens to visit our canyons.

Comment I-95-2

Overall the plan looks interesting and there appears to be some good varied options for meeting the new burdens of using our canyons enjoying them. My only real comment is opposition to any sort of toll or ridership fee for Utah residents, as this puts a burden on all classes of Utah citizens to visit our canyons.

Comment I-95-3

There needs to be more innovative options for paying for these needs or discouraging too many cars up the canyon. Like resorts paying fees based on how much use, vehicle metering, vice taxes, vandalism/littering charges pay fees towards canyon maintenance, etc. However, Non-resident charges are totally on the table in my opinion.

I-96: Katie Pappas**Comment I-96-1**

After reading through the proposals, I prefer MTS Draft Alternative 1 as long as the buses used are clean energy buses.

Comment I-96-2

Also, instead of a large parking lot at the mouth of the canyon, bus transportation to the mouth of the canyon should be included in the cost of the shuttle bus to encourage public transportation use from home.

I-97: Brian Stillman

Comment I-97-1

One thing is for sure. There needs to be a study done on what the over-flow the Ski Resorts Parking Lot's experience at peak season. That will determine what the Parking Requirement's are at the mouths of the canyons. I think this is realistically the best approach. Address the "Problem" and then create the parking necessary including the infrastructure that will most efficiently achieve the best traffic flows.

I-98: John Veranth

Comment I-98-1

While I complement the staff on the excellent work done to date I believe that the alternatives are overly biased toward further industrialization of the local canyons. Specifically, I see alternatives that appear to use large amounts of taxpayer funding to support developed winter recreation at the privately owned ski areas.

Regarding the presented alternatives I strongly support the bus-based concepts and am totally opposed to the intrusion of "Disneyland-style" gondolas and cog railway infrastructure. The bus option is flexible, can be implemented in phases, and can be easily modified to adapt to changing circumstances and use patterns in the decades ahead. Fixed facilities lock-in a current design for generations to come.

Comment I-98-2

The "1000 users per hour" discussed for the gondola indicate that this is NOT a serious transportation option but rather a tourist ski lift or scenic ride.

Regarding the proposals to reduce trailhead parking, I also have serious concerns. While no one wants to make the canyons into parking lots the idea of encouraging transit by restricting parking "a half mile in each direction" is problematic. Depending on the definition of "popular trailheads" this parking restriction will likely cover most of the canyon length. Transit will not accommodate very early, pre-dawn, alpine starts nor will it work for planned or unintentional very late returns to the trail head. Geology tours need to stop and park at different locations than hikers. It will not be feasible to offer adequate transit frequency during shoulder seasons when the weather is uncertain and the opportunities to visit the canyons change from day to day. There will always be backcountry users who need in canyon parking. Less intrusive measures to encourage transit can be equally effective in promoting transit. For example: parking fees (purchased hang tag) and restrictions on cars per hour at peak times.

Comment I-98-3

The best way to make transit popular is to provide excellent service. For example, why should driving be "free" while transit has a fee and schedule hassles? This cost allocation issue applies to both the canyons and to the urban areas served by UTA. Frequent, free shuttle buses will attract riders.

Thank you.

I-99: Ed Marshall**Comment I-99-1**

The presentations and the Q&A session at the September 18th meeting were excellent. Based on them, my spouse and I currently support the expanded bus/cog railway alternative for LCC. While this alternative would have higher capital costs up front, our experience in other countries is that cog railways last an exceptionally long time and provide a wonderful user experience. Moreover, the ability to significantly increase the number of passengers carried per hour is extremely important, and a system that cannot be significantly expanded may not be worth the costs. Our current opinion could change once we have more information about the impacts upon local residents, wildlife, and the watershed.

Comment I-99-2

The presentations and the Q&A session at the September 18th meeting were excellent. Based on them, my spouse and I currently support the expanded bus/cog railway alternative for LCC. While this alternative would have higher capital costs up front, our experience in other countries is that cog railways last an exceptionally long time and provide a wonderful user experience. Moreover, the ability to significantly increase the number of passengers carried per hour is extremely important, and a system that cannot be significantly expanded may not be worth the costs. Our current opinion could change once we have more information about the impacts upon local residents, wildlife, and the watershed.

Comment I-99-3

The presentations and the Q&A session at the September 18th meeting were excellent. Based on them, my spouse and I currently support the expanded bus/cog railway alternative for LCC. While this alternative would have higher capital costs up front, our experience in other countries is that cog railways last an exceptionally long time and provide a wonderful user experience. Moreover, the ability to significantly increase the number of passengers carried per hour is extremely important, and a system that cannot be significantly expanded may not be

worth the costs. Our current opinion could change once we have more information about the impacts upon local residents, wildlife, and the watershed.

Comment I-99-4

The presentations and the Q&A session at the September 18th meeting were excellent. Based on them, my spouse and I currently support the expanded bus/cog railway alternative for LCC. While this alternative would have higher capital costs up front, our experience in other countries is that cog railways last an exceptionally long time and provide a wonderful user experience. Moreover, the ability to significantly increase the number of passengers carried per hour is extremely important, and a system that cannot be significantly expanded may not be worth the costs. Our current opinion could change once we have more information about the impacts upon local residents, wildlife, and the watershed.

Comment I-99-5

The presentations and the Q&A session at the September 18th meeting were excellent. Based on them, my spouse and I currently support the expanded bus/cog railway alternative for LCC. While this alternative would have higher capital costs up front, our experience in other countries is that cog railways last an exceptionally long time and provide a wonderful user experience. Moreover, the ability to significantly increase the number of passengers carried per hour is extremely important, and a system that cannot be significantly expanded may not be worth the costs. Our current opinion could change once we have more information about the impacts upon local residents, wildlife, and the watershed.

Comment I-99-6

If a sub-alternative is pursued to link the canyons, we currently favor the tunnel alternative between BCC & LCC. While this approach would once again cost more up front, it would last for an extremely long time, allow the circular bus service, provide a much better emergency egress for both canyons, and allow heavy equipment to be brought up to work on serious slides or avalanches from the top down. In addition, we currently feel that this alternative would have less impact on the natural setting, the wildlife, and the watershed.

These are our personal views, which you have solicited; and they do not represent the views of my spouse's business, which remains impartial with respect to BCC & LCC.

Comment I-99-7

If a sub-alternative is pursued to link the canyons, we currently favor the tunnel alternative between BCC & LCC. While this approach would once again cost more up front, it would last for an extremely long time, allow the circular bus service, provide a much better emergency egress for both canyons, and allow heavy equipment to be brought up to work on serious slides or avalanches from the top down. In addition, we currently feel that this alternative would have less impact on the natural setting, the wildlife, and the watershed.

These are our personal views, which you have solicited; and they do not represent the views of my spouse's business, which remains impartial with respect to BCC & LCC.

Comment I-99-8

If a sub-alternative is pursued to link the canyons, we currently favor the tunnel alternative between BCC & LCC. While this approach would once again cost more up front, it would last for an extremely long time, allow the circular bus service, provide a much better emergency egress for both canyons, and allow heavy equipment to be brought up to work on serious slides or avalanches from the top down. In addition, we currently feel that this alternative would have less impact on the natural setting, the wildlife, and the watershed.

These are our personal views, which you have solicited; and they do not represent the views of my spouse's business, which remains impartial with respect to BCC & LCC.

Comment I-99-9

If a sub-alternative is pursued to link the canyons, we currently favor the tunnel alternative between BCC & LCC. While this approach would once again cost more up front, it would last for an extremely long time, allow the circular bus service, provide a much better emergency egress for both canyons, and allow heavy equipment to be brought up to work on serious slides or avalanches from the top down. In addition, we currently feel that this alternative would have less impact on the natural setting, the wildlife, and the watershed.

These are our personal views, which you have solicited; and they do not represent the views of my spouse's business, which remains impartial with respect to BCC & LCC.

Comment I-99-9

Comment I-99-9

Comment I-99-9

Comment I-99-9

Comment I-99-9

I-100: Del Draper**Comment I-100-1****I-101: Scott Kisling****Comment I-101-1**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report.

I am a frequent skier of both Alta and Snowbird resorts in Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC), and frequent three-season hiker in Mill Creek Canyon (MCC) and hold an annual access pass to that canyon. Fortunately for me I am retired and prefer to avoid either of these canyons on weekends and holidays due to traffic and parking challenges.

Firstly, I am very much opposed to Sub-Alternatives A, B and C due to their negative impacts on hydrology, watershed, wilderness and visual quality. Alternative C, a PC-LCC gondola, would have the additional additional damaging effects of suddenly bringing far more people into LCC than resort base operations and terrain can handle, now and in the future.

Comment I-101-2

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report.

I am a frequent skier of both Alta and Snowbird resorts in Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC), and frequent three-season hiker in Mill Creek Canyon (MCC) and hold an annual access pass to that canyon. Fortunately for me I am retired and prefer to avoid either of these canyons on weekends and holidays due to traffic and parking challenges.

Firstly, I am very much opposed to Sub-Alternatives A, B and C due to their negative impacts on hydrology, watershed, wilderness and visual quality. Alternative C, a PC-LCC gondola, would have the additional additional damaging effects of suddenly bringing far more people into LCC than resort base operations and terrain can handle, now and in the future.

Comment I-101-3

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report.

I am a frequent skier of both Alta and Snowbird resorts in Little Cottonwood Canyon (LCC), and frequent three-season hiker in Mill Creek Canyon (MCC) and hold an annual access pass to that

canyon. Fortunately for me I am retired and prefer to avoid either of these canyons on weekends and holidays due to traffic and parking challenges.

Firstly, I am very much opposed to Sub-Alternatives A, B and C due to their negative impacts on hydrology, watershed, wilderness and visual quality. Alternative C, a PC-LCC gondola, would have the additional additional damaging effects of suddenly bringing far more people into LCC than resort base operations and terrain can handle, now and in the future.

Comment I-101-4

With up to 7000 vehicles per day, Highway 210 up LCC has an Avalanche Hazard Index approaching 500, which is considered extreme. Snow sheds, it seems to me, should be installed in avalanche prone areas under any transportation alternative. These should be implemented as the first step, improving traffic wait times and safety even under the current system, while reducing lifecycle costs driven by current avalanche mitigation efforts.

Comment I-101-5

I have little preference among the three LCC alternatives, with two caveats, both of which can be addressed with minimal incremental cost:

1) With fixed bus routes, loading an already partially-filled bus at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon or at a future Gravel Pit Transit Hub would likely cause long wait times at the intermediate stop. Zion NP's shuttle service has a similar challenge, with many people stopping late in the day at the Lodge, an intermediate stop, and finding down-canyon busses already full. They seem to have successfully met that challenge by calling dedicated Lodge-to-Visitor Center busses into service by an observer at the Lodge's loading station. Some similar system would ensure a more satisfied up-canyon ridership in LCC on busy days.

Comment I-101-6

2) In an effort to increase capacity, UTA and most other transit services limit passenger space, especially leg room. At my 6'3" height, I chose to avoid systems with busses or trains designed to be that tight, especially when required to carry skis or a pack. The possibility of getting stuck for an hour or more on a bus due to avalanche mitigation, which is not uncommon today, is a complete deal-breaker for me.

Comment I-101-7

2) In an effort to increase capacity, UTA and most other transit services limit passenger space, especially leg room. At my 6'3" height, I chose to avoid systems with busses or trains designed to be that tight, especially when required to carry skis or a pack. The possibility of getting stuck for an hour or more on a bus due to avalanche mitigation, which is not uncommon today, is a complete deal-breaker for me.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.
Scott Kisling

I-102: Marjorie McCloy

Comment I-102-1

Thank you all for your hard work on this. My preference is Tier 1.

Comment I-102-2

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

Comment I-102-2

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

Comment I-102-3

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

Comment I-102-4

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

Comment I-102-5

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

Comment I-102-6

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

Comment I-102-7

My priorities are preserving the wilderness aspects of the canyon, reducing automobile traffic, cleaning the air, and providing an economical and practical alternative to reaching ski areas (other than private vehicles). I would especially like to see more winter bus service to the ski areas that is convenient to those who live in SLC (most current Bus routes serve the south). I disapprove of a gondola or train, due to its added infrastructure. I am an avid hiker and skier and use the canyon several times/week year-round.

I-103: Susan F Fleming**Comment I-103-1**

My recommendation as a resident in Utah for almost 50 years is that we use existing roads with electric buses,

Comment I-103-2

My recommendation as a resident in Utah for almost 50 years is that we use existing roads with electric buses,

Comment I-103-3

not gondolas or trams, to transport people up to the ski areas.

Comment I-103-4

The electric buses should be charged with solar or wind power.

Comment I-103-5

Limiting the number of people allowed in the canyon on crowded days is fair. Our population is increasing quickly and even eco-conscious humans can deteriorate the environment if there are too many in these delicate mountain areas. We need efficiency, restraint, common sense to keep our plants and wildlife safe. Too many people in the canyons will inevitably damage the very places we love.

Comment I-103-6

Limiting the number of people allowed in the canyon on crowded days is fair. Our population is increasing quickly and even eco-conscious humans can deteriorate the environment if there are too many in these delicate mountain areas. We need efficiency, restraint, common sense to keep our plants and wildlife safe. Too many people in the canyons will inevitably damage the very places we love.

Comment I-103-7

Limiting the number of people allowed in the canyon on crowded days is fair. Our population is increasing quickly and even eco-conscious humans can deteriorate the environment if there are too many in these delicate mountain areas. We need efficiency, restraint, common sense to keep our plants and wildlife safe. Too many people in the canyons will inevitably damage the very places we love.

Comment I-103-8

Trams and gondolas create more infrastructure and more problems. Keep it simple.

Comment I-103-9

Limiting the number of people allowed in the canyon on crowded days is fair. Our population is increasing quickly and even eco-conscious humans can deteriorate the environment if there are too many in these delicate mountain areas. We need efficiency, restraint, common sense to keep our plants and wildlife safe. Too many people in the canyons will inevitably damage the very places we love.

I-104: JAMES KING**Comment I-104-1**

I am very much opposed to any widening of the roads because drivers will only go faster and be more dangerous, including those on bikes. People will just have to slow down if they're in a line of cars. Besides, widening the roads means more forest destruction.

Comment I-104-2

A Swiss-type small railway might be a possibility for Little C. but that would be expensive. There really are no easy answers or solutions.

I-105: Craig Denton**Comment I-105-1**

In an earlier response asking the public to comment on possible solutions to exponentially increasing recreational uses in the Central Wasatch Canyons, I advised not committing to expensive technology. I said that climate change will ultimately govern what happens to recreation in the canyons, especially in winter.

I'm disappointed that climate change isn't even mentioned in this MTS Draft Alternatives Report. Granted, it is difficult to plan around climate change since it can't be quantified as easily as cars and parking spaces. But to not even mention its existence in planning scenarios is disconcerting. Just one example: Most models indicate that we'll have less snow and winters will be shorter. Wouldn't that affect the number of people using LCC and BCC during the winter? Would a shorter season mean fewer people would invest in ski gear, meaning fewer visitor numbers? Or would a shorter season mean more people would use the canyons in the winter, trying to get in the maximum number of skiing days in a shorter season?

Comment I-105-2

So, all the thoughtful recommendations in the various alternatives are squishy at best.

For that reason I support Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus). It's the least expensive in terms of public dollars and probably in environmental impacts. Moreover, it's flexible. It can be ramped up or down quickly. It doesn't commit us to planning for visitor uses that might not be there in the future or committing to technology that could become white elephants (rail and gondola). Even if it doesn't explicitly incorporate climate change as a planning variable, it allows us to pivot as we learn more about the local effects of climate change.

Comment I-105-3

So, all the thoughtful recommendations in the various alternatives are squishy at best.

For that reason I support Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus). It's the least expensive in terms of public dollars and probably in environmental impacts. Moreover, it's flexible. It can be ramped up or down quickly. It doesn't commit us to planning for visitor uses that might not be there in the future or committing to technology that could become white elephants (rail and gondola). Even if it doesn't explicitly incorporate climate change as a planning variable, it allows us to pivot as we learn more about the local effects of climate change.

Comment I-105-4

So, all the thoughtful recommendations in the various alternatives are squishy at best.

For that reason I support Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus). It's the least expensive in terms of public dollars and probably in environmental impacts. Moreover, it's flexible. It can be ramped up or down quickly. It doesn't commit us to planning for visitor uses that might not be there in the future or committing to technology that could become white elephants (rail and gondola). Even if it doesn't explicitly incorporate climate change as a planning variable, it allows us to pivot as we learn more about the local effects of climate change.

Comment I-105-5

So, all the thoughtful recommendations in the various alternatives are squishy at best.

For that reason I support Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus). It's the least expensive in terms of public dollars and probably in environmental impacts. Moreover, it's flexible. It can be ramped up or down quickly. It doesn't commit us to planning for visitor uses that might not be there in the future or committing to technology that could become white elephants (rail and gondola). Even if it doesn't explicitly incorporate climate change as a planning variable, it allows us to pivot as we learn more about the local effects of climate change.

I-106: Dell Draper**Comment I-106-1**

I am 69 years old and a home owner in the Town of Alta. I drive up and down Little Cottonwood Canyon approximately 90 times a year and have done so for many years. I am an Alta season ski pass holder and I am familiar with the traffic situation in the canyon on winter days, especially when there is new powder. I bought an Ikon pass last year and I am familiar with the bus service in both canyons and the pay-to-park system at Solitude resort.

Comprehensive bus system is the way to go in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.

–Σ The roadway is already in existence, and this is by far the least expensive alternative.

–Σ The existing road in Little Cottonwood Canyon, in its current form, is adequate 98% of the time. Outside of traffic incidents I have never been in a traffic jam in Little Cottonwood Canyon in the Summer, Spring or Fall, even during the height of Oktoberfest. The traffic problem is limited to winter days, either when there is new powder or a crowded ski weekend day. Yet even on these very worst days when it may take over an hour to get from the mouth of

Big Cottonwood to the mouth of Little Cottonwood, once in the Canyon the traffic seems to flow.

Comment I-106-2

–Σ It is of critical importance to improve Wasatch Blvd and North Little Cottonwood Canyon Road so that busses can get ahead of any car traffic jams on Wasatch Blvd. Busses must be able to get ahead of the traffic jam on Wasatch on crowded winter days. This will help drive folks out of their cars and into busses.

Topic: bus priority

Comment I-106-3

–Σ Build the intermodal hubs and parking structures. This is a crucial step to get more people out of their cars and into busses.

o In addition to the two planned hubs, consider (re)purchasing the large no-man,Äôs-land between Olympus Hills Mall and I-215 and adding 39th south to the possible parking areas. The existing park and ride at 39th south for UTA could be expanded if UDOT (or the County?) staging area for snow plows were moved and the park and ride tripled in size.

Comment I-106-4

–Σ One reason the aerial tram and cog rail system are less desirable, in addition to their high costs, is that there is not adequate parking where people get onto these systems. If you have to take a bus to the bottom terminus of the tram or cog rail, why not just stay on the bus and ride it up the canyon. This is much more convenient and is more efficient.

Comment I-106-5

Use tolling and parking fees to encourage more people in fewer vehicles.

Comment I-106-6

–Σ With respect to buses you can incentivize people to use them by a having a bus service that is frequent, reliable and inexpensive. Reliable service includes service that can bypass the worst of the traffic jams on Wasatch and North Little Cottonwood Road and get to the head of the line at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Inexpensive is a relative term, and bus service needs to be inexpensive compared to other options. One means of making this occur is to put a price on driving private cars.

Comment I-106-7

–Σ With respect to buses you can incentivize people to use them by a having a bus service that is frequent, reliable and inexpensive. Reliable service includes service that can bypass the worst of the traffic jams on Wasatch and North Little Cottonwood Road and get to the head of

the line at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. Inexpensive is a relative term, and bus service needs to be inexpensive compared to other options. One means of making this occur is to put a price on driving private cars.

Comment I-106-8

–Σ The occupancy of cars can be increased by putting a toll on those who drive up the canyon. This also makes the bus look more attractive.

–Σ Occupancy of cars will also increase if cars that are not carpools must pay to park. The pay-to-park scheme adopted by Solitude resort last year should in some form be adopted by Alta and Snowbird. There may be other means to get more people in fewer vehicles that should be explored. A „Busses Only“ rule in effect for the first few hours of each day would reduce the number of cars. Please note that all of these steps, except building another lane or a bus lane between the mouth of Big Cottonwood and the mouth of Little Cottonwood, are very inexpensive compared to the options under consideration.

Comment I-106-9

–Σ Only after these steps have been taken and have been found to be wanting should consideration be given to an enhanced bus lane in the Canyon. Go for the low hanging fruit first before expensive „fixes“ that may not be necessary. If better bus service, tolling, charging for non-carpool parking and like do not solve the problem, then at a later date add a dedicated bus lane.

Comment I-106-10

Snow sheds may not be worth it.

–Σ An expenditure in the range of \$72 million dollars for snow sheds in Little Cottonwood Canyon increases the likelihood that skiers will have better access to the ski resorts for about 5 days each year. Even that is no guarantee. In the 2019/2020 winter the sheds as outlined in the UDOT EIS would have protected the road from only 40% of the slides, so resort access would still have been reduced for 2 or 3 days anyway.

–Σ Consider also, this is not a vital route connecting two major cities „this is a road that serves two privately owned ski resorts. If the road were closed for a few days what,“ the big deal? Is it worth \$72 million to solve this inconvenience? For some visitor it is part of the adventure and they will have a story to tell about how they got stuck for an extra night or two at a ski resort or could not get there immediately upon arrival. The inability to travel to the resorts for a few days each year is an acceptable risk when considered in light of the cost of the snow sheds.

Comment I-106-11

Lighten up on the opposition to road side parking and consider its benefits.

The MTS Plan calls for reduced road side parking in the Canyons. Efforts should be made to reduce roadside parking, but it should not be banned. Please consider:

–Σ There are huge numbers of cars parking at the trailhead of White Pine and many are parking roadside. This usual number of cars seems to have increased during the Covid induce cabin fever, but it may be here to stay.

To reduce roadside parking a larger off road parking lot is needed. While it is painful to advocate for paving paradise and building infrastructure that supports a car based solution to traffic in the canyons, I believe a larger parking lot is required and I assume one will be built. I also assume it is not possible to build a lot that could handle the number of cars currently parking on the roadside at this trailhead.

–Σ Summer and winter road side parking must be distinguished. In winter it may hamper snow removal and perhaps it should be banned. In summer the issues include blocking of the bike land and general safety issues but there is no reason to ban roadside parking.

–Σ If this expanded White Pine parking lot does not meet peak demand, one option is to prohibit roadside parking and have the parking lot be first come first serve, so some folks would find that they need to abort their planned adventure up White Pine when they arrive too late to find a parking stall. Another option is to continue to allow road side parking in the summer months for overflow demand. Continuing to allow roadside parking, which is a matter of traffic regulation, may be the best option.

–Σ If roadside parking is allowed, the speed limit in this area could be reduced. The limit is currently 40 mph but the area is just several hundred yards from the point before Snowbird where the speed limit on 210 is 30 mph for the balance of the road eastward towards Alta, where it drops to 25 mph.

–Σ This area with roadside parking could also be managed something like a school zone and have flashing signs that reduce the speed limit to 25 mph on those summer weekend days when everyone seems to want to go White Pine.

–Σ It would be totally illogical to ban roadside parking for the backcountry enthusiasts using the White Pine trail head and to not treat Snowbird,Ãs Octoberfest the same way. If you ban roadside parking at White Pine you must also ban roadside parking at Snowbird.

–Σ I argue that neither should be banned, that using the edge of the road to park is environmental sensitive alternative to building massive parking lots in the in canyon, and that the safety issue can be addressed with reduces speed limits, warning signs and proper highway and roadside striping and marking

I-107: David Kliger**Comment I-107-1**

As a resident of Cottonwood Heights and avid user of both Canyons I fail to see how having a Tram/gondola up Little would aid in alleviating traffic flow in the canyons and to the canyons. Who will benefit? Skiers at Alta, Snowbird? They are only a small fraction of the people heading into the canyons. Why spend so much money that would benefit only a few at best.

Comment I-107-2

As a resident of Cottonwood Heights and avid user of both Canyons I fail to see how having a Tram/gondola up Little would aid in alleviating traffic flow in the canyons and to the canyons. Who will benefit? Skiers at Alta, Snowbird? They are only a small fraction of the people heading into the canyons. Why spend so much money that would benefit only a few at best.

Comment I-107-3

An enhanced bus system along with canyon tolling would be more flexible and much less expensive as well as requiring less new canyon infrastructure. WE need to tax the bad (single use vehicles) to support the good(mass transit). To me it is a no brainer.

Comment I-107-4

An enhanced bus system along with canyon tolling would be more flexible and much less expensive as well as requiring less new canyon infrastructure. WE need to tax the bad (single use vehicles) to support the good(mass transit). To me it is a no brainer.

Comment I-107-5

An enhanced bus system along with canyon tolling would be more flexible and much less expensive as well as requiring less new canyon infrastructure. WE need to tax the bad (single use vehicles) to support the good(mass transit). To me it is a no brainer.

Comment I-107-6

An enhanced bus system along with canyon tolling would be more flexible and much less expensive as well as requiring less new canyon infrastructure. WE need to tax the bad (single use vehicles) to support the good(mass transit). To me it is a no brainer.

Comment I-107-7

An enhanced bus system along with canyon tolling would be more flexible and much less expensive as well as requiring less new canyon infrastructure. WE need to tax the bad (single use vehicles) to support the good(mass transit). To me it is a no brainer.

Comment I-107-8

An enhanced bus system along with canyon tolling would be more flexible and much less expensive as well as requiring less new canyon infrastructure. WE need to tax the bad (single use vehicles) to support the good(mass transit). To me it is a no brainer.

I-108: Thomas Quam**Comment I-108-1**

The only real solution is a buses only canyons and they should be electric. Start with the NP model.

Comment I-108-2

I don't support gondolas, trains or wider roads. It's all about changing behavior. Developing these canyons would be a mistake discussed by citizens and travelers for decades.

Comment I-108-3

I don't support gondolas, trains or wider roads. It's all about changing behavior. Developing these canyons would be a mistake discussed by citizens and travelers for decades.

Comment I-108-4

I don't support gondolas, trains or wider roads. It's all about changing behavior. Developing these canyons would be a mistake discussed by citizens and travelers for decades.

I-109: Phyllis Mandel**Comment I-109-1**

I strongly favor increased bus transit up the canyons, including stops at major trailheads, not just at the ski resorts. In addition, an express bus to Alta during ski season would be a user-friendly option. I would also favor a toll on cars going up the canyon, and keeping bus fares reasonable.

Comment I-109-2

I strongly favor increased bus transit up the canyons, including stops at major trailheads, not just at the ski resorts. In addition, an express bus to Alta during ski season would be a user-friendly option. I would also favor a toll on cars going up the canyon, and keeping bus fares reasonable.

Comment I-109-3

I strongly favor increased bus transit up the canyons, including stops at major trailheads, not just at the ski resorts. In addition, an express bus to Alta during ski season would be a user-friendly option. I would also favor a toll on cars going up the canyon, and keeping bus fares reasonable.

Comment I-109-4

I strongly favor increased bus transit up the canyons, including stops at major trailheads, not just at the ski resorts. In addition, an express bus to Alta during ski season would be a user-friendly option. I would also favor a toll on cars going up the canyon, and keeping bus fares reasonable.

Comment I-109-5

The expense of a gondola is unconscionable, and if people still need to take a bus to the gondola, what's the point.

Comment I-109-6

Widening the road is an enormously costly proposition, with heavy environmental consequences, and only leads to having more polluting traffic going into the canyons, and doesn't address the issue of limited parking capacity once in the Canyon.

Comment I-109-7

Widening the road is an enormously costly proposition, with heavy environmental consequences, and only leads to having more polluting traffic going into the canyons, and doesn't address the issue of limited parking capacity once in the Canyon.

Comment I-109-8

Widening the road is an enormously costly proposition, with heavy environmental consequences, and only leads to having more polluting traffic going into the canyons, and doesn't address the issue of limited parking capacity once in the Canyon.

Comment I-109-9

Similar, building snow sheds will have an enormous cost, both financially and environmentally, and does not make any sense.

Comment I-109-10

Similar, building snow sheds will have an enormous cost, both financially and environmentally, and does not make any sense.

Comment I-109-11**I-110: Joan Degiorgio****Comment I-110-1**

First, I appreciate that the CWC is taking a regional approach to the difficult issue of canyon transportation. For me, the bottom line is canyon protection and conservation because of its importance as watershed. While it may be difficult to hold the line on development, it will be nearly impossible to reverse any increased development facilitated by choosing Alternatives 2 or 3.

Comment I-110-2

First, I appreciate that the CWC is taking a regional approach to the difficult issue of canyon transportation. For me, the bottom line is canyon protection and conservation because of its importance as watershed. While it may be difficult to hold the line on development, it will be nearly impossible to reverse any increased development facilitated by choosing Alternatives 2 or 3.

Comment I-110-3

First, I appreciate that the CWC is taking a regional approach to the difficult issue of canyon transportation. For me, the bottom line is canyon protection and conservation because of its importance as watershed. While it may be difficult to hold the line on development, it will be nearly impossible to reverse any increased development facilitated by choosing Alternatives 2 or 3.

Comment I-110-4

I support Alternative 1. We have not yet vigorously put our energy into these more accessible, while perhaps socially challenging, measures. We first need to choose the alternative that does the least amount of environmental harm. The one aspect of Alternative 1 that I question is the need for snow sheds. With all of the work the resorts are doing with UDOT (gasex, etc.), is there still the need for snow sheds with their visual impacts?

Comment I-110-5

I support Alternative 1. We have not yet vigorously put our energy into these more accessible, while perhaps socially challenging, measures. We first need to choose the alternative that does

the least amount of environmental harm. The one aspect of Alternative 1 that I question is the need for snow sheds. With all of the work the resorts are doing with UDOT (gasex, etc.), is there still the need for snow sheds with their visual impacts?

Comment I-110-6

I support Alternative 1. We have not yet vigorously put our energy into these more accessible, while perhaps socially challenging, measures. We first need to choose the alternative that does the least amount of environmental harm. The one aspect of Alternative 1 that I question is the need for snow sheds. With all of the work the resorts are doing with UDOT (gasex, etc.), is there still the need for snow sheds with their visual impacts?

Comment I-110-7

I support Alternative 1. We have not yet vigorously put our energy into these more accessible, while perhaps socially challenging, measures. We first need to choose the alternative that does the least amount of environmental harm. The one aspect of Alternative 1 that I question is the need for snow sheds. With all of the work the resorts are doing with UDOT (gasex, etc.), is there still the need for snow sheds with their visual impacts?

Comment I-110-8

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-9

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-10

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-11

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-12

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-13

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-14

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-15

I am very much opposed to the gondola with its visual impact, expense and lack of utility for dispersed users. Similarly, I am very concerned with Alternative 3 and the rail. Besides the potential environmental impact, its potential to facilitate interconnect is concerning.

Comment I-110-16

I am surprised that any form of interconnect is still being considered. I thought consideration of this idea had long been exhausted from potential hydrologic disruption of a tunnel, to the visual impact of a gondola, to the resultant "commodification" of the canyons with either proposal. Interconnect will ensure that the upper regions of these unique canyons become even more dominated by the ski resorts and we will lose an irreplaceable treasure.

Comment I-110-17

I am surprised that any form of interconnect is still being considered. I thought consideration of this idea had long been exhausted from potential hydrologic disruption of a tunnel, to the visual impact of a gondola, to the resultant "commodification" of the canyons with either proposal. Interconnect will ensure that the upper regions of these unique canyons become even more dominated by the ski resorts and we will lose an irreplaceable treasure.

Comment I-110-18

I am surprised that any form of interconnect is still being considered. I thought consideration of this idea had long been exhausted from potential hydrologic disruption of a tunnel, to the visual impact of a gondola, to the resultant "commodification" of the canyons with either proposal. Interconnect will ensure that the upper regions of these unique canyons become even more dominated by the ski resorts and we will lose an irreplaceable treasure.

Comment I-110-19

I am surprised that any form of interconnect is still being considered. I thought consideration of this idea had long been exhausted from potential hydrologic disruption of a tunnel, to the visual impact of a gondola, to the resultant "commodification" of the canyons with either proposal. Interconnect will ensure that the upper regions of these unique canyons become even more dominated by the ski resorts and we will lose an irreplaceable treasure.

Comment I-110-20

I am surprised that any form of interconnect is still being considered. I thought consideration of this idea had long been exhausted from potential hydrologic disruption of a tunnel, to the visual impact of a gondola, to the resultant "commodification" of the canyons with either proposal. Interconnect will ensure that the upper regions of these unique canyons become even more dominated by the ski resorts and we will lose an irreplaceable treasure.

Comment I-110-21

I am surprised that any form of interconnect is still being considered. I thought consideration of this idea had long been exhausted from potential hydrologic disruption of a tunnel, to the visual impact of a gondola, to the resultant "commodification" of the canyons with either proposal. Interconnect will ensure that the upper regions of these unique canyons become even more dominated by the ski resorts and we will lose an irreplaceable treasure.

Comment I-110-22

Which brings me to my final comment: carrying capacity. As Laura Briefer highlighted on the CWC panel, while we have yet to fully understand "carrying capacity" what we do know is that already management is overwhelmed and barely keeping up. I was also disappointed that any reference to the Environmental Dashboard was not mentioned in this context. If we can recall back to the Mountain Accord days - an environmental dashboard was universally supported. I hope that effort is going forward and the CWC will use it to inform its decisions.

Just because we can move more people up the canyons - doesn't mean we should.

Thank you for all of your efforts!

Comment I-110-23

Which brings me to my final comment: carrying capacity. As Laura Briefer highlighted on the CWC panel, while we have yet to fully understand "carrying capacity" what we do know is that already management is overwhelmed and barely keeping up. I was also disappointed that any reference to the Environmental Dashboard was not mentioned in this context. If we can recall back to the Mountain Accord days - an environmental dashboard was universally supported. I hope that effort is going forward and the CWC will use it to inform its decisions.

Just because we can move more people up the canyons - doesn't mean we should.

Thank you for all of your efforts!

I-111: Sylvia Wilcox

Comment I-111-1

Increased bus service to the ski resorts from the base is something I would use. I think there needs to be a cut-off point when cars are turned away if the resort parking is full, or even a way to turn cars away before they get all the way up the canyon.

Comment I-111-2

Increased bus service to the ski resorts from the base is something I would use. I think there needs to be a cut-off point when cars are turned away if the resort parking is full, or even a way to turn cars away before they get all the way up the canyon.

I-112: JD Ethington

Comment I-112-1

I am generally in favor of expanding access to the Cottonwood canyons through non-vehicular means. My use of the canyons is widespread as I consider myself a skier (resort and backcountry), biker (road and mountain), peak climber (all seasons), and also a rock climber. I favor aerial travel over trains, but trains seem like a good option when using existing tunnels as long as the environmental impact is low and manageable.

Specifically, I am for an aerial gondola up Little Cottonwood starting from La Caille with recommendations. If ski resorts were to expand their daytime hours, it could spread out travelers also reduce the peak time travel capacity- making the gondola an even better solution.

I am ok with connecting Big and Little with recommendations.

Comment I-112-2

My recommendations are to consider recreational viewpoints that have not seemed to be represented very clearly in previous drafts and meetings, although there are mentions of some of these problems. As an example, a gondola up little cottonwood that heavily services the ski resorts seems flawed and catering to a limited population. A gondola up Little Cottonwood that functions year round, allows for bicycle transport, has stops at major trailheads and the town of Alta becomes a solution for a much larger group of people. Also, the gondola travel time needs to be reduced to make it a competitive transportation alternative. This seems possible from what other cities have done around the world with top gondola speeds around 35 mph

Comment I-112-3

My recommendations are to consider recreational viewpoints that have not seemed to be represented very clearly in previous drafts and meetings, although there are mentions of some of these problems. As an example, a gondola up little cottonwood that heavily services the ski resorts seems flawed and catering to a limited population. A gondola up Little Cottonwood that functions year round, allows for bicycle transport, has stops at major trailheads and the town of Alta becomes a solution for a much larger group of people. Also, the gondola travel time needs to be reduced to make it a competitive transportation alternative. This seems possible from what other cities have done around the world with top gondola speeds around 35 mph.

Comment I-112-4

My recommendations are to consider recreational viewpoints that have not seemed to be represented very clearly in previous drafts and meetings, although there are mentions of some of these problems. As an example, a gondola up little cottonwood that heavily services the ski resorts seems flawed and catering to a limited population. A gondola up Little Cottonwood that functions year round, allows for bicycle transport, has stops at major trailheads and the town of Alta becomes a solution for a much larger group of people. Also, the gondola travel time needs to be reduced to make it a competitive transportation alternative. This seems possible from what other cities have done around the world with top gondola speeds around 35 mph

Comment I-112-5

If train is chosen as an alternative, I would have the same recommendations as above, but with an added concern that train tracks seem like they could impede access to trails and trailheads.

Comment I-112-6

In terms of snow sheds, I was all for them in addition to alternative transportation methods, but I thought I read something that said the canyon roads would still need to be closed while they did avalanche control. This seems counter productive to the building of snow sheds, and I hope this is incorrect. Regardless, I believe those details should be more clearly stated to the public in order to manage expectations.

Comment I-112-7

In terms of snow sheds, I was all for them in addition to alternative transportation methods, but I thought I read something that said the canyon roads would still need to be closed while they did avalanche control. This seems counter productive to the building of snow sheds, and I hope this is incorrect. Regardless, I believe those details should be more clearly stated to the public in order to manage expectations.

I-113: Jenny Hawke

Comment I-113-1

I support the position of the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance concerning this matter. I don't feel that this draft has taken the consideration of climbers usage into account.

I-114: Jessica Powell

Comment I-114-1

I wanted to reach out and comment on the plans to change transportation in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Though reform is necessary especially in consideration of the winter traffic in the canyon, some major issues have failed to be recognized by this committee namely being:

1. Roadside parking reduction is not acceptable at this time;

Comment I-114-2

2. Roadside widening continues to threaten climbing resources;

Comment I-114-3

3. Exclusion of additional bathrooms at trailheads threatens water quality;

Comment I-114-3

4. Supporting the needs of climbers supports general dispersed use;

Comment I-114-4

5. Aerial-based alternatives do not serve climbers and threaten viewsheds; and

Comment I-114-5

5. Aerial-based alternatives do not serve climbers and threaten viewsheds; and

Comment I-114-6

6. Canyon tolls should be directed to the infrastructure of recreation resources and conservation of the watershed.

Comment I-114-7

Please, please consider these as you move on making plans for changing the canyon. The proposed solutions have major impacts lower in the canyon.

I-115: Margaret Bourke

Comment I-115-1

I find this process and the alternatives submitted flawed in the same way I find the UDOT EIS flawed. Each are focused primarily, if not solely, on moving people into a box canyon. Neither even mention the consequences of that movement. There is no effort to reign in the number of people or establish base line carrying capacity of the environment into which people are to be deposited. Visitation, whether from the valley, the state, the nation, or the world has been steadily increasing; all while the geography has NOT grown. Alta Town did a study determining that summer visitation doubled every 5 years.

Comment I-115-2

I find this process and the alternatives submitted flawed in the same way I find the UDOT EIS flawed. Each are focused primarily, if not solely, on moving people into a box canyon. Neither even mention the consequences of that movement. There is no effort to reign in the number of people or establish base line carrying capacity of the environment into which people are to be deposited. Visitation, whether from the valley, the state, the nation, or the world has been steadily increasing; all while the geography has NOT grown. Alta Town did a study determining that summer visitation doubled every 5 years.

Comment I-115-3

Parking had been, and continues to be used by the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest personnel to "limit" visitation, and possibly likely human impacts on the ecosystem.

Comment I-115-4

Parking had been, and continues to be used by the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest personnel to "limit" visitation, and possibly likely human impacts on the ecosystem.

Comment I-115-5

Parking had been, and continues to be used by the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest personnel to "limit" visitation, and possibly likely human impacts on the ecosystem.

Comment I-115-6

Watershed concerns are not addressed in making it more convenient or "speedy" to move an ever growing number of people into a finite space.

Comment I-115-7

What are the impacts on the ecosystem from these ever growing number of people?

Comment I-115-8

What are the effects to the same ecosystem by changes to the climate in precipitation coming in the form of rain rather than snow, as well as continuing droughts? What are the effects to the ecosystem by unlimited human interface with the natural environment, further and further from the established urban/rural/wild-land interface?

Comment I-115-9

What are the effects to the same ecosystem by changes to the climate in precipitation coming in the form of rain rather than snow, as well as continuing droughts? What are the effects to the ecosystem by unlimited human interface with the natural environment, further and further from the established urban/rural/wild-land interface?

Comment I-115-10

Is there a way to build a gondola which primarily benefits of the developer, and two for profit businesses - the resorts, without taxing the citizens?

The gondola serves only the resorts, not the various trails and trailheads located not immediately adjacent at those resorts. This means that private vehicles would still be required for recreation outside the resorts. Buses do not travel in the summer for recreation. There is merely a single bus up in the morning and down in the evening, primarily serving the employees of the resorts; again it stops only at the resorts.

Comment I-115-11

Is there a way to build a gondola which primarily benefits of the developer, and two for profit businesses - the resorts, without taxing the citizens?

The gondola serves only the resorts, not the various trails and trailheads located not immediately adjacent at those resorts. This means that private vehicles would still be required for recreation outside the resorts. Buses do not travel in the summer for recreation. There is merely a single bus up in the morning and down in the evening, primarily serving the employees of the resorts; again it stops only at the resorts.

Comment I-115-12

Is there a way to build a gondola which primarily benefits of the developer, and two for profit businesses - the resorts, without taxing the citizens?

The gondola serves only the resorts, not the various trails and trailheads located not immediately adjacent at those resorts. This means that private vehicles would still be required for recreation outside the resorts. Buses do not travel in the summer for recreation. There is merely a single bus up in the morning and down in the evening, primarily serving the employees of the resorts; again it stops only at the resorts.

Comment I-115-13

Cheaper alternatives exist. One is to provide an express lane for buses; implementing traction law changes, plus a sticker program to address congestion at the mouth of the canyon.

Comment I-115-14

Cheaper alternatives exist. One is to provide an express lane for buses; implementing traction law changes, plus a sticker program to address congestion at the mouth of the canyon.

Comment I-115-15

Cheaper alternatives exist. One is to provide an express lane for buses; implementing traction law changes, plus a sticker program to address congestion at the mouth of the canyon.

Comment I-115-16

Cheaper alternatives exist. One is to provide an express lane for buses; implementing traction law changes, plus a sticker program to address congestion at the mouth of the canyon.

Comment I-115-17

Cheaper alternatives exist. One is to provide an express lane for buses; implementing traction law changes, plus a sticker program to address congestion at the mouth of the canyon.

Comment I-115-18

Absent re-working the entire topography of the canyon, there will be risks of rock and debris flows, whether driven by rain, snowfall, or earthquake.

Another alternative, with much less expense; impose a limit on the number of people/vehicles in the canyon. Reservations, to provide and ensure adequate parking; excellent visitor experience on arrival at areas with adequate facilities to accommodate the visitors, including in restaurants, hotels, hygiene facilities and outdoor spaces including slopes.

Comment I-115-19

Absent re-working the entire topography of the canyon, there will be risks of rock and debris flows, whether driven by rain, snowfall, or earthquake.

Another alternative, with much less expense; impose a limit on the number of people/vehicles in the canyon. Reservations, to provide and ensure adequate parking; excellent visitor experience on arrival at areas with adequate facilities to accommodate the visitors, including in restaurants, hotels, hygiene facilities and outdoor spaces including slopes.

Comment I-115-20

"Moving people efficiently to desired locations" is not the end of the movement. Once they arrive, there must be place "there" for them.

A possible transit tunnel between BCC and LCC is a bad idea. Watershed will be negatively impacted, almost certainly. A primary reason the land transfer did not occur for Grizzly Gulch between Alta Ski Lifts, company and the forest service, was that the USFS would NOT acquire lands that had prior mining operations because those lands were viewed as possible contamination sites due to that historical mining activity. So many mines were patented in LCC that possible heavy metals exist in many abandoned shafts. Once disturbed, these shafts, tunnels could present serious issues to the quality of the currently considered high quality water in LCC.

Comment I-115-21

while a base to base gondola connection between LCC and BCC might not have such a large likely negative impact due to support towers not requiring excavations at mining depths, it is difficult to imagine not experiencing similar negative environmental impacts from unfettered travel of people between the canyons. Trash and other debris can be found along the track of any and likely all conveyance mechanisms. For nearly 40 years, the LCC citizen volunteers, perform a "canyon clean-up," attempting to remove trash and other deleterious material from the watershed.

Comment I-115-22

while a base to base gondola connection between LCC and BCC might not have such a large likely negative impact due to support towers not requiring excavations at mining depths, it is difficult to imagine not experiencing similar negative environmental impacts from unfettered travel of people between the canyons. Trash and other debris can be found along the track of any and likely all conveyance mechanisms. For nearly 40 years, the LCC citizen volunteers, perform a "canyon clean-up," attempting to remove trash and other deleterious material from the watershed.

Comment I-115-23

Trails are becoming increasingly damaged from overuse; single-tracks have become doubles, rogue trails are developing in far more places. there is simply no ability to accommodate, both safely and with safe air and water quality all who might wish to visit.

Comment I-115-24

Trails are becoming increasingly damaged from overuse; single-tracks have become doubles, rogue trails are developing in far more places. there is simply no ability to accommodate, both safely and with safe air and water quality all who might wish to visit.

Comment I-115-25

I urge you to not follow the lead of developers, ever bent on "more and more." If you don't build it, they will still come.

I-116: Margaret Bourke

Comment I-116-1

I find this process and the alternatives submitted flawed in the same way I find the UDOT EIS flawed. Each are focused primarily, if not solely, on moving people into a box canyon. Neither even mention the consequences of that movement. There is no effort to reign in the number of people or establish base line carrying capacity of the environment into which people are to be deposited. Visitation, whether from the valley, the state, the nation, or the world has been steadily increasing; all while the geography has NOT grown. Alta Town did a study determining that summer visitation doubled every 5 years. Parking had been, and continues to be used by the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest personnel to "limit" visitation, and

Comment I-116-2

possibly likely human impacts on the ecosystem. Watershed concerns are not addressed in making it more convenient or "speedy" to move an ever growing number of people into a finite space.

What are the impacts on the ecosystem from these ever growing number of people? What are the effects to the same ecosystem by changes to the climate in precipitation coming in the form of rain rather than snow, as well as continuing droughts? What are the effects to the ecosystem by unlimited human interface with the natural environment, further and further from the established urban/rural/wild-land interface?

Comment I-116-3

Is there a way to build a gondola which primarily benefits of the developer, and two for profit businesses - the resorts, without taxing the citizens?

The gondola serves only the resorts, not the various trails and trailheads located not immediately adjacent at those resorts. This means that private vehicles would still be required for recreation outside the resorts. Buses do not travel in the summer for recreation. There is merely a single bus up in the morning and down in the evening, primarily serving the employees of the resorts; again it stops only at the resorts.

Cheaper alternatives exist. One is to provide an express lane for buses; implementing traction law changes, plus a sticker program to address congestion at the mouth of the canyon.

Comment I-116-4

Absent re-working the entire topography of the canyon, there will be risks of rock and debris flows, whether driven by rain, snowfall, or earthquake.

Another alternative, with much less expense; impose a limit on the number of people/vehicles in the canyon. Reservations, to provide and ensure adequate parking; excellent visitor experience on arrival at areas with adequate facilities to accommodate the visitors, including in restaurants, hotels, hygiene facilities and outdoor spaces including slopes.

"Moving people efficiently to desired locations" is not the end of the movement. Once they arrive, there must be place "there" for them.

A possible transit tunnel between BCC and LCC is a bad idea. Watershed will be negatively impacted, almost certainly. A primary reason the land transfer did not occur for Grizzly Gulch between Alta Ski Lifts, company and the forest service, was that the USFS would NOT acquire lands that had prior mining operations because those lands were viewed as possible contamination sites due to that historical mining activity. So many mines were patented in LCC that possible heavy metals exist in many abandoned shafts. Once disturbed, these shafts, tunnels could present serious issues to the quality of the currently considered high quality water in LCC.

Comment I-116-5

while a base to base gondola connection between LCC and BCC might not have such a large likely negative impact due to support towers not requiring excavations at mining depths, it is difficult to imagine not experiencing similar negative environmental impacts from unfettered travel of people between the canyons. Trash and other debris can be found along the track of any and likely all conveyance mechanisms. For nearly 40 years, the LCC citizen volunteers, perform a "canyon clean-up," attempting to remove trash and other deleterious material from the watershed.

Comment I-116-6

Trails are becoming increasingly damaged from overuse; single-tracks have become doubles, rogue trails are developing in far more places. there is simply no ability to accommodate, both safely and with safe air and water quality all who might wish to visit.

Comment I-116-7

Trails are becoming increasingly damaged from overuse; single-tracks have become doubles, rogue trails are developing in far more places. there is simply no ability to accommodate, both safely and with safe air and water quality all who might wish to visit.

Comment I-116-8

I urge you to not follow the lead of developers, ever bent on "more and more." If you don't build it, they will still come.

I-117: Roger Bourke

Comment I-117-1

The gondola is a huge subsidy to two businesses, Alta Ski Lifts and Snowbird, at taxpayers expense. It appears to be promoted by a real estate developer near the base, plus the two

resorts. Moreover, it doesn't meet transportation needs in the canyon, only to those two resorts.

Comment I-117-2

The gondola is a huge subsidy to two businesses, Alta Ski Lifts and Snowbird, at taxpayers expense. It appears to be promoted by a real estate developer near the base, plus the two resorts. Moreover, it doesn't meet transportation needs in the canyon, only to those two resorts.

Comment I-117-3

The gondola is a huge subsidy to two businesses, Alta Ski Lifts and Snowbird, at taxpayers expense. It appears to be promoted by a real estate developer near the base, plus the two resorts. Moreover, it doesn't meet transportation needs in the canyon, only to those two resorts.

Comment I-117-4

Any bus plan is far better as it doesn't rely on a single starting point, but rather has the flexibility to pick up at multiple locations and let them off at multiple locations, particularly in summer.

Comment I-117-5

Any bus plan is far better as it doesn't rely on a single starting point, but rather has the flexibility to pick up at multiple locations and let them off at multiple locations, particularly in summer.

Comment I-117-6

Any bus plan is far better as it doesn't rely on a single starting point, but rather has the flexibility to pick up at multiple locations and let them off at multiple locations, particularly in summer.

I-118: James Moore

Comment I-118-1

As a frequent recreational traveler of both BCC and LCC, I appreciate the focus the CWC is placing on the MTS draft alternatives. I feel that MTS Alternative 1 with enhanced bus services is the best option.

Comment I-118-2

The gondola and rail options would certainly lead to long queues of users waiting to board on busy days. I also think users wouldn't be likely to take advantage of these systems if they also need to board a bus just to reach the base of the gondola/train.

Therefore, alternative 1 with enhanced bus service would be the most direct and least time consuming for the users.

Comment I-118-3

The gondola and rail options would certainly lead to long queues of users waiting to board on busy days. I also think users wouldn't be likely to take advantage of these systems if they also need to board a bus just to reach the base of the gondola/train.

Therefore, alternative 1 with enhanced bus service would be the most direct and least time consuming for the users.

Comment I-118-4

The gondola and rail options would certainly lead to long queues of users waiting to board on busy days. I also think users wouldn't be likely to take advantage of these systems if they also need to board a bus just to reach the base of the gondola/train.

Therefore, alternative 1 with enhanced bus service would be the most direct and least time consuming for the users.

Comment I-118-5

Additionally, I do not support the subalternatives which would interconnect the canyons and PC. These suggestions would drive up the cost of an ever-increasing season pass, as the resorts would almost certainly create an interconnect pass that would be vastly more expensive. Also these initiatives would pass through our already limited backcountry ski terrain. Please do not allow the beautiful Central Wasatch terrain to become further privatized and filled with "no trespassing" signs.

Comment I-118-6

While I do support alternative 1, there are some issues that I would like to illuminate. The resorts need to have more options for people to store their gear and belongings at the resorts after riding the bus. Most of the time I drive the canyons because I want to bring food, water, spare clothes, 2 snowboards, extra goggle lenses, etc. When I ride the bus I can't bring the extra supplies up the canyon with me. I know it sounds excessive, but many avid skiers/riders like to have extra gear in the event of weather changes or breakage. Also most of us can't afford to eat at the resorts. Possibly seasonal locker rental options? I understand this would be the responsibility of each respective resort.

Comment I-118-7

One more issue with the enhanced buses is the access to backcountry trailheads. Backcountry users would need the ability to get off the bus at the key trailheads. Every season the numbers

of folks earning their turns is increasing, especially now with the current COVID-19 situation. I'm sure that this trend of increased backcountry skiing/riding will continue through 2050, and those users should not be ignored. Especially since a majority of those users are Utah residents.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comment, and for considering the opinions of those who love the Wasatch. I'm looking forward to the future of our beautiful range.

-James

I-119: Cabot Curtis

Comment I-119-1

Build gondola to twin lakes pass with a day lodge stops at gad valley - with new trailhead to white pine, snowbird center, Alta and a new day lodge at the pass to give access to Brighton and solitude. Build a large parking garage at mouth of canyon.

Comment I-119-2

Build gondola to twin lakes pass with a day lodge stops at gad valley - with new trailhead to white pine, snowbird center, Alta and a new day lodge at the pass to give access to Brighton and solitude. Build a large parking garage at mouth of canyon.

Comment I-119-3

Build gondola to twin lakes pass with a day lodge stops at gad valley - with new trailhead to white pine, snowbird center, Alta and a new day lodge at the pass to give access to Brighton and solitude. Build a large parking garage at mouth of canyon.

I-120: Miguel Pabon

Comment I-120-1

I believe three improvements will make drastic changes to traffic flow up our heavily used canyons:

1. MORE parking at the base of the canyons, for car pooling and for riding public transportation. MORE parking at ski resorts, and areas with popular BC access, for improving traffic flow right at the end of the road. Why have parking areas not been expanded or parking structures built in the course of the years? Infrastructure needs to catch up to population growth. Expanded parking areas and parking structures will ensure parking to visitors, which will prevent people from idling/driving in circles/parking on the road, all of which contribute to traffic jams.

Comment I-120-2

I believe three improvements will make drastic changes to traffic flow up our heavily used canyons:

1. MORE parking at the base of the canyons, for car pooling and for riding public transportation. MORE parking at ski resorts, and areas with popular BC access, for improving traffic flow right at the end of the road. Why have parking areas not been expanded or parking structures built in the course of the years? Infrastructure needs to catch up to population growth. Expanded parking areas and parking structures will ensure parking to visitors, which will prevent people from idling/driving in circles/parking on the road, all of which contribute to traffic jams.

Comment I-120-3

I believe three improvements will make drastic changes to traffic flow up our heavily used canyons:

1. MORE parking at the base of the canyons, for car pooling and for riding public transportation. MORE parking at ski resorts, and areas with popular BC access, for improving traffic flow right at the end of the road. Why have parking areas not been expanded or parking structures built in the course of the years? Infrastructure needs to catch up to population growth. Expanded parking areas and parking structures will ensure parking to visitors, which will prevent people from idling/driving in circles/parking on the road, all of which contribute to traffic jams.

Comment I-120-4

I believe three improvements will make drastic changes to traffic flow up our heavily used canyons:

1. MORE parking at the base of the canyons, for car pooling and for riding public transportation. MORE parking at ski resorts, and areas with popular BC access, for improving traffic flow right at the end of the road. Why have parking areas not been expanded or parking structures built in the course of the years? Infrastructure needs to catch up to population growth. Expanded parking areas and parking structures will ensure parking to visitors, which will prevent people from idling/driving in circles/parking on the road, all of which contribute to traffic jams.

Comment I-120-5

2. WIDEN the roads, and install ROAD DIVIDERS and ROAD RAILS. These will effectively reduce the numbers of hours the narrow, two lane canyons roads are blocked by traffic accidents and blocked by those who are slow drivers on snowy roads.

Comment I-120-6

2. WIDEN the roads, and install ROAD DIVIDERS and ROAD RAILS. These will effectively reduce the numbers of hours the narrow, two lane canyons roads are blocked by traffic accidents and blocked by those who are slow drivers on snowy roads.

Comment I-120-7

3. Improve public transport up the canyons. I believe more busses can alleviate the traffic problem. I would definitively create two bus routes: bus route one would be exclusively dedicated to resort stops. Bus route two would be exclusively dedicated to backcountry stops. Busses would that way make less stops, and there could be two different loading stations at the bottom of the canyons, which will help minimize overcrowding.
Hope these help us all.

I-121: Eric Shmookler**Comment I-121-1**

I support Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC).

Comment I-121-2

I support Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC).

Comment I-121-3

I support Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC).

I-122: Ryan Bucknum**Comment I-122-1**

I believe a busing system up bc and lcc along with expanded parking in the gravel pit s the way go for the future

Comment I-122-2

I believe a busing system up bc and lcc along with expanded parking in the gravel pit s the way go for the future

I-123: Andrew Campbell**Comment I-123-1**

I support CWC's Mountain Transportation Option 1. This is the only option that can quickly and efficiently address the current traffic issues in LCC. The other options will take too long to implement and cost too much for taxpayers. These options also disproportionately benefit Alta and Snowbird rather than the citizens who will be paying taxes to support them. There are no details as to whether or not the resorts will financially support these options in any way. The

gondola and train option imply that the only canyon destinations are Alta and Snowbird. It is obvious that this is not true and that the inability of these options to have multiple efficient stops in the canyon makes them unrealistic for any canyon user who's sole destination is not one of these resorts. These options are nothing but a taxpayer subsidized ski lift for the resorts. Increased bussing with major improvements to Highway 210 costs less and gives people the option to reach multiple canyon destinations as well as Alta and Snowbird. Additionally, the resorts have always subsidized bus access for ticket holders and would have no precedent to not do so in the future.

Comment I-123-2

I support CWC's Mountain Transportation Option 1. This is the only option that can quickly and efficiently address the current traffic issues in LCC. The other options will take too long to implement and cost too much for taxpayers. These options also disproportionately benefit Alta and Snowbird rather than the citizens who will be paying taxes to support them. There are no details as to whether or not the resorts will financially support these options in any way. The gondola and train option imply that the only canyon destinations are Alta and Snowbird. It is obvious that this is not true and that the inability of these options to have multiple efficient stops in the canyon makes them unrealistic for any canyon user who's sole destination is not one of these resorts. These options are nothing but a taxpayer subsidized ski lift for the resorts. Increased bussing with major improvements to Highway 210 costs less and gives people the option to reach multiple canyon destinations as well as Alta and Snowbird. Additionally, the resorts have always subsidized bus access for ticket holders and would have no precedent to not do so in the future.

Comment I-123-3

I support CWC's Mountain Transportation Option 1. This is the only option that can quickly and efficiently address the current traffic issues in LCC. The other options will take too long to implement and cost too much for taxpayers. These options also disproportionately benefit Alta and Snowbird rather than the citizens who will be paying taxes to support them. There are no details as to whether or not the resorts will financially support these options in any way. The gondola and train option imply that the only canyon destinations are Alta and Snowbird. It is obvious that this is not true and that the inability of these options to have multiple efficient stops in the canyon makes them unrealistic for any canyon user who's sole destination is not one of these resorts. These options are nothing but a taxpayer subsidized ski lift for the resorts. Increased bussing with major improvements to Highway 210 costs less and gives people the option to reach multiple canyon destinations as well as Alta and Snowbird. Additionally, the resorts have always subsidized bus access for ticket holders and would have no precedent to not do so in the future.

Comment I-123-4

I also disagree with creating resort to resort connections at the top of the canyon. Again, this is not a transportation option and only an additional lift for the resorts that will only be used for a

few months of the year. The argument these lifts can be used for emergency egress or to improve traffic makes little sense. It is clear that these lifts will be left unused in off seasons and during the season I can't imagine that if these were to exist, the resorts would allow non ticket holders to use them. And if they did allow it, there is little reason to believe that they would be accessible without using the resort's other lift connections, which would require a lift ticket.

Comment I-123-5

The bottom line is that the chosen solution should decrease traffic while improving air and water quality and not marring the existing beautiful landscape of LCC. If the solution doesn't save canyon users time and costs significantly more, whether in taxes or usage fees, the solution will not be used and people will continue with their current behavior.

Comment I-123-6

I love this canyon and feel that it has played an important part in shaping me as a person. I hope those who have a decision making voice will use it to decide on an option that preserves the canyon's natural beauty for future generations.

I-124: Jefferson Schmidt

Comment I-124-1

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

Comment I-124-2

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

Comment I-124-3

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my

opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

Comment I-124-4

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

Comment I-124-5

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

Comment I-124-6

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

Comment I-124-7

As a resident (of 25 years) near the mouth of little and big cottonwood, I am heavily impacted by the traffic issues that these areas experience. I advocate for the solution that will best preserve the natural beauty of these canyons while also relieving traffic congestion. In my opinion, the Alternative 1 is the only option I can support at this time. I reject the alternative 2,3 and all sub-alternatives.

I-125: Mark Christensen

Comment I-125-1

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed transportation alternatives. I use the canyons affected by these proposals at least once a week year round for various recreational purposes including hiking, resort skiing, backcountry skiing, road biking, and mountain biking. After reviewing the alternatives I feel strongly that the best option is Alternative 1 and I am strongly against the other proposals.

Comment I-125-2

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed transportation alternatives. I use the canyons affected by these proposals at least once a week year round for various recreational purposes including hiking, resort skiing, backcountry skiing, road biking, and mountain biking. After reviewing the alternatives I feel strongly that the best option is Alternative 1 and I am strongly against the other proposals.

Comment I-125-3

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed transportation alternatives. I use the canyons affected by these proposals at least once a week year round for various recreational purposes including hiking, resort skiing, backcountry skiing, road biking, and mountain biking. After reviewing the alternatives I feel strongly that the best option is Alternative 1 and I am strongly against the other proposals.

Comment I-125-4

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed transportation alternatives. I use the canyons affected by these proposals at least once a week year round for various recreational purposes including hiking, resort skiing, backcountry skiing, road biking, and mountain biking. After reviewing the alternatives I feel strongly that the best option is Alternative 1 and I am strongly against the other proposals.

Comment I-125-5

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed transportation alternatives. I use the canyons affected by these proposals at least once a week year round for various recreational purposes including hiking, resort skiing, backcountry skiing, road biking, and mountain biking. After reviewing the alternatives I feel strongly that the best option is Alternative 1 and I am strongly against the other proposals.

Comment I-125-6

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed transportation alternatives. I use the canyons affected by these proposals at least once a week year round for various recreational purposes including hiking, resort skiing, backcountry skiing, road biking, and mountain biking. After reviewing the alternatives I feel strongly that the best option is Alternative 1 and I am strongly against the other proposals.

Comment I-125-7

Alternative 1 will adequately decrease traffic and provide means to transport more people on peak use days. It will also improve safety. These are the two main objectives of this commission.

Comment I-125-8

Alternative 1 will adequately decrease traffic and provide means to transport more people on peak use days. It will also improve safety. These are the two main objectives of this commission.

Comment I-125-9

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-10

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-11

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-12

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-13

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-14

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-15

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-16

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-17

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-18

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-19

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-20

The other options will require significant infrastructure that will ruin the natural beauty of our canyons. They also will put a train/gondola in place that really is only needed for a limited number of peak weekend ski days.

Comment I-125-21

The idea is to help improve the traffic when needed and increase safety, not to turn the canyons into Disneyland. A gondola or train will create that feel.

Comment I-125-22

I fear that we are trying to increase traffic so much that the resorts (which are already overly crowded) will become so crowded that lift lines will be unbearably long and we will be packing so many people into the upper canyons that it will ruin the peace and solitude that people go there to find. Let's make a wise and measured decision by increasing buses and safety but not make the mistake of ruining our canyons by turning them into an amusement park.

-M

Comment I-125-23

I fear that we are trying to increase traffic so much that the resorts (which are already overly crowded) will become so crowded that lift lines will be unbearably long and we will be packing so many people into the upper canyons that it will ruin the peace and solitude that people go there to find. Let's make a wise and measured decision by increasing buses and safety but not make the mistake of ruining our canyons by turning them into an amusement park.

-M

I-126: Mike Thompson**Comment I-126-1**

I believe solution must think about the long-term. While I support concept of Aerial transport the current solution is flawed. The current gondola set up necessitating parking at gravel pit then a bus ride and then transfer to gondola will not be widely used. Its too complicated especially for families with young children.

Comment I-126-2

I believe solution must think about the long-term. While I support concept of Aerial transport the current solution is flawed. The current gondola set up necessitating parking at gravel pit then a bus ride and then transfer to gondola will not be widely used. Its too complicated especially for families with young children.

Comment I-126-3

I strongly support gondola or train in LCC, but need a base station for both alternatives with wide spread parking that does not necessitate transfer to another mode of transportation.

Comment I-126-4

I strongly support gondola or train in LCC, but need a base station for both alternatives with wide spread parking that does not necessitate transfer to another mode of transportation.

Comment I-126-5

Linkage between LCC and BCC is highly desirable as is a connection to to Park City. I support gondola link as proposed, but this would also necessitate parking at the base on the Park City side

Comment I-126-6

Status quo is not an option. The transportation system has problems that need to be addressed. Bus service is not the answer unless reliability/speed is massively improved, with more efficient parking at base where buses depart from

Comment I-126-7

Status quo is not an option. The transportation system has problems that need to be addressed. Bus service is not the answer unless reliability/speed is massively improved, with more efficient parking at base where buses depart from

Comment I-126-8

Status quo is not an option. The transportation system has problems that need to be addressed. Bus service is not the answer unless reliability/speed is massively improved, with more efficient parking at base where buses depart from

I-127: Julia Geisler**Comment I-127-1**

,Ä Air quality improvements and climate change considerations with better and cleaner public transit options should play a bigger role in this decision-making process.

Comment I-127-2

,Ä Air quality improvements and climate change considerations with better and cleaner public transit options should play a bigger role in this decision-making process.

Comment I-127-3

,Ä Wildlife movement corridors are not considered at all in any of these alternatives and need to be.

Comment I-127-4

,Ä Heber/Wasatch County and Kamas/Summit County should be considered as recreation nodes to disperse populations and provide for transit connectivity for those who work, live, and come to play between these areas.

Comment I-127-5

,Ä Public transit connection from Salt Lake airport to the ski resort accommodations should be put back on the table if the point is to reduce single occupancy cars, regardless of rental car companies, Uber, and Lyft.

Comment I-127-6

,ÄÇ The amount of development happening around the Jordanelle needs to be included in these plans for transit and traffic congestion considerations.

Comment I-127-7

,ÄÇ The amount of increased traffic in the Bonanza Flats area needs to be regulated and this transit connection point between canyons needs to be better analyzed for impacts to this landscape as visitation increases.

Comment I-127-8

,ÄÇ The amount of increased traffic in the Bonanza Flats area needs to be regulated and this transit connection point between canyons needs to be better analyzed for impacts to this landscape as visitation increases.

Comment I-127-9

,ÄÇ The amount of increased traffic in the Bonanza Flats area needs to be regulated and this transit connection point between canyons needs to be better analyzed for impacts to this landscape as visitation increases.

Comment I-127-10

,ÄÇ Paid parking at resorts should be put in place before canyon wide tolls if the point is to reduce vehicles headed to resorts.

Comment I-127-11

,ÄÇ Paid parking at resorts should be put in place before canyon wide tolls if the point is to reduce vehicles headed to resorts.

Comment I-127-12

,ÄÇ Regardless of what ski area centric alternative is adopted, day use ski area skiers should not be allowed to continue to drive up the cottonwood canyons and to PCMR and Deer Valley if this level of public transit is going to be put in place that accommodates resort skiers.

Comment I-127-13

,ÄÇ Recreation nodes should be year-round and there needs to be a "node" that addresses dispersed use. Every dispersed use trail head in Park City is at capacity for parking for hiking, mountain biking, snowshoeing, and Nordic skiing.

Comment I-127-14

,Äç There needs to be public transit options to accommodate for the growth in mountain biking and Nordic skiing in particular in the Park City area. Buses need to accommodate for mountain bikes (more than the limited number they currently allow to be put on the racks).

Comment I-127-15

,Äç Salt Lake residents travel to Park City to recreate in the summer and to escape the smog in the winter and should have a public transit option.

,Äç Workers traveling between canyons should have public transit options.

Comment I-127-16

,Äç If roadside parking near popular trailheads is eliminated, then these trailheads need to have public transit options. The reason people are parking on the road is that the trailhead parking areas are full.

Comment I-127-17

,Äç Sustainable and well-maintained recreation infrastructure, that addresses the entire user system from parking, to restrooms, trails and fixed anchors used in climbing needs to be in place before public transit can bring more people to dispersed recreation sites.

Comment I-127-18

,Äç The land agencies tasked with managing the majority of these landscapes needs to be better funded and more proactive in ensuring that human use doesn't irreversibly harm this forest and our watershed. Tolls should be directed here and be transparent in use.

Comment I-127-19

,Äç The land agencies tasked with managing the majority of these landscapes needs to be better funded and more proactive in ensuring that human use doesn't irreversibly harm this forest and our watershed. Tolls should be directed here and be transparent in use.

Comment I-127-20

,Äç "recreation nodes" identified on the CWC map are ski resort centric and do not address transportation and infrastructure needs for dispersed users including hikers, climbers, and backcountry skiers.

Comment I-127-21

,Äç Some of these transit alternatives may destroy lower LCC bouldering resources.

I-128: Hugh Ferguson

Comment I-128-1

I would be in favor of expanded bus service and snow sheds. Also if there was a way to have a bus lane in the upper canyon to incentivize use of public transport on busy days.

Comment I-128-2

I would be in favor of expanded bus service and snow sheds. Also if there was a way to have a bus lane in the upper canyon to incentivize use of public transport on busy days.

I-129: Christian Paul

Comment I-129-1

The difficulty selecting a solution to the traffic problem in the Cottonwoods exposes the lack of vision by both the managing partners of these lands, and the resorts that lease the land to run their resorts on. The nature of the terrain and the protections by federal law, not to mention watershed, make any solution a pickle to solve. I see the bulk of the responsibilities in the financing of any solution should be placed on the driver of traffic in these canyons for said solution. These are public lands and if someone is not patronizing these resorts, they should not be held accountable for another businesses traffic problem. Recreationalists who are not visiting these resorts should not be penalized for their use of public lands.

The Cottonwoods were never designed to be a Vail or Park City. The nature of the geology of these canyons cannot handle the high traffic they attract these days. Any "solution" you present today will only bring us back to this moment of trying to find another solution for this one you decide when you see it fail.

The only option for Little Cottonwood is to widen the road and tunnel the road in the avalanche paths.

Comment I-129-2

The difficulty selecting a solution to the traffic problem in the Cottonwoods exposes the lack of vision by both the managing partners of these lands, and the resorts that lease the land to run their resorts on. The nature of the terrain and the protections by federal law, not to mention watershed, make any solution a pickle to solve. I see the bulk of the responsibilities in the financing of any solution should be placed on the driver of traffic in these canyons for said solution. These are public lands and if someone is not patronizing these resorts, they should not be held accountable for another businesses traffic problem. Recreationalists who are not visiting these resorts should not be penalized for their use of public lands.

The Cottonwoods were never designed to be a Vail or Park City. The nature of the geology of these canyons cannot handle the high traffic they attract these days. Any "solution" you present today will only bring us back to this moment of trying to find another solution for this one you decide when you see it fail.

The only option for Little Cottonwood is to widen the road and tunnel the road in the avalanche paths.

Comment I-129-3

Big Cottonwood Canyon is a parking issue not as much as a traffic back up issue. The resorts need to provide more parking for their guests. Multilevel parking areas would accomodate more vehicles. Also there needs to be better parking for trailheads to keep the road wide enough for backcountry users.

Comment I-129-4

Big Cottonwood Canyon is a parking issue not as much as a traffic back up issue. The resorts need to provide more parking for their guests. Multilevel parking areas would accomodate more vehicles. Also there needs to be better parking for trailheads to keep the road wide enough for backcountry users.

Comment I-129-5

If the Bus is the solution, the only way it works is to have 4 times the busses you use now, and make them free.

Comment I-129-6

If you do the gondola solution, is that free to all canyon users? Will it service backcountry users as well as folks that slide at the resorts?

Comment I-129-7

If you widen the road, what about parking for trailheads?

Comment I-129-8

I have been recreating in these canyons all my life. Wanna cut traffic in these canyons? Simple, outlaw the Ikon passes being sold by these resorts.

Good luck! No matter what you do, it won't be enough in the long run. You'll be back here trying to figure it out in 10 years.

I-130: kathryn torello**Comment I-130-1**

I support expanded bus service.

Comment I-130-2

No interconnected ski area. Preserve the open space left. Least amount of disruption to nature.

Comment I-130-3

A parking structure many stories high @ highland & 9400 s.
Many busses from there.

Comment I-130-4

No gondola, too impractical. I am traveling by bus with a toddler & too long & too many changes

I-131: Scott Reichard**Comment I-131-1**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond!

Option 1, expanded bus services without gondola, train or tunnel connections of any type clearly offers the maximum Total Return On Investment for tax payers. TROI includes financial ROI, as well as flexibility gain for different seasons and user types, all environmental ROI, disruption ROI during construction phases of other options and congestion ROI that other options don't solve because of inflexibility and not planning connection Mountain Access Hubs at locations to improve economic growth where appropriate.

Comment I-131-2

Thank you for the opportunity to respond!

Option 1, expanded bus services without gondola, train or tunnel connections of any type clearly offers the maximum Total Return On Investment for tax payers. TROI includes financial ROI, as well as flexibility gain for different seasons and user types, all environmental ROI, disruption ROI during construction phases of other options and congestion ROI that other options don't solve because of inflexibility and not planning connection Mountain Access Hubs at locations to improve economic growth where appropriate.

Comment I-131-3

Thank you for the opportunity to respond!

Option 1, expanded bus services without gondola, train or tunnel connections of any type clearly offers the maximum Total Return On Investment for tax payers. TROI includes financial ROI, as well as flexibility gain for different seasons and user types, all environmental ROI, disruption ROI during construction phases of other options and congestion ROI that other options don't solve because of inflexibility and not planning connection Mountain Access Hubs at locations to improve economic growth where appropriate.

Comment I-131-4

Thank you for the opportunity to respond!

Option 1, expanded bus services without gondola, train or tunnel connections of any type clearly offers the maximum Total Return On Investment for tax payers. TROI includes financial ROI, as well as flexibility gain for different seasons and user types, all environmental ROI, disruption ROI during construction phases of other options and congestion ROI that other options don't solve because of inflexibility and not planning connection Mountain Access Hubs at locations to improve economic growth where appropriate.

Comment I-131-5

Thank you for the opportunity to respond!

Option 1, expanded bus services without gondola, train or tunnel connections of any type clearly offers the maximum Total Return On Investment for tax payers. TROI includes financial ROI, as well as flexibility gain for different seasons and user types, all environmental ROI, disruption ROI during construction phases of other options and congestion ROI that other options don't solve because of inflexibility and not planning connection Mountain Access Hubs at locations to improve economic growth where appropriate.

Comment I-131-6

When you add in possible/potential financial waste from development spending that does not get utilized a meaningful percentage of days per year, TROI diminishes further.

All other options must pass a true TROI analysis before any taxpayer investment can be justified. The economic benefit from increased tourism and increased jobs from other options don't generate the TROI needed to outweigh the TROI Option 1 presents. Please do the math and utilize Option 1 without any connection gondolas/trains and tunnels.
Scott Reichard

I-132: Josh Ampil

Comment I-132-1

I am in favor of the expansion of the bus service with no gondola or train service. The bus service is a cheaper and less intrusive option.

Comment I-132-2

I am in favor of the expansion of the bus service with no gondola or train service. The bus service is a cheaper and less intrusive option.

Comment I-132-3

I am in favor of the expansion of the bus service with no gondola or train service. The bus service is a cheaper and less intrusive option.

Comment I-132-4

I am in favor of the expansion of the bus service with no gondola or train service. The bus service is a cheaper and less intrusive option.

I-133: Dave Bowling

Comment I-133-1

Thanks for all your planning efforts, this is fantastic.

I strongly support the bus alternative (option 1). Please consider additional stops in the canyons for those whose destinations are not the top of the canyons.

Comment I-133-2

I am supportive of the LCC train provided this does not turn into an attempt to reduce wilderness areas. Here too additional mid-canyon stops should be implemented.

Comment I-133-3

I am supportive of the LCC train provided this does not turn into an attempt to reduce wilderness areas. Here too additional mid-canyon stops should be implemented.

Comment I-133-4

I am supportive of the LCC train provided this does not turn into an attempt to reduce wilderness areas. Here too additional mid-canyon stops should be implemented.

Comment I-133-5

I am vehemently opposed to tunnels and gondolas. We are not Europe and I don't want to see us turn into that circus.

Comment I-133-6

I am vehemently opposed to tunnels and gondolas. We are not Europe and I don't want to see us turn into that circus.

Comment I-133-7

The private ski resorts should bear the primary burden for the costs of these projects as they are the primary user group.

I-134: Larry Steinbach**Comment I-134-1**

Whether on the Wasatch Front or the Wasatch Back, transportation solutions must include all options that are economically feasible. We pay for these solutions and when they prove ineffective the money has already been spent. The Wasatch Front has multiple solutions for mass transit as well as personal and commercial vehicular traffic. The percent of population using these options won't change buy government pressure and ineffective traffic controls. Proper planning and design to accommodate all our needs is responsible planning and design.

Comment I-134-2

Whether on the Wasatch Front or the Wasatch Back, transportation solutions must include all options that are economically feasible. We pay for these solutions and when they prove ineffective the money has already been spent. The Wasatch Front has multiple solutions for mass transit as well as personal and commercial vehicular traffic. The percent of population using these options won't change buy government pressure and ineffective traffic controls. Proper planning and design to accommodate all our needs is responsible planning and design.

Comment I-134-3

Round-a-bouts work in low traffic, but fail in heavy traffic. I personally witnessed this in Edmonton, Alberta during a 2 1/2 year work assignment. A very large round-a-bout (over 300 feet in diameter) with 5-way major thoroughfares backed up traffic for more than a mile every morning and every evening when rush hour traffic increased. That is what would happen in most heavy commuter traffic and ski resort rush hour conditions.

Comment I-134-4

I'm all for good public mass transit solutions like BRT, light rail and heavy rail or good local bus routes. Just don't think that you can force locals and our out of town visitors to use them by designing restrictive surface options and unused remote park and ride lots or making traffic so congested there is no other choice. That creates anger, frustration, accidents and traffic deaths because of planning ignorance and "prima donna" attitudes.

People are people as they always have been and they do what they do. Good design allows for our freedom, yet channels us in a safe way to move us from point A to point B smoothly and safely, regardless of you political ideals or your emotional attitudes.

So explore all the options for the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back knowing full well that we all rely heavily on tourism, economic development, and all of us locals who enjoy our life here. Don't screw it up with ineffective costly ideas. Build funiculars, trams, light rail, gondolas, round-a-bouts, diverging intersections/interchanges and better flowing highways and freeways ONLY when they work properly and are cost effective. Don't let your political posturing create more traffic congestion and "carmageddon" (a video game by the same name has a copywrite) as has been experienced in Park City and other high use locations.

My compliments on your continued efforts from a former participant with Envision Utah for both the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back community interests.

I-135: David R. & Penelope Smith**Comment I-135-1**

As long-time (year-round) users of the local canyons (climbing, hiking and both resort & back-country skiing) we applaud CWC for a Mountain Transportation System draft which is comprehensive in its coverage and thorough in its analysis. Dynamic Tolling (for demand management) along with the variable pricing structure has the potential for imposing the highest fees on those using the canyons at the times of highest use and thus could contribute to spreading out said use.

Comment I-135-2

We favor MTS Alternative 1: Bus (with the addition of snow sheds and the extended shoulder in Little Cottonwood). We speak having the first-hand experience of using the ski bus almost exclusively for skiing at Alta the last five years. Of the three options, this is the only one that has the potential to benefit all canyon users and that can be implemented in a reasonably short-time frame at an acceptable cost. It will reduce canyon congestion year-round (unlike the gondola option which will not even run outside of the ski season. Further, it offers the most flexibility and potential for easy modification if (as seems likely) climate change significantly alters canyon use. Adequate trail-head bus stops will have to be included if the roadside parking prohibition is to be viable however.

Comment I-135-3

We favor MTS Alternative 1: Bus (with the addition of snow sheds and the extended shoulder in Little Cottonwood). We speak having the first-hand experience of using the ski bus almost exclusively for skiing at Alta the last five years. Of the three options, this is the only one that has the potential to benefit all canyon users and that can be implemented in a reasonably short-time frame at an acceptable cost. It will reduce canyon congestion year-round (unlike the gondola option which will not even run outside of the ski season. Further, it offers the most flexibility and potential for easy modification if (as seems likely) climate change significantly alters canyon use. Adequate trail-head bus stops will have to be included if the roadside parking prohibition is to be viable however.

Comment I-135-4

We favor MTS Alternative 1: Bus (with the addition of snow sheds and the extended shoulder in Little Cottonwood). We speak having the first-hand experience of using the ski bus almost exclusively for skiing at Alta the last five years. Of the three options, this is the only one that has the potential to benefit all canyon users and that can be implemented in a reasonably short-time frame at an acceptable cost. It will reduce canyon congestion year-round (unlike the gondola option which will not even run outside of the ski season. Further, it offers the most flexibility and potential for easy modification if (as seems likely) climate change significantly alters canyon use. Adequate trail-head bus stops will have to be included if the roadside parking prohibition is to be viable however.

Comment I-135-5

The gondola option will benefit only resort skiers/boarders. Given that both Alta and Snowbird prohibit uphill traffic, it will be of very limited use to snow-shoers or back-country skiers/boarders. It is completely unreasonable to ask the general public to provide funding for a gondola which will benefit (almost exclusively) two private businesses! In addition, the gondola will take longer (53 min. to Snowbird and 63 min. to Alta) than it generally takes to get there now (via either private auto or the ski bus) and will require two mode changes.

Comment I-135-6

The train option is significantly more expensive than the other options and has the most potential environmental impact. In the present form, the proposal for it does not include trail-head stops, so in its present form it would be of no value to back-country users. Further it would take years to construct.

Comment I-135-7

The train option is significantly more expensive than the other options and has the most potential environmental impact. In the present form, the proposal for it does not include trail-head stops, so in its present form it would be of no value to back-country users. Further it would take years to construct.

Comment I-135-8

The train option is significantly more expensive than the other options and has the most potential environmental impact. In the present form, the proposal for it does not include trail-head stops, so in its present form it would be of no value to back-country users. Further it would take years to construct.

Comment I-135-9

None of the three Sub-Alternatives should be included. They all involve major costs and have significant environmental impacts without offering offsetting public benefits.

Comment I-135-10

None of the three Sub-Alternatives should be included. They all involve major costs and have significant environmental impacts without offering offsetting public benefits.

Comment I-135-11

None of the three Sub-Alternatives should be included. They all involve major costs and have significant environmental impacts without offering offsetting public benefits.

Comment I-135-12

None of the three Sub-Alternatives should be included. They all involve major costs and have significant environmental impacts without offering offsetting public benefits.

Comment I-135-13

None of the three Sub-Alternatives should be included. They all involve major costs and have significant environmental impacts without offering offsetting public benefits.

Comment I-135-14

None of the three Sub-Alternatives should be included. They all involve major costs and have significant environmental impacts without offering offsetting public benefits.

Comment I-135-15

The traffic congestion problems exist now and are getting worse each year. We need solutions that can be implemented now--not many years in the future! Let's focus on improvements that have both reasonable costs and can be in place in a few years rather than futuristic schemes that will require decades (or more) to build.

I-136: John Badila**Comment I-136-1**

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-2

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-3

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-4

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will

have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-5

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-6

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-7

As a Salt Lake City resident and a regular user of Little Cottonwood Canyon, I am writing in support of Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC). As a rock climber, a backcountry skier, a hiker, and a resort skier I can see that all other alternatives will have clearly detrimental effects on both natural resources and crowding in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Expanded bus service will help greatly with traffic congestion while having minimal impact on the canyon.

Comment I-136-8

As a resort employee, I often made the difficult decision to drive by myself to Alta rather than take the bus, which I would have preferred to do, because the bus was very slow, did not have frequent enough runs, and was often overcrowded. Improving this system seems to me the first thing to do to improve transportation in the canyons.

I-137: David Carroll

Comment I-137-1

I'm uncertain as to the purpose of the CWC's Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report, because it seems to put every conceivable idea discussed over the last several years back on the table. It does so without adequate contextualization of cost,

practicality or consequence. Some ideas are blatantly part of ski industry objectives to make interconnect a reality, some are ridiculously expensive like the train and tunnel, of great potential risk to watershed and the list goes on. Putting everything back on the table with such a weak effort to characterize need, value or cost further muddies already very murky waters. This document does not actually move the conversation towards something feasible, but encourages more of the "let's study it some more" gridlock that's plagued this conversation for the past decade or more.

I will readily admit that my views are colored by who I am - a long time Salt Lake County resident, an avid year around user of the central Wasatch mountains and spoiled in having taken it for granted most of my adult life. What I now know to be true is the problems in our canyons are merely a symptom of the stresses of a constant escalation of demand on a finite resource. I have witnessed this first hand. The choices that need to be made go beyond simply figuring out new efficiencies in cramming as many people as possible into a finite space. Other questions, like the criticality of protecting the watershed, the environment for its own sake, and the value of recreational opportunity for those who dwell nearby mean that sooner or later we must somehow wrestle with the central issues - what is most critical to preserve and for whom. I don't relish limitations on my personal choices - for over thirty years year-around I have had the luxury of enjoying the Wasatch when, where, and largely how on my terms. Increasingly I have come to believe the luxury I have long taken for granted has already become unsustainable. I and every other person who enjoys life in the shadow of the Wasatch must make concessions. The transportation problems are a symptom, the one we collectively focus on largely because in our collective narcissism it's what impacts us most personally. The real questions are the choices we make and the sacrifices that might come with them if we make the right choices in the years to come. The one concept that seems to be absent from the conversation and should be central to it is sustainability.

Addressing the questions of transportation enhancements, it seems that there are mainly multiple choices contemplated for traversing Little Cottonwood Canyon. Since I believe that the problem has already achieved criticality and that it continues to grow exponentially, I am not a proponent of ideas that cannot be implemented quickly, are inherently finite or inflexible. Aside from the potentially astronomical cost, I feel that both the train and tram suffer from the aforementioned short comings. Neither can be done quickly or cheaply and both lack scalability and/or the flexibility to accommodate a variety of users and seasons. Both also require adding infrastructure on the south side of Little Cottonwood Creek with a potential risk to a major source of culinary water.

The alternative of enhanced bus service, which I do favor, has a shorter implementation time, is scalable (to a point), is more flexible and will result in less infrastructure added to the canyon.

Comment I-137-2

I'm uncertain as to the purpose of the CWC's Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report, because it seems to put every conceivable idea discussed over the last several years back on the table. It does so without adequate contextualization of cost, practicality or consequence. Some ideas are blatantly part of ski industry objectives to make interconnect a reality, some are ridiculously expensive like the train and tunnel, of great potential risk to watershed and the list goes on. Putting everything back on the table with such a weak effort to characterize need, value or cost further muddies already very murky waters. This document does not actually move the conversation towards something feasible, but encourages more of the "let's study it some more" gridlock that's plagued this conversation for the past decade or more.

I will readily admit that my views are colored by who I am - a long time Salt Lake County resident, an avid year around user of the central Wasatch mountains and spoiled in having taken it for granted most of my adult life. What I now know to be true is the problems in our canyons are merely a symptom of the stresses of a constant escalation of demand on a finite resource. I have witnessed this first hand. The choices that need to be made go beyond simply figuring out new efficiencies in cramming as many people as possible into a finite space. Other questions, like the criticality of protecting the watershed, the environment for its own sake, and the value of recreational opportunity for those who dwell nearby mean that sooner or later we must somehow wrestle with the central issues - what is most critical to preserve and for whom. I don't relish limitations on my personal choices - for over thirty years year-around I have had the luxury of enjoying the Wasatch when, where, and largely how on my terms. Increasingly I have come to believe the luxury I have long taken for granted has already become unsustainable. I and every other person who enjoys life in the shadow of the Wasatch must make concessions. The transportation problems are a symptom, the one we collectively focus on largely because in our collective narcissism it's what impacts us most personally. The real questions are the choices we make and the sacrifices that might come with them if we make the right choices in the years to come. The one concept that seems to be absent from the conversation and should be central to it is sustainability.

Addressing the questions of transportation enhancements, it seems that there are mainly multiple choices contemplated for traversing Little Cottonwood Canyon. Since I believe that the problem has already achieved criticality and that it continues to grow exponentially, I am not a proponent of ideas that cannot be implemented quickly, are inherently finite or inflexible. Aside from the potentially astronomical cost, I feel that both the train and tram suffer from the aforementioned short comings. Neither can be done quickly or cheaply and both lack scalability and/or the flexibility to accommodate a variety of users and seasons. Both also require adding infrastructure on the south side of Little Cottonwood Creek with a potential risk to a major source of culinary water.

The alternative of enhanced bus service, which I do favor, has a shorter implementation time, is scalable (to a point), is more flexible and will result in less infrastructure added to the canyon.

Comment I-137-3

I'm uncertain as to the purpose of the CWC's Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report, because it seems to put every conceivable idea discussed over the last several years back on the table. It does so without adequate contextualization of cost, practicality or consequence. Some ideas are blatantly part of ski industry objectives to make interconnect a reality, some are ridiculously expensive like the train and tunnel, of great potential risk to watershed and the list goes on. Putting everything back on the table with such a weak effort to characterize need, value or cost further muddies already very murky waters. This document does not actually move the conversation towards something feasible, but encourages more of the "let's study it some more" gridlock that's plagued this conversation for the past decade or more.

I will readily admit that my views are colored by who I am - a long time Salt Lake County resident, an avid year around user of the central Wasatch mountains and spoiled in having taken it for granted most of my adult life. What I now know to be true is the problems in our canyons are merely a symptom of the stresses of a constant escalation of demand on a finite resource. I have witnessed this first hand. The choices that need to be made go beyond simply figuring out new efficiencies in cramming as many people as possible into a finite space. Other questions, like the criticality of protecting the watershed, the environment for its own sake, and the value of recreational opportunity for those who dwell nearby mean that sooner or later we must somehow wrestle with the central issues - what is most critical to preserve and for whom. I don't relish limitations on my personal choices - for over thirty years year-around I have had the luxury of enjoying the Wasatch when, where, and largely how on my terms. Increasingly I have come to believe the luxury I have long taken for granted has already become unsustainable. I and every other person who enjoys life in the shadow of the Wasatch must make concessions. The transportation problems are a symptom, the one we collectively focus on largely because in our collective narcissism it's what impacts us most personally. The real questions are the choices we make and the sacrifices that might come with them if we make the right choices in the years to come. The one concept that seems to be absent from the conversation and should be central to it is sustainability.

Addressing the questions of transportation enhancements, it seems that there are mainly multiple choices contemplated for traversing Little Cottonwood Canyon. Since I believe that the problem has already achieved criticality and that it continues to grow exponentially, I am not a proponent of ideas that cannot be implemented quickly, are inherently finite or inflexible. Aside from the potentially astronomical cost, I feel that both the train and tram suffer from the aforementioned short comings. Neither can be done quickly or cheaply and both lack scalability and/or the flexibility to accommodate a variety of users and seasons. Both also require adding infrastructure on the south side of Little Cottonwood Creek with a potential risk to a major source of culinary water.

The alternative of enhanced bus service, which I do favor, has a shorter implementation time, is scalable (to a point), is more flexible and will result in less infrastructure added to the canyon.

Comment I-137-4

Though it will impact me personally and I'm generally opposed to regressive taxation, I accept tolling and paid parking as acceptable inevitabilities so long as the core purpose is to reduce the number of vehicles and/or increase the number of occupants in vehicles. The HOV program on Utah's interstate system provides the luxury of single occupant use for those for who can pay. I only wonder if canyon tolling will operate with the same mind set. Not mentioned though it should have been, ride sharing apps and ways to provide readily accessible real-time information on canyon congestion and the availability of parking would also be cheap ways to reduce congestion and peak time usage.

Comment I-137-5

Though it will impact me personally and I'm generally opposed to regressive taxation, I accept tolling and paid parking as acceptable inevitabilities so long as the core purpose is to reduce the number of vehicles and/or increase the number of occupants in vehicles. The HOV program on Utah's interstate system provides the luxury of single occupant use for those for who can pay. I only wonder if canyon tolling will operate with the same mind set. Not mentioned though it should have been, ride sharing apps and ways to provide readily accessible real-time information on canyon congestion and the availability of parking would also be cheap ways to reduce congestion and peak time usage.

Comment I-137-6

Enhanced bus service, new parking near the mouths of canyons, a shuttle system in Mill Creek, plans for the Wasatch back, seem to be ideas that are ubiquitous regardless of the alternatives under discussion for the Cottonwoods. Some of these ideas are free-standing and will happen regardless of the CWC and its Transportation Plan.

Comment I-137-7

Enhanced bus service, new parking near the mouths of canyons, a shuttle system in Mill Creek, plans for the Wasatch back, seem to be ideas that are ubiquitous regardless of the alternatives under discussion for the Cottonwoods. Some of these ideas are free-standing and will happen regardless of the CWC and its Transportation Plan.

Comment I-137-8

Other recycled ghosts in the CWC Transportation Plan like the trams from Little Cottonwood to Big Cottonwood and/or Park City, the tunnel, and the train still seem as absurd, unnecessary, and over-priced as when they were previously introduced. My initial impulse was to ask myself really, 'Äi didn't we already have this conversation?

Comment I-137-9

Other recycled ghosts in the CWC Transportation Plan like the trams from Little Cottonwood to Big Cottonwood and/or Park City, the tunnel, and the train still seem as absurd, unnecessary, and over-priced as when they were previously introduced. My initial impulse was to ask myself really, "Didn't we already have this conversation?"

Comment I-137-10

The only new feature in the CWC plan regarding these concepts is the chimera of egress. The Cottonwood Canyons are largely now and have been for decades mainly recreation destinations. Aside from a few year-around residents, the preponderance having established themselves only in the last few years (so this whole egress thing isn't a mystery), the Cottonwoods are a recreation destination. The risk of being "trapped" in the canyon is overblown at best. Most instances have been in Little Cottonwood due to avalanche risk when visitors are not allowed to leave the buildings they are in. These situations have occurred and been managed over the years, so what's changed? Can't the risk, however remote of being stuck in the canyon, be considered a part of one's individual choice and responsibility for recreate or living there? I would also argue that a tram with limitations of capacity, above ground infrastructure, and after all it is mechanical device, is a poor recommendation for an egress solution. It might be great rationalization to create the dream sought by some for years, "to interconnect and better still at tax payers expense. In that sense the egress bogey man appears to be a convenient rationalization for what has long been part of a grander marketing scheme for the resort skiing industry in Utah.

Comment I-137-11

The only new feature in the CWC plan regarding these concepts is the chimera of egress. The Cottonwood Canyons are largely now and have been for decades mainly recreation destinations. Aside from a few year-around residents, the preponderance having established themselves only in the last few years (so this whole egress thing isn't a mystery), the Cottonwoods are a recreation destination. The risk of being "trapped" in the canyon is overblown at best. Most instances have been in Little Cottonwood due to avalanche risk when visitors are not allowed to leave the buildings they are in. These situations have occurred and been managed over the years, so what's changed? Can't the risk, however remote of being stuck in the canyon, be considered a part of one's individual choice and responsibility for recreate or living there? I would also argue that a tram with limitations of capacity, above ground infrastructure, and after all it is mechanical device, is a poor recommendation for an egress solution. It might be great rationalization to create the dream sought by some for years, "to interconnect and better still at tax payers expense. In that sense the egress bogey man appears to be a convenient rationalization for what has long been part of a grander marketing scheme for the resort skiing industry in Utah.

Comment I-137-12

A tunnel seems like a more useful though obviously very expensive concept fraught with its own inherent risks. Its visual intrusion on the landscape is limited as compared to a tram and it doesn't lend itself to the hidden agenda as does the canyon to canyon tram. For something with such limited utility, the probable cost and high potential for disturbing watershed hydrology make the tunnel seem like a bad idea at best. As with the other glitzy, high dollar ideas on the table (again) the feasibility of funding, let alone the practicality of justifying, i.e. high cost, low benefit such an idea will I hope make it seem unlikely at best. Again, the Cottonwoods are a recreation destination. Even for those motivated only by dollars this golden goose may not be fat enough to sell a tunnel.

Comment I-137-13

A tunnel seems like a more useful though obviously very expensive concept fraught with its own inherent risks. Its visual intrusion on the landscape is limited as compared to a tram and it doesn't lend itself to the hidden agenda as does the canyon to canyon tram. For something with such limited utility, the probable cost and high potential for disturbing watershed hydrology make the tunnel seem like a bad idea at best. As with the other glitzy, high dollar ideas on the table (again) the feasibility of funding, let alone the practicality of justifying, i.e. high cost, low benefit such an idea will I hope make it seem unlikely at best. Again, the Cottonwoods are a recreation destination. Even for those motivated only by dollars this golden goose may not be fat enough to sell a tunnel.

Comment I-137-14

To reiterate what I do support are the practical measures that can be implemented in the shortest time. The alternative that makes the most sense is enhanced bus service supported by: expanded parking, reduced roadside parking, improved valley mass transit and all measures including tolling that might reduce traffic congestion. Solutions must be envisioned and applied concurrently to both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. There are differences between the two, but both canyons suffer equally and for similar reasons from the ills of their increasing popularity. A bus-based mass transit approach must be planned as year around with the intent of getting people out of their cars and into mass transit, which makes it equally a large-scale reeducation project to shift imbedded behaviors.

Comment I-137-15

To reiterate what I do support are the practical measures that can be implemented in the shortest time. The alternative that makes the most sense is enhanced bus service supported by: expanded parking, reduced roadside parking, improved valley mass transit and all measures including tolling that might reduce traffic congestion. Solutions must be envisioned and applied concurrently to both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. There are differences between the two, but both canyons suffer equally and for similar reasons from the ills of their increasing popularity. A bus-based mass transit approach must be planned as year around with the intent

of getting people out of their cars and into mass transit, which makes it equally a large-scale reeducation project to shift imbedded behaviors.

Comment I-137-16

To reiterate what I do support are the practical measures that can be implemented in the shortest time. The alternative that makes the most sense is enhanced bus service supported by: expanded parking, reduced roadside parking, improved valley mass transit and all measures including tolling that might reduce traffic congestion. Solutions must be envisioned and applied concurrently to both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. There are differences between the two, but both canyons suffer equally and for similar reasons from the ills of their increasing popularity. A bus-based mass transit approach must be planned as year around with the intent of getting people out of their cars and into mass transit, which makes it equally a large-scale reeducation project to shift imbedded behaviors.

Comment I-137-17

I also support, despite the potential environmental disturbance and visual intrusion, enhanced avalanche protection measures along the Little Cottonwood Canyon road including sheds where warranted and the expanded use of Gazex, Obellx or Wyssen towers to replace artillery. Reducing winter avalanche risk on the road particularly must be pursued with an increased reliance on the road as part of a transit solution.

Comment I-137-18

Somewhere, somehow and sometime the real issue must still be aired. The Wasatch is a small and finite place, with multiple and increasing demands placed upon it. I think we, particularly those who live in its shadow, have the most at stake in what happens to it. Doing nothing, choosing to do nothing, is in essence a decision, but one that will likely have outcomes that we will all regret. Maybe the non-decision is an inevitability, a fundamental flaw in our culture, the inability to look beyond ourselves. I'm not an optimist, but I would gladly be proven wrong.

I-138: Michael B Williams

Comment I-138-1

Hello CWC-

Thanks for putting together the various Alternatives and asking for public content. To understand my comments below. I feel it is important to understand the lens which I view the problem. I teach skiing at Alta, I ski in the backcountry in both canyons. I hike and Mountain Bike in both canyons during the summer season. Over the course of any given year I will drive the canyons on 200 calendar days out of a year. My comments are below.

I do not see any of the alternatives or sub alternatives addressing the traffic issues in a sustainable manner. He is my reason for that. In all of the options nothing is mandatory. If the canyon traffic was managed like the access to Zion National Park the issue would be removed and traffic times up and down the canyon would be greatly improved. This system would create the ability to change how it is run during different seasons. To make this work. The following would need to happen.

Comment I-138-2

Hello CWC-

Thanks for putting together the various Alternatives and asking for public content. To understand my comments below. I feel it is important to understand the lens which I view the problem. I teach skiing at Alta, I ski in the backcountry in both canyons. I hike and Mountain Bike in both canyons during the summer season. Over the course of any given year I will drive the canyons on 200 calendar days out of a year. My comments are below.

I do not see any of the alternatives or sub alternatives addressing the traffic issues in a sustainable manner. He is my reason for that. In all of the options nothing is mandatory. If the canyon traffic was managed like the access to Zion National Park the issue would be removed and traffic times up and down the canyon would be greatly improved. This system would create the ability to change how it is run during different seasons. To make this work. The following would need to happen.

Comment I-138-3

Hello CWC-

Thanks for putting together the various Alternatives and asking for public content. To understand my comments below. I feel it is important to understand the lens which I view the problem. I teach skiing at Alta, I ski in the backcountry in both canyons. I hike and Mountain Bike in both canyons during the summer season. Over the course of any given year I will drive the canyons on 200 calendar days out of a year. My comments are below.

I do not see any of the alternatives or sub alternatives addressing the traffic issues in a sustainable manner. He is my reason for that. In all of the options nothing is mandatory. If the canyon traffic was managed like the access to Zion National Park the issue would be removed and traffic times up and down the canyon would be greatly improved. This system would create the ability to change how it is run during different seasons. To make this work. The following would need to happen.

Comment I-138-4

Hello CWC-

Thanks for putting together the various Alternatives and asking for public content. To understand my comments below. I feel it is important to understand the lens which I view the problem. I teach skiing at Alta, I ski in the backcountry in both canyons. I hike and Mountain Bike in both canyons during the summer season. Over the course of any given year I will drive the canyons on 200 calendar days out of a year. My comments are below.

I do not see any of the alternatives or sub alternatives addressing the traffic issues in a sustainable manner. He is my reason for that. In all of the options nothing is mandatory. If the canyon traffic was managed like the access to Zion National Park the issue would be removed and traffic times up and down the canyon would be greatly improved. This system would create the ability to change how it is run during different seasons. To make this work. The following would need to happen.

Comment I-138-5

Hello CWC-

Thanks for putting together the various Alternatives and asking for public content. To understand my comments below. I feel it is important to understand the lens which I view the problem. I teach skiing at Alta, I ski in the backcountry in both canyons. I hike and Mountain Bike in both canyons during the summer season. Over the course of any given year I will drive the canyons on 200 calendar days out of a year. My comments are below.

I do not see any of the alternatives or sub alternatives addressing the traffic issues in a sustainable manner. He is my reason for that. In all of the options nothing is mandatory. If the canyon traffic was managed like the access to Zion National Park the issue would be removed and traffic times up and down the canyon would be greatly improved. This system would create the ability to change how it is run during different seasons. To make this work. The following would need to happen.

Comment I-138-6

Hello CWC-

Thanks for putting together the various Alternatives and asking for public content. To understand my comments below. I feel it is important to understand the lens which I view the problem. I teach skiing at Alta, I ski in the backcountry in both canyons. I hike and Mountain

Bike in both canyons during the summer season. Over the course of any given year I will drive the canyons on 200 calendar days out of a year. My comments are below.

I do not see any of the alternatives or sub alternatives addressing the traffic issues in a sustainable manner. He is my reason for that. In all of the options nothing is mandatory. If the canyon traffic was managed like the access to Zion National Park the issue would be removed and traffic times up and down the canyon would be greatly improved. This system would create the ability to change how it is run during different seasons. To make this work. The following would need to happen.

Comment I-138-7

1) Ski Areas would need to transfer some parking lots space into large locker/changing/ski storage thus providing local skiers and families a easy option.

Comment I-138-8

2) different buses for different users. For LCC that would look like an Alta Express, A Snowbird express, and a whistle stop option for non resort users.

3) starting the routes away from the mouth. The big UTA lots could be used, as could routes that start at various points in the valley. Or a massive transit hub could be built in between LCC and BCC. This hub would have ticket sales, food, Apres options etc.

Comment I-138-9

2) different buses for different users. For LCC that would look like an Alta Express, A Snowbird express, and a whistle stop option for non resort users.

3) starting the routes away from the mouth. The big UTA lots could be used, as could routes that start at various points in the valley. Or a massive transit hub could be built in between LCC and BCC. This hub would have ticket sales, food, Apres options etc.

Comment I-138-10

4) Employees and Residents - residents would be able to drive personal vehicles. Employees would need to either ride the bus or the various companies could use UTA ride share options. These would need to run at lots of different times.

5) Lodging Guests - each lodge would either need to run its own shuttle service or bus service would need to run frequently enough to transport guests who arrive late in the day or need to leave early.

Comment I-138-11

6) for the summer season the basic structure could be kept but the season would require some tweaking in timing.

7) install snow sheds to remove closure

Comment I-138-12

The hard part about the above plan is the change the end user would need to accept. The pulling of that band would be very painful and lots of people would be upset. However, I believe that frustration would be short lived as the frustration of the red snake would disappear.

Other ideas.

Rental cars- a system that holds the rental car agency and user responsible. Lots of rental cars during winter have no business driving up the canyon because of the non snow rated tires.

Comment I-138-13

Personal cars - much like the employee pilot system last year from UDOT. Push this option out to individual users to speed up tire checks at the bottom.

Change to chain law - the current writing of the law does not allow for pre-storm chain restrictions to go into affect. With a change to the law that applies only to BCC/LCC it would allow UDOT to manage access to the roads prior to the arrival of the storms.

Comment I-138-14

The same system each time at the mouth of the canyon on road restriction days. Currently the system changes each day. Some days we are staged in the mouth lot, some days on the side of the road, some days we are told to drive around, some days we are told to drive up to the a certain gate. If a system was out in place and was the same every time and was broadcast publicly it would allow for planning.

Dedicated travel times/lanes- 7-9 am two uphill lanes, 1 downhill lane. 3-6 pm two downhill, 1 uphill. In LCC we almost have three lanes for the full length of the canyon.

Reduce the number of mergers in LCC. - currently going downhill this is what causes the most issues with traffic. Put cones out to remove the ones mid canyon. Allow Alta/Grizzly traffic to bypass the Snowbird exits. Over the last couple of years an effort has been made to move the merge point. This does not solve the issue

Cars doing u turns across lanes - not sure how to change this. It is scary and causes massive back ups.

Good luck in this process. Thanks for asking for public comment.

Have a great day,

Ben

I-139: Julie Daily

Comment I-139-1

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I have to merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily throughout winter especially by the solution to our canyon transportation problem. I am strongly in favor of Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. Right now, cost is so important with the impact of the virus to,our economy. In addition, the problem is worst in winter so a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives. Thank you for listening to the residents. Please do not make a political solution for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-139-2

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I have to merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily throughout winter especially by the solution to our canyon transportation problem. I am strongly in favor of Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. Right now, cost is so important with the impact of the virus to,our economy. In addition, the problem is worst in winter so a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives. Thank you for listening to the residents. Please do not make a political solution for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-139-3

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I have to merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily throughout winter especially by the solution to our canyon transportation problem. I am strongly in favor of Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. Right now, cost is so important with the impact of the virus to,our economy. In addition, the problem is worst in winter so a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives. Thank you for listening to the residents. Please do not make a political solution for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-139-4

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I have to merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily throughout winter especially by the solution to our canyon transportation problem. I am strongly in favor of Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. Right now, cost is so important with the impact of the virus to,our economy. In addition, the problem is worst in winter so a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives. Thank you for listening to the residents. Please do not make a political solution for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-139-5

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I have to merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily throughout winter especially by the solution to our canyon transportation problem. I am strongly in favor of Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. Right now, cost is so important with the impact of the virus to,our economy. In addition, the problem is worst in winter so a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives. Thank you for listening to the residents. Please do not make a political solution for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-139-6

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I have to merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily throughout winter especially by the solution to our canyon transportation problem. I am strongly in favor of Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. Right now, cost is so important with the impact of the virus to,our economy. In addition, the problem is worst in winter so a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives. Thank you for listening to the residents. Please do not make a political solution for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

I-140: Robert and Linda Grow**Comment I-140-1**

No transportation hub should be created or maintained at the inverted V intersection at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon for four reasons that are not clearly articulated in the pros and cons of the alternatives.

Comment I-140-2

First, the land at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon was given by the Whitmore family with the specific intent that it would be preserved in its natural state and they were promised that no development would occur on that land. The people who managed that contribution for the Whitmore family are still alive to testify to the facts surrounding this contribution. Any land received from the Whitmore family must be preserved in perpetuity and not be used for parking lots, parking ramps, gondola or train terminals, etc.

Second, the Temple Quarry Trail and Park at the mouth of the Little Cottonwood Canyon is one of the most visited historic sites in all of Utah and is used every day by large numbers of hikers, mountain bikers, and other recreation enthusiasts. It was funded by donors with the belief it would not be tampered with or destroyed. There is no other location that would provide the same historic value and preserve the legacy of those who over several decades quarried the granite blocks for the Salt Lake Temple. Developing the mouth of the Canyon on or around the Quarry should not be permitted.

Comment I-140-3

First, the land at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon was given by the Whitmore family with the specific intent that it would be preserved in its natural state and they were promised that no development would occur on that land. The people who managed that contribution for the Whitmore family are still alive to testify to the facts surrounding this contribution. Any land received from the Whitmore family must be preserved in perpetuity and not be used for parking lots, parking ramps, gondola or train terminals, etc.

Second, the Temple Quarry Trail and Park at the mouth of the Little Cottonwood Canyon is one of the most visited historic sites in all of Utah and is used every day by large numbers of hikers, mountain bikers, and other recreation enthusiasts. It was funded by donors with the belief it would not be tampered with or destroyed. There is no other location that would provide the same historic value and preserve the legacy of those who over several decades quarried the granite blocks for the Salt Lake Temple. Developing the mouth of the Canyon on or around the Quarry should not be permitted.

Comment I-140-4

First, the land at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon was given by the Whitmore family with the specific intent that it would be preserved in its natural state and they were promised that no development would occur on that land. The people who managed that contribution for the Whitmore family are still alive to testify to the facts surrounding this contribution. Any land received from the Whitmore family must be preserved in perpetuity and not be used for parking lots, parking ramps, gondola or train terminals, etc.

Second, the Temple Quarry Trail and Park at the mouth of the Little Cottonwood Canyon is one of the most visited historic sites in all of Utah and is used every day by large numbers of hikers, mountain bikers, and other recreation enthusiasts. It was funded by donors with the belief it would not be tampered with or destroyed. There is no other location that would provide the same historic value and preserve the legacy of those who over several decades quarried the granite blocks for the Salt Lake Temple. Developing the mouth of the Canyon on or around the Quarry should not be permitted.

Comment I-140-5

Third, the Tier 1 Objectives should include not only protecting the "visual quality" of the Canyon experience, but also protecting other key qualitative aspects of that experience, including specifically, preventing the impact of "noise and vibration." Unlike Switzerland, where trains travel to Murrin and other high Alpine locations by climbing the face of the Jungfrau, a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon would operate in the bottom of a narrow canyon with high walls and would create an "echo chamber" effect exacerbating the train's noise and vibration. This noise and vibration would significantly impact not only residents living near or in the Canyon, but also degrade the recreational experience of all Canyon users.

Comment I-140-6

Fourth, any solution that focuses traffic to the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon will continue to significantly degrade air quality for residents in the Triangle and other nearby neighborhoods. When traffic is held up at various locations at or near the mouth of the Canyon, thousands of cars and buses idle on all three sides of the Triangle. This produces a cloud of exhaust containing CO, NOX, SOX, and PM 2.5. This noxious cloud is very potent and can be smelled by all nearby residents. There is little question that the air being breathed on these mornings is very unhealthy for the residents, the skiers, and the first responders and exceeds federal clean air standards. An analysis of the proposed alternatives must consider the impact on local air quality. Bad local air quality (pockets of unhealthy air near plants, refineries, rail yards, freeways, congested urban centers, etc.) is the next frontier for air quality science and regulation to protect public health and needs to be modeled and fully taken into account in evaluating the proposed alternatives.

Comment I-140-7

In addition to the foregoing, any selected alternative must connect the Wasatch Front Resorts directly and efficiently to the Wasatch Back Resorts. There is no question that a significant fraction of the traffic up Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons is tourist skiers coming from the Park City Area in rental cars. It is also true that the roads to Park City are partially congested with tourists from the Wasatch Front. This two-way tourist traffic uses up road capacity and degrades regional and local air quality. This essential connection to any long-term solution is only treated as an after thought in the alternatives analysis.

Comment I-140-8

The information about the alternatives is insufficient for the public to make wise choices. Little is disclosed about the environmental damage from the extensive cutting and filling necessary to create the bed for a train up the Canyon. More information please. Preventing environmental damage is a top-listed objective but the information to evaluate these alternatives is lacking.

Comment I-140-9

All three alternatives and their variations would just pack more people up the Canyons to benefit the ski resorts. Where is the NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE that keeps Canyon visitation at the current level by charging a significant variable toll at the mouths of the Canyons and ramps up bus service as personal car use declines? The ski resorts could subsidize the bus transit alternative for their customers.

Comment I-140-10

All three alternatives and their variations would just pack more people up the Canyons to benefit the ski resorts. Where is the NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE that keeps Canyon visitation at the current level by charging a significant variable toll at the mouths of the Canyons and ramps up bus service as personal car use declines? The ski resorts could subsidize the bus transit alternative for their customers.

Comment I-140-11

Either the train or and gondola alternative will cost billions in construction, maintenance, and operation. Indeed, as much as the capital cost of UTA's entire system of commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, and bus rapid transit. Spending billions on one of these Canyon transit alternatives must be balanced against using this money to expand and upgrade UTA's current transit system. Improving the current system would benefit the two million Wasatch Front residents who live in the valleys and not primarily the ski resorts and their customers.

Comment I-140-12

Either the train or and gondola alternative will cost billions in construction, maintenance, and operation. Indeed, as much as the capital cost of UTA's entire system of commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, and bus rapid transit. Spending billions on one of these Canyon transit alternatives must be balanced against using this money to expand and upgrade UTA's current transit system. Improving the current system would benefit the two million Wasatch Front residents who live in the valleys and not primarily the ski resorts and their customers.

I-141: Ken Kiss**Comment I-141-1**

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily basis through winter by skiers and others heading up Little Cottonwood. My strong vote is Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. With congestion worse in winter, a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives with the upper Canyon to canyon connections. Please do not make a political solution - whether it be for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-141-2

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily basis through winter by skiers and others heading up Little Cottonwood. My strong vote is Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. With congestion worse in winter, a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives with the upper Canyon to canyon connections. Please do not make a political solution - whether it be for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-141-3

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily basis through winter by skiers and others heading up Little Cottonwood. My strong vote is Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. With congestion worse in winter, a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives with the upper Canyon to canyon connections. Please do not make a political solution - whether it be for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-141-4

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily basis through winter by skiers and others heading up Little Cottonwood. My strong vote is Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. With congestion worse in winter, a solution that can be turned on seasonally

makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives with the upper Canyon to canyon connections. Please do not make a political solution - whether it be for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-141-5

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily basis through winter by skiers and others heading up Little Cottonwood. My strong vote is Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. With congestion worse in winter, a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives with the upper Canyon to canyon connections. Please do not make a political solution - whether it be for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-141-6

I live in Cottonwood Heights. To enter or exit my neighborhood, I merge onto Wasatch Blvd right by the High T. I am directly impacted on a daily basis through winter by skiers and others heading up Little Cottonwood. My strong vote is Alternative 1 which is the expanded bus service with no train or gondola In Little Cottonwood Canyon. I believe this to be the most cost effective solution. With congestion worse in winter, a solution that can be turned on seasonally makes sense. I am not in favor of any of the 3 sub alternatives with the upper Canyon to canyon connections. Please do not make a political solution - whether it be for someone's legacy or other political factor. Please select a solution for the residents of the Central Wasatch. Thank you.

I-142: Ryan Gillespie

Comment I-142-1

I vote for option 1.

Comment I-142-2

All other options are TERRIBLE. The traffic 'problem' generally only occurs a few weekends out of the year. Mitigate those weekends, do not ruin the wilderness.

Comment I-142-3

All other options are TERRIBLE. The traffic 'problem' generally only occurs a few weekends out of the year. Mitigate those weekends, do not ruin the wilderness.

Comment I-142-4

All other options are TERRIBLE. The traffic 'problem' generally only occurs a few weekends out of the year. Mitigate those weekends, do not ruin the wilderness.

Comment I-142-5

All other options are TERRIBLE. The traffic 'problem' generally only occurs a few weekends out of the year. Mitigate those weekends, do not ruin the wilderness.

Comment I-142-6

All other options are TERRIBLE. The traffic 'problem' generally only occurs a few weekends out of the year. Mitigate those weekends, do not ruin the wilderness.

I-143: Lendy Gillespie**Comment I-143-1**

To me, Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC) is the best option for preserving the integrity of the canyon and keeping access open to the most amount of people / activities. It seems as though the canyon is being sacrificed for two businesses at the top. I am a Snowbird season pass holder so understand the inconveniences but still do not think it warrants the loss of wild land.

Comment I-143-2

To me, Alternative 1 (expanded bus service with no gondola or train in LCC) is the best option for preserving the integrity of the canyon and keeping access open to the most amount of people / activities. It seems as though the canyon is being sacrificed for two businesses at the top. I am a Snowbird season pass holder so understand the inconveniences but still do not think it warrants the loss of wild land.

Comment I-143-3

Therefore, I do not agree with any of the three sub-alternatives either. Please keep our canyons wild so the the next generation of outdoor adventurers (my children) are able to enjoy the amazing beauty and freedom of the Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-143-4

Therefore, I do not agree with any of the three sub-alternatives either. Please keep our canyons wild so the the next generation of outdoor adventurers (my children) are able to enjoy the amazing beauty and freedom of the Wasatch. Thank you.

Comment I-143-5

Therefore, I do not agree with any of the three sub-alternatives either. Please keep our canyons wild so the the next generation of outdoor adventurers (my children) are able to enjoy the amazing beauty and freedom of the Wasatch. Thank you.

I-144: Andrew Chandler

Comment I-144-1

Option 1. Expanded bus service,

Comment I-144-2

no train, no gondola

Comment I-144-3

no train, no gondola

I-145: Marsha Leclair-Marzolf

Comment I-145-1

I'm not in favor of any of the current ideas especially the gondola.

Comment I-145-2

I'm not in favor of any of the current ideas especially the gondola.

Comment I-145-3

I'm not in favor of any of the current ideas especially the gondola.

Comment I-145-4

I'm not in favor of any of the current ideas especially the gondola.

Comment I-145-5

I'm not in favor of any of the current ideas especially the gondola.

Comment I-145-6

I'm not in favor of any of the current ideas especially the gondola.

Comment I-145-7

As a hiker the gondola would be of no use to me plus even as a skier it's too slow. All suggestions seem unnecessarily damaging to the environment. Till better solutions can be found how about expanding bus service and bus parking Phd

I-146: Howie Garber**Comment I-146-1**

I participated in Mountain Accord for three years before moving to Idaho. I have looked at and participated in many studies done on Wasatch since the early 1980s.

I favor expanded bus service up BCC, LCC that is year- round. Bus should enable trailhead stops for dispersed users.

Comment I-146-2

I participated in Mountain Accord for three years before moving to Idaho. I have looked at and participated in many studies done on Wasatch since the early 1980s.

I favor expanded bus service up BCC, LCC that is year- round. Bus should enable trailhead stops for dispersed users.

Comment I-146-3

There should be no gondola or train in LCC. There should be variable tolls for driving up BCC and LCC.

Comment I-146-4

There should be no gondola or train in LCC. There should be variable tolls for driving up BCC and LCC.

Comment I-146-5

There should be no gondola or train in LCC. There should be variable tolls for driving up BCC and LCC.

Comment I-146-6

Snowsheds to mitigate avalanche danger provides adequate safety as far as egress from canyon.

Comment I-146-7

At public hearing on Mt. Accord, there was not one person who testified in favor of a train up LCC. Gondola and train would allow canyons to exceed carrying capacity and would stress the ecosystem.

Comment I-146-8

At public hearing on Mt. Accord, there was not one person who testified in favor of a train up LCC. Gondola and train would allow canyons to exceed carrying capacity and would stress the ecosystem.

Comment I-146-9

At public hearing on Mt. Accord, there was not one person who testified in favor of a train up LCC. Gondola and train would allow canyons to exceed carrying capacity and would stress the ecosystem.

Comment I-146-10

At public hearing on Mt. Accord, there was not one person who testified in favor of a train up LCC. Gondola and train would allow canyons to exceed carrying capacity and would stress the ecosystem.

Comment I-146-11

I agree with the development of a new parking lot at the 6200 S gravel pit. This would facilitate some bus transfers and would remove an eyesore that is bad for air quality.

Comment I-146-12

I agree with the development of a new parking lot at the 6200 S gravel pit. This would facilitate some bus transfers and would remove an eyesore that is bad for air quality.

Comment I-146-13

There should be improved transit between the Salt Lake Valley and Park City via the Parley's Canyon corridor (that should also include a paved bicycle path).
Thanks much

Comment I-146-14

There should be improved transit between the Salt Lake Valley and Park City via the Parley's Canyon corridor (that should also include a paved bicycle path).
Thanks much

I-147: Valoree Dowell

Comment I-147-1

Commissioners:

Although I live in Minnesota now, I was born and raised in Salt Lake City. When I moved (due to valley pollution that caused health problems) I left my ski equipment in Utah, because, well, skiing in Minnesota is "different." I admit it, I was spoiled by the Wasatch, forever.

With a lifetime of canyon experience deep in my soul, I write in wholehearted support of Alternative 1, expanded bus service in Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Comment I-147-2

I am adamantly opposed to a gondola or train up the canyon. The canyons are not just routes to seasonal resorts, they are wild and mostly untrammelled places where human beings can still lose their sense of superiority and be absorbed by the natural world. To foist ourselves yet again on the beauty, majesty, challenge, and magnificence of the Wasatch in the name of speed and convenience would be destructive and permanent. We have in our power the ability to solve our human-caused problems without causing more. Do not trade the glory of these canyons' irreplaceable assets for the ephemeral financial gain of a few. The people who really want to experience the aptly named Mt. Superior and Mt. Majestic will do so even if it means carpool or bus. The rest can go to Disneyland (or Park City) for pavement and a gondola ride. Respectfully submitted,
Valoree's Dowell

Comment I-147-3

I am adamantly opposed to a gondola or train up the canyon. The canyons are not just routes to seasonal resorts, they are wild and mostly untrammelled places where human beings can still lose their sense of superiority and be absorbed by the natural world. To foist ourselves yet again on the beauty, majesty, challenge, and magnificence of the Wasatch in the name of speed and convenience would be destructive and permanent. We have in our power the ability to solve our human-caused problems without causing more. Do not trade the glory of these canyons' irreplaceable assets for the ephemeral financial gain of a few. The people who really want to experience the aptly named Mt. Superior and Mt. Majestic will do so even if it means carpool or bus. The rest can go to Disneyland (or Park City) for pavement and a gondola ride. Respectfully submitted,
Valoree's Dowell

Comment I-147-4

I am adamantly opposed to a gondola or train up the canyon. The canyons are not just routes to seasonal resorts, they are wild and mostly untrammelled places where human beings can still lose their sense of superiority and be absorbed by the natural world. To foist ourselves yet

again on the beauty, majesty, challenge, and magnificence of the Wasatch in the name of speed and convenience would be destructive and permanent. We have in our power the ability to solve our human-caused problems without causing more. Do not trade the glory of these canyons' irreplaceable assets for the ephemeral financial gain of a few. The people who really want to experience the aptly named Mt. Superior and Mt. Majestic will do so even if it means carpool or bus. The rest can go to Disneyland (or Park City) for pavement and a gondola ride. Respectfully submitted,
Valoree's Dowell

Comment I-147-5

I am adamantly opposed to a gondola or train up the canyon. The canyons are not just routes to seasonal resorts, they are wild and mostly untrammelled places where human beings can still lose their sense of superiority and be absorbed by the natural world. To foist ourselves yet again on the beauty, majesty, challenge, and magnificence of the Wasatch in the name of speed and convenience would be destructive and permanent. We have in our power the ability to solve our human-caused problems without causing more. Do not trade the glory of these canyons' irreplaceable assets for the ephemeral financial gain of a few. The people who really want to experience the aptly named Mt. Superior and Mt. Majestic will do so even if it means carpool or bus. The rest can go to Disneyland (or Park City) for pavement and a gondola ride. Respectfully submitted,
Valoree's Dowell

I-148: Vicki Turner

Comment I-148-1

I have listened to proposals, gone to open house meeting, and listened to recent Zoom meetings on transportation issues. This process has gone on forever. LCC and BCC cannot be separated into separate issues when considering traffic solutions. Unfortunately, UDOT has money to burn and builds stuff. The overwhelming support by ordinary citizens for less impactful and more efficient, fiscally responsible, year round traffic solutions is clear. Buses, shuttles are more efficient, provide for more flexible destination drop-offs and is the least impactful on neighborhoods, vieww sheds.

Comment I-148-2

I have listened to proposals, gone to open house meeting, and listened to recent Zoom meetings on transportation issues. This process has gone on forever. LCC and BCC cannot be separated into separate issues when considering traffic solutions. Unfortunately, UDOT has money to burn and builds stuff. The overwhelming support by ordinary citizens for less impactful and more efficient, fiscally responsible, year round traffic solutions is clear. Buses, shuttles are more efficient, provide for more flexible destination drop-offs and is the least impactful on neighborhoods, vieww sheds.

Comment I-148-3

I have listened to proposals, gone to open house meeting, and listened to recent Zoom meetings on transportation issues. This process has gone on forever. LCC and BCC cannot be separated into separate issues when considering traffic solutions. Unfortunately, UDOT has money to burn and builds stuff. The overwhelming support by ordinary citizens for less impactful and more efficient, fiscally responsible, year round traffic solutions is clear. Buses, shuttles are more efficient, provide for more flexible destination drop-offs and is the least impactful on neighborhoods, vieww sheds.

Comment I-148-4

I have listened to proposals, gone to open house meeting, and listened to recent Zoom meetings on transportation issues. This process has gone on forever. LCC and BCC cannot be separated into separate issues when considering traffic solutions. Unfortunately, UDOT has money to burn and builds stuff. The overwhelming support by ordinary citizens for less impactful and more efficient, fiscally responsible, year round traffic solutions is clear. Buses, shuttles are more efficient, provide for more flexible destination drop-offs and is the least impactful on neighborhoods, vieww sheds.

Comment I-148-5

Building snow sheds does not provide a lot of bang for the buck considering that a reduction of 5 days on average of avy disruption is all that will be achieved.

Comment I-148-6

Spend the money on road improvements for shuttling type services. The goal should be to remove excessive roadside parking and cars in the canyon year round. The current situation is extremely dangerous. People are parked along a very tight area around the S curve and White pine trailheads. Can't imagine that this could possible be within code when people are not within a foot of white line. I was told by UDOT personnel at a UDOT open house that they don't want parking on shoulders because it results in undermining of the road base. Parking lots are not the answer in most cases. There could be limited improvements to existing road side parking, however.

Comment I-148-7

Spend the money on road improvements for shuttling type services. The goal should be to remove excessive roadside parking and cars in the canyon year round. The current situation is extremely dangerous. People are parked along a very tight area around the S curve and White pine trailheads. Can't imagine that this could possible be within code when people are not within a foot of white line. I was told by UDOT personnel at a UDOT open house that they don't want parking on shoulders because it results in undermining of the road base. Parking lots are not the answer in most cases. There could be limited improvements to existing road side parking, however.

Comment I-148-8

The idea of a gondola sounds like a great idea if you are a developer that would service only 2 ski resorts in LCC. But, property owners along Wasatch blvd would have their quality of life reduced for the sake of increased traffic to a parking garage? Obviously, a "alpine" village at the base of LCC is the goal and the gondola a nice attraction. But, it is degrading urban blight most likely.

Comment I-148-9

The idea of a gondola sounds like a great idea if you are a developer that would service only 2 ski resorts in LCC. But, property owners along Wasatch blvd would have their quality of life reduced for the sake of increased traffic to a parking garage? Obviously, a "alpine" village at the base of LCC is the goal and the gondola a nice attraction. But, it is degrading urban blight most likely.

Comment I-148-10

The idea of a gondola sounds like a great idea if you are a developer that would service only 2 ski resorts in LCC. But, property owners along Wasatch blvd would have their quality of life reduced for the sake of increased traffic to a parking garage? Obviously, a "alpine" village at the base of LCC is the goal and the gondola a nice attraction. But, it is degrading urban blight most likely.

Comment I-148-11

Bussing and shuttles remain the only reasonable solution to getting cars off the road. May I suggest that this concept be taken across the valley and developed in the Ochres if Rio Tinto would open up some space. Have an express lane that bypasses cars and people will take notice.

Comment I-148-12

This is going to be a transformative process. Goals have to be clearly stated and reasonable solutions acted upon. It's time to seriously plan for conservation and a more sustainable watershed and Central Wasatch that serves all.

Thank you to all who have dedicated their time and expertise in helping to solve these transportation issues.

Comment I-148-13

This is going to be a transformative process. Goals have to be clearly stated and reasonable solutions acted upon. It's time to seriously plan for conservation and a more sustainable watershed and Central Wasatch that serves all.

Thank you to all who have dedicated their time and expertise in helping to solve these transportation issues.

I-149: Martin McGregor

Comment I-149-1

I think I already did this but here are some additional comments. I don't recall knowing about the La Caille hub stuff. (I read many of the comments already entered.) To this option I would be opposed. The gondola will wreck what naturalness remains of the canyon and the La Caille hub would wreck the entrance. SOC appears to be correct. The process has become a transportation issue with emphasis on resorts rather than a comprehensive study.

Comment I-149-2

I think I already did this but here are some additional comments. I don't recall knowing about the La Caille hub stuff. (I read many of the comments already entered.) To this option I would be opposed. The gondola will wreck what naturalness remains of the canyon and the La Caille hub would wreck the entrance. SOC appears to be correct. The process has become a transportation issue with emphasis on resorts rather than a comprehensive study.

I-150: George Vargyas

Comment I-150-1

First, all three of the sub alternatives providing connections between the Cottonwoods, and Park City, should be discarded and removed from consideration. There are several reasons for this. These connections will not reduce canyon congestion and flow. They will magnify and worsen it.

Comment I-150-2

First, all three of the sub alternatives providing connections between the Cottonwoods, and Park City, should be discarded and removed from consideration. There are several reasons for this. These connections will not reduce canyon congestion and flow. They will magnify and worsen it.

Comment I-150-3

First, all three of the sub alternatives providing connections between the Cottonwoods, and Park City, should be discarded and removed from consideration. There are several reasons for this. These connections will not reduce canyon congestion and flow. They will magnify and worsen it.

Comment I-150-4

1. The vast majority of Summit county day visitors will continue to travel down Parleys and up LCC or BCC because travel with aials from Park City will not begin until 830 or 9AM. They will not reach Alta until after 11 AM, and will need to travel back by 2PM. In order for Park City residents and tourists to ski a whole day at Alta or Snowbird, they will want to arrive before 9-930 - which will only be feasible via Wasatch Blvd and LCC.

Comment I-150-5

2. The expense associated with sitting in an aerial most of the day will only appeal to visitors, and local residents will avoid it.

Comment I-150-6

3. It will be unreliable in stormy weather.

Comment I-150-7

4. These aerial gimmicks will indeed draw visitors/tourists - but without decreasing people flowing into BCC or LCC, congestion will only worsen on the whole - not improve in the long run.

Comment I-150-8

The loss of wild and open spaces, and the impact on the watershed - with associated development, will be a huge loss of local residents - and no improvement in canyon congestion.

Comment I-150-9

The loss of wild and open spaces, and the impact on the watershed - with associated development, will be a huge loss of local residents - and no improvement in canyon congestion.

Comment I-150-10

The loss of wild and open spaces, and the impact on the watershed - with associated development, will be a huge loss of local residents - and no improvement in canyon congestion.

Comment I-150-11

The loss of wild and open spaces, and the impact on the watershed - with associated development, will be a huge loss of local residents - and no improvement in canyon congestion.

Comment I-150-12

In addition, the concept of emergency egress is misguided and a Trojan horse for resort expansion and development. Aerials are subject to too many unreliable variables for mass evacuation of the upper cottonwoods. Expense (24/7 operation), wind, power outage, heavy

snow, ice, staffing, are all major impediments for reliability and efficiency. Our open spaces will suffer at the expense of grandiose ideas that masquerade as safety and aid real transportation.

Comment I-150-13

No inter-canyon connections should occur.

Comment I-150-14

Regarding MTS concepts, I favor Alternative 1. It is the most practical short and long term solution. Alternative 2 and 3 are too impactful, and will not decrease road congestion. They will likely make congestion worse in the long run, and make crowding more problematic, not better.

Thank you

Comment I-150-15

Regarding MTS concepts, I favor Alternative 1. It is the most practical short and long term solution. Alternative 2 and 3 are too impactful, and will not decrease road congestion. They will likely make congestion worse in the long run, and make crowding more problematic, not better.

Thank you

Comment I-150-16

Regarding MTS concepts, I favor Alternative 1. It is the most practical short and long term solution. Alternative 2 and 3 are too impactful, and will not decrease road congestion. They will likely make congestion worse in the long run, and make crowding more problematic, not better.

Thank you

I-151: Clay Watson

Comment I-151-1

I've been rock climbing in the Wasatch for a very long time, exploring the back country and getting out and away from the road to find solitude, peace and adventure. Thanks goodness for the Wasatch and especially for the ability to disperse throughout the canyon and away from the road!

I am extremely concerned that the Central Wasatch Commissions (CWC) Mountain Transportation Study (MTS) Draft Plan does not address the needs of the tens of thousands of rock climbers who use these canyons every day. In fact, the current draft actively hurts access to rock climbing in many ways.

One of the biggest challenges facing rock climbing in the Wasatch is the fact that so many people love it. Obviously, the reason the CWC exists is that you could say the same thing about everyone who spends time in the Central Wasatch. We all love this place!

That's why I am heavily involved with the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance, spending many years volunteering time, energy and brute effort with the Forest Service and Church to develop trails infrastructure.

The SLCA has been very fortunate to have the trail building success we've had. However, those trails will never allow me access to places further up the canyon. In fact, the current CWC MTS will make access far, far worse for us.

Comment I-151-2

While we've made great strides towards infrastructure that allows dispersal, these resources only affect a very small percentage of climbing resources in the Wasatch. For instance, our current parking resources push people to into climbing at only a few, very concentrated areas. This will greatly worsen crowding and overuse at a few crags, while limiting access to other areas with existing routes and great potential for more.

I encourage you to please consider the very well documented concerns the SLCA has expressed in their comments.

These six issues are:

1) Roadside parking reduction is not acceptable at this time;

Comment I-151-3

2) Roadside widening continues to threaten climbing resources;

Comment I-151-4

3) Exclusion of additional bathrooms at trailheads threatens water quality;

Comment I-151-5

4) Supporting the needs of climbers supports general dispersed use;

Comment I-151-6

5) Aerial-based alternatives do not serve climbers and threaten viewsheds; and

Comment I-151-7

5) Aerial-based alternatives do not serve climbers and threaten viewsheds; and

Comment I-151-8

6) Canyon tolls should be directed to the infrastructure of recreation resources and conservation of the watershed.

Thank you for considering these comments.
Clay Watson

I-152: Jackie Waring

Comment I-152-1

I am so grateful that people are working to improve canyon transportation! Thank you for your work on this! And thank you for considering my input...

I favor the bus options because buses are so flexible and bus access can be implemented immediately. Of course, it's **critical** to make bus transport **convenient*!!*

- spread hubs throughout the county so that not everyone is trying to park in the limited space at the mouth of the canyon and stand in long lines for a bus

Comment I-152-2

- allow flexibility in drop-off/pick-up points for flexible access throughout the canyons

Comment I-152-3

- minimize cost to riders; make it an economically preferable choice!

Comment I-152-4

- I love the idea of dedicated lanes or other options to prioritize bus travel. No sense in having people who made the effort to commute on the bus sit in traffic lines with individual cars. Of course, this requires more money and time.

Comment I-152-5

I am in favor of charging drivers for access to the canyons. I am in favor of the ski resorts fronting costs since they are the primary reason for and beneficiaries of all the traffic.

Comment I-152-6

I am warm to the option of a train. I like the idea of trains cruising past car traffic. I wonder and worry about the feasibility, cost, and flexibility (i.e. access to atypical stopping points).

Comment I-152-7

I am warm to the option of a train. I like the idea of trains cruising past car traffic. I wonder and worry about the feasibility, cost, and flexibility (i.e. access to atypical stopping points).

Comment I-152-8

Gondolas are silly. Tunnels are silly. I am opposed to both.

Comment I-152-9

Gondolas are silly. Tunnels are silly. I am opposed to both.

I-153: Forrest Vargyas**Comment I-153-1**

I support the Alternative 1 transport system. I think that this is the best way to get people up the canyons in a way that is not as impactful, decreases canyon traffic, and allows everyone to get the the resorts and backcountry in a quick fashion.

Comment I-153-2

I support the Alternative 1 transport system. I think that this is the best way to get people up the canyons in a way that is not as impactful, decreases canyon traffic, and allows everyone to get the the resorts and backcountry in a quick fashion.

Comment I-153-3

I support the Alternative 1 transport system. I think that this is the best way to get people up the canyons in a way that is not as impactful, decreases canyon traffic, and allows everyone to get the the resorts and backcountry in a quick fashion.

Comment I-153-4

A gondola would be too impactful and too cold during the winter. People would prefer to drive.

Comment I-153-5

A train is also too impactful.

Comment I-153-6

Interconnect between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would be a novelty item that is too impactful, too expensive, and does nothing to decrease congestion. The interconnect ride would take so long that on a power day, any one in their right mind would rather drive to get the fresh snow. Therefore, alternative 1 makes the most sense.

Comment I-153-7

Interconnect between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would be a novelty item that is too impactful, too expensive, and does nothing to decrease congestion. The interconnect ride would take so long that on a power day, any one in their right mind would rather drive to get the fresh snow. Therefore, alternative 1 makes the most sense.

Comment I-153-8

Interconnect between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would be a novelty item that is too impactful, too expensive, and does nothing to decrease congestion. The interconnect ride would take so long that on a power day, any one in their right mind would rather drive to get the fresh snow. Therefore, alternative 1 makes the most sense.

Comment I-153-9

Interconnect between the Cottonwood Canyons and Park City would be a novelty item that is too impactful, too expensive, and does nothing to decrease congestion. The interconnect ride would take so long that on a power day, any one in their right mind would rather drive to get the fresh snow. Therefore, alternative 1 makes the most sense.

I-154: Denise Marlowe**Comment I-154-1**

I favor alternative one-bus as the best way to manage traffic flow and as it is the least impactful to the environment.

Comment I-154-2

I favor alternative one-bus as the best way to manage traffic flow and as it is the least impactful to the environment.

Comment I-154-3

Alternatives 2 and 3 are too impactful to the environment and will lead to more crowding. I am against any Canyon to canyon transport as it won't decrease congestion of people in the canyons and is also too impactful. We should be starting with the least environmentally impactful choice,

Comment I-154-4

Alternatives 2 and 3 are too impactful to the environment and will lead to more crowding. I am against any Canyon to canyon transport as it won't decrease congestion of people in the canyons and is also too impactful. We should be starting with the least environmentally impactful choice,

Comment I-154-5

Alternatives 2 and 3 are too impactful to the environment and will lead to more crowding. I am against any Canyon to canyon transport as it won't decrease congestion of people in the canyons and is also too impactful. We should be starting with the least environmentally impactful choice,

Comment I-154-6

Alternatives 2 and 3 are too impactful to the environment and will lead to more crowding. I am against any Canyon to canyon transport as it won't decrease congestion of people in the canyons and is also too impactful. We should be starting with the least environmentally impactful choice,

I-155: Chris Firmage**Comment I-155-1**

Little and big cottonwood canyon are a corner piece of Utah. There are very few places in the world that have such incredible places so close to home. As a climber and a frequent user of the canyon I implore you to think about the longevity of the canyon. There is so much more than just skiing in this canyon yet the ski industry is the one who calls the shots for this canyon. Climbers come from all around the world to climb in Utah and little cottonwood specifically. As climbing is becoming more and more into the normal our wishes need to be heard. The climbing industry is growing and so we need to make it sustainable. We need more representation in decisions made in the canyon. We need more SLCA in your talks with canyon partners. I implore you to listen to climbers because we want the canyon to survive and be used by the people who love it. By destroying climbing areas you are eliminating a source of income for the surrounding area.

Comment I-155-2

Little and big cottonwood canyon are a corner piece of Utah. There are very few places in the world that have such incredible places so close to home. As a climber and a frequent user of the canyon I implore you to think about the longevity of the canyon. There is so much more than just skiing in this canyon yet the ski industry is the one who calls the shots for this canyon. Climbers come from all around the world to climb in Utah and little cottonwood specifically. As climbing is becoming more and more into the normal our wishes need to be heard. The climbing industry is growing and so we need to make it sustainable. We need more

representation in decisions made in the canyon. We need more SLCA in your talks with canyon partners. I implore you to listen to climbers because we want the canyon to survive and be used by the people who love it. By destroying climbing areas you are eliminating a source of income for the surrounding area.

I-156: Caleb Wood

Comment I-156-1

I believe the most efficient way of transport while maintaining and improving the atmosphere and safety of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons is MTS Draft Alternative 2.

And I think the gondola should run year round at peak times for access to the many trails and attractions that exist in the summer time.

Comment I-156-2

A gondola service would free up the road from unnecessary traffic and provide a safer environment for skiers, hikers, climbers and all others who enjoy the Wasatch.

Comment I-156-3

A gondola service would free up the road from unnecessary traffic and provide a safer environment for skiers, hikers, climbers and all others who enjoy the Wasatch.

Comment I-156-4

However, the gondola service may take a few years to be operational, I am also fully endorsing the MTS Draft alternative 1. Getting private vehicles out of the canyons is a priority and the comprehensive bus plan can solve that problem.

Comment I-156-5

I do not think private vehicles should be permitted in the canyons during peak visitation times. However hard-line this view is, and I for one love driving to the resorts and walking 30 seconds to the lifts and driving to the trailheads in summertime, think that there are too many vehicles trying to get into the narrow canyons. Its time for a change.

Comment I-156-6

I do not think private vehicles should be permitted in the canyons during peak visitation times. However hard-line this view is, and I for one love driving to the resorts and walking 30 seconds to the lifts and driving to the trailheads in summertime, think that there are too many vehicles trying to get into the narrow canyons. Its time for a change.

Comment I-156-7

I am in full support of MTS Draft Alternative 2, and if that can't be met immediately, the I am in full support of MTS Draft Alternative 1.

Comment I-156-8

I am in full support of MTS Draft Alternative 2, and if that can't be met immediately, the I am in full support of MTS Draft Alternative 1.

I-157: Shayna Pugh**Comment I-157-1**

As a rock climber who frequently climbs at Little Cottonwood Canyon, I would like to express my concerns on the impact that proposed transportation changes may have on climbing areas and resources.

Many of the alternatives proposed will destroy popular climbing areas and access to them. As the sport of climbing grows in popularity, more people have been visiting these areas.

Comment I-157-2

The impact of destroying them will affect a lot of people who frequently climb there. Additionally, many climbers travel just to visit these classic climbing areas. I support the enhanced bus system with no road widening as it will have the least impact on climbing areas that so many love and appreciate.

I-158: Lindsay Charlton**Comment I-158-1**

I think a transportation overhaul is long overdue for the cottonwoods. Environmentally speaking it's not sustainable for everyone to drive.

Comment I-158-2

My concerns bus travel is the loss of access for backcountry skiing and climbing. My concern is access to these areas during times that busses will not be available (early starts/late exits).

Thanks!

I-159: Pieter Leeflang**Comment I-159-1**

Maps and where impact would take place would be ideal for me or I feel anyone to make an impact. Are these drafts going to be shared. I'm a skier and climber and don't want climbing areas to be impacted.

I-160: Bryan Lence**Comment I-160-1**

Hi,

I'm a Salt Lake City resident, frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons (in summer and winter) and long-time observer/participant in the CWC process. I would like to express my support for "MTS Alternative 1." I agree whole-heartedly with the statement from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and agree with their criticism of other options up for review.

Comment I-160-2

Hi,

I'm a Salt Lake City resident, frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons (in summer and winter) and long-time observer/participant in the CWC process. I would like to express my support for "MTS Alternative 1." I agree whole-heartedly with the statement from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and agree with their criticism of other options up for review.

Comment I-160-3

Hi,

I'm a Salt Lake City resident, frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons (in summer and winter) and long-time observer/participant in the CWC process. I would like to express my support for "MTS Alternative 1." I agree whole-heartedly with the statement from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and agree with their criticism of other options up for review.

Comment I-160-4

Hi,

I'm a Salt Lake City resident, frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons (in summer and winter) and long-time observer/participant in the CWC process. I would like to express my support for "MTS Alternative 1." I agree whole-heartedly with the statement from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and agree with their criticism of other options up for review.

Comment I-160-5

Hi,

I'm a Salt Lake City resident, frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons (in summer and winter) and long-time observer/participant in the CWC process. I would like to express my support for "MTS Alternative 1." I agree whole-heartedly with the statement from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and agree with their criticism of other options up for review.

Comment I-160-6

Hi,

I'm a Salt Lake City resident, frequent user of Big and Little Cottonwood canyons (in summer and winter) and long-time observer/participant in the CWC process. I would like to express my support for "MTS Alternative 1." I agree whole-heartedly with the statement from Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, and agree with their criticism of other options up for review.

Comment I-160-7

Enhanced bus service is fast to implement and utilizes much of the infrastructure we already have to move people up and down the canyons. It is also the cheapest option, and allows for stopping at more trailheads, especially if new trailheads become popular in the future.

Comment I-160-8

Enhanced bus service is fast to implement and utilizes much of the infrastructure we already have to move people up and down the canyons. It is also the cheapest option, and allows for stopping at more trailheads, especially if new trailheads become popular in the future.

Comment I-160-9

Enhanced bus service is fast to implement and utilizes much of the infrastructure we already have to move people up and down the canyons. It is also the cheapest option, and allows for stopping at more trailheads, especially if new trailheads become popular in the future.

I-161: Marisa cones**Comment I-161-1**

Before any thing is desired all uses of the canyon need to be considered not just winter sports including hiking and climbing in the impacts on those specific sports and implications of the transportation routes being considered. Without this being done is one-sided and looks at less

than half the year he uses versus the rest of the year. Why do the resorts get to dictate what happens while the rest of us have to deal with the consequences.

I-162: Mary McIntyre

Comment I-162-1

Of all the proposed alternatives, Alternative 1 with increased bus service (moving towards electric/emission free!) makes the most sense because a. it can be implemented immediately and this is a NOW problem, not just a future problem, b. it can easily be scaled up or down based on demand c. it can easily serve backcountry trailheads which are an increasing source of traffic in the canyons as backcountry use surges in popularity d. it will require less travel mode switches (who wants to put all their gear and children in the car, then on trax, then on a bus, then on a gondola? that sounds like a whole day affair on it's own!)

Comment I-162-2

Of all the proposed alternatives, Alternative 1 with increased bus service (moving towards electric/emission free!) makes the most sense because a. it can be implemented immediately and this is a NOW problem, not just a future problem, b. it can easily be scaled up or down based on demand c. it can easily serve backcountry trailheads which are an increasing source of traffic in the canyons as backcountry use surges in popularity d. it will require less travel mode switches (who wants to put all their gear and children in the car, then on trax, then on a bus, then on a gondola? that sounds like a whole day affair on it's own!)

Comment I-162-3

Of all the proposed alternatives, Alternative 1 with increased bus service (moving towards electric/emission free!) makes the most sense because a. it can be implemented immediately and this is a NOW problem, not just a future problem, b. it can easily be scaled up or down based on demand c. it can easily serve backcountry trailheads which are an increasing source of traffic in the canyons as backcountry use surges in popularity d. it will require less travel mode switches (who wants to put all their gear and children in the car, then on trax, then on a bus, then on a gondola? that sounds like a whole day affair on it's own!)

Comment I-162-4

Of all the proposed alternatives, Alternative 1 with increased bus service (moving towards electric/emission free!) makes the most sense because a. it can be implemented immediately and this is a NOW problem, not just a future problem, b. it can easily be scaled up or down based on demand c. it can easily serve backcountry trailheads which are an increasing source of traffic in the canyons as backcountry use surges in popularity d. it will require less travel mode switches (who wants to put all their gear and children in the car, then on trax, then on a bus, then on a gondola? that sounds like a whole day affair on it's own!)

Comment I-162-5

I am confused about why inter-canyon aerial options keep returning to the table when public opinion has shown time and time again (the dreaded Ski Link!) that Utahns DON'T WANT THIS. We are not discussing transit solutions to draw tourists with our snazzy new gondola, we are trying to improve traffic congestion for people who use these canyons every day, in all seasons. The gondola won't serve the multitude of trailheads which means there will still be hundreds of cars parked on the road at White Pine, or Lake Blanche, or Cardiff.

Comment I-162-6

I am confused about why inter-canyon aerial options keep returning to the table when public opinion has shown time and time again (the dreaded Ski Link!) that Utahns DON'T WANT THIS. We are not discussing transit solutions to draw tourists with our snazzy new gondola, we are trying to improve traffic congestion for people who use these canyons every day, in all seasons. The gondola won't serve the multitude of trailheads which means there will still be hundreds of cars parked on the road at White Pine, or Lake Blanche, or Cardiff.

Comment I-162-7

I believe Alternative 3, the cog train, could work *if done right* - if it got most cars OFF the road, and wasn't yet another tourist trap that doesn't actually help locals. It would need to have the ability to stop at all trailheads, summer and winter, and run on the existing roadway so as not to create an environmental impact in LCC's riparian zone. But this solution is very far off - 2050 - so even if this is decided upon, we need the bus option to save us in the meantime.

Comment I-162-8

I believe Alternative 3, the cog train, could work *if done right* - if it got most cars OFF the road, and wasn't yet another tourist trap that doesn't actually help locals. It would need to have the ability to stop at all trailheads, summer and winter, and run on the existing roadway so as not to create an environmental impact in LCC's riparian zone. But this solution is very far off - 2050 - so even if this is decided upon, we need the bus option to save us in the meantime.

Comment I-162-9

I believe Alternative 3, the cog train, could work *if done right* - if it got most cars OFF the road, and wasn't yet another tourist trap that doesn't actually help locals. It would need to have the ability to stop at all trailheads, summer and winter, and run on the existing roadway so as not to create an environmental impact in LCC's riparian zone. But this solution is very far off - 2050 - so even if this is decided upon, we need the bus option to save us in the meantime.

Comment I-162-10

I urge UDOT and the CWC to move forward with the expanded express bus offerings and to add surge pricing for single occupancy vehicles in the canyons immediately.

Thank you,

Mary McIntyre

Comment I-162-11

I urge UDOT and the CWC to move forward with the expanded express bus offerings and to add surge pricing for single occupancy vehicles in the canyons immediately.

Thank you,
Mary McIntyre

I-163: Tim Kemple

Comment I-163-1

Dear Central Wasatch Commission Officers, Commissioners, and Staff:

As a climber and skier who has spent the last 15 years exploring both the wilderness and roadside attractions in the Wasatch, I (like many of you) have seen the popularity of our canyons boom. It,Äôs a challenge we can no longer ignore, AND it,Äôs a challenge that needs multi agency support to be successful ,Äî including the National Forest. Take a drive up Big Cottonwood on a fall Saturday. Do it. Our canyons are alive with hikers, runners, climbers, photographers, tourists, instagram-ers, tik tok-ers and more at a level unseen ever before.

I encourage the CWC to pursue year around solutions that equitably allow the continued use of our canyons for all users. A plan that takes into consideration the capacity of the canyons during a given season and has a structure in place to limit the number of people when necessary ,Äî those days are not too far off.

Comment I-163-2

Dear Central Wasatch Commission Officers, Commissioners, and Staff:

As a climber and skier who has spent the last 15 years exploring both the wilderness and roadside attractions in the Wasatch, I (like many of you) have seen the popularity of our canyons boom. It,Äôs a challenge we can no longer ignore, AND it,Äôs a challenge that needs multi agency support to be successful ,Äî including the National Forest. Take a drive up Big Cottonwood on a fall Saturday. Do it. Our canyons are alive with hikers, runners, climbers, photographers, tourists, instagram-ers, tik tok-ers and more at a level unseen ever before.

I encourage the CWC to pursue year around solutions that equitably allow the continued use of our canyons for all users. A plan that takes into consideration the capacity of the canyons during a given season and has a structure in place to limit the number of people when necessary ,Äî those days are not too far off.

Comment I-163-3

A gondola to a private ski areas with \$125 life tickets is not equitable.

Comment I-163-4

A dearth of parking lots in all canyons is not safe.

Comment I-163-5

A complete lack of toilets along the canyons does not preserve our watershed.

An archaic, underfunded trail system will not continue to support the number of users we are seeing on a daily basis.

Comment I-163-6

A MTS from the CMC that fails to even mention the word „climbing,“ reflects poorly on the commission as whole and begs the question, „Have you even spent time in these canyons talking to users?,“

Comment I-163-7

The CWC must plan for a future that looks beyond the ski industry and Oktoberfest. A future that recognizes the year around users of the canyons. A future that understands that roads and parking lots don't do much unless you have clean toilets and safe trails for people to use.

Sincerely,
Tim Kemple

I-164: Kyle Daly

Comment I-164-1

As an avid user of both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, I strongly oppose the construction of any gondola, railway, widening of road, or any other action that will have dramatic impact on the landscape.

Comment I-164-2

As an avid user of both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, I strongly oppose the construction of any gondola, railway, widening of road, or any other action that will have dramatic impact on the landscape.

Comment I-164-3

As an avid user of both Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, I strongly oppose the construction of any gondola, railway, widening of road, or any other action that will have dramatic impact on the landscape.

Comment I-164-4

Instead, I believe we should pursue less destructive means to addressing congestion in the canyons by expanding bus service year round and creating multiple new bus stops at popular access points in the canyon (outside of the ski resorts).

Comment I-164-5

Instead, I believe we should pursue less destructive means to addressing congestion in the canyons by expanding bus service year round and creating multiple new bus stops at popular access points in the canyon (outside of the ski resorts).

Comment I-164-6

Instead, I believe we should pursue less destructive means to addressing congestion in the canyons by expanding bus service year round and creating multiple new bus stops at popular access points in the canyon (outside of the ski resorts).

Comment I-164-7

Please also consider the negative impacts of eliminating roadside parking in the canyons to the countless recreational users that rely on this for access. Climbing access should be considered in conjunction with the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance, as many of these areas are only accessible via roadside parking.

Comment I-164-8

Please also consider the negative impacts of eliminating roadside parking in the canyons to the countless recreational users that rely on this for access. Climbing access should be considered in conjunction with the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance, as many of these areas are only accessible via roadside parking.

I-165: Will McKay**Comment I-165-1**

More bus stops, more bussing, and larger park & ride areas!

I-166: Amanda Maze

Comment I-166-1

This canyon is for the people, not just those who profit or pay to be here. The ski resorts generate a large revenue of money during the winter, but the climbing is just as important. Because it's "free" does that mean it's not valued the same importance? Boulders are now exposed to the road, causing a dangerous landing zone and now no longer accessible. This is a place where climbers create a community and it is taken away. Value climbing and the outdoors the same as a skiing and snowboarding. Money cannot outweigh what the environment provides. This destruction is permanent and nature will never be able to regrow what has been destroyed.

Comment I-166-2

This canyon is for the people, not just those who profit or pay to be here. The ski resorts generate a large revenue of money during the winter, but the climbing is just as important. Because it's "free" does that mean it's not valued the same importance? Boulders are now exposed to the road, causing a dangerous landing zone and now no longer accessible. This is a place where climbers create a community and it is taken away. Value climbing and the outdoors the same as a skiing and snowboarding. Money cannot outweigh what the environment provides. This destruction is permanent and nature will never be able to regrow what has been destroyed.

Comment I-166-3

This canyon is for the people, not just those who profit or pay to be here. The ski resorts generate a large revenue of money during the winter, but the climbing is just as important. Because it's "free" does that mean it's not valued the same importance? Boulders are now exposed to the road, causing a dangerous landing zone and now no longer accessible. This is a place where climbers create a community and it is taken away. Value climbing and the outdoors the same as a skiing and snowboarding. Money cannot outweigh what the environment provides. This destruction is permanent and nature will never be able to regrow what has been destroyed.

Comment I-166-4

This canyon is for the people, not just those who profit or pay to be here. The ski resorts generate a large revenue of money during the winter, but the climbing is just as important. Because it's "free" does that mean it's not valued the same importance? Boulders are now exposed to the road, causing a dangerous landing zone and now no longer accessible. This is a place where climbers create a community and it is taken away. Value climbing and the outdoors the same as a skiing and snowboarding. Money cannot outweigh what the environment provides. This destruction is permanent and nature will never be able to regrow what has been destroyed.

I-167: Kate Galliett**Comment I-167-1**

I am very concerned about the current proposal for the Mountain Transportation System and how it does not account for dispersed recreators, such as climbers and hunters. Widening the road will have a direct impact on climbing, and in some cases, will destroy the iconic climbing that LCC is known for.

Comment I-167-2

I am very concerned about the current proposal for the Mountain Transportation System and how it does not account for dispersed recreators, such as climbers and hunters. Widening the road will have a direct impact on climbing, and in some cases, will destroy the iconic climbing that LCC is known for.

Comment I-167-3

In addition, eliminating roadside parking without adding other parking structures or transport will ensure that volume in the existing parking lot reaches capacity far quicker and thus perpetuates the problem of not enough places for people to park and ride.

Comment I-167-4

Lastly, dispersed recreators tend to enter and exit the canyon at all hours of the day and night. For instance, as a hunter, I may need to come in at 3 or 4AM to hike in, or I may be leaving at 2AM with an animal I've harvested and had to pack out. Transport in and out of the canyon must account for recreators who need to be able to easily get in and out of the canyon at anytime of day or night, possibly with tons of gear or a harvested animal (not something you likely want on a gondola).

I-168: Linda Oswald**Comment I-168-1**

In my opinion, option 1 (without subalternatives) is the best choice to deal with transportation issues in our canyons.

Comment I-168-2

In my opinion, option 1 (without subalternatives) is the best choice to deal with transportation issues in our canyons.

Comment I-168-3

In my opinion, option 1 (without subalternatives) is the best choice to deal with transportation issues in our canyons.

Comment I-168-4

In my opinion, option 1 (without subalternatives) is the best choice to deal with transportation issues in our canyons.

Comment I-168-5

However, this option has some serious problems that would need to be dealt with. I am far more likely to participate in hiking in the summer and snowshoeing in the winter than skiing at one of the resorts. If traveling in personal vehicles, having to park and walk half a mile from the bus stop to a trailhead isn't a viable option for me and my friends who are in our 70s and 80s.

Comment I-168-6

However, this option has some serious problems that would need to be dealt with. I am far more likely to participate in hiking in the summer and snowshoeing in the winter than skiing at one of the resorts. If traveling in personal vehicles, having to park and walk half a mile from the bus stop to a trailhead isn't a viable option for me and my friends who are in our 70s and 80s.

Comment I-168-7

However, this option has some serious problems that would need to be dealt with. I am far more likely to participate in hiking in the summer and snowshoeing in the winter than skiing at one of the resorts. If traveling in personal vehicles, having to park and walk half a mile from the bus stop to a trailhead isn't a viable option for me and my friends who are in our 70s and 80s.

Comment I-168-8

We have always carpooled to help reduce the number of vehicles in the canyons. If roadside parking is totally eliminated, I believe that our group would be more than willing to ride a bus, but only if there are stops at all Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon trailheads instead of traveling directly to the ski resorts. Return trips by bus would also necessitate having buses stop at trailheads heading down canyon. Shelters and restrooms at trailheads would also be necessary for protection from the elements and to safeguard our watershed while awaiting down-canyon buses.

Comment I-168-9

We have always carpooled to help reduce the number of vehicles in the canyons. If roadside parking is totally eliminated, I believe that our group would be more than willing to ride a bus, but only if there are stops at all Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon trailheads instead of traveling directly to the ski resorts. Return trips by bus would also necessitate having buses stop at trailheads heading down canyon. Shelters and restrooms at trailheads would also be

necessary for protection from the elements and to safeguard our watershed while awaiting down-canyon buses.

Comment I-168-10

We have always carpooled to help reduce the number of vehicles in the canyons. If roadside parking is totally eliminated, I believe that our group would be more than willing to ride a bus, but only if there are stops at all Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon trailheads instead of traveling directly to the ski resorts. Return trips by bus would also necessitate having buses stop at trailheads heading down canyon. Shelters and restrooms at trailheads would also be necessary for protection from the elements and to safeguard our watershed while awaiting down-canyon buses.

Comment I-168-11

We have always carpooled to help reduce the number of vehicles in the canyons. If roadside parking is totally eliminated, I believe that our group would be more than willing to ride a bus, but only if there are stops at all Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon trailheads instead of traveling directly to the ski resorts. Return trips by bus would also necessitate having buses stop at trailheads heading down canyon. Shelters and restrooms at trailheads would also be necessary for protection from the elements and to safeguard our watershed while awaiting down-canyon buses.

Comment I-168-12

Living on the East bench, I wouldn't consider driving to 9400 South to board a bus, so other park-and-ride options would need to be created for those of us living in the city, suburbs and north into Davis County.

Comment I-168-13

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-14

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-15

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-16

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-17

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-18

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-19

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-20

In addition to being bad ideas, a gondola or cog rail would be prohibitively expensive, detrimental to Little Cottonwood Canyon and its environment, and very inconvenient logistically. Only the ski resorts would benefit from either of these options.

Comment I-168-21

With the current overuse and subsequent overcrowding of the canyon roads year-round, the fewer private vehicles allowed in the canyons, the better. Carpooling helps and a toll and parking fees would discourage some canyon visitors, but unless the number of private vehicles is severely limited or eliminated altogether, overcrowding will continue to be an ongoing problem. This isn't good for everyone's mountain experience or for the environment.

Comment I-168-22

With the current overuse and subsequent overcrowding of the canyon roads year-round, the fewer private vehicles allowed in the canyons, the better. Carpooling helps and a toll and parking fees would discourage some canyon visitors, but unless the number of private vehicles is severely limited or eliminated altogether, overcrowding will continue to be an ongoing problem. This isn't good for everyone's mountain experience or for the environment.

Comment I-168-23

With the current overuse and subsequent overcrowding of the canyon roads year-round, the fewer private vehicles allowed in the canyons, the better. Carpooling helps and a toll and parking fees would discourage some canyon visitors, but unless the number of private vehicles is severely limited or eliminated altogether, overcrowding will continue to be an ongoing problem. This isn't good for everyone's mountain experience or for the environment.

Comment I-168-24

With the current overuse and subsequent overcrowding of the canyon roads year-round, the fewer private vehicles allowed in the canyons, the better. Carpooling helps and a toll and parking fees would discourage some canyon visitors, but unless the number of private vehicles is severely limited or eliminated altogether, overcrowding will continue to be an ongoing problem. This isn't good for everyone's mountain experience or for the environment.

I-169: Amy Cairn**Comment I-169-1**

There are several other uses besides skiers in Little Cottonwood Canyon; climbers, hikers, bird watches, etc. These groups need to be considered when determining the impact of the transportation plans. Are climbing areas disturbed? Is parking disturbed? Is there still access for other users? Skiers are only ONE user of LCC.

I-170: Steven Glaser**Comment I-170-1**

Comments on Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report

Page 4, MTS Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus) Features:

This alternative lists the ability to move about 100 people per hour by bus directly to the ski resorts as

one of its features. This number is too low.

When this option was discussed in the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Draft Alternative Report (LCC EIS),

it was deemed impractical to have a higher number of passengers than this due to the time required to

load/unload a bus. However, this assumes that only one bus is loaded or unloaded at a time.

That is an

artificial and unnecessary constraint. There can be several loading/unloading operations both at a central

bus hub and at the ski resorts (note that if there are many more people traveling to the ski resorts by bus, space that is currently used to park cars can be converted to areas for buses without causing hardship to the resorts).

It should also be noted that the IOW people per hour bus capacity identified in the LCC EIS was specific to Little Cottonwood Canyon only. The total number of people being by bus will higher when Big Cottonwood Canyon is also considered.

Page 7, MTS Draft Alternatives, Salt Lake Valley Transit Connections

The CWC is to be commended for considering Salt Lake Valley transit connections in its planning. One of

the challenges is finding places to park so that one can catch the bus. I live a block away from Highland

Drive, and walk from my house with my ski equipment in my ski boots so that I can catch the 220 bus.

My suspicion is that most people will not walk this distance (even if they will walk this far in a Park 'N

Ride lot). Even if they will, most people live more than a block from a bus stop. The revised version of

this document should consider a range of strategies for making it easy for people to catch a bus outside

of the Park 'N Ride lots when laden with ski/snowboard gear.

Comment I-170-2

Comments on Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report

Page 4, MTS Draft Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus) Features:

This alternative lists the ability to move about 100 people per hour by bus directly to the ski resorts as

one of its features. This number is too low.

When this option was discussed in the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS Draft Alternative Report (LCC EIS),

it was deemed impractical to have a higher number of passengers than this due to the time required to

load/unload a bus. However, this assumes that only one bus is loaded or unloaded at a time. That is an artificial and unnecessary constraint. There can be several loading/unloading locations both at a central bus hub and at the ski resorts (note that if there are many more people traveling to the ski resorts by bus, space that is currently used to park cars can be converted to areas for buses without causing hardship to the resorts).

It should also be noted that the IOW people per hour bus capacity identified in the LCC EIS was specific to Little Cottonwood Canyon only. The total number of people being by bus will be higher when Big Cottonwood Canyon is also considered.

Page 7, MTS Draft Alternatives, Salt Lake Valley Transit Connections

The CWC is to be commended for considering Salt Lake Valley transit connections in its planning. One of the challenges is finding places to park so that one can catch the bus. I live a block away from Highland Drive, and walk from my house with my ski equipment in my ski boots so that I can catch the 220 bus. My suspicion is that most people will not walk this distance (even if they will walk this far in a Park 'N Ride lot). Even if they will, most people live more than a block from a bus stop. The revised version of this document should consider a range of strategies for making it easy for people to catch a bus outside of the Park 'n Ride lots when laden with ski/snowboard gear.

Comment I-170-3

Qualitative Evaluation of Alternatives (Pages 25, 27, and 29), Protection of Watershed, Wilderness, and Visual Quality

This objective is scored as 'Adequate' for all three alternatives. It needs to be rescored. The bus/aerial

alternative may not even be 'Adequate' (the report apparently does not allow for unacceptable ratings),
and the Comprehensive Bus Alternative is better than Cog Rail.

The Comprehensive Bus (Alternative 1) is the best of these three for this characteristic, and that should
be acknowledged by the spreadsheet.

Comment I-170-4

The gondola portion of the bus/aerial alternative will have a
much greater visual impact, running hundreds of feet above the canyon floor.

Comment I-170-5

The nature of the cog rail
system is not discussed, but if it is to be in addition to (as opposed to replacing the roads up the
canyons), the transportation footprint will need to be substantially widened, which will affect the
streams and wildlife access. This system also has the potential to be noisy, although not enough
information is provided in the reports to conclude that.

Comment I-170-6

Qualitative Evaluation of Alternatives (Pages 25, 27, and 29), 'Quality of Recreational
Experience' and
'Sensitivity to Ridgelines'
These attributes are scored as 'Better' for the Bus/Aerial alternative. However, a gondola would
degrade the recreational experience and likely be highly visible (in an undesirable way) from
ridgelines
for dispersed recreationists. Someone who hikes or skis to the top of a mountain or up to a
ridge does
not want to see a gondola; they also do not want to see a gondola even if they go only half way
up a
mountain (and note that the gondola's movement would make it more visible/irritating). They
want to
feel part of the wilderness that they have just moved through. The rating should reflect this
reality.

Comment I-170-7

Subalternative A, Transit Tunnel

The description of this subalternative should note the construction time required, along with the number of years heavy trucks would be hauling dirt down canyon roads, and impacts on trailhead access while this is occurring. Potential destinations should be identified for the dirt (at least conceptually; e.g., the West Desert), so that other impacts of the hauling could be described.

Comment I-170-8

It is unclear what the advantage a year-around circulator bus would have on a routine basis, as opposed to just increasing bus service from the Salt Lake Valley (as opposed to a bus going back and forth between the ski resorts which obviously reduces travel times).

Comment I-170-9

If the same amount of money was spent on further increasing transit from the Salt Lake Valley, what would the comparative impact be on traffic? In other words, the report should compare the impact of spending approximately \$2 billion on the tunnel versus increased bus service.

Subalternatives B and C (Gondola BCC-LCC and Gondola BCC-PC)

The report properly notes negative visual impacts of gondola connections. They would worsen the

experience of people who enjoy dispersed recreation in the backcountry.

The Wasatch Mountains provide a wide range of incredible recreation opportunities near a major

metropolitan area. A superb balance has been achieved that allows for people to enjoy the outdoors

whether they want the excitement of skiing or the solitude of hiking. The key is to solve the transportation issues while maintaining that balance. Any way of addressing the transportation problems that degrades the outdoor experience of a large number of people who use the canyons is a

failure. These subalternatives should be rejected.

Comment I-170-10

If the same amount of money was spent on further increasing transit from the Salt Lake Valley, what

would the comparative impact be on traffic? In other words, the report should compare the impact of spending approximately \$2 billion on the tunnel versus increased bus service.

Subalternatives B and C (Gondola BCC-LCC and Gondola BCC-PC)

The report properly notes negative visual impacts of gondola connections. They would worsen the

experience of people who enjoy dispersed recreation in the backcountry.

The Wasatch Mountains provide a wide range of incredible recreation opportunities near a major

metropolitan area. A superb balance has been achieved that allows for people to enjoy the outdoors

whether they want the excitement of skiing or the solitude of hiking. The key is to solve the transportation issues while maintaining that balance. Any way of addressing the transportation problems that degrades the outdoor experience of a large number of people who use the canyons is a

failure. These subalternatives should be rejected.

I-171: Daniel Shanks

Comment I-171-1

I urge you to consider the impact to rock climbing in LCC, a granite Mecca rivaling Yosemite in density, quality, and accessibility. The climbing areas may not generate the same revenue as the ski areas up the road, but the number of professional climbers and climbing manufacturers based in slc are a testament to the importance of climbing access in LCC.

Comment I-171-2

I urge you to consider the impact to rock climbing in LCC, a granite Mecca rivaling Yosemite in density, quality, and accessibility.

The climbing areas may not generate the same revenue as the ski areas up the road, but the number of professional climbers and climbing manufacturers based in slc are a testament to the importance of climbing access in LCC.

I-172: Beat von Allmen

Comment I-172-1

It is most important to fully consider the water shed protection and scenic quality of the Little Cottonwood resort and recreation setting. - Thank you for including the option of a "Rail/Pedestrian/Bicycle corridor avoiding most avalanche paths". This makes the most sense and would be most viable overall.

Comment I-172-2

It is most important to fully consider the water shed protection and scenic quality of the Little Cottonwood resort and recreation setting. - Thank you for including the option of a "Rail/Pedestrian/Bicycle corridor avoiding most avalanche paths". This makes the most sense and would be most viable overall.

Comment I-172-3

It is most important to fully consider the water shed protection and scenic quality of the Little Cottonwood resort and recreation setting. - Thank you for including the option of a "Rail/Pedestrian/Bicycle corridor avoiding most avalanche paths". This makes the most sense and would be most viable overall.

Comment I-172-4

It is clear today that dispersed recreation is needed and a strictly point-to-point system, i.e. 3S-gondola, is therefore not desirable.

Comment I-172-5

The MTS Draft Amendment includes several blunders, such as, cost of a lift connection between Alta and Brighton, rail cost estimate by UDOT, cost of buses, etc. It is very hard to follow the tiered approach. It seems to be confusing. Most problematic is that the formulas to arrive at the "2050 life cycle cost is not explained. The life cycle of various systems is not the same. While the life cycle of a rail system reaches far beyond 2050, that of buses and highways will not reach 2050...

Comment I-172-6

It is annoying that this urgent resolution for the mountain transportation in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon is encumbered with connecting to Park City. Nobody can support a total overloading of these two canyons. The Wasatch Front residents would be be overrun and/or priced-out.

A train to Alta with a relatively low-key lift connection to Brighton could likely be agreed on by all those that cherish an enhanced experience staying within the recreation carrying capacity of the mighty Wasatch Front which is not a true Wilderness, but largely protected as one today.

Comment I-172-7

It is annoying that this urgent resolution for the mountain transportation in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon is encumbered with connecting to Park City. Nobody can support a total overloading of these two canyons. The Wasatch Front residents would be be overrun and/or priced-out.

A train to Alta with a relatively low-key lift connection to Brighton could likely be agreed on by all those that cherish an enhanced experience staying within the recreation carrying capacity of the mighty Wasatch Front which is not a true Wilderness, but largely protected as one today.

Comment I-172-8

I believe the single track, regular-gauge, electrified mountain railway following a separate (recreation) corridor along the South of U210, is a viable choice. Similar systems have proven most successful and would be absolutely do-able aesthetically, environmentally and economically here.

Comment I-172-9

I believe the single track, regular-gauge, electrified mountain railway following a separate (recreation) corridor along the South of U210, is a viable choice. Similar systems have proven most successful and would be absolutely do-able aesthetically, environmentally and economically here.

Comment I-172-10

I believe the single track, regular-gauge, electrified mountain railway following a separate (recreation) corridor along the South of U210, is a viable choice. Similar systems have proven most successful and would be absolutely do-able aesthetically, environmentally and economically here.

I-173: Nyima Ming**Comment I-173-1**

I am in support of creating an alternative transportation system that services big, little, and parley canyons.

Comment I-173-2

After sitting in traffic for hours up and down each canyon it is clear that there needs to be a better transportation system up and down the canyons. In the near future, I am in support for expanding the bus system and incorporation electric busses. In the distant future I support implementing a rail line that would service each canyon.

Comment I-173-3

After sitting in traffic for hours up and down each canyon it is clear that there needs to be a better transportation system up and down the canyons. In the near future, I am in support for expanding the bus system and incorporation electric busses. In the distant future I support implementing a rail line that would service each canyon.

Comment I-173-4

I do not support implementing a gondola or tunnel between big, little, and PC. I believe that the Wasatch is small enough that having a gondola or tunnel between the canyons would disrupt the feeling of wilderness. This would also impact what little habitat is left for wildlife.

Comment I-173-5

I do not support implementing a gondola or tunnel between big, little, and PC. I believe that the Wasatch is small enough that having a gondola or tunnel between the canyons would disrupt the feeling of wilderness. This would also impact what little habitat is left for wildlife.

Comment I-173-6

Please protect the integrity of the Wasatch!

Thank you

I-174: David Stein**Comment I-174-1**

David Stein

The four draft alternatives (including the cog rail option) do not effectively meet ANY of the CWC

Staff Recommended Attributes or Objectives for a Mountain Transportation System.

Comment I-174-2

The snow shed

design is terrible. It will result in a totally unusable bike path (drainage directly on to the center of

the path): roadside erosion and destruction (16' drop waterfall onto the road side after smooth acceleration of water flow across >50' 12% pitched roof). The earthen berms are unconstructable

and with erosion will shortly end up in Little Cottonwood Creek.

Comment I-174-3

The cog railroad is slow (25 kph

uphill: 17-12.5 kph downhill according to Stadler locomotive fact sheet) and subject to many disadvantages.

Comment I-174-4

Road widening would be bad for the wildlife (deeper hillside cuts to navigate to water), more erosion, high maintenance costs: and increase the avalanche clearing effort

Comment I-174-5

All of these alternatives do nothing to address BCC or the Wasatch Back: and at great expense. They all leave the same bottlenecks: just in different locations_ None are expandable in any significant way, especially the gondola and train options.

Comment I-174-6

For a time solution, use these guiding principles
Fossil fuels will run out.

The MTS must be powered entirely by renewable energy.
EVs with regenerative braking are inherently more efficient since they recover a good portion of the energy expended ascending mountains when they descend later.

Comment I-174-7

An underground system is inherently more heating/cooling energy efficient since tunnels are relatively warm in the winter and relatively cool in the summer.
An on-demand autonomous system is superior to a schedule-based system. Better service, much lower operational cost.
24-hours per day, 365 days per year is superior.
To eliminate bottlenecks don't just move them, distribute many system access points geographically.
The MTS should inherently last effectively forever and be infinitely expandable.
The parts of the system that wear out should last as long as possible with replacements being superior to previous versions.
The MTS should as invisible as possible.
There should be only positive environmental impacts.
The MTS should be fast, fun, free to ride, and convenient. So superior to driving that nobody would drive unless they had to (transporting construction materials, for example).

The MTS should be world-class and a tourist attraction.

The Solar Farm and Big Battery systems should be infinitely expandable.

The MTS should support homeowners, resort suppliers, police, medical, and fire personnel.

The MTS capacity could be expanded with private vehicles. Tesla Network EV owners could opt-in for income (tire upgrades included if needed before acceptance).

The Express proposal (attached) details a MTS that has all the Staff Recommended Attributes and fulfills all the Staff Recommended Objectives.

Comment I-174-8

If anything needs to be done as a stop-gap measure, the More Buses with No SR-210 Widening has the least environmental impact and is the easiest and least expensive to remove when no longer needed. No gravel pit mobility center needed if the Cottonwoods Express becomes the selected alternative since the Express will have at least 25 different access points distributed in the Salt Lake Valley. No bottlenecks

Comment I-174-9

You have my request and permission to post either or both of these documents for public scrutiny on the CWC MTS website.

Best regards,

David Stein

CEO Cottonwoods Express Inc.

Note: If the Express the selected alternative, I will become at least a part-time Utah resident for as long as needed to make it happen.

I-175: Nate Furman

Comment I-175-1

Commissioners, Staff, Stakeholders, and Citizens:

As a year-round recreation user in the Central Wasatch, I have major concerns about the Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report.

I appreciate the CWC working hard on behalf of citizens of Central Wasatch communities and visiting recreationists. The work you are doing will benefit people for decades to come. Developing alternatives is a necessary step before deciding on a course of action, but two of the alternatives would be disastrous if executed on.

The MTS appears biased towards the need to transport skiers to the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon and biased away from the year-round recreation needs of dispersed users. Aerial alternatives do not serve the majority of recreational users or recreation areas in the canyons, and the "potential of 'whistle-stops' serving popular trailheads" (p. 6) seems like wishful thinking in the absence of further elaboration.

Comment I-175-2

Commissioners, Staff, Stakeholders, and Citizens:

As a year-round recreation user in the Central Wasatch, I have major concerns about the Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report.

I appreciate the CWC working hard on behalf of citizens of Central Wasatch communities and visiting recreationists. The work you are doing will benefit people for decades to come. Developing alternatives is a necessary step before deciding on a course of action, but two of the alternatives would be disastrous if executed on.

The MTS appears biased towards the need to transport skiers to the top of Little Cottonwood Canyon and biased away from the year-round recreation needs of dispersed users. Aerial alternatives do not serve the majority of recreational users or recreation areas in the canyons, and the "potential of 'whistle-stops' serving popular trailheads" (p. 6) seems like wishful thinking in the absence of further elaboration.

Comment I-175-3

Fortunately, Mill Creek, Big, and Little Cottonwood Canyons already have 90% of the infrastructure that they need without including aerial or rail-based alternatives. Enhanced bus service, tolling, and parking fees at ski areas will not require much additional infrastructure, support all forms of dispersed recreation throughout the canyons, and develop revenue streams to support maintenance. Additional restrooms and parking lot development will reduce detrimental impacts on watersheds and reduce roadway parking. In addition, the development of a shuttle-based electric vehicle service will assist UTA for trailheads that are not easily amendable to buses.

Comment I-175-4

Fortunately, Mill Creek, Big, and Little Cottonwood Canyons already have 90% of the infrastructure that they need without including aerial or rail-based alternatives. Enhanced bus service, tolling, and parking fees at ski areas will not require much additional infrastructure, support all forms of dispersed recreation throughout the canyons, and develop revenue streams to support maintenance. Additional restrooms and parking lot development will reduce detrimental impacts on watersheds and reduce roadway parking. In addition, the development of a shuttle-based electric vehicle service will assist UTA for trailheads that are not easily amendable to buses.

Comment I-175-5

Fortunately, Mill Creek, Big, and Little Cottonwood Canyons already have 90% of the infrastructure that they need without including aerial or rail-based alternatives. Enhanced bus service, tolling, and parking fees at ski areas will not require much additional infrastructure, support all forms of dispersed recreation throughout the canyons, and develop revenue streams to support maintenance. Additional restrooms and parking lot development will reduce detrimental impacts on watersheds and reduce roadway parking. In addition, the development of a shuttle-based electric vehicle service will assist UTA for trailheads that are not easily amendable to buses.

Comment I-175-6

Fortunately, Mill Creek, Big, and Little Cottonwood Canyons already have 90% of the infrastructure that they need without including aerial or rail-based alternatives. Enhanced bus service, tolling, and parking fees at ski areas will not require much additional infrastructure, support all forms of dispersed recreation throughout the canyons, and develop revenue streams to support maintenance. Additional restrooms and parking lot development will reduce detrimental impacts on watersheds and reduce roadway parking. In addition, the development of a shuttle-based electric vehicle service will assist UTA for trailheads that are not easily amendable to buses.

Comment I-175-7

Fortunately, Mill Creek, Big, and Little Cottonwood Canyons already have 90% of the infrastructure that they need without including aerial or rail-based alternatives. Enhanced bus service, tolling, and parking fees at ski areas will not require much additional infrastructure, support all forms of dispersed recreation throughout the canyons, and develop revenue streams to support maintenance. Additional restrooms and parking lot development will reduce detrimental impacts on watersheds and reduce roadway parking. In addition, the development of a shuttle-based electric vehicle service will assist UTA for trailheads that are not easily amendable to buses.

Comment I-175-8

Climate change and decreasing mineral resources are a reality. It is time for our communities and legislatures to focus on solutions that recognize that leaving less trace, less footprint, and less impact is the responsible way forward. Fortunately, though, the Wasatch has the resources it needs already in place. Instead of building new structures, it only requires building new mindsets and incentivizing those mindsets to support both the environment and the people.

Best regards,

Nate Furman

I-176: KIRK NICHOLS**Comment I-176-1**

CWC-MTS Alternatives (first) Comment:

Thank you for taking a broad view of the entire central Wasatch. A Programmatic -EIS is needed. Starting with Little Cottonwood has the tail wagging the dog. Transportation decisions made in Little Cottonwood will have un-studied effects across the entire area. The purpose of an EIS is to study the effects of each alternative on all connected areas. Starting in Little Cottonwood with a transportation goal of delivering clients to one of two ski resorts is inadequate to meet NEPA. All the canyons, front and back are connected. Anything done in one canyon affects the entire region. Anything done in one canyon affects possible solutions in all other venues and canyons, some will eliminate unstudied options in the other areas.

Comment I-176-2

More time and money should be spent on transportation solutions out in the valley so the canyon recreationists, residents, and employees are already in the transportation mode of final choice before arriving at the bottom of the canyons in their private vehicles.

Comment I-176-3

Driving to a transportation hub at Big Cottonwood and then transferring to another transportation mode to get to another transportation mode to go up to the canyon location of choice is not efficient or desirable.

No connections between canyons should be made. Keeping each canyon unique allows for a greater diversity of opportunities. The forces behind interconnecting canyons are for developing out of state and out of country dollars rather than favoring the local residents who have been paying into the system for decades and will lose out to a monied international market. Keep the Cottonwoods for Utahns. Park City is already lost.

Comment I-176-4

Driving to a transportation hub at Big Cottonwood and then transferring to another transportation mode to get to another transportation mode to go up to the canyon location of choice is not efficient or desirable.

No connections between canyons should be made. Keeping each canyon unique allows for a greater diversity of opportunities. The forces behind interconnecting canyons are for developing out of state and out of country dollars rather than favoring the local residents who have been paying into the system for decades and will lose out to a monied international market. Keep the Cottonwoods for Utahns. Park City is already lost.

Comment I-176-5

Driving to a transportation hub at Big Cottonwood and then transferring to another transportation mode to get to another transportation mode to go up to the canyon location of choice is not efficient or desirable.

No connections between canyons should be made. Keeping each canyon unique allows for a greater diversity of opportunities. The forces behind interconnecting canyons are for developing out of state and out of country dollars rather than favoring the local residents who have been paying into the system for decades and will lose out to a monied international market. Keep the Cottonwoods for Utahns. Park City is already lost.

I-177: Paul Steinman**Comment I-177-1**

The transportation solution to Little Cottonwood Canyon should focus on improving access and minimizing environmental impact across the many user groups that utilize this canyon for recreation.

Comment I-177-2

I am in support of a modified/expanded bus/shuttle service to alleviate congestion and improve the parking situation with the least development necessary.

Comment I-177-3

I am in support of a modified/expanded bus/shuttle service to alleviate congestion and improve the parking situation with the least development necessary.

Comment I-177-4

I am in support of a modified/expanded bus/shuttle service to alleviate congestion and improve the parking situation with the least development necessary.

Comment I-177-5

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-6

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-7

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-8

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-9

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-10

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem

needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-11

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-12

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-13

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-14

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-15

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-16

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the

canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-17

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

Comment I-177-18

Bus stops should be created along the canyon rather than just the resorts in order to serve climbers, hikers, backcountry skiers, runners, etc. Charge tolls for individuals driving up the canyon, make the shuttle service affordable and accessible. The other solutions seem needlessly destructive and/or solely benefiting the resorts and their patrons without fully addressing the problem. Please do not build a gondola up Little Cottonwood!

I-178: James Kowalski

Comment I-178-1

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-2

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood

Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-3

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-4

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning

of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-5

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-6

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-7

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood

Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-8

I highly suggest that the Central Wasatch Commission should reconsider their plans to develop Little Cottonwood Canyon. A more efficient bus transportation should be implemented rather than the options to build a rail/gondola system or expand 210. Much of Little Cottonwood Canyon is used for recreation. There are over 1000 climbing routes within the canyon along with miles of maintained hiking and biking trails within a flourishing ecosystem. A road expansion or rail system would put popular bouldering areas (e.g., Secret Garden, Cabbage Patch, 5 mile Boulders, Gate Boulders) in jeopardy as a lot of the bouldering in LCC is right off highway 210. A gondola and its construction would also disturb climbing areas and taint the beauty of the canyon. People come to SLC to recreate because of its "under-developed" canyons; visitors do not come to recreate below or next to tourists taking pictures of them climbing/hiking as they ride the gondola up the canyon to have dinner at Snowbird's Cliff Lodge. Implementing a gondola or rail system would be the end to the wild wasatch and the beginning of a European-style canyon where gondolas are seen going up peak after peak. Moreover, the commission's sub alternatives or "add-ons" would bring Little and Big Cottonwood closer to a European-style canyon and destroy the backcountry in the Wasatch.

Comment I-178-9

Grizzly Gulch must be kept wild. Little Cottonwood must be kept wild. As a final point, I would like to add that environmental impacts must be taken into consideration.

Comment I-178-10

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-11

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-12

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-13

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-14

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-15

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-16

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-17

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-18

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

Comment I-178-19

Little Cottonwood Canyon is home to many species of plants and animals that risk losing their homes to a road expansion or construction of a gondola/rail system. If implemented, either option would decrease biodiversity in the canyon ecosystem which could then lead to increased geohazard risk (e.g., slope failure).

Also, since most of SLC's water comes from Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, their ecosystems must be protected in order for us to survive on the water that the canyons provide. Please think about future generations. More infrastructure in Little Cottonwood Canyon does not mean a more environmentally friendly canyon.

I-179: KIRK NICHOLS

Comment I-179-1

KIRK NICHOLS

None of the alternatives including the No-Change alternative has addressed the cumulative or the connected effects to the forest environment. No study is in development that addresses the Increased de-vegetation: alteration of wildlife mortality: or displacement of native species that will be effects of any of the alternatives.

No indicators of environmental health have been studied.

No thresholds of acceptable environmental change have ever developed for the Wasatch Mountains. This CWC-MTS proposal continues to neglect this requirement of NEPA_ Let's make it happen.

Comment I-179-2

Dynamic tolling is necessary and the money needs to remain in area for improvements and not given to the legislature to divert to other projects. Various forms of tolling in Mill Creek: American Fork: and Highway 150 in the Uintas have well accepted as normal business. People who use the roads should be the ones paying for the roads, trails, and safety (fire, police, SAR etc.).

Comment I-179-3

Roadside parking is a safety issue and solutions are critically late in coming. Roadside parking forces pedestrians: runners: and cyclists into automobile and truck traffic. A solution that allows trailhead use of the majority of roadside parking) Without roadside parking is a necessary goal. All trains: busses: or aerial tram systems must provide access to dispersed recreation to even considered as viable alternatives.

Comment I-179-4

Study running a train (and/or TRAX) up 9400 South

Comment I-179-5

Isolated bike lanes will be preferred by many; however: some cyclists will prefer the road cycling over the likely more winding and slower bike lane. Always allow for the cyclists who prefer a road (especially a road with no roadside parking)

Comment I-179-6

Eliminate all parking along the down canyon side of the road right now. Slower moving uphill cyclists can maneuver a little, however: down canyon speeds on a bicycle are fatal if a car is open in the down-canyon lane

Comment I-179-7

Drop the Cottonwoods and Millcreek canyon speed limits to 35 mph even in summer. This is no place to hurry. A speed limit of 45 mph with pedestrians and cyclists forced into the traffic lane is Irresponsible.

Comment I-179-8

In Big Cottonwood: curve the highway such that the parking at Willow Heights: Dogwood, Ledgemere: and all other similar places correctly placing the parking on the same side of the road as the trailhead or picnic area. The current situation of walking a 4 year-old across a 45 mph highway to get to their picnic table is irresponsible. The Hawk light at Cardiff is a great solution where parking and trailheads are on both sides of the road.

Comment I-179-9

Residents in the canyons drive the road the most: causing more than our share of expense to the community _ Take a hard look at a reduced driving toll for residents (I am a resident and do not find myself special or in need of a second discount). We residents are hard users of the canyon roads, trails, and services.

Comment I-179-10

If charging for parking at the resorts reduces congestion in the canyon: charge for resort-use parking.

Enhance the bus service,
skip the trains: and aerial tranys_

Comment I-179-11

Do not connect the canyons through

Comment I-179-12

tunnels or aerial systems. Each canyon will lose their unique personality and become one conglomerate of overpriced sameness. Utahns can only lose as prices for the connections phase the locals out.

Comment I-179-13

tunnels or aerial systems. Each canyon will lose their unique personality and become one conglomerate of overpriced sameness. Utahns can only lose as prices for the connections phase the locals out.

Comment I-179-14

Do not pave any more lanes for busses or autos/tmcks

Kirk Nichols

I-180: Vickie Smoot**Comment I-180-1**

Please know that climbers need to be able to drive their cars to the climbing areas. There is so much gear, and the need to go to your car between climbing routes/locations so that you can get the gear required for that area. You need a backpack full of gear, at least 2 pair of shoes (for the approach and for the climb) you may need several crash pads, you will want to bring your food for the day in a cooler, a full day's worth of water, you need a coat for early in the morning, you need the appropriate gear in case a rescue is required, etc., etc. There is a lot of stuff climbers need, and we need our cars nearby. We have been climbing in those canyons for decades and love it and it is an important part of our lives. Climbers often begin climbing pre-dawn and come down late at night. Most all of the climbing is in the lower few miles of the canyon which doesn't affect traffic up higher. Climbing in these canyons is a long-standing tradition for generations. It would be devastating to lose access that allows us to climb proficiently and, most importantly, safely. We can't take everything we need on a bus or other type of public transportation. The climber's season is the opposite of the skier's season, so there isn't any reason to close off summer parking for climbers. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment I-180-2

Please know that climbers need to be able to drive their cars to the climbing areas. There is so much gear, and the need to go to your car between climbing routes/locations so that you can get the gear required for that area. You need a backpack full of gear, at least 2 pair of shoes (for the approach and for the climb) you may need several crash pads, you will want to bring your food for the day in a cooler, a full day's worth of water, you need a coat for early in the morning, you need the appropriate gear in case a rescue is required, etc., etc. There is a lot of stuff climbers need, and we need our cars nearby. We have been climbing in those canyons for decades and love it and it is an important part of our lives. Climbers often begin climbing pre-dawn and come down late at night. Most all of the climbing is in the lower few miles of the canyon which doesn't affect traffic up higher. Climbing in these canyons is a long-standing tradition for generations. It would be devastating to lose access that allows us to climb proficiently and, most importantly, safely. We can't take everything we need on a bus or other type of public transportation. The climber's season is the opposite of the skier's season, so there isn't any reason to close off summer parking for climbers. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment I-180-3

Please know that climbers need to be able to drive their cars to the climbing areas. There is so much gear, and the need to go to your car between climbing routes/locations so that you can get the gear required for that area. You need a backpack full of gear, at least 2 pair of shoes (for the approach and for the climb) you may need several crash pads, you will want to bring your food for the day in a cooler, a full day's worth of water, you need a coat for early in the morning, you need the appropriate gear in case a rescue is required, etc., etc. There is a lot of stuff climbers need, and we need our cars nearby. We have been climbing in those canyons for decades and love it and it is an important part of our lives. Climbers often begin climbing pre-dawn and come down late at night. Most all of the climbing is in the lower few miles of the canyon which doesn't affect traffic up higher. Climbing in these canyons is a long-standing tradition for generations. It would be devastating to lose access that allows us to climb proficiently and, most importantly, safely. We can't take everything we need on a bus or other type of public transportation. The climber's season is the opposite of the skier's season, so there isn't any reason to close off summer parking for climbers. Thank you for your consideration.

I-181: Samuel Carter**Comment I-181-1**

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-181-2

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-181-3

The outdoor community in the Salt Lake Valley is built on access to wilderness, and ANY alternative to connect Big Cottonwood, Little Cottonwood, and Park City, for example, would destroy this wilderness and create one big resort comparable to European ski resorts. Furthermore, there is not nearly enough infrastructure at the base of the canyons to support large amounts of cars parked for a gondola or train, and those resources should be used to

expand bus parking and public transportation that already exists. The ONLY reasonable plan to preserve the integrity of the Wasatch Mountains recreational areas is to increase bus availability and frequency, and work on expanding parking at the base of the canyons to decrease traffic and keep the Wasatch wild.

I-182: Lisa Carter

Comment I-182-1

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-182-2

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-182-3

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-182-4

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-182-5

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-182-6

I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life. The SLC valley has seen a tremendous amount of growth in my lifetime, and the only escape from the chaos of the city is the access to the canyons. Not only would a train or gondola ruin the aesthetic and the "wilderness" of the cottonwood canyons, but it would negatively effect the integrity of bouldering areas near the road, damage and further intersect ecosystems, and make the Wasatch incredibly more busy with short-sighted tourism that ruins the experience for Utah locals.

Comment I-182-7

The outdoor community in the Salt Lake Valley is built on access to wilderness, and ANY alternative to connect Big Cottonwood, Little Cottonwood, and Park City, for example, would destroy this wilderness and create one big resort comparable to European ski resorts.

Comment I-182-8

Furthermore, there is not nearly enough infrastructure at the base of the canyons to support large amounts of cars parked for a gondola or train, and those resources should be used to expand bus parking and public transportation that already exists.

Comment I-182-9

Furthermore, there is not nearly enough infrastructure at the base of the canyons to support large amounts of cars parked for a gondola or train, and those resources should be used to expand bus parking and public transportation that already exists.

Comment I-182-10

Furthermore, there is not nearly enough infrastructure at the base of the canyons to support large amounts of cars parked for a gondola or train, and those resources should be used to expand bus parking and public transportation that already exists.

Comment I-182-11

The ONLY reasonable plan to preserve the integrity of the Wasatch Mountains recreational areas is to increase bus availability and frequency, and work on expanding parking at the base of the canyons to decrease traffic and keep the Wasatch wild.

Comment I-182-12

The ONLY reasonable plan to preserve the integrity of the Wasatch Mountains recreational areas is to increase bus availability and frequency, and work on expanding parking at the base of the canyons to decrease traffic and keep the Wasatch wild.

Comment I-182-13

The ONLY reasonable plan to preserve the integrity of the Wasatch Mountains recreational areas is to increase bus availability and frequency, and work on expanding parking at the base of the canyons to decrease traffic and keep the Wasatch wild.

I-183: Zach Niemeyer**Comment I-183-1**

please consider ALL users as you make plans, not just the users that end up at the top of the mountain on powder days.

Comment I-183-2

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-3

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-4

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-5

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses

only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-6

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-7

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-8

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

Comment I-183-9

There are other skiers that do not go to the top of the mountain and would not be helped by a train or gondola. There are hikers all throughout the year that would not be helped by busses only in the winter. There are climbers that would lose access if the road is widened. And there are more users that would not be able to recreate if there is not adequate access to parking and toilet facilities. Please consider all users.

I-184: Shane Wake

Comment I-184-1

Please protect the climbing in this historic location! Climbing is a unique sport that isn't about massive salaries, or being marketed to the masses for fame or riches. It is a sport that not only is an exercise but a connection to nature that teaches stewardship to respect, protect, and take care of our natural environment. Climbing doesn't have powerful and large financial entities in the sport to push back on these threats to our coveted crags. So we are urging you to use

your moral compass and help protect these spaces. The climbing in Little Cottonwood is home to climbs that are known around the world.

Comment I-184-2

Please protect the climbing in this historic location! Climbing is a unique sport that isn't about massive salaries, or being marketed to the masses for fame or riches. It is a sport that not only is an exercise but a connection to nature that teaches stewardship to respect, protect, and take care of our natural environment. Climbing doesn't have powerful and large financial entities in the sport to push back on these threats to our coveted crags. So we are urging you to use your moral compass and help protect these spaces. The climbing in Little Cottonwood is home to climbs that are known around the world.

Comment I-184-3

Please protect the climbing in this historic location! Climbing is a unique sport that isn't about massive salaries, or being marketed to the masses for fame or riches. It is a sport that not only is an exercise but a connection to nature that teaches stewardship to respect, protect, and take care of our natural environment. Climbing doesn't have powerful and large financial entities in the sport to push back on these threats to our coveted crags. So we are urging you to use your moral compass and help protect these spaces. The climbing in Little Cottonwood is home to climbs that are known around the world.

Comment I-184-4

One of the top twenty classic boulder problems is there. Utah held another that was recently destroyed by non-climbers unaware of what their actions would cause. Protection and education is needed for our special climbs. I worry about the future of these areas as they are irreplaceable. My dream is to be able to share these climbs with my boys, to teach them this sport and the stewardship for nature it requires. The climbing community is growing at an unparalleled rate. This community will look back on these choices and it will be clear whether this decision was to help and protect or for financial gain in the name of progress. You are in a unique position to make a difference. Please help protect our sacred natural areas.

I-185: Erik Badger

Comment I-185-1

I do not support gondolas, trains and especially no inter canyon connect.

Comment I-185-2

I do not support gondolas, trains and especially no inter canyon connect.

Comment I-185-3

I do not support gondolas, trains and especially no inter canyon connect.

Comment I-185-4

Expanded bus service seems to be the best answer for solving the immediate traffic problems. Please do pursue expensive construction projects that permanently harm the little wilderness that's left at the top of big, little, and Millcreek canyons.

I-186: Kristin Thompson**Comment I-186-1**

It seems like ya'll are choosing these "fancy" options (train/gondola) to get people "interested", when in reality, the fastest, cheapest, and most effective option is to just ramp up the bus system. Give people more options for the bus and they'll take it.

Comment I-186-2

As a backcountry skier, I don't use the bus because the schedule and the bus stops don't work for me. Instead, I hitchhike. The people who use LCC/BCC on powder days aren't going to take the bus unless its worth it - give the bus priority getting up the mountain (i.e. bus only lane), and people will start to take it to get to their precious powder stash. BUT, for the love of sweet baby Jesus, please put the bus stop somewhere that has parking. Our park and ride lots fill up SO quick as it is. Make taking the bus an easy, reliable option.

Comment I-186-3

As a backcountry skier, I don't use the bus because the schedule and the bus stops don't work for me. Instead, I hitchhike. The people who use LCC/BCC on powder days aren't going to take the bus unless its worth it - give the bus priority getting up the mountain (i.e. bus only lane), and people will start to take it to get to their precious powder stash. BUT, for the love of sweet baby Jesus, please put the bus stop somewhere that has parking. Our park and ride lots fill up SO quick as it is. Make taking the bus an easy, reliable option.

Comment I-186-4

And lets just go ahead and ditch this idea of connecting of LCC/BCC/Park City via tunnel/gondola/etc. This is un-necessary, expensive, not efficient, and cuts into precious backcountry terrain. For such an enormous toll to be waged on the access of land, taxpayer money, as well as the environment, at the benefit of such a small number of people would be atrocious.

Comment I-186-5

And lets just go ahead and ditch this idea of connecting of LCC/BCC/Park City via tunnel/gondola/etc. This is un-necessary, expensive, not efficient, and cuts into precious backcountry terrain. For such an enormous toll to be waged on the access of land, taxpayer money, as well as the environment, at the benefit of such a small number of people would be atrocious.

Comment I-186-6

And lets just go ahead and ditch this idea of connecting of LCC/BCC/Park City via tunnel/gondola/etc. This is un-necessary, expensive, not efficient, and cuts into precious backcountry terrain. For such an enormous toll to be waged on the access of land, taxpayer money, as well as the environment, at the benefit of such a small number of people would be atrocious.

Comment I-186-7

And lets just go ahead and ditch this idea of connecting of LCC/BCC/Park City via tunnel/gondola/etc. This is un-necessary, expensive, not efficient, and cuts into precious backcountry terrain. For such an enormous toll to be waged on the access of land, taxpayer money, as well as the environment, at the benefit of such a small number of people would be atrocious.

Comment I-186-8

And lets just go ahead and ditch this idea of connecting of LCC/BCC/Park City via tunnel/gondola/etc. This is un-necessary, expensive, not efficient, and cuts into precious backcountry terrain. For such an enormous toll to be waged on the access of land, taxpayer money, as well as the environment, at the benefit of such a small number of people would be atrocious.

Comment I-186-9

And lets just go ahead and ditch this idea of connecting of LCC/BCC/Park City via tunnel/gondola/etc. This is un-necessary, expensive, not efficient, and cuts into precious backcountry terrain. For such an enormous toll to be waged on the access of land, taxpayer money, as well as the environment, at the benefit of such a small number of people would be atrocious.

I-187: JONATHAN STARR**Comment I-187-1**

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as

bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

Comment I-187-2

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

Comment I-187-3

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

Comment I-187-4

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

I-188: John Byrne

Comment I-188-1

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

Comment I-188-2

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

Comment I-188-3

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

Comment I-188-4

The problem is now and we need immediate action. Increasing bus traffic and incentivizing bus usage is the easiest and obvious solution. The addition of a flex lane (3rd lane) could be used as bus only and create very efficient bus travel. It needs to be easier than driving your car for people to actual use the bus. If the bus will be stuck in the same traffic then many people would prefer to sit in there cars.

I-189: Morgan Daily**Comment I-189-1**

My address that I listed above is not my home. I find the most peace in the heart of the Wasatch mountain range. A space I can find serenity, clear air, and be able to enjoy my favorite forms of physical activity. These three things are all flaws I see in the Mountain Transportation System Draft. Mass amount of transportation opportunities will provide crowds to the very small spaces left in the Wasatch.

Comment I-189-2

My address that I listed above is not my home. I find the most peace in the heart of the Wasatch mountain range. A space I can find serenity, clear air, and be able to enjoy my favorite forms of physical activity. These three things are all flaws I see in the Mountain Transportation System Draft. Mass amount of transportation opportunities will provide crowds to the very small spaces left in the Wasatch.

Comment I-189-3

Clean air will soon disappear with the MANY years of contracted work to put these new systems into place. And, will there be room for everyone..please reflect on the current long lift lines during a powder day. I do ask of you, please look at the present times. Will these plans make it a better place right now, when it is most important time to focus on green solutions (not after the years of tearing down the land)?

Comment I-189-4

Clean air will soon disappear with the MANY years of contracted work to put these new systems into place. And, will there be room for everyone..please reflect on the current long lift lines during a powder day. I do ask of you, please look at the present times. Will these plans make it a better place right now, when it is most important time to focus on green solutions (not after the years of tearing down the land)?

I-190: Landon Haycock**Comment I-190-1**

I previously lived in Holladay, UT and have rock climbed in Little Cottonwood for years. I support allowing access for climbers to reach trailheads and pullouts by car. There are too many scenarios where you need to have a car to be able to climb something, mostly involving the freedom to have access (and get home) when you want to and can. These public lands provide so much more than people and politicians realize. This area is where people come to rejuvenate and recharge. Forcing them to get on a bus at only certain schedules is going to completely change the nature and benefit of the canyon.

Comment I-190-2

I previously lived in Holladay, UT and have rock climbed in Little Cottonwood for years. I support allowing access for climbers to reach trailheads and pullouts by car. There are too many scenarios where you need to have a car to be able to climb something, mostly involving the freedom to have access (and get home) when you want to and can. These public lands provide so much more than people and politicians realize. This area is where people come to rejuvenate and recharge. Forcing them to get on a bus at only certain schedules is going to completely change the nature and benefit of the canyon.

I-191: Elliott Barcikowski**Comment I-191-1**

First of all, I'm happy to finally see serious busing proposals in the Cottonwood canyons. Good and reliable access to bussing could make major headway into solving the traffic issues in the canyons, especially if coupled with active measures to reduce car traffic. In the last few years of the various transportation solutions, bussing has seemed to be an afterthought.

Comment I-191-2

I'm really disappointed to see the new gondola alternative. Throughout the process, many of the solutions have seemed to simply be give always to the ski resorts as this clearly is. Having a winter only transportation alternative that only stops at the resorts is simply absurd and has no business being part of this process.

Comment I-191-3

I'm really disappointed to see the new gondola alternative. Throughout the process, many of the solutions have seemed to simply be give always to the ski resorts as this clearly is. Having a winter only transportation alternative that only stops at the resorts is simply absurd and has no business being part of this process.

Comment I-191-4

The interconnects and trains are similar. These are enormous projects with huge environmental and monetary costs that are simply designed to give a marketing play to the big ski resorts. These are unlikely to ever be better than just having a solid bus system. As has been stated before, the interconnects aren't good transportation solutions and come directly from the ski resort marketing departments. We have known about them for years.

Comment I-191-5

The interconnects and trains are similar. These are enormous projects with huge environmental and monetary costs that are simply designed to give a marketing play to the big ski resorts. These are unlikely to ever be better than just having a solid bus system. As has been stated before, the interconnects aren't good transportation solutions and come directly from the ski resort marketing departments. We have known about them for years.

Comment I-191-6

The interconnects and trains are similar. These are enormous projects with huge environmental and monetary costs that are simply designed to give a marketing play to the big ski resorts. These are unlikely to ever be better than just having a solid bus system. As has been stated before, the interconnects aren't good transportation solutions and come directly from the ski resort marketing departments. We have known about them for years.

Comment I-191-7

Bussing and infrastructure such as road widening, parking and snowsheds are great. That is where the planning should be focused.

Comment I-191-8

Bussing and infrastructure such as road widening, parking and snowsheds are great. That is where the planning should be focused.

Comment I-191-9

Bussing and infrastructure such as road widening, parking and snowsheds are great. That is where the planning should be focused.

Comment I-191-10

Bussing and infrastructure such as road widening, parking and snowsheds are great. That is where the planning should be focused.

I-192: Rosie Staes**Comment I-192-1**

I am in favor of Alternative 1. I believe increasing bus frequency and stops is the best choice as it can implemented immediately, reduces traffic congestion, and reduces impact on the ecology and watershed in the canyons. It also serves ALL canyon users and not just those visiting the resorts. As a life long Utah resident and frequenter of the Cottonwoods, I understand their beauty and the desire to get out in pristine nature during all seasons of the year. We need to implement transportation options that preserve the canyons for generations to come.

Comment I-192-2

I am in favor of Alternative 1. I believe increasing bus frequency and stops is the best choice as it can implemented immediately, reduces traffic congestion, and reduces impact on the ecology and watershed in the canyons. It also serves ALL canyon users and not just those visiting the resorts. As a life long Utah resident and frequenter of the Cottonwoods, I understand their beauty and the desire to get out in pristine nature during all seasons of the year. We need to implement transportation options that preserve the canyons for generations to come.

Comment I-192-3

I am in favor of Alternative 1. I believe increasing bus frequency and stops is the best choice as it can implemented immediately, reduces traffic congestion, and reduces impact on the ecology and watershed in the canyons. It also serves ALL canyon users and not just those visiting the resorts. As a life long Utah resident and frequenter of the Cottonwoods, I understand their beauty and the desire to get out in pristine nature during all seasons of the year. We need to implement transportation options that preserve the canyons for generations to come.

Comment I-192-4

I am in favor of Alternative 1. I believe increasing bus frequency and stops is the best choice as it can implemented immediately, reduces traffic congestion, and reduces impact on the ecology and watershed in the canyons. It also serves ALL canyon users and not just those visiting the resorts. As a life long Utah resident and frequenter of the Cottonwoods, I understand their beauty and the desire to get out in pristine nature during all seasons of the year. We need to implement transportation options that preserve the canyons for generations to come.

Comment I-192-5

I am in favor of Alternative 1. I believe increasing bus frequency and stops is the best choice as it can be implemented immediately, reduces traffic congestion, and reduces impact on the ecology and watershed in the canyons. It also serves ALL canyon users and not just those visiting the resorts. As a life long Utah resident and frequenter of the Cottonwoods, I understand their beauty and the desire to get out in pristine nature during all seasons of the year. We need to implement transportation options that preserve the canyons for generations to come.

Comment I-192-6

I am in favor of Alternative 1. I believe increasing bus frequency and stops is the best choice as it can be implemented immediately, reduces traffic congestion, and reduces impact on the ecology and watershed in the canyons. It also serves ALL canyon users and not just those visiting the resorts. As a life long Utah resident and frequenter of the Cottonwoods, I understand their beauty and the desire to get out in pristine nature during all seasons of the year. We need to implement transportation options that preserve the canyons for generations to come.

I-193: Carston Oliver**Comment I-193-1**

Of the draft alternatives presented, I support alternative 1, for enhanced bus service in the canyons that operates year round, and ties into enhanced service from distributed nodes all over the valley and Wasatch back to feed into service up/down the canyons. This should also serve distributed recreation and trailheads all along the corridor; not just the developed sites/ski areas. Ideally the busses will be electric.

Comment I-193-2

Of the draft alternatives presented, I support alternative 1, for enhanced bus service in the canyons that operates year round, and ties into enhanced service from distributed nodes all over the valley and Wasatch back to feed into service up/down the canyons. This should also serve distributed recreation and trailheads all along the corridor; not just the developed sites/ski areas. Ideally the busses will be electric.

Comment I-193-3

Of the draft alternatives presented, I support alternative 1, for enhanced bus service in the canyons that operates year round, and ties into enhanced service from distributed nodes all over the valley and Wasatch back to feed into service up/down the canyons. This should also serve distributed recreation and trailheads all along the corridor; not just the developed sites/ski areas. Ideally the busses will be electric.

Comment I-193-4

Of the draft alternatives presented, I support alternative 1, for enhanced bus service in the canyons that operates year round, and ties into enhanced service from distributed nodes all over the valley and Wasatch back to feed into service up/down the canyons. This should also serve distributed recreation and trailheads all along the corridor; not just the developed sites/ski areas. Ideally the busses will be electric.

Comment I-193-5

I do not support a gondola, as it's scope of service is too narrow and cost too high.

Comment I-193-6

I also do not support any of the sub-alternatives for transit connections between the upper ends of the canyons, as they do not actually solve any problems. Connecting one busy, crowded, weather dependent canyon to another does very little in an emergency egress situation.

Comment I-193-7

I also do not support any of the sub-alternatives for transit connections between the upper ends of the canyons, as they do not actually solve any problems. Connecting one busy, crowded, weather dependent canyon to another does very little in an emergency egress situation.

Comment I-193-8

I also do not support any of the sub-alternatives for transit connections between the upper ends of the canyons, as they do not actually solve any problems. Connecting one busy, crowded, weather dependent canyon to another does very little in an emergency egress situation.

Comment I-193-9

I also do not support any of the sub-alternatives for transit connections between the upper ends of the canyons, as they do not actually solve any problems. Connecting one busy, crowded, weather dependent canyon to another does very little in an emergency egress situation.

Comment I-193-10

I also do not support any of the sub-alternatives for transit connections between the upper ends of the canyons, as they do not actually solve any problems. Connecting one busy, crowded, weather dependent canyon to another does very little in an emergency egress situation.

Comment I-193-11

I also do not support any of the sub-alternatives for transit connections between the upper ends of the canyons, as they do not actually solve any problems. Connecting one busy, crowded, weather dependent canyon to another does very little in an emergency egress situation.

I-194: Wasatch Backcountry Alliance,**Comment I-194-1**

For years now, the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance (WBA) has been stating that we envision a low cost, low emission, energy efficient year-round multi-modal transportation scenario for improving the current traffic issues in the Central Wasatch. The system we envision must be capable of providing efficient and predictable service from numerous locations around the Salt Lake Valley, Park City and the Wasatch Back to both developed locations (ski resorts) and to trailheads and other stopping points for dispersed use and canyon residents in the Central Wasatch. WBA firmly believes that before any transportation system is selected, there must be a thorough analysis of the purpose and need of the transportation system, and the carrying capacity of the Cottonwood Canyons and Mill Creek. This will help establish the volume of people that need to be moved by the system, which will in turn help determine which transportation system best fits that purpose and need. WBA strongly encourages the CWC to work with other stakeholders, including UDOT, the US Forest Service, and Salt Lake County to undertake a purpose and need assessment as well as a carrying capacity analysis that would be used as a baseline by the various stakeholders for decision making. While we applaud the fact that the CWC is looking at transportation issues for the entire Wasatch Front and Back, in our opinion the CWC MTS, which has seemingly put every conceivable transportation option and alternative back on the table, is going to create a great deal of confusion with regard to Little Cottonwood Canyon. Given UDOT is leading an EIS process for Little Cottonwood

Canyon, which the CWC addresses in the MTS, does UDOT have an obligation to listen to the CWC,Âs recommendation, let alone follow it? Are people going to be more frustrated that their preferred solution (eg. rail) is not even being considered or discussed by UDOT but is being suggested as a potential solution by the CWC? ,ÂPlanning,Â for a theoretical solution that the contracting/controlling agency has not/will not consider seems counterproductive at best and a source of confusion and frustration at worst. Therefore, it seems hard to imagine that Alternative 3 in the CWC MTS is viable, and/or we,Âd like to understand how the CWC plans to address this discrepancy. WBA agrees that the MTS should get people to ,Âdesired destinations any time of the year,Â and that the system should ,Âminimize negative environmental impacts on the watershed, ridgelines, air quality, visual quality, both in transit construction and when ultimately in use.,Â However, as we discuss in more detail below, we take issue with the argument that any transportation system must also allow for egress in the Cottonwood Canyons, as that provides an opportune excuse for connecting LCC ,Â BCC ,Â Park City ,Â Wasatch Back by aerial, tunnel, or both for development purposes. While we of course value safety and do not want to put lives at risk, people choosing to drive and/or live in a mountain environment understand that they inherently accept some level of responsibility and accountability realizing that an avalanche or mudslide could occur and that they could be stuck up the canyon for some period of time. Promising egress as an option is really just interconnect in disguise. Regarding the gondola and train associated with Alternatives 2 and 3. While we recognize that there may be potential benefits of either operation, there are important components of both a gondola and a cog train that we take issue with:

- ,Â Volume ,Â the gondola and/or train as proposed by UDOT will only carry about 1/3 of those people heading up LCC. This means that 2/3 will still be on the LCC road, so how does installing either a gondola or train at an extra (over the expanded bus service) cost of ~\$240M or \$1B, respectively make any sense if it will not help alleviate the traffic issue currently plaguing LCC and the surrounding Sandy and Cottonwood Heights communities?
- ,Â Schedule ,Â Backcountry enthusiasts, employees, and contractors travel the canyon at all hours. It is our understanding that the proposed gondola/train options would focus the schedule around resort opening/closing hours. Scheduling gondola availability for only the

peak skiing hours transforms it from a transportation solution to a taxpayer-paid ski lift that primarily benefits two private companies that operate largely on public land.

,ÄÇ It is clear that summertime use of the canyons is as high as wintertime, with the White Pine trailhead currently overwhelmed in the summer resulting in dangerous highway-side parking conditions. Both gondola and/or train must be year-round, particularly since many summertime users are not skiers, yet are taxpayers who will be footing much of the bill for these expensive options.

,ÄÇ Some ability for a stop at the White Pine trailhead for either option would have to be enabled.

,ÄÚWhistle stops,Äù for trailheads is only an identified option for the train, not the gondola, and it

seems unrealistic that the train would stop anywhere other than White Pine (eg. is it really going to stop at the Gate Butte or Lisa Falls on the way up, and will it stop for people standing there on the way down?).

,ÄÇ Both Alts 2 and 3 mention ,ÄÚreduce/limit on-road parking?,Äù There are two ways to address

this: add transit stops for trailheads, or dramatically expand parking places. Is there effort/dollars/ability to account for this addition?

,ÄÇ Fees ,Äì there was no mention of the potential costs to riders. If fees are prohibitive, the system

won,Äôt be utilized. There is no mention of the ski resorts supplementing/offsetting the cost of the gondola as they currently do with the bus, though a Tier 3 objective is ,ÄÚa mix of private/public funds,Äù is this a reference to the resorts paying for part of this option?

,ÄÇ Highway 210 improvements ,Äì In the Draft Alternatives 2 and 3 there was no mention of improvements to Hwy 210 in addition to the gondola or train. For service vehicles, delivery trucks, residents, emergency vehicles, and those who don,Äôt use the gondola or train, the threats that the canyon represents will still exist. For example, if the gondola is chosen, will any improvements be made to Hwy 210, ie. snowsheds/extra lane?

,ÄÇ Convenience of travel ,Äì the three-step process for getting up the canyon using the gondola/train (drive your car to one of two intermodal hubs, put on your ski gear (plus potentially help your kids with their gear) to get on a bus, get off the bus to get on the gondola/train, and finally get off the gondola/train 35-40 minutes later to ski (knowing in the back of your mind that you will have to reverse this process in a matter of hours) will create awkwardness at best and a strong disincentive to many at worst. Particularly in the morning, skiers are generally intolerant of time-consuming barriers that threaten their ability to indulge in scarce resources, ie. new snow, which is the defining factor of why new transit options are being considered. There needs to be a better way to get people from where they live to the gondola/train terminal, or we are afraid that people won,Äôt use these options.

,ÄÇ We feel that it,Äôs vital to include a regional transit system from across the SL Valley and potentially additional parking at the gondola/train base itself. Utilizing a seamless transit system from urban stops (eg. downtown, U of U, Olympus Cove, Sandy City, etc.) that is closer

to ,ÄÚdoor-to-door,Äù could be more efficient, which would encourage use and alleviate near-

canyon traffic issues.

• Parking/traffic • a bottom terminal at the mouth of LCC (or near La Caille as alternately proposed) will potentially create the same traffic and congestion issues that are supposed to be resolved by implementing the gondola/train in the first place. When coupled with buses trying to deliver people to the gondola and vehicles traveling up the canyon, could adding the gondola/train actually have a negative impact on travel?

• Timing • there was no discussion of the potential timing of gondola/train implementation beyond a generic goal of the 2050 plan. The problem is acute now and will only intensify over the next few years. We are disturbed with the apparent lack of planning associated with staged improvements (with all of the options). The relative length of design/development/construction time and disruption associated with the gondola/train vs the other options (particularly with Alternative 3, the rail project) is important and should be part of an open and transparent process. We understand the complexity and long timeframe of implementing bold transit solutions, but there is no mention of any iterative solutions to a problem that is acute now, much less in 10 or 20 years; all well shy of the 30 year timeframe.

Alternative 3 reintroduces the LCC train, which has long not been a part of the Mountain Accord/CWC conversation.

• Alternative 3 conveniently did not include a row showing total costs. It appears that a cog railway would total ~\$1.5B, or nearly \$500 for every Utah citizen. Considering that this is an order of magnitude more expensive than any other option, we are concerned that it is simply too much, and/or will have exorbitant fees that could discourage use.

• Considering the infrastructure investment, it does not make sense to curtail train (or gondola) use in the summer. The more dispersed-but-heavy over the course of the day traffic and parking issues at trailheads continues to increase each year and must be part of whatever option is selected.

• Of the many objectives, one of the three Tier 1 objectives is "Protection of watershed, wilderness, and visual quality" of the canyons. It is difficult for us to imagine that a train (or a gondola) is not a huge blight on, much less "protect" the mountain environment in both construction and final impact, particularly as compared to the expanded-bus Alternative 1. There are several "sub-alternatives" listed that all address LCC to BCC to Park City to Wasatch Back

connections. It is unclear to the Wasatch Backcountry Alliance what import "sub-alternatives" have

in this case, but we are vehemently against these connections. Salt Lake City has become as world

famous for its backcountry skiing as it is for its resort skiing, and canyon-to-canyon connections threaten the already-tenuous nature of the backcountry terrain at the top of the canyons.

With regard to Sub-alternative 1 • Tunnel:

„The first sentence in the sub-alternative 1 description is „This tunnel would help in providing a direct connection between the two canyons and resorts, serving skiers who desire to visit both resorts, as well as making transfers to Snowbird or Solitude.„ Again, this is a taxpayer-subsidized ski lift, not a transit option.

„Additionally, a year-round Cottonwood Canyons circulator bus service could be implemented and would be of benefit to all canyon users.„ The „benefit„ of a circular bus service vs two canyon bus services that go up and down each is unclear to us.

„This service would supplement the previous year-round local bus route serving each canyon.„

There is currently no year-round local bus route; if there was „with stops at trailheads „ it would not only be utilized, it could provide a multi-year baseline to determine if additional connections were necessary.

„A cost of an additional \$1.5-\$2.3B tunnel - \$500-700 for every Utahn „ is simply outrageous,

especially on top of the cost of the other far-more necessary transit improvements.

All three sub-alternatives reference an emergency egress option as their primary benefit. We are

concerned that an egress system may not actually function in a crisis. Some of the same conditions

that would force road closures (high wind, heavy snow, snow, ice) would create dangerous avalanche

conditions or power outages, or a devastating high canyon fire could/would affect both canyons and

their respective transit operations. For example, would an aerial lift actually be running from LCC to

BCC during a fire or after an earthquake that closes Hwy 210?

Additionally, canyon-to-canyon connections only shift the traffic burden. BCC is already experiencing

its own major traffic issues, and in an emergency there is no doubt that it cannot handle the egress of

both LCC and BCC visitors and residents. How does CWC propose that UDOT/UTA would move 5000-

10,000 people coming from upper LCC to BCC back to the Salt Lake Valley if Hwy 210 is closed? Improved egress is only a Tier 2 Objective. Again, we do not feel that a tremendously expensive emergency egress option that may or may not be available for a once-in-a-generation potential emergency is a reasonable validation for implementation. Enabling a Tier 2 Objective to take priority

over a Tier 1 Objective of „protection of watershed, wilderness, and water quality„ is contradictory,

which is acknowledged by admitting a negative impact on those qualities, as well as threatening the quality of the backcountry terrain being affected.

It is our understanding that some of the six ski resorts potentially affected by the upper-canyon connections actually do not enthusiastically support the connections, nor does the traffic-affected town

of Park City. Thus additional taxpayer-subsidized ski lifts are not warranted.

It is important to note that with canyon-to-canyon connections via aerials in the upper canyons, the

traffic and congestion at the canyon entrances will not diminish or be improved. It will lead to more

crowding in the both the resorts and the backcountry, and the traffic patterns will remain the same. The

amount of time it would take to get from Park City to BCC to LCC via gondolas and their respective

connections would likely be greater than that of driving around from Park City, and most Salt Lake

County residents have equal access to the two Cottonwood canyons, so only the relatively small population of BCC hotel guests and residents would be in a reasonable position to take advantage of

upper canyon connections. Therefore, it's possible that canyon to canyon connections would not see

much use, despite the hard and soft costs of such systems.

Additionally, as effective "ski lifts," that would likely not run in the shoulder seasons or summertime,

addressing canyon to-canyon connections as vehicles for emergency egress for only the 4 months of ski

season would at best be cumbersome to utilize to address the potential for non-winter emergencies.

Therefore, upper canyon connections serve no useful purpose aside from being an expensive marketing

tool for the six ski resorts and communities that don't necessarily want it.

Most of this document focuses on what we don't want. What we do want is easy: MTS Alternative 1

focuses on enhanced bus service that is year-round, enables trailhead stops for dispersed users on

enhanced roadways, introduces snowsheds and variable tolling for private vehicles, and enables greater

safety for bicyclists, and all of these aspects are applied to Little Cottonwood AND Big Cottonwood

Canyon across all three options. This is what WBA would like to see, with no upper canyon connections

for the reasons stated above.

Additionally, we appreciate that Mill Creek Canyon is addressed with the need to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety and implement a much-needed year-round canyon shuttle system and are encouraged that receiving a recent FLAP grant is the first step towards achieving these goals. We also appreciate the effort to improve transit between the Salt Lake Valley and Park City via the Parley,Ãs Canyon corridor (that should also include a paved bicycle path). Wasatch Backcountry Alliance has formally been a part of the Mountain Accord and Central Wasatch Commission since the beginning of the former,Ãs process, and its board and members have been engaged in the community for decades prior to that. We understand the acute need and challenges associated with this process, and hope that our comments will be taken into due consideration to best help craft and create a solution that fits the current and future needs of the Salt Lake Valley residents and those people visiting the area who wish to explore and enjoy the beauty and majesty of the Central Wasatch.

I-195: Salt Lake County,

Comment I-195-1

Dear Central Wasatch Commission Board Members and Staff,
The Salt Lake County (SLCo) Mayor,Ãs Office appreciates the opportunity to provide public comment on the Central Wasatch Commission,Ãs Draft Mountain Transportation System Alternatives Transportation Report (the ,ÃDraft Report,Ã). We have reviewed the Draft Report regarding a potential Mountain Transportation System (,ÃMTS,Ã), and we

look forward to the further development of proposed ideas that result in increased multi-modal access, mobility, and safety of canyon users.

In June 2020, the SLCo Council approved the Wasatch Canyon General Plan (WCGP). While there are many documents that provide guidance for the central Wasatch prepared by various parties, the key document for SLCo is the WCGP. The WCGP was a culmination of a three-year effort to update the prior general plan pursuant to an extensive public engagement process. The WCGP includes vision statements, goals, strategies, and policies for the central Wasatch canyons. The elements in the WCGP include land use, environment, recreation, transportation, and economy. In the evaluation of the potential MTS alternatives, we ask that consideration be given to the

goals and objectives found in this document. The WCGP can be found at <https://www.slco.org/planning-transportation/wasatch-canyons-general-plan-update/>. Please note that the issues outlined below are not prioritized in any particular order and represent the comments of my office and not necessarily the Salt Lake County Council.

Issue #1 Social Equity / Access

We recommend that any proposed effort focus on social equity - as it relates to transportation issues - to ensure that the central Wasatch canyons remain accessible to a broad swath of our community regardless of economic status or zip code. The assets of the central Wasatch are publicly owned and managed by the USDA Forest Service and should be accessible to all users. Transportation expenses typically amount to the second largest cost of a household. As a result, methods to mitigate inequality should be included in any consideration of a transportation alternative.

Comment I-195-2

Issue *2 Transportation Environmental Impacts

The WCGP addresses various issues related to environmental management in the canyons. These issues include water and air quality: wildlife preservation: native plant protection, and preserving open space.

We request that a detailed analysis be undertaken of how a MTS alternative, or any component part: might affect these types of environmental issues. Air quality is of particular concern to the residents of Salt Lake County. For the proposed MTS: it is important for all the proposed transportation projects to be zero or low emission sources. Further, we recommend consideration be given to utilizing power from renewable energy sources.

Comment I-195-3

Stormwater runoff is another area of concern. Any significant road widening project poses a potential increased danger of contamination to waterways. We recommend that the CWC take this risk into consideration in connection with any potential MTS in an effort to prevent waterway pollution created from any new transportation infrastructure.

Comment I-195-4

We also request priority be given to mitigating landscape degradation: addressing visual impacts (e.g., on account of project footprint) and keeping environmental and land impacts to a minimum.

Comment I-195-5

Issue *3 Year-Round Availability

We request consideration be given to year-round use of any MTS alternative. The central Wasatch offers recreational during all seasons and we request that such year-

round accommodation be considered as part of the assessment of any potential MTS alternative_

Year-round service options would have the added benefit of reducing the impact of motorists in the central Wasatch. In addition, we support the expansion: Improvement: and enhanced maintenance of the trails system in the central Wasatch canyons: all of which would increase the advantages of year-round multi-modal transportation options.

Comment I-195-6

Issue *4 Visitor Management

We support the proposed research efforts of Central Wasatch Commission to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the recreational uses of the central Wasatch. The results of this study will help to inform visitor management and the potential impacts that increased visitation might have on trails: viewing sites: geological features: and the natural landscape. We request further analysis on the concept of visitor capacity and how it might positively influence the visitor experience of the central Wasatch: as well as decrease human impacts to the natural environment and potential conflicts with wildlife.

The WCGP supports the concept of a visitor management study, and we recommend that the Central Wasatch Commission consider recommendations and limitations that might be set forth in any such study. The text from the WCGP related to a visitor management study includes:

"The

County to consider the usage of visitor studies through collaboration and of partner agencies: which may include Forest Service: SLCPU: UDOT: UTA, CWC: Town of Brighton, and Town of Alton. Visitor study assessments shall involve the public and support by partner agencies with jurisdictional authority.

Comment I-195-7

Issue Impact on Neighboring Communities

The MTS alternatives contemplated in the Draft Report have the potential of negatively affecting

the communities in and around the Wasatch Canyons. For example: the alternatives could result

in property takings, traffic flow disruptions: etc. We request that such negative impacts be considered and mitigated against to the extent reasonably possible.

In conclusion: we appreciate the efforts of the CWC and its partners in connection with the preparation of the Draft Report. We look forward to continuing this important conversation regarding the development of a MTS for the Central Wasatch and its surrounding

Sincerely,

Jenny Wilson

Salt Lake County Mayor

I-196: Little Cottonwood Canyon Community,

Comment I-196-1

Little Cottonwood Canyon Community Response to the CWC Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

The following is the response to the CWC Mountain Transportation System Alternatives_ The response is from 27 members of the Little Cottonwood Canyon community: which is the area east

of Wasatch Blvd between SR-210 and SR-209_

Problems/Concerns With This

Before offering our input to the MTS Alternatives we want to state our concerns with this request

for comments:

Some entries in the cost data spreadsheets provided are difficult to follow and base decisions on.

These spreadsheets should have included footnotes the derivation and assumptions made to arrive at some of the figures as they morph through the three Alternatives.

The "choice evaluation tool" appears to rely on cost data presented. If these numbers are inaccurate

the includes incorrect financial weighting of the options.

Comment I-196-2

The rail alternative cost data presented here is significantly different from that used by UDOT in

their EIS and calls into question how two entities can have such different cost estimates.

Comment I-196-3

Asking for input on a set of options without first identifying constraints and boundaries can set unreasonable public expectations that may be difficult to reset once actual limitations are defined and identified.

Comment I-196-4

CWC purports to build on the "Ork of Mountain Accord A member of our community was on one of the panels. That diverse interest group used a total "systems approach" in considering transportation options in its process and excluded a rail option for several reasons. Bringing that

alternative back to the forefront without an explanation might suggest that CWC did not get the

answer desired from Mountain Accord.

While CWC acknowledges there is a difference between the UDOT LCC EIS based primarily on targeted geography it not offer insight to how the outcomes of the two efforts will be reconciled or if a 2nd EIS would be required to cover the larger CWC scorrd area.

Comment I-196-5

Public participation in providmg input to CWC MTS scope, goals and attributes amounted to 366

individuals (2/7 thiu 31/2020). In a similar request for citizen input on public policy in 2019 Envision Utah garnered input from over 11:000 individuals in their surcey effort Our concern is that CWC' s public outreach lacks depth and bread and: as such: conclusions drawn are less representative of the larger community.

Comment I-196-6

Comments on the Alternatives

After evaluating the three alternatives presented by CWC for comment we believe Alternative 1 is

the best option because it makes the least impact on the canyons: is easily the most scalable, provides the least amount of inconvenience for users and provides the service for diverse users year round.

Comment I-196-7

Comments on the Alternatives

After evaluating the three alternatives presented by CWC for comment we believe Alternative 1 is

the best option because it makes the least impact on the canyons: is easily the most scalable, provides the least amount of inconvenience for users and provides the service for diverse users year round.

Comment I-196-8

Comments on the Alternatives

After evaluating the three alternatives presented by CWC for comment we believe Alternative 1 is

the best option because it makes the least impact on the canyons: is easily the most scalable, provides the least amount of inconvenience for users and provides the service for diverse users year round.

Note that our comments are directed primarily to the Alternatiib as they impact BCC and LCC_ These two areas are often referred to as "special places" and the "jewels" of the Wasatch

front and we believe that as these areas are impacted so goes the larger targeted region.
CWC Alternative 1

This alternative provides advantages over the other options:
It is a scalable solution where service can be relatively easily increased or decreased depending on

It provides the possibility to serve other canyon destinations for a range of users in the summer:
not just Alta and Snowbird. Likewise it does not use public funds to build transportation facilities that primarily benefit for-profit commercial concerns.

Comment I-196-9

The use of selectively placed avalanche sheds will have a positive impact on reducing road closures and snow removal time in those areas deemed to provide the greatest benefit. Regardless of an anticipated and desired reduction in personal vehicles it will still be necessary to provide emergency vehicle reliable access.

The use of selectively placed avalanche sheds will have a positive impact on reducing road closures and snow removal time in those areas deemed to provide the greatest benefit. Regardless of an anticipated and desired reduction in personal vehicles it will still be necessary to provide emergency vehicle reliable access.

Comment I-196-10

Bus routes originating from the north and from the south create the most direct/efficient routes to the ski areas. In addition this alternative provides express buses minimizing the number of en route stops and avoids the Snowbird stops for Alta riders.

Comment I-196-11

We agree with the inclusion of variable tolling as a disincentive for continued private vehicle use.

Additionally we think the use of paid parking at the resorts should also be included in this alternative increasing the incentive to use public transit or high occupancy vehicle use. Although not calculated in the CWC presentation Alternative 1 is faster than Alternatives 2 & 3 (according to I-TIX) EIS data).

Comment I-196-12

We agree with the inclusion of variable tolling as a disincentive for continued private vehicle use.

Additionally we think the use of paid parking at the resorts should also be included in this alternative increasing the incentive to use public transit or high occupancy vehicle use.

Although not calculated in the CWC presentation Alternative 1 is faster than Alternatives 2 & 3 (according to I-TIX)T EIS data).

Comment I-196-13

We agree with the inclusion of variable tolling as a disincentive for continued private vehicle use.

Additionally we think the use of paid parking at the resorts should also be included in this alternative increasing the incentive to use public transit or high occupancy vehicle use.

Although not calculated in the CWC presentation Alternative 1 is faster than Alternatives 2 & 3 (according to I-TIX)T EIS data).

Comment I-196-14

CWC Alternatives 2 & 3 ,Äî Gondola and Train options

Other than creating a very sexy travel bribe for two ski areas these options provide little value

for the majority of riders: local residents and taxpayers. The transportation mode transfers required

for Alternatives 2 & 3 would appear to make Alternative 1 more efficient and less inconvenient for

Winter riders schlepping their gear to and from contributing modes

topic: rail, aerial subtopic: doesn't serve all canyon users

Comment I-196-15

CWC Alternatives 2 & 3 ,Äî Gondola and Train options

Other than creating a very sexy travel bribe for two ski areas these options provide little value

for the majority of riders: local residents and taxpayers. The transportation mode transfers required

for Alternatives 2 & 3 would appear to make Alternative 1 more efficient and less inconvenient for

Winter riders schlepping their gear to and from contributing modes

topic: rail, aerial subtopic: doesn't serve all canyon users

Comment I-196-16

CWC Alternatives 2 & 3 ,Äî Gondola and Train options

Other than creating a very sexy travel bribe for two ski areas these options provide little value for the majority of riders: local residents and taxpayers. The transportation mode transfers required for Alternatives 2 & 3 would appear to make Alternative 1 more efficient and less inconvenient for winter riders schlepping their gear to and from contributing modes
topic: rail, aerial subtopic: doesn't serve all canyon users

Comment I-196-17

CWC Alternatives 2 & 3, "Gondola and Train options
Other than creating a very sexy travel bribe for two ski areas these options provide little value for the majority of riders: local residents and taxpayers. The transportation mode transfers required for Alternatives 2 & 3 would appear to make Alternative 1 more efficient and less inconvenient for winter riders schlepping their gear to and from contributing modes
topic: rail, aerial subtopic: doesn't serve all canyon users

Comment I-196-18

As long as Alternative 2 requires people coming from the south to travel north past the entrance to LCC before changing transportation and then doubling back to the south to head east this option will be a tough sell to local skiers.

Comment I-196-19

The exclusion of avalanche sheds for highway 210 should make Alternatives 2 & 3 non-starters. While CWC makes no representations of net private vehicle use UDOT proposals assume 70% of car traffic will remain and: as such: would be subject to the same road clearing delays creating the same for neighborhoods as the present state. In addition: unrestricted access concerns of emergency vehicles should require that the highway have the of the avalanche sheds. The absence of this cost calculations creates a false notion of the real lifecycle
The gondola and train serve just 2 fixed destinations in the canyon. While a train or gondola might appeal to tourists it will not appeal to dedicated canyon users who hike and recreate outside only two structured stops. As such they will do little to reduce vehicle use year round as has been an objective of Mountain Accord and the CWC Hikers and other diverse users will still driving cars to the various trailheads when the ski season wanes.

Comment I-196-20

No transportation hub should be created or maintained at the inverted V intersection at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon for the following reasons:

Comment I-196-21

No transportation hub should be created or maintained at the inverted V intersection at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon for the following reasons:

Comment I-196-22

The land at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon was given by the Whitmore family with the specific intent that it would be preserved in its natural state and they were promised that no development would occur on that land. The people who managed that contribution for the Whitmore family are still alive to testify to the facts surrounding this contribution. Any land received from the Whitmore family must be preserved in perpetuity and not be used for parking lots, parking ramps, gondola or train terminals: etc.

The Temple Quarry Trail and Park at the mouth of the Little Cottonwood Canyon is one of the most visited historic sites in all of Utah and is used every day by large numbers of hikers: mountain bikers: and other recreation enthusiasts. It was funded by donors with the belief it would not be tampered with or destroyed. There is no other legislation that would provide the same historic value and preserve the legacy of those who: over several decades: quarried the granite blocks for the Salt Lake Temple. Developing the mouth of the Canyon on or around the Quarry should not be permitted.

Comment I-196-23

Any solution that focuses traffic to the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon will continue to significantly degrade air quality for residents in the Triangle and other nearby neighborhoods. When traffic is held up at various locations at or near the mouth of the Canyon: thousands of cars and buses idle on all three sides of the Triangle. This produces a cloud of exhaust containing CO, NOX, SOX: and PM 2.5. This noxious cloud is very potent and can be smelled by all nearby residents. There is little question that the air being breathed on these mornings is very unhealthy for the residents: the skiers: and the first responders and exceeds federal clean air standards. An

analysis of the proposed alternatives must consider the impact on local air quality. Bad local air quality (pockets of unhealthy air near plants: refineries: rail yards: freeways: congested urban centers, etc.) is the next frontier for air quality science and regulation to protect public health and needs to be modeled and fully taken into account in evaluating the proposed alternatives.

It is not clear how CWC would handle traffic collecting around a gondola or train station at the mouth of LCC Is it intended that only bus service would access a loading station? Will "kiss and ride" traffic, or riders who otherwise did not originate at the mobility hub, be prohibited access to

the station? We have little faith that such a restriction can or would be maintained going forward.

We believe that a train or gondola alternative with a loading station as proposed is the proverbial

"carnel's nose in the tent". Regardless of how well intentioned CWC and the political powers are:

eventually, the political will to prevent "kiss and rides" and parking at the loading station will fail.

This will result in new drop off zones: expanded parking structures: and continued worsening congestion at the canyon mouth and beyond. We think that this could result in delays far worse than they are today.

Comment I-196-24

Alternative 3 the train option "Would create noise and vibration pollution. Unlike Switzerland: where

trains travel to Murrin and other high Alpine locations by climbing the face of the Jungfrau: a train

up Little Cottonwood Canyon would operate in the bottom of a narrow canyon with high walls and

would create an "echo chamber" effect exacerbating the train's noise and vibration. This noise and

vibration would significantly impact not only residents living near or in the Canyon, but also degrade the recreational experience of all Canyon users.

Comment I-196-25

Alternative 3 the train option "Would create noise and vibration pollution. Unlike Switzerland: where

trains travel to Murrin and other high Alpine locations by climbing the face of the Jungfrau: a train

up Little Cottonwood Canyon would operate in the bottom of a narrow canyon with high walls and would create an "echo chamber" effect exacerbating the train's noise and vibration. This noise and vibration would significantly impact not only residents living near or in the Canyon, but also degrade the recreational experience of all Canyon users.

Comment I-196-26

Wasatch Back

Any selected must connect the Wasatch Front Resorts directly and efficiently to the Wasatch Back Resorts. There is no question that a significant fraction of the traffic up Little and Big Cottonwood Canyons is tourist skiers coming from the Park City Area in rental cars. It is also true that the roads to Park City are partially congested with tourists from the Wasatch Front. This two-way tourist traffic uses up road capacity and degrades regional and local air quality. This essential connection to any long-term solution is only treated as an after thought in the alternatives analysis.

Comment I-196-27

Other Relevant Issues

Two additional critical points regarding the future of BCC and LCC are related to need to be considered when weighing CWC Mountain Transportation System Alternatives.
Canyon Carrying Capacity

Comment I-196-28

When making changes to an existing current state there are desired outcomes and often undesired outcomes. Some can be anticipated and some will be unanticipated. What do we want the canyon experience to be and how will any related decision impact that vision?
In the chartering documents for Mountain Accord two key issues appear to repeat several times.
protect the ecological system and protect the watershed including the resulting water supply quality. On September 15 of this year CWC held its "Expert Panel." On it was Laura Briefer: Director of Salt Lake City Public Utilities. She described her organization's prime objective as protecting the quality of SLC's drinking water from the "source waters to the tap." She identified four vulnerabilities to this end goal with number 1 being "development" (roads: buildings and parking) and number 2 being "recreation overuse." Transportation systems impact source water quality through their footprint and construction (structures: roads and tunnels) and through the inducement of additional development pressures. Little is disclosed about the environmental

damage from the extensive cutting and filling necessary to create the bed for a train up the Canyon.

The information about the alternatives is insufficient for the public to make wise choices. Preventing environmental damage is a top-listed objective but the information to evaluate these alternatives is lacking.

Comment I-196-29

In addition: new transportation modes can carry more and more visitors to the watershed and: without a plan to manage this increase: it can lead to overuse and eventual degradation. To what

degree does a specific choice introduce an unpublished objective: Increase the of visitors to the canyon?

Snowbird and Alta have made public their belief that when their parking lots are full there is still

plenty of capacity on the for additional skiers. The comparative density standard they are applying is that of the ski experience found at California resorts which is greater than normally enjoyed here. The Forest Service leaves the management of the skier experience up to the respective resorts. What are the long-term growth plans of the resorts?

Comment I-196-30

The Forest Service also takes no position regarding the capacity of visitors during the summer. They employ strategies to mitigate the impact of increasing numbers: closing areas that have become "worn out": harden trails (asphalt): increase parking lot size, install toilets, etc. What

won't do is promote discussion the general public on what is the desired experience of visitors to the noncommercialized canyon sites. When does an increase in volume of visitors degrade the

outdoor experience ?

Currently canyon visitor occupancy is indirectly controlled by the limited parking at the resorts, trailhead parking lots and whatever off highway space drivers can find. In many ways LCC's transportation challenges helped slow use demand relative to an increasing population.

Over the years both BCC and LCC have gone through incremental change without the benefit of a

formalized carrying capacity study- how much activity can the canyons handle? Putting a lot of skiers on 10' of snow may negatively impact the skiing experience but not necessarily degrade the

ecology. In the summer an increase in users can degrade both the ecology and the user experience.

At some point nature cannot accommodate an increase in users. User experience likewise degrades.

Mountain Accord went through its process and made their recommendations without conducting a

capacity study. The CWC has agreed a study should be done not only on how capacity impacts the ecology but also on how capacity impacts the subjective experience of the visitor. Where is that study? And yet here we are: without the of a consensus on the canyon carrying capacity, considering transportation alternatives that may have anticipated and unanticipated consequences.

Sometimes it feels that we are expecting more out of these canyons than they can deliver based on

their ecology: small size and importance to valley water supply. In her opening remarks to the Panel" (9/18/20) May-nr Jenny Wilson reminded us that "we are in danger of loving our canyons to death.

All three alternatives and their variations would just pack more up the Canyons to benefit the ski resorts_

Where is the NO-BUILD that keeps Canyon visitation at the current

Comment I-196-31

by charging a significant variable toll at the mouths of the Canyons and ramps up bus service as personal car use declines? The ski resorts could subsidize the bus transit alternative for their customers _

Comment I-196-32

by charging a significant variable toll at the mouths of the Canyons and ramps up bus service as personal car use declines? The ski resorts could subsidize the bus transit alternative for their customers _

Comment I-196-33

A carrying capacity study that includes both environmental impact and a visitor's desired experience component needs to guide decisions regarding transportation alternatives in both BCC and LCC_

Comment I-196-34

Specializing cost: privatizing profits

The gondola and train solutions require major capital dollars for permanent transportation infrastructure to be built: operated and maintained in LCC_ While safety and traffic flow are of the primary concerns driving the initiative the proposed transportation system serves and solely two private businesses. If Alternative 2 or 3 it would be appropriate that the two private businesses solely benefitting from this public project make a significant contribution to the cost of the installation and its ongoing operating costs (beyond just providing passes for employees and season passholders).

Comment I-196-35

Either the train or gondola alternative will cost billions in construction, maintenance, and operation.

Indeed: as much as the capital cost of s entire system of commuter rail, light rail: streetcar: and bus rapid transit Spending billions on one of these Canyon transit alternatives must be balanced

against using this money to expand and upgrade UTA' s cuffent transit system. Improving the current system uould benefit the two million Wasatch Front residents who live in the valleys and

not primarily the ski resorts and their customers.

Comment I-196-36

Growth and development confronts "life elevated"

The phase "life elevated" appears over a scenic Utah back drop. We market and sell this untouched

natural beauty to attract business and development. Yet it seems like development and growth reigns supreme in this state. At some point in time this strategy runs smack into the image of scenic

Utah and brings diminished returns. Again: as Mayor Wilson said: "we are loving our canyons to Values and Assumptions used in the Planning Process

Several years ago both Mountain Accord (NIA) and Envision Utah projected massive increases in regional population over the next 20 years. As part of their argument for change NI_A infelTed that

all the demand for recreational activity from this groivth would be channeled to BCC and LCC_ We

just needed to figure out how to put all that increased demand into the existing recreational ' 'container". Perhaps a better solution for Utah would be to find or develop additional recreational options- create new campgrounds, hiking trails and reservoirs to handle increased Yosemite has a reserv-ation and lottery system to climb Half Dome via its cable system. Zions prohibits rrrsonal cars and is considering a reservation system for park entrance. The Wave trail in

southern Utah requires reservations. Finite fragile resources require changes in how we share and use them.

The nature of small box canyons with vertical walls in a ivatershed area does not present the same

development opportunity as does the open space that sulTounds places like Park City: Vail,

Creek, and Whistler Mountain. In contrast: Jackson Hole has done a nice job limiting development sprawl at the base of their mountain and in providing bus service from town.

Signatories

Craig and Kimiko Osterloh
Mike and Susan Marker
Doug and Susan Vogeler
David and Michele Han
Mike and Rachel Robinson
James and An Anderson
Steve and Melissa Schaefer
Brad and Amy Butterfield
Craig and Ranae Zimmerman
Scott and Toni Whipperman
Jeff and Victoria Schmidt
Taylor and Jean Hartman
Mike and Denice Osterloh
Robert and Ann
Robert and Linda Grow
Matt and Kim Osbome
Ivan and Tarnara Lazarev
Craig and Betty Wardle
Clark and Judy Sessions
Lear and Lonni Thorpe
Robert and Came Meek
Kent and Farrah Crauford
Rich and Valarie Winwood
Nate and Jenna Kimball
Christian and Kiersten
Amy Winwood
Monte and Mary Yedlin
Gary and Nancy Peterson

I-197: Jon Pearson

Comment I-197-1

I've been reviewing all you progress carefully. Good stuff I am currently in favor of the option with really great bus service along with the dynamic tolling and the transit hub.

Comment I-197-2

NO to gondolas and
trains and tunnels.

Comment I-197-3

NO to gondolas and
trains and tunnels.

Comment I-197-4

NO to gondolas and
trains and tunnels.

Comment I-197-5

NO to gondolas and
trains and tunnels.

Comment I-197-6

I think many people are worried that the bus-only option won't work well under the assumption that the traffic will still be heavy: and they will be stuck on a bus for 2-3 hours.

This

actually DOES happen currently: and it's a big reason why I don't ever take the chance riding a bus.

got to prove to the public that the buses will be able to zoom up to the resorts_ I think a direct express route in the winter would be great: but I don't really think a "normal" bus would be

slowed down by getting off at trailheads very often or for very long. Anyway: you've got to use the right balance of cars and sticks to get the canyon less congested so the buses can work and

be affordable (or at least cheaper than what it would cost people to drive). I favor buses only.

Comment I-197-7

I think many people are worried that the bus-only option won't work well under the assumption that the traffic will still be heavy: and they will be stuck on a bus for 2-3 hours.

This

actually DOES happen currently: and it's a big reason why I don't ever take the chance riding a bus.

got to prove to the public that the buses will be able to zoom up to the resorts_ I think a direct express route in the winter would be great: but I don't really think a "normal" bus would be

slowed down by getting off at trailheads very often or for very long. Anyway: you've got to use the right balance of cars and sticks to get the canyon less congested so the buses can work and

be affordable (or at least cheaper than what it would cost people to drive). I favor buses only.

Comment I-197-8

I think many people are worried that the bus-only option won't work well under the assumption that the traffic will still be heavy: and they will be stuck on a bus for 2-3 hours.

This

actually DOES happen currently: and it's a big reason why I don't ever take the chance riding a bus.

got to prove to the public that the buses will be able to zoom up to the resorts_ I think a direct express route in the winter would be great: but I don't really think a "normal" bus would be

slowed down by getting off at trailheads very often or for very long. Anyway: you've got to use the right balance of call it and stick to get the canyon less congested so the buses can work and

be affordable (or at least cheaper than what it would cost people to drive). I favor buses only.

Comment I-197-9

Create one system and people will get used to it Particularly in winter: everyone wants to get to the resorts

(and the backcountry) all in the same 1 or 2 hour time-window. Gondolas and trains can't really flex

up capacity in the way that buses potentially could.

Comment I-197-10

Create one system and people will get used to it Particularly in winter: everyone wants to get to the resorts

(and the backcountry) all in the same 1 or 2 hour time-window. Gondolas and trains can't really flex

up capacity in the way that buses potentially could.

Comment I-197-11

Admittedly: it's really hard to predict ahead of time the demand: but perhaps an "on-call" bonus pay system for drivers on the mornings of fresh

powder _ At least: you can predict the traditionally busy weekends like NITK and Presidents. You

can run a bus every 5 minutes during those surge hours. You could probably pay for that extra surge busing for YEARS for the cost of building tunnels: gondolas: or trains. I would like to add a comment about bikes as well

Comment I-197-12

Admittedly: it's really hard to predict ahead of

time the demand: but perhaps an "on-call" bonus pay system for drivers on the mornings of fresh

powder _ At least: you can predict the traditionally busy weekends like NILK and Presidents. You

can run a bus every 5 minutes during those surge hours. You could probably pay for that extra surge busing for YEARS for the cost of building tunnels: gondolas: or trains. I would like to add a comment about bikes as well

Comment I-197-13

Certainly I think bikes have a place in the Wasatch. However: I think it is important to remember that if we have to make a tough choice between a continuous bike lane

(which I do support in general) and a transportation solution such as a 3rd lane dedicated bus;HOV

option, we should choose the "greater good" The red-snake is devastating to air quality and will ultimately also begin to potentially impact tourism dollars for the state (guests become too frustrated to visit LCC,'BCC)_ The bikes might just have to make do with minor improvements. People certainly seem to enjoy going up and down currently: and there is a very low rate of injury fatality (I do recall the young lady up by Solitude about 15 years ago).

Comment I-197-14

Certainly I think bikes have a place in the Wasatch. However: I think it is important to remember that if we have to make a tough choice between a continuous bike lane

(which I do support in general) and a transportation solution such as a 3rd lane dedicated bus;HOV

option, we should choose the "greater good" The red-snake is devastating to air quality and will ultimately also begin to potentially impact tourism dollars for the state (guests become too frustrated to visit LCC,'BCC)_ The bikes might just have to make do with minor improvements. People certainly seem to enjoy going up and down currently: and there is a very low rate of injury fatality (I do recall the young lady up by Solitude about 15 years ago).

Comment I-197-15

Certainly I think bikes have a place in the Wasatch. However: I think it is important to remember that if we have to make a tough choice between a continuous bike lane

(which I do support in general) and a transportation solution such as a 3rd lane dedicated bus;HOV

option, we should choose the "greater good" The red-snake is devastating to air quality and will ultimately also begin to potentially impact tourism dollars for the state (guests become too frustrated to visit LCC,'BCC)_ The bikes might just have to make do with minor improvements. People certainly seem to enjoy going up and down currently: and there is a very low rate of

injury fatality (I do recall the young lady up by Solitude about 15 years ago).

I-198: Massi Romanelli

Comment I-198-1

Thank you for taking a look at these tough issues we are facing. My only request is to please incorporate noise abatement strategies as part of your future plans. There is nothing more bothersome than going into nature and hear human-caused noise. Use of noise-suppressing road materials is very important. It would be beneficial to also use these along the most traveled routes including I80 and I215 on the east side of the valley. Concrete, while might last longer, causes a lot of road noise and does not shed water as well as asphalt. I invite you to resurface I215 with noise reducing asphalt on the East side between the interchange with I80 and the 6200S exit. Loud bikes are also a common nuisance especially in the canyons. Thanks again, Massi Romanelli

I-199: Da Yang

Comment I-199-1

We support more buses on the same road (without widen it), keep the Canyon less developed.

Comment I-199-2

We support more buses on the same road (without widen it), keep the Canyon less developed.

I-200: Patricia Becnel

Comment I-200-1

Thank you for the work you have done to protect our mountains and develop a feasible transportation system. Before deciding on one of the options for canyon travel, thought, I believe it would be necessary to do an impact statement on use. How many people use the mountain?

Comment I-200-2

This needs to be known before a long term transportation is developed. Also, how will the ski areas and summer recreation be affected by continued global warming?

State hydrologist predicts less snow, more rain, and potential drought. There may not be enough snow to support the ski industry. Before billions are spent on a transportation system, why aren't climate predictions a part of this?

Comment I-200-3

It would be expensive and damaging to create elaborate systems that would eventually not be needed. My proposal for now is to close the canyon during the winter and allow only shuttles, just as is done in Zion NP. Thank you

I-201: Peter Harvey**Comment I-201-1**

I wish to submit the following comment on the September 2020 CWC-MTC report. One policy that is common to all three proposals is tolling, which I understand to mean a per-vehicle access fee to the canyons for privately owned vehicles other than those of canyon residents. Preferentially encouraging recreational use of the canyons by social groups and by large families is not one of the explicit goals of the proposals. I,Äô therefore not in favor of high-occupancy reduction or elimination of tolls, an arrangement that discriminates against smaller families and single persons who do not view outdoor recreation as a social activity. The report acknowledges (page 17) that a tolling system needs to avoid discriminating against low-income users. A needs-based tolling structure is likely to be invasive of privacy and difficult to enforce effectively.

Comment I-201-2

Has the option of reducing vehicle traffic for non-ski recreation by rationing or lottery-limited access been previously considered and rejected?,Äî found no mention of this alternative in the report.

Comment I-201-3

It is not clear what distinction is being made between ,Äúshuttle service,Äù in Millcreek Canyon and ,Äúyear-round local bus service,Äù in the two Cottonwood Canyons for public transportation to trailheads and other recreation access points.

Comment I-201-4

I have some concern that economic and political focus on the cog railway that is part of Alternative 3 may come at the expense of adequate bus-furnished local access in Little Cottonwood Canyon.

I-202: Utahns For Better Transportation,**Comment I-202-1**

Utahns For Better Transportation

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Utahns for Better Transportation supports Alternative 1 (Comprehensive Bus): including all strategies mentioned for Salt Lake Valley connections to Summit County: Millcreek Canyon: and the Cottonwood Canyons.

Comment I-202-2

We do not support any of the sub-alternatives and we reject the idea of a gondola or train in Little Cottonwood Canyon: which would negatively Impact its essential wildemess character and thus would be inappropriate.

Comment I-202-3

We do not support any of the sub-alternatives and

Comment I-202-4

We do not support any of the sub-alternatives and

Comment I-202-5

we reject the idea of a gondola or train in Little Cottonwood Canyon: which would negatively Impact its essential wildemess character and thus would be inappropriate.

Comment I-202-6

we reject the idea of a gondola or train in Little Cottonwood Canyon: which would negatively Impact its essential wildemess character and thus would be inappropriate.

Comment I-202-7

Our comments are focused on the Cottonwood Canyons because we they are under the biggest threat of intmsion by development and thus deserve additional attention to ensure their protection. The preferred alternative should be designed to address the needs of ALL users of the Canyons: not just those headed to the ski resons_ As such, we strongly support the option of frequent buses,Äîconvenient: reliable and affordable,Äîwith first-class loading/unloading stations (mobility hubs) i_e_ the gravel pit and 9400 South and Highland Drive transit centers.

Comment I-202-8

Our comments are focused on the Cottonwood Canyons because we they are under the biggest threat of intmsion by development and thus deserve additional attention to ensure their protection. The preferred

alternative should be designed to address the needs of ALL users of the Canyons: not just those headed to the ski resorts. As such, we strongly support the option of frequent buses, which are convenient, reliable and affordable, with first-class loading/unloading stations (mobility hubs) near the gravel pit and 9400 South and Highland Drive transit centers.

Comment I-202-9

Our comments are focused on the Cottonwood Canyons because they are under the biggest threat of intrusion by development and thus deserve additional attention to ensure their protection. The preferred alternative should be designed to address the needs of ALL users of the Canyons: not just those headed to the ski resorts. As such, we strongly support the option of frequent buses, which are convenient, reliable and affordable, with first-class loading/unloading stations (mobility hubs) near the gravel pit and 9400 South and Highland Drive transit centers.

Comment I-202-10

Each hub could have a digital readout of parking availability at up-canyon lots; the time of the next bus arrival; and amenities including hot and cold drinks, making the bus/ride share option an attractive and convenient choice.

Comment I-202-11

It also could significantly increase the number of people using transit because it would provide direct access to trailheads and resorts. During visitation times: bus and Hall-car ONLY on SR. 210 and S.R 190 (from 8:00, to 9:30 a.m. and p.m.) could be instituted to encourage transit use. Zion Canyon had to initiate 'shuttle-service only' into the canyon to preserve the mobility to and experience of that special place. The Cottonwood Canyons will need the same protection in the coming years by reducing the use of private vehicles into the canyons.

I-203: Lee Anne Walker

Comment I-203-1

This process is flawed as far as representing the public goes. These entities coming up with proposals pre-framed the issue. Apparently we are getting ready for 2050: expecting a high rate of local population growth and ski tourism to match. And no change in technology: climate and weather, pollution, taste and style.

Comment I-203-2

This process is flawed as far as representing the public goes. These entities commg up with proposals pre-framed the issue. Apparently we are getting ready for 2050: expecting a high rate of local population growth and ski tourism to match. And no change in technology: climate and weather, pollution, taste and style.

Comment I-203-3

No mention of covid or any next pandemic.

Comment I-203-4

Or how gondolas or mudsheds are going to handle 100 mile an hour winds: mudslides: or earthquakes newly in our Utah experience? When a harder autumn rain than usual brought mud--not snow, down nine avalanches, had a clear view and were able to power to the dry spots and wait in safety for rescue how heavy of an avalanche shed would it take to old up a mudslide? I believe it would be a dark ugly cement death trap. And how would you rescue people from gondolas from the smallest broken part: high wind: or earthquake? What if the pounding and lasting and polluting in the canyon broke loose a chunk of the granite road: eliminatig the only road in and flooding the river all over?

Comment I-203-5

Or how gondolas or mudsheds are going to handle 100 mile an hour winds: mudslides: or earthquakes newly in our Utah experience? When a harder autumn rain than usual brought mud--not snow, down nine avalanches, had a clear view and were able to power to the dry spots and wait in safety for rescue how heavy of an avalanche shed would it take to old up a mudslide? I believe it would be a dark ugly cement death trap. And how would you rescue people from gondolas from the smallest broken part: high wind: or earthquake? What if the pounding and lasting and polluting in the canyon broke loose a chunk of the granite road: eliminatig the only road in and flooding the river all over?

Comment I-203-6

Or how gondolas or mudsheds are going to handle 100 mile an hour winds: mudslides: or earthquakes newly in our Utah experience? When a harder autumn rain than usual brought mud--not snow, down nine avalanches, had a clear view and were able to power to the dry spots and wait in safety for rescue how heavy of an avalanche shed would it take to old up a mudslide? I believe it would be a dark ugly cement death trap. And how would you rescue people from gondolas from the smallest broken part: high wind: or earthquake? What if the pounding and lasting and polluting in the canyon broke loose a chunk of the granite road: eliminatig the only road in and flooding the river all over?

Comment I-203-7

Or how gondolas or mudsheds are going to handle 100 mile an hour winds: mudslides: or earthquakes newly in our Utah experience? When a harder autumn rain than usual brought mud--not snow,--down nine avalanches, had a clear view and were able to power to the dry spots and wait in safety for rescue how heavy of an avalanche shed would it take to hold up a mudslide? I believe it would be a dark ugly cement death trap. And how would you rescue people from gondolas from the smallest broken part: high wind: or earthquake? What if the pounding and lasting and polluting in the canyon broke loose a chunk of the granite road: eliminating the only road in and flooding the river all over?

I-204: Stephen Maeger**Comment I-204-1**

Please Save not pave. Wasatch blvd does not need to be widened. It does not need to be the FREEWAY to the mountains.

Comment I-204-2

Choose other alternatives to access the resorts. Parking and more expensive busses or smaller shuttles more frequently could help solve the congestion. If there's no where to park and busses are infrequent and too crowded people will drive. Make parking and busses accessible.
Stephen Maeger

Comment I-204-3

Choose other alternatives to access the resorts. Parking and more expensive busses or smaller shuttles more frequently could help solve the congestion. If there's no where to park and busses are infrequent and too crowded people will drive. Make parking and busses accessible.
Stephen Maeger

Comment I-204-4

Choose other alternatives to access the resorts. Parking and more expensive busses or smaller shuttles more frequently could help solve the congestion. If there's no where to park and busses are infrequent and too crowded people will drive. Make parking and busses accessible.
Stephen Maeger

Comment I-204-5

Choose other alternatives to access the resorts. Parking and more expensive busses or smaller shuttles more frequently could help solve the congestion. If there's no where to park and busses are infrequent and too crowded people will drive. Make parking and busses accessible.

Stephen Maeger

I-205: Kyle Maynard**Comment I-205-1**

First, we would like to commend your efforts to address our traffic woes. This is a complicated subject matter and one that is not easy to solve. There are a few edits, additions, and concerns that we would like to suggest for your adoption.

Opportunity to Truly Address Canyon Needs

Integrating transportation solutions in the canyons with our regional transit systems will have the greatest impact on our communities and catch the broadest appeal of our elected officials. The CWC has the right direction in this sense. The CWC serves as the collective voice for all of us who work and recreate in the canyons. All of us, including the business entities (ski areas and lodges) are stewards of the land: making our individual efforts to improve our corners of the Wasatch Mountains. As such, the Central Wasatch Commission must take the opportunity to advocate for innovation with restraint and creativity when it comes to transportation in the Wasatch.

In all the Alternatives proposed, "protect watershed, wilderness, and visual" is considered. However, we propose rather than listing these considerations in Tier 1, that these considerations are the lens through which you examine and refine transit improvements.

In this way, we hope you can avoid the same pitfalls of the UDOT LCC EIS, and accurately represent your constituents. At the end of the day, this process to improve transportation is necessary only because Salt Lake City is home to incredible, and in some sense, "unfortunate, access to amazing year-round alpine recreation. If we do not actively and continuously encourage restraint, the entities that control these transit projects, namely UDOT, will do what they do best, "build roads and transit systems to move as many people as humanly possible, regardless of the negative impact on our beloved canyons.

Restraint with Innovation

An issue that is tangential to altering our mindset to these transportation issues, is to stop setting the bar low (or lowering the bar) and falling victim to our addiction for personal vehicles. Similar to the LCC

EIS, the MTS does not show a hard commitment to the reduction of cars in the canyon. Planning on 1/3

of the visitors to LCC using mass-transit will not solve our traffic problem and will increase our visitation

through induced demand.

While lip service is given to „Üvisitor management,À (see last/lowest ranked objectives), there is no real

commitment or discussion on the existing push from the Central Wasatch Commission for a Visitor Use

Management (VUM) Study. How will the MTS be impacted if a VUM Study negates the findings and

preferences of the MTS?

Being at the beginning of the problem-solving/transit updating process, we are at the crucial point in

the process of dictating the forward direction. The LCC EIS fails, in our perspective, to plan with innovation and with an initiative to drastically limit cars in the canyon. The CWC has a proverbial second

bite at the apple and propose that if want a Zermatt-esque aesthetic, we should strive to achieve access

entirely by mass-transit. Every option in the MTS and the LCC EIS can serve as the sole means of transportation. However, to this point, no one has been willing to argue that mass-transit alone should be

our goal, because we as citizens are addicted to our personal vehicles and such a stance would be

unpopular . . . at first. What this gives us, though, is a half-baked alternative that strives to use mass

transit at 1

/5 its ability while continuing to use S.R. 210 at full capacity. Not only does this proposal not solve our environmental problems, it sets a dangerous precedent that we stretch our existing infrastructure

to beyond capacity and then introduce new modes of transportation to work in conjunction with the

existing infrastructure.

Electric Buses

The MTS has suggested is examining some modes of transportation that are not currently included in

the LCC EIS. However, one mode of transportation that is not included is electric buses. Both UDOT and

the CWC have flatly rejected the idea of electric buses being a feasible transportation alternative. In

recent weeks, this notion has proved to be categorically incorrect. UTA currently has an electric bus

program running 5 buses down with funding to obtain 100 more buses. These entirely electric buses have

been tested on steepest hills in Salt Lake City, as well as run up to Park City via Parleys Canyon. In the coming weeks the buses will be test in Little and Big Cottonwood Canyon, but UTA is very confident in the buses ability to function in the canyons. These Electric Buses have proven to very reliable, and where deficient; the technology is improving significantly fast. The batteries used for the bases can provide 160 miles per charge with the capability to recharge in 5 to 8 minutes. The energy harvesting system that is utilized while the gas pedal is not engaged and while braking. This would allow for energy recovery while the buses travel the 8 miles down canyon.

Electric Buses incorporate the flexibility of service and faster implementation time associated with the current bus alternatives. It also come the significant benefit of improving our air quality and decreasing our carbon output in Little Cottonwood, which is aiding in premature snowmelt. We respectfully request that electric buses be added to the MTS and that UDOT actively advocate for UDOT

to include electric buses in the EIS, as it is a reasonable alternative. All reasonable alternatives must be examined by the agency in charge per NEPA.

Interconnect

Interconnect from LCC to BCC or to Park City is always a popular conversation. It ties into this notion of one-Wasatch. Now, not only is the conversation about the merits of connecting the canyon, but about the safety and ingress/egress benefits of interconnect. There is no scenario where an emergency

only connection would be made, so this argument is simply another way of saying „Úlet,Âôs put a 30-foot-wide road through the mountain or a gondola over the top.,Âù This rarely takes into considerations the

economic and environmental impacts on Alta and the Albion Basin.

Economically. Every conversation about interconnect that I have been a part of ignores the impact

interconnect would have on the business and lodges in the Town of Alta. A connection to BCC would

promote land development and would likely turn Alta and Brighton into generic, commercial ski

destinations rather than the unique, historic communities that they are. A connection to Park City would put the Alta Lodges into competition with the Park City lodges and Airbnb. While this is not an issue for hardcore skiers those with families that are not interested in the 24/7 ski-centric experience (a large number of tourists in my experience), would consider Park City to be the prime lodging location with Alta being a ,Únice to-do,À or a day trip. This would be catastrophic for the historic lodges in Alta.

Environmentally. Interconnect invites far more environmental degradation than what we would see with normal increase in visitation. Both a train and a gondola will create more induced demand (due to their high ridership capacities compared to buses) by merely being constructed. Immediately we would see erosion on trails, creation of social trails (or unplanned trails), loss of native plant life, increases in invasive plants, and the decrease of water quality in a vital watershed.

With the gondola, the environmental impacts are easy to lose sight of because it is an electric system with minimal ground impact from the system itself. However, interconnect via the gondola option will place towers in what is otherwise minimally impacted high alpine forest. As discussed above, interconnect with either BCC or Park City would significantly increase visitation to the Albion Basin through induced demand.¹ This is demand beyond those who already visit by car today. This induced demand will be significant and unaccounted for by UDOT,Às travel models, as indicated by UDOT in prior public meetings. The result would be visitation beyond what is predicted for the next 30 years causing significantly more damage to the environment and watershed than anticipated. Lastly, the gondola interconnect would ruin a viewshed that is magnificent and a big part of why visitors come to the Albion Basin and travel in the passes between BCC and LCC. They search for the quiet places of pure nature. Interconnect will ruin that experience.

With a train or bus interconnect, the viewshed remains largely intact, but the watershed is impacted. We often talk about run off and snowmelt being impacted by pollution. We rarely talk about the water

table in the Albion Basin that is the source of existing wetlands. Water can be stored in the water table for up to 30 years before entering Little Cottonwood Creek. By putting a tunnel through the mountains to either BCC or Park City, there would be significant and lasting impact on the water table and our culinary

1 Induced Demand is the increase in travel simply due to transportation improvements. <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/itfaq.cfm>. Induced demand is the term used when Latent Demand is realized. Latent Demand are those travelers that currently do not visit LCC because of the traffic but would visit if it were easier.

water, by extension. On top of induced demand, interconnect continues to perpetuate the use of single occupant cars.

Adopting the Flaws of the EIS

As stated above, the MTS is not bound by the NEPA process. However, the MTS has, through adopting the alternatives of the EIS without digging deeper into them, adopted the flaws of the EIS.

The EIS is more concerned with increasing traffic flow and allowing more visitors. There is no concern for the impact of more visitors and the consideration of protecting the resources, a paramount reason people visit Little Cottonwood Canyon. The MTS is not bound by NEPA and can advocate for a more thoughtful approach to our canyons. In fact, this is the primary way local entities and citizens, including the CWC, can influence an EIS. Do not simply let UDOT check boxes and proceed absent real input from locals.

The LCC EIS only proposes to incentivize 1000 riders per hour on mass transit. This only removes 500 to 1000 cars from SR 210, but leaves the remaining 1000 cars on the road. While this may slightly alleviate traffic, it will not significantly change traffic. It is far more probable that this ridership prediction will only capture the Latent Demand, and the traffic on SR 210 will remain as bad as it is now. In the same vein, the alternatives in the EIS do not explore enough options for avalanche mitigation.

There are many ways to decrease avalanche risk, including by lessening traffic flow to get people through

slid paths faster and off of the road. This is never discussed. Yet, the bus options are the only options that consider snowsheds, costing \$70 - \$80 million. For this price, we are still not eliminating road closures, only buying a few days. The Gondola option actually doubles the number of road closure days (from 10 to 21) because a gondola provides an excuse to do less avalanche mitigation, even though the majority of visitors will still arrive at ski areas via car. This all circles back to the point made in the first section. The CWC has the latitude to dream bigger for what we want to see in our canyons in 30 years. Why is this study satisfied with settling for minimal

ridership and maximum road usage? Why is it not advocating for the gradual phasing out of all non-residential vehicles in the canyon?

Transportation Alternatives

Buses. Friends of Alta fully supports the implementation of buses as the transit solution to Little Cottonwood Canyon. This alternative is the most affordable and provides the shortest implementation timeline.

The UDOT LCC EIS estimates the cost of buses with no additional lanes on SR 210 at \$283 million and buses with the priority use shoulder on SR 210 at \$470 million. Both bus projects include two (2) transit hubs and the construction of snowsheds. The extra parking depot at 9400S has a price tag of \$52 million.

The snowsheds cost \$70-90 million. At the low end, both bus alternatives have an extra \$122 million tied to them in associated projects not replicated in the gondola proposal. Vehicles are heavily relied upon in all of UDOT's proposals, yet buses are the only alternatives with two (2) transit hubs AND snowsheds.

Further analysis and creative thinking could save a significant amount of money and allow for the faster implementation of buses. Our primary concern is that these associated projects are boosting the price tag of buses, making this option less appealing than the gondola or train.

Buses are the simplest, most beneficial, and most flexible solution in both the MTS and the UDOT EIS.

Do not let the allure of shiny transit systems cloud your judgement. All that is gilded is not gold. Gondola. The gondola alternative falls squarely in this box of fanciful but tragically flawed. As alluded to

in the paragraphs above, the Gondola, while less expensive than the Enhanced Bus with the Priority Lane,

lacks the second transit hub and snowsheds, sparing it \$122 million. However, the Gondola Alternative

relies heavily on vehicle travel on SR 210, but despite that reliance, predicts 10 to 21 road closures days,

the same as taking no action.

This raises two points. Why is it necessary to spend \$70-90 million for approximately 5 less road closure

days for the bus, but not necessary for the gondola, despite heavy reliance on SR 210? The second point

is, how is a gondola providing optimal equitable access when there will be an increase in road closures for

everyone not going to Alta or Snowbird, making it more difficult to get into LCC? Additionally, you are

afforded a mass transit options only if you are a patron of private ski companies. The gondola, as it is

proposed, unduly and unnecessarily benefits the ski areas at the expense of all the other users ,Äi

backcountry, cross-country, hikers, climbers, etc. - because the gondola can only stop at the ski areas.

Referring to my opening paragraphs, the Gondola proposal could be more refined. While Friends of Alta

does not believe the Gondola is the best alternative, it could achieve a higher purpose with less impact by

being aligning within the existing roadway. Tie a Gondola with the long-term goal of eliminating visitor

vehicles in canyons in favor of mass transit. If we are going to invest so much into a mass-transit system,

we should be striving for more.

Cog-Rail. The MTS mentions a push for the Cog-Rail alternatives to be reintroduced after the UDOT

LCC Screening Report ruled out the Cog-Rail as a viable alternative. From prior meetings, it appears that

this logic is based on the thought that the Cog-Rail needed to be measured from the same starting point as

the other alternatives, as opposed to connecting to other TRAX stations in the Valley. However, under

NEPA, UDOT must include in the EIS the impacts of foreseeable associated projects. The reality is that

we will not have a train start at the mouth of LCC without connecting to the rest of the system, so it must

account for the impacts associated with connecting to TRAX.

That said, the Cog-Rail has the same issues as the gondola, in that it does not strive to eliminate cars in

the canyons. As stated above, this sets the precedent for there to be two modes of transportation (road and

mass transit) working at the highest possible capacity. Furthermore, the Cog-Rail, as well as the Gondola,

moves us that much closer to interconnect, which would have a grave impact on LCC ,Ä as stated above.

The EIS excluded interconnect, specifically to Park City, because it would have little impact on existing

traffic patterns and would cost a lot to accomplish.

The Cog-Rail, while potentially decreasing air pollution, would have an increased impact on the watershed because the rail system would run adjacent to the road corridor rather than on it.

Tie this with

the proposal that the road continue to be used, the positive benefits would be lost.

Conclusion

Friends of Alta thanks the Central Wasatch Commission for undertaking this task and agrees with the

CWC,Äs sentiment that the MTS can serve as a powerful advocacy tool. Our criticism is only that the MTS

can advocate for more and should consider the associated negative implications of each transportation

alternative, as laid out in the paragraphs above. Lastly, we ask that the CWC join us and demanding that

UDOT include electric buses in the alternative analysis. NEPA requires all reasonable alternatives be

examined in the EIS process. However, electric buses have erroneously been excluded to this point.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions you have or clarifications you need.

Sincerely,

Kyle Maynard

Executive Director

Friends of Alta

I-206: Robert Myers

Comment I-206-1

Robert Myers

I believe The Central Wasatch Commission has done a very good job in collecting the thought and

ideas of the general public: as a plan is put forward on: how to address the transportation Improvements needed in the Wasatch Canyons. It is my purpose to make comment on my feelings for the priorities which will best suit the economics and the demands for efficient transportation which serves the bulk of the needs of the Valley's population.

It is obvious that the Commission needs to move forward with the most economical solutions which address the majority of the needs of the challenges for traveling in and out of the canyons.

Comment I-206-2

addressing the most important issues first will serve the majority of the people traveling in the canyons both summer and winter. The following ideas: in my opinion: are the most practical and will have the most productive solutions for the near future_

Mass utilizing bus transportation on schedules addressing the demand for transportation is the most productive measure for giving public transportation the best results. The schedules for buses and the frequency and key to the success of the program. Secondly, there must be more transportation hubs from which to run those buses. Small parking lots at the mouths of the canyons, do not cut it when we are trying to gather greater numbers of riders who want practical

means of adapting to that mode. There needs to be large parking lot - like using the gravel pit at the mouth of Big

Canyon for a large parking lot with possible parking structures.

Additionally there is a large plot of land to the west of Wasatch Blvd: just below the Gravel Pit, located close to the Old Mill and Big Creek that is vacant and was previously owned by the gravel company and now used by the State which could become a parking lot Buses need to serve for stops in both Millcreek: Big and Little Canyons which will encourage more

drivers to use that service.

More parking lot need to be developed in both Big and Little canyons, specifically the enlargement of the White Pine Parking lot in Little Cottonwood canyon Parking lots need the installation of a bus stops at each of the location which would be off the road.

Comment I-206-3

addressing the most important issues first will serve the majority of the people traveling in the canyons both summer and winter. The following ideas: in my opinion: are the most practical and will have the most productive solutions for the near future_

Mass utilizing bus transportation on schedules addressing the demand for transportation is the most productive measure for giving public transportation the best results. The schedules for buses and the frequency and key to the success of the program. Secondly, there must be more transportation hubs from which to run those buses. Small parking lots at the mouths of the canyons, do not cut it when we are trying to gather greater numbers of riders who want practical means of adapting to that mode. There needs to be large parking lot - like using the gravel pit at the mouth of Big Canyon for a large parking lot with possible parking structures. Additionally there is a large plot of land to the west of Wasatch Blvd: just below the Gravel Pit, located close to the Old Mill and Big Creek that is vacant and was previously owned by the gravel company and now used by the State which could become a parking lot Buses need to serve for stops in both Millcreek: Big and Little Canyons which will encourage more drivers to use that service. More parking lot need to be developed in both Big and Little canyons, specifically the enlargement of the White Pine Parking lot in Little Cottonwood canyon. Parking lots need the incorporation of a bus stops at each of the location which would be off the road.

Comment I-206-4

addressing the most important issues first will serve the majority of the people traveling in the canyons both summer and winter. The following ideas: in my opinion: are the most practical and will have the most productive solutions for the near future_

Mass utilizing bus transportation on schedules addressing the demand for transportation is the most productive measure for giving public transportation the best results. The schedules for buses and the frequency and key to the success of the program. Secondly, there must be more transportation hubs from which to run those buses. Small parking lots at the mouths of the canyons, do not cut it when we are trying to gather greater numbers of riders who want practical means of adapting to that mode. There needs to be large parking lot - like using the gravel pit at the mouth of Big Canyon for a large parking lot with possible parking structures. Additionally there is a large plot of land to the west of Wasatch Blvd: just below the Gravel Pit, located close to the Old Mill and Big Creek that is vacant and was previously owned by the gravel company and now used by the State which could become a parking lot

Buses need to serve for stops in both Millcreek: Big and Little Canyons which will encourage more drivers to use that service.

More parking lot need to be developrd in both Big and Little canyons, specifically the enlargement of the White Pine Parking lot in Little Cottonwood canyom Parking lots need the incorporation of a bus stops at each of the IVllation which would be off the road.

Comment I-206-5

Snow shed should be built in Little Cottonwood canyon to protect buses: cars and other and preventmg road closures due to needed snow clearmg

Comment I-206-6

There needs to be something in the mix that encourages people to either carpool or pay an additional fee to use space at canyon parking lots: along the side of the road or at the resorts. At the same time there needs to be allowances for parties traveling in the canyons who may not have other riders: either they work at jobs or live m the canyons. Their travel requires them to drive to and from those destinations, maybe it is the purchase of a parking pass or verification of their frequent travels

Comment I-206-7

There needs to be something in the mix that encourages people to either carpool or pay an additional fee to use space at canyon parking lots: along the side of the road or at the resorts. At the same time there needs to be allowances for parties traveling in the canyons who may not have other riders: either they work at jobs or live m the canyons. Their travel requires them to drive to and from those destinations, maybe it is the purchase of a parking pass or verification of their frequent travels

Comment I-206-8

There needs to be something in the mix that encourages people to either carpool or pay an additional fee to use space at canyon parking lots: along the side of the road or at the resorts. At the same time there needs to be allowances for parties traveling in the canyons who may not have other riders: either they work at jobs or live m the canyons. Their travel requires them to drive to and from those destinations, maybe it is the purchase of a parking pass or verification of their frequent travels

Comment I-206-9

Lastly, I am against building tunnels: tramways: and chair lifts from other resorts, which only bring more traffic: pollution: and only serve the reasons_ I am totally against additional ski lift which reach the ridges because they destroy the views of our mountains and only deliver more people to Big and Little from the communities around Park City and the mouth of the canyons.

Comment I-206-10

Lastly, I am against building tunnels: tramways: and chair lifts from other resorts, which only bring more traffic: pollution: and only serve the reasons_ I am totally against additional ski lift which reach the ridges because they destroy the views of our mountains and only deliver more people to Big and Little from the communities around Park City and the mouth of the canyons.

Comment I-206-11

Lastly, I am against building tunnels: tramways: and chair lifts from other resorts, which only bring more traffic: pollution: and only serve the reasons_ I am totally against additional ski lift which reach the ridges because they destroy the views of our mountains and only deliver more people to Big and Little from the communities around Park City and the mouth of the canyons.

Comment I-206-12

Lastly, I am against building tunnels: tramways: and chair lifts from other resorts, which only bring more traffic: pollution: and only serve the reasons_ I am totally against additional ski lift which reach the ridges because they destroy the views of our mountains and only deliver more people to Big and Little from the communities around Park City and the mouth of the canyons.

I-207: Save Not Pave,**Comment I-207-1**

Save Not Pave is a 6CH3-member non-partisan: community coalition based in Cottonwood Heights working with other like-minded organizations toward logical transportation and land use solutions for Utah's growing population. For community safety & health, we seek a regional: year round: Express transit plan for SL valley residents, recreationalists & commuters: and to have Cottonwood Heights' stretch of Wasatch Blvd treated by UDOT as a "street"

(narrow lanes: wider bike/sidewalks: crosswalks: slow speed) not a "road" (high speed travel to get from one spot to another spot).

An immediate imperative we see is the need for UDOT to be held to the NEPA process. That is: according to NEPA: UDOT must thoroughly screen all comments which meet their criteria: "provide an integrated transportation system that Improves the reliability: mobility and safety for all users on SR 210 from Ft Union Blvd through the town of Alta." This must include comments that stress a regionalized plan serving local communities in and around SR 210: instead of UDOT's current focus on road reliability for local & out-of-state skiers and north-south commuters _

Comment I-207-2

Like CWC's stakeholder componentry, SNP is a galvanized group of stakeholders, concerned citizens: with every vested interest in a revised transportation system that supports our highly mobile lifestyles. To protect our neighborhoods from the urban blight associated with Midemong neighborhood streets into fast moving: dangerous and car-based arterials: Not Pave is demanding logical, long term: financially sound solutions to address growing needs of tax-paying residents, as well as commuters: bicyclists: runners: hikers: climbers and skiers, local and visiting: within our foothill corridor. Thoughtful public comment has been collected on this issue for decades. The voice is clear for transit and active transportation. The two dovetail together to protect public health and safety. More lanes: high speeds and parking lots induce traffic-causing bottlenecks, as well as air, noise and light pollution for the communities they penetrate _

Comment I-207-3

With no holistic vision for SL Valley development: the race to monetize, "build, build, build" is more fierce than ever. The Wasatch Front is looking at the air quality disaster that removing more vegetation, replacing it with huge concrete and asphalted airport, prison: inland port and The Point projects will bring. The further insult of adding lanes and parking lots to induce more traffic is the final nail in the air quality coffin should Salt Lake County, WYRC and the CWC go down that path _

Dr. Brian Muench of Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment documents scientifically that air pollution in all its forms harms all people, even fetuses: not just "sensitive persons" when breathed in even smallest amounts. Respiratory,

neurological: Immune bodily systems are permanently compromised as the air we breathe "Orsens_
More than ever the argument arises, as we assault the natural balance with urban sprawl and antiquated building zeal: the Wasatch Front and Back need a masterfi_al regionalized transportation plan that improves air quality by getting more cars off our roads and turning our tax dollars to v•und UTA not UDOT. We need meaningful transit for citizens: commuters and recreationalists not just visiting skiers as the state legislature would have it

Comment I-207-4

Plans need specificity. Whether the Kem C. Gardner Institute Utah Roadmap or II'TRC' s Wasatch Choice 2050: these plans are nebulous and lacking when it comes to addressing specific challenges of mobility for the citizens within each city along SL Valley' s east side as well as effectively moving east-sidecommuters and recreationalists _

Save Not Pave' s recommendations to CWC:

,ÄÇ Funding. At the core of the Mountainland System needs to be the brutal honesty that the Utah Legislature through IWRC v•unds car-centric transportation with of taxpayer dollars and only 250 0 of these funds on transit/active transportation. Reverse that model. Fund transit and active transportation !

Comment I-207-5

,ÄÇ Transit north/south for eastern SL Valley. UTA's current "Express Bus" commuter system is flaued and inadequate. Many of our Save Not Pave who work in Research Park and the University of Utah indicate that they would ride transit if it were designed and executed m a viable way. Commuters within eastern Draper and Sandy should have a collector point such as 9800 South Highland; Heights _ 6200 South Park & Ride; Holladay and Millcreek: TBA: etc. Every ten minutes: M-F, during the first peak morning rush hour an Express Bus loads and leaves. It travels non-stop utilizing 1-215 until reaching Research Park, University of Utah and SLC Likewise: in the other direction leaving between 4:45-6pm

Comment I-207-6

,ÄÇ Transit east/west_ CTA' s fleet should slowly over the years change to a mix including smaller "shuttle" vans that h.wuld be numerous, frequent and free. Key east/uest rail or tunneling system from existing 9400 South and

7000 South Light Rail or Frontrunner stations connecting to Alta: Snowbird: Solitude: Brighton Express Buses during the peak weekends throughout the year as well as smaller: free and frequent trail head shuttles utilizing 10-seat vans or the equivalent leave from canyon mouth intermodal hubs sans parking lots.

Again: frequent and free.

Comment I-207-7

,ÄÇ Transit east/west_ CTA' s fleet should slowly over the years change to a mix including smaller "shuttle" vans that h.wuld be numerous, frequent and free. Key east/uest rail or tunneling system from existing 9400 South and 7000 South Light Rail or Frontrunner stations connecting to Alta: Snowbird: Solitude: Brighton Express Buses during the peak weekends throughout the year as well as smaller: free and frequent trail head shuttles utilizing 10-seat vans or the equivalent leave from canyon mouth intermodal hubs sans parking lots.

Again: frequent and free.

Comment I-207-8

,ÄÇ Shuttles. Replace parking lots with shuttle service Over time: utilizing public awareness campaigns and interlual agreements between city/county,UTA: a shuttling plan Mithin each east-side city should phase in. ,ÄÇ Public Awareness Campaign. Citizens: understanding of incorporating active transportation and transit into their everyday lives needs to be part of the Mountainland Transportation InitiatiiZ This campaign should be an inter-lual eff01t emphasizing tax savings: convenience: community camaraderie: daily exercise of active transportation, health: and safety. Local businesses: elected representatives and school districts should lead young and old tolvard new: more safe and healthftl lifestyle choices by entermg into a unified campaign. For example: a person in West Valley or Murray gets up in the morning and thinks: "I lvant to go hiking today." That thought develops to 'I could go on a walk within my neighborhood to a nearby park or: altematively: I could lvalk or ride my bike to the shuttle system that would drop me off at a trailhead. Rome wasn' t built in a day but with recent natural challenges of Covid: earthquakes: and forest fires Utahans can evolve. Leadership mixed Mith a little coaxing goes a long way!

Comment I-207-9

,ÄÇ Aesthetics. No longer dreaded by the few that currently utilize buses, the

system needs to include shade by summer, warmth by winter, restrooms, pleasing visuals:

,ÄÇ Technological app. Vehicular real-time communication through a comprehensive app giving drivers information on currently available and projected availability for best route: parking and shuttles related to recreation opportunities summer: fall, winter, and spring (i.e. for trailheads, resorts)

Comment I-207-10

,ÄÇ Wasatch Front & Back. 1-80 already exists as the thorough-fare. One of those lanes in each direction should be convened to either Express Bus or rail of:fering free and frequent transit for commuters and recreational users.

Comment I-207-11

,ÄÇ Fleet Management Diversifr UTA fleet over time. Phase out emphasis on large buses (except enough needed for rush hour) and phase in 10-15 seat vans that are agile and non-carbon emitting providing service that can make more numerous on-demand stops: frequent and free. Instead of spending tax dollars on UDOT acquiring property: asphaltting and maintainmg more roadways: Utahans from less expenditures for their own private vehicles as they utilize viable transit: and the system creates employment opportunity uithin UTA as drivers, engineers: marlagers: etc. need is heightened.

Topic: Diversify UTA fleet

The time has come. The train is leaving the station. Let's be on it, and each bring ten of our best friends!

Respectfi_al ly submitted,

Ellen Birrell

Andy Agardy

Carolyn Akston

Carrie Akston

Josie

Mark Aldridge

Debra Alldredge

D Kay Alldredge

Megan Allman

Valera A Itagracia

Ashley Anderson
Donna Anderson
Taylor W Anderson
Leslie Anderson
Amanda Apple
Diana Arensman
Brandie Arko
Elizabeth Auger
Charles Ayers
Susan Ayers
Steven Ayers
Robin Ayers
Tracey Bagley
Caroline Bagley
Bagley
Matt Baker
Henry Barth
Fred Bartlit
Elizabeth A _ Bartlit
Candace Bastow
Joe Bateman
Carolina Battistone
Michael Battistone
Zach Baughman
Beverly Bawden
Austin Beck
Brianna Beck
Kristin Becker
Lorrie Belcher
Susan Bennett
Ellen Birrell
Stevie Black
Chere Blackham
John Blackham
Jill Blevins
Kim Bloom
Kelly Boardman
Don Boling
Taylor Both
Ayja Bounous
Kelly Boyd
Deborah Bradford
Paula Breen
Sarah Brennan

Jennifer Bridgeman
Ken Bfiercheck
Barbara Briser
Sherry Britt
Rebecca Broadhead
Julia Brogli
Sara Brooder
Carolyn Brooks
Linda Brooks
Rachel Brooks
Derek Brown
Olivia Bruce
Tali Bmce
Brumley
Paul Bruno
Teara Bryan
Bonnie Bryde
Cooper Burn
Amy Bums
Cheryl Busch
Bailey Butler
Larry Butterfield
Sonya Campana
Lisa Cannella
Ginger Cannon
Allison Cao
Bill Carrigan
Deborah Case
Judd Casper
Patricia Casrrr
Andrew Chamarro
J eff Chatelain
Ed Chauner
Jennifer Cherland
Igor Chernyavskiy
Eric Chisholm
Eeshan Chowdhary
Amie Clark
Brianna Clark
Jo Clay
Clayne
Cathy Collins
Thomas Collins
Combs

Kathy Combs
Stephanie Combs
Mansa Cones
Marcie Conner
Chris Coombs
Leo Coombs
Brenda Corbett
Chad Cordell
Clayne Corey
Jason Corless
Cole Couvillion
Michelle Cowan
Alex Crawford
Kathy Czaja
Heather Dance
Taylor Dankmyer
Christian Davidson
Siobhan Davis
Bill Davis
Ann Day
Pamela Day
Henrique De Agostim
Whitney De Agostini
Samantha Debenham
Aaron Dekeyzer
Luca DeLio
Patricia Dennis
Manha Derouin
Brian Derouin
Victor DiNardo
Shari Dirksen
Kevin Dolan
Brian Donahue
Kathleen Donahue
Cody Donahue
Daniel J. Donnay
Laurie Donnay
Nancy Downing
Randy Downing
Dana Dredge
Alexus Dredge
Jan Duane
Paul Eben
Kathy Eggertz

Lincoln Tyler Eggenz
Suzie Eillison
Bob Elkington
W endy E lkington
Dan Ellis
Suzie Ellison
Gaye H England
Glenn England
Igor Ermakov
Maia Ermakova
David P. Escalante
Mia Evans
N ate Evans
Bill Ewer
Stefanie Eyerkauf er
Dylan F alrchild
Heidi F airchild
Jim F airchild
Eshal F alahati
Tosha F arrer
Douglas Kelley Farrer
Stacey F arrer
Abia F azili
Gerald F ede
Kian F eiz
Jamie F endler
George Fett
Asha Flick
F 01 lansbee
Diane F orster-Burke
Wyatt F resh
Annette F uller
Giora Garay
Maren Garces
S. Gemmell
Kyle Gibbons
Erin Giles
Jerty Gill
Christian Gc+out
Robyn Goeller
Eric Goldstein
Susan Goodsell
Ira
Jamison Gordon

Kaytlyn Gordon
Melanie Gordon
Steve Gordon
Layne Gordon
Christine Gore
Gediminas Grazulis
Wendy Grealish
Jerry R Grigsby
Caroline Grigsby Bagley
Monica Grimm
Ashli Gronberg
Jeff Groves
Mana Groves
Eliana Groves
Alyssa Grow
Matthew Grow
Alex Gullledge
Randy Gunter
Kathryn Gustafson
Gwendolyn Gwen
John Gygi
Nila Haenel
Zac Hales
Gabriela Haley
Kara Haley
Lisa Hamann
Lisa Hamann
Mindi Hamilton-Novasio
Haley Hammock
Brett Hampton
Colleen Hancock
Nancy Hardy
Steve Hardy
Matthew Harlan
Russ Harmer
Jessica Harris
Suzanne Harris
Tyler Harris
Micki Harris
Jane Harrison
Ross Hart
Taylor Hallman
Tira Haslem
Tyler Hatch

Wendy Haym ond
Rachel Heath
Jeff Heaton
Stephanie Herrig
JeneV© Hibler
Juan Higinio
Ross Hinman
Greg Hobson
Alli Hockett
Jessica Hoffine
Jim Holden
Lynda Holden
Bo Hong
Will iam Hopkins
Tyson Howard
Courtney Howard
Rachel Hou,Äard
Jane Hudson
Paul Hudson
Meghan Hunt
Carlene C Hunter
Dorothy Huntsman
B errett Huntsman
Darren Hurley
Darren Hurley
Jacob Hustedt
J ames Hutchins
Cory Isaac
J oshua Jabez
Nate Jackman
Lindsey Jackson
Azita Jamaludin
Joni Jensen
J ackson Jeprrrson
Amanda Johns
Mark A. Johnson
MaryE11en Johnson
Wayne Johnson
Patricia Johnson
Janet Johnson
Saralee J ohnston
Kimberley Jones
Andrew Jones
Marty Jopling

Katie K earl
Hailey Keller
Paul Kelly
Carma K ershaw
Judy Kershaw
Julie Kershaw
Mahjolee Kershaw
Thomas Kessinger
Stacey Khokhar
Mary Allyson Kimbell
Nadia Kirelev
Scott Klepper
Phyllis Kliger
David P _ Khger
Kelly Kline
Mark Kline
J on Koenig
Dan Kovach
Leslie Kovach
Eric Kraan
Kimberly Kraan
Lynne Kraus
Connor Kuhl
Susan La Maffe
Alexandria Lambert
Paige Lane
Susan LaPoint
Christina Larv¶helle
Lily Larsen
Cal Larson
Cleone Larson
Ashley Larson
Kevin Lavin
Tiffan Lee
Megan Leether
Alex L emieux
Brenda Leonard
Stonnie Leslie
Jessica Lin
Jaya Lindberg
Terrance Lingerfelt
Ryan Lonergan
Kristin Longson
Menno Lott

Kenneth Louie
Ann Love
Macy Lund
Kyra Lythgoe
Ramona Macdonald
Ashley Mackay
Mark Maday
Stephen Maeger
Annette Mahler
Suzanne Mahre
P Mandel
Christopher Maoney
Michelle Marsh
Mike Masters
Chad Mattes
James McCloskey
Kathleen McCloskey
Madeline McCloskey
Abigail Mcentire
Gary McGee
Ed McKell
Thomas McKenna
Jay McManamin
Anna McNamer
Stephen McSweeney
Cynthia Mecklenburg
Lauri Meidell
William David Meiling
Madelne Melini
Brian Merrell
Nikole Merrell
Shelbi Metivier
Jeff Mickell
Laura Millar
Robert Millar
Elaine Miller
Joanne Miller
Zane Miller
Matt Misbach
Carly Miskol
Jon Moffitt
Jorgen Moller
Erica
Shane Moreno

Zachary Moreno
Melody Morgan
Wen dy Morgan
Anthony Morrison
Omeed Moshirfar
Pegah Moshirfar
Ameen Moshirfar
Majid Moshirfar
Lily Moshirfar
Jessica Moskowitz
Janet Moss
Amanda Moxley
Mauricio Munoz
J oAn Murdock
J ennifer Murphy
Abby Murri
Allie Murri
Caroline Murri
Myrtice
Gabrielle Nacey
Nancy N arvaez
J ennifer Navarro
Amir N avzarl
Ellie Nazari
Amir N azari
J ake Ncholson
Shanna Nelson
Julie Nelson
Alysha Nemeschy
Michelle NeiB
Beth Newhall
Julie Newman
J anet Newman
L Nguyen
Kathy Nicholson
Jake Nicholson
Craig Nielson
Kasrrr Nilsson
Kelly Nolan
Norberto
Bob Noms
Richard N ovasio
Ashley Nye
Laurie O'Connor

Jeanette Okeefe
Cory Olsen
Darren Orr
Amelia Ortega
Andrea Orton
Rich Otter strom
Anna Ottowicz
Jozef Ottowicz
Bonnie Pace
J onathon Pace
Elise Pace
Amy Palmer
Jaime Palmer
Brian Palmer
Tracie Palmer
Chantal Papilion
Barbra P archman-Wong
Keith Parietti
Monir Parikh
Kate Parker
Veromca Parkinson
Winslow Passey
Raquel Passey
Tim P autler
Mary Pautler
Mataya Peters
Katherine Peter son
Isabelle Phillips
Davis Phillips
Chad Phillips
Audrey Pines
Tony Pines
Becky Pitcher
Travis Pitcher
Kerstin Pole-voy
Nicholas Polevoy
Eduardo Pooja
Kendal Poole
J ayne Poner
Brittany Pouson
Elie Powell
El izabeth P owell
Gwen Poynor
Virginia Prowse

Ethan Raap
Susan R Rampton
J ames Rampton
Kristen Randak
Race Rankin
Sarah Ratzlaff
Marla Rausch
Neve Rauscher
Annabelle Reed
Talia Reeshard
Anthony Rehmer
Laurie Rehmer
P. Reid
Pauline K Reisner
Andy Rich
Sam Richardson
Amy Riggs
Leslie Rinaldi
Hilary Ripley
Holly Robbins
Kelly Robinson
Kathleen Rocco
Amol do Romo
Robert Ross
Amy Ross
Rachel Roy ster
Remy Russell
Jeremy Sabin
Theadora Sakata
Laurel Samuels
Mark Schaerrer
Stephanie Schaerrer
Richard Schmidt
Diane Schnarr
Paul Schna_ff
Cindy Schoeck
Kim Schovaers
Ron
Emory Schwieger
Gabriela Sessions
Mark Shah
Trina Sheranian
Stephanie Shew
Lorraine Shew

Tanya Shroeder
Tom Shroeder
Megan Sieverts
Mary Sinden
Emma Sintz
Mark Skidmore
Tyler Slater
Zoe Slind
Kristin Smith
John Sooklaris
Eliza South"Qk
Penny Spangler
Molly Sparks
Julie Christine Spencer
Darlene Slrncer
Barbara Spiro
Lori Stahler
Sarah Starkey
Jes Starley
Nick Stenquist
Amy Stephens
Jeff Stevens
mvid p. Stevenson
Kirsten D Steu,Äçart
Priscilla Ste'.vart
Kimmie Stojack
Devon Stone
Emily Stromness
Marcia Stroud
Alfred S troud
Sarah Suher
Michelle Sutor
Mark Sullivan
Sue Sullivan
Charlotte Sullivan
Rachael Sullivan
Michael Swanicke
Nancy Tanner
Leslie Tate
Nicholas A Taylor
Tad Taylor
Carla Teitt
Alex Terrill
Kimball Thomas

Stephen Thomock
Tiffley
Matt Tietje
Richard T ingey
Torrey
Lori Tuerpe
Edward T uer#
P Turner
Lonzo Turner
Andrew Tuttle
Carrie Tuttle
Altagracia V alera
Nicole Vander Meyden
Kelley V anetti
Chuck V anetti
Kelley V anetti
Michelle Vansice
J onny Vasic
J ade Velazquez
Verner
Cambri Visser
JeffWade
Bert Wagner
Aimee Walker
Emily W ebb
Judith Webb
Jim Webb
J ennifer Welding
Sharlene Wells
Manha Wemer
Aubrey Wheat
Aaron Wight
J ennifer Wight
Laura Wiliams
Glen Willardson
Ann Williams
Bruce Wil liams
Rana Williams
Parker Williams
Stephen Wilson
Anna Kristina Wilson
Tatum Winn
Jesse Winslow
Suzanne Winslow

Winston
Hanna Wolfson
Warren Wong
Fritz Woods
Nate Woodward
Eugene Wooldridge
Lori Wooldridge
Loisi Yee
Jessica Ymgling
Melvin S. Young
Joan E. Young
Eena Yu
Abbie Zahler
Jordan Zuckert
Nikki Cavin-Grace
Annalys Barton
Perilyn Barton
Ross Han
Otilie O'Keefe
Garry Gleason
Natasha L ichtenberg
Mike McCarrick
Cynthia Campbell

I-208: Salt Lake City Public Utilities,

Comment I-208-1

Dear Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) Staff and Board:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Draft Mountain Transportation Study, and for

the opportunity to serve on the Expert Panel and committees for this process. We are very appreciative of the

work that has been conducted to date to solve transportation problems in the Central Wasatch, while continuing to

recognize and prioritize the protection of the Central Wasatch watersheds for the public benefit. We also

appreciate the Central Wasatch Commission,Âs continuing support for the National Conservation and Recreation

Area Act (NCRA) as a key aspect of addressing transportation concerns. As agreed in Mountain Accord,

resolving transportation issues and enacting the NCRA together are part of a single package to address numerous

public concerns in a balanced manner.

Salt Lake City has been actively protecting and monitoring the Central Wasatch watersheds for over a century in

order to ensure that the public has access to clean, reliable, and affordable water supplies. We are a municipal

water provider to more than 360,000 people in the Salt Lake Valley, including Salt Lake City, Mill Creek,

Holladay, Cottonwood Heights, South Salt Lake, Midvale, and Murray.

The majority of the water supply to our service area emanates from the Central Wasatch Mountains, namely the

Little Cottonwood, Big Cottonwood, Parleys, and City Creek canyon streams. Salt Lake City holds significant

water rights within these canyon watersheds and has an obligation pursuant to state laws to maintain these water

resources so they can be used for the public benefit.

Salt Lake City operates an extensive public water system and must meet federal and state safe drinking water

requirements. In addition to regulatory requirements, we have a very important public obligation to protect public

health through the provision water supplies. The federal Safe Drinking Water Act and state statutes and rules

identify several strategies that we are required to employ to meet drinking water standards. These include the

protection of water resources from pollution at the source (also called source water protection); water treatment;

water distribution; water quality monitoring throughout the system from the source to the tap; and public

communication about the quality of our water. Salt Lake City does all of these and is extremely accountable to the

public every step of the drinking water process.

Our watershed management and monitoring are conducted in collaboration with other jurisdictions that have

various authorities in these areas, such as the United States Forest Service and Salt Lake County. The policies of

the public entities that have management responsibility prioritize watershed protection to ensure public health.

One of our most important responsibilities is to assess these watersheds for vulnerabilities, and mitigate risk based

on these assessments. As identified in Salt Lake City's 1999 Watershed Management Plan and in our recent

source water protection updates, the primary vulnerabilities of these watersheds to degradation and resulting

pollution include the following:

• Development, including roads, buildings, parking lots

,ÄÇ Recreation overuse, which can cause sanitation issues, introduce non-native vegetation, and increase erosion and wildfire risk

,ÄÇ The use and transportation of chemicals and raw materials that have pollutant compounds

,ÄÇ Climate-related impacts that affect water quality and quantity, vegetation, and wildfire behavior

We agree that the work of identifying transportation problems and their solutions is very important. In the Central

Wasatch, we have a unique situation where current and future transportation systems are located in the heart of

the source of water for not only the residents of our extensive service area, but also for other communities, such as

Sandy City and Park City. We appreciate that the CWC recognizes that this context requires special care and

consideration given the significant potential of short- and long-term impacts of selected solutions. Transportation

solutions could impact our precious watersheds in two primary ways:

1) The footprint and construction of the solution itself. Increasing the footprint of corridors and roads, adding

new corridors or roads, constructing tunnels, and encroaching within the riparian area would all have negative

consequences to the watershed and contribute to additional pollution vulnerabilities. Aerial solutions, trains and

roads fit within this category especially if it requires the grading of a new corridor and service roads across

previously undeveloped land.

2) The role of transportation in changing land use and recreational uses. Transportation and land use are

interdependent. Transportation solutions that induce additional development pressures in the watershed are a great

concern to us. In addition, transportation modes that carry ever increasing amounts of visitors to the watersheds

without a plan to manage the increased visitation will lead to overuse and degradation of the watersheds.

Each of the draft alternatives have common watershed risks related to increasing recreation, land development

pressures, and construction. To help address these risks, we recommend the following:

,ÄÇ The proposed National Conservation and Recreation Area (NCRA) federal legislation should be passed to

resolve the risk of additional development pressures in these watersheds. This will protect especially

pressures on federal land for new or expanded development. The transportation solutions and NCRA need to be considered as a single package, not as separate initiatives. This was the basis of Salt Lake City's agreement and signing of Mountain Accord, as well as many other members of the public.

• The development of a good understanding of the environmental capacities of these watersheds to inform current and future policies and actions. The environment that naturally provides clean and reliable water to the public, as well as other significant public benefits, will degrade in the face of unlimited visitation growth. In other words, we are at risk for loving these mountains to death. Understanding capacities will help our community proactively approach both the protection of the Central Wasatch and the resolution of transportation issues.

• Because increasing transit will likely create increasing access and demand for recreation in the Central Wasatch, transportation system improvements could be integrated with companion operational and monitoring plans developed in coordination with agencies such as ours, the United States Forest Service, Salt Lake County, and other agencies to manage recreational use at sustainable levels, including targeted approaches in managing sanitation, waste, vegetation impacts, and wildfire risk. This may also align with the land management and coordination initiatives in the NCRA.

• Tunneling through the Central Wasatch mountains carries a significant risk to water resources that may not be reversible. The upper areas of the Big and Little Cottonwood watersheds, as well as in Summit County have a history of mining and a complex geology. Salt Lake City is very concerned about the impact of tunneling to water quality and hydrology and does not recommend this alternative. Should tunneling continue to be considered, significant resources and expertise will be needed to study its feasibility and risk to water resources.

• Snow sheds would require significant cutting into the mountain in Little Cottonwood Canyon. We recommend detailed engineering to determine impacts to water resources should alternatives with snow sheds continue.

,ÄÇ A gondola system may require additional access roads be constructed through the watershed and would need engineering and best practices employed to avoid erosion and stream sedimentation risks.
,ÄÇ If rail continues to be considered, we recommend the use of existing developed transportation corridors for the rail system in order to reduce watershed impact.

,ÄÇ Salt Lake City recommends developing information related to the cost/benefit and financing of each

alternative to better understand alignment with public values.

,ÄÇ We recommend considering positive watershed contributions as part of any transportation solution. For

instance, restoring land scarred by old roads and development no longer in use; reducing private vehicle use;

including green infrastructure and restoring wetlands; right-sizing culverts to account for increasing storm

intensity; and implementing operational solutions that can help with visitor management impacts.

We understand that the draft alternatives presented by the CWC are meant to be a starting point for discussion and public comment, and that the CWC is seeking to better understand the pros and cons of various transportation options from a variety of perspectives. We also understand that identification of financing options for any alternatives are envisioned to be studied in the future. With that in mind, Salt Lake City is not recommending an alternative as we believe additional evaluation is necessary to fully understand how each aligns with public values. We do hope that this feedback is helpful as the process evolves. We also reiterate our commitment to providing our expertise regarding watershed and water resource issues. Thank you again for the opportunity to participate.
Sincerely,

Laura Briefer
Director

I-209: Save Our Canyons,

Comment I-209-1

Save Our Canyons

Save Our Canyons' CWC Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternative Comments Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Central Wasatch Commission's, Mountain Transportation System (MTS) Draft Alternatives_ Our organization, its volunteers: supporters and partners are extremely interested in the health, beauty and wildness of the Wasatch. Transportation poses significant threats and Impacts to these canyons: as such we look forward to seeing how you address the comments and concerns addressed below

Regional Scope

We applaud the regional scope and scale which the CWC has looked at these issues. Most notably acknowledging and incorporating ideas for how we might deliver people to the mouth of the canyons (Millcreek: Big and Little Cottonwood) without their private automobiles: stands to become one of the most substantial and long overdue shifts of any transportation effort we have participated in in the past 20 years. By helping people get on transit nearer their homes: we address the tram problems that manifest themselves as you get nearer the three entrances to the canyons at the source. One oversight in the regional analysis is not only looking at how to get people to and from the canyons for their recreational visits: but looking at how commuters heading perhaps away from the canyons may also benefit from the routes. There is a general deficit in transit in our valley: particularly around busy canyons. Could it also be to see if an east-side light rail connecting Cottonwood Heights or Sandy to the University of Utah (not to mention an interchange or intermodal hub at the mouth of Parley's) aid in transit connectivity in our canyon approaches and east-side communities.

Our primary concern with the regional scope is that it doesn't prohibit new transportation corridors from being established across our forests and watersheds. A recent study noted we have lost a wilderness the size of Mexico in the past 13 years, the lead researcher telling The Guardian: "We found substantial area of intact ecosystems had lost in just 13 years, nearly two million square kilometres which is terrifying to think about. Our findings show that human pressure is extending ever further into the last ecologically intact and wilderness areas." Many areas, which the CWC has reduced to transportation corridors: are in fact: ecologically intact areas, some of which are inventoried roadless areas. Given the threats to biodiversity, the threat of climate change: and staggering growth pressures in our region, these places need more: not less protection.

Comment I-209-2

Save Our Canyons

Save Our Canyons' CWC Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternative Comments Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Central Wasatch Commission's, Mountain

Transportation System (MTS) Draft Alternatives_ Our organization, its volunteers: supporters and partners are extremely interested in the health, beauty and wildness of the Wasatch. Transportation poses significant threats and Impacts to these canyons: as such we look forward to seeing how you address the comments and concerns addressed below

Regional Scope

We applaud the regional scope and scale which the CWC has looked at these issues. Most notably acknowledging and incorporating ideas for how we might deliver people to the mouth of the canyons (Millcreek: Big and Little Cottonwood) without their private automobiles: stands to become one of the most substantial and long overdue shifts of any transportation effort we have participated in in the past 20 years. By helping people get on transit nearer their homes: we address the transit problems that manifest themselves as you get nearer the three entrances to the canyons at the source. One oversight in the regional analysis is not only looking at how to get people to and from the canyons for their recreational visits: but looking at how commuters heading perhaps away from the canyons may also benefit from the routes. There is a general deficit in transit in our valley: particularly around busy canyons. Could it also be to see if an east-side light rail connecting Cottonwood Heights or Sandy to the University of Utah (not to mention an interchange or intermodal hub at the mouth of Parley's) aid in transit connectivity in our canyon approaches and east-side communities.

Our primary concern with the regional scope is that it doesn't prohibit new transportation corridors from being established across our forests and watersheds. A recent study noted we have lost a wilderness the size of Mexico in the past 13 years, the lead researcher telling The Guardian: "We found substantial area of intact ecosystems had lost in just 13 years, nearly two million square kilometres which is terrifying to think about. Our findings show that human pressure is extending ever further into the last ecologically intact and wilderness areas." Many areas, which the CWC has reduced to transportation corridors: are in fact: ecologically intact areas, some of which are inventoried roadless areas. Given the threats to biodiversity, the threat of climate change: and staggering growth pressures in our region, these places need more: not less protection.

Comment I-209-3

With that in mind: we insist that the CWC design transportation around what needs to be protected: rather than what is the most feasible and cost effective. Failure to do so will result in the damaging trend of damaging ecosystems and biodiversity: which are in fact: the most threatened elements of the Wasatch Mountains. Far more vulnerable than the economies the transportation systems seek to engorge.

Comment I-209-4

Jurisdiction

One of our higher level concerns with the CWC's MTS process is one of jurisdiction. Much of the land in the mountainous area of your study is not in the jurisdiction of the CWC may be much more realizable in the urban areas: while the mountainous areas are administered by the USDA Forest Service. Your process may find consensus: it may get bogged down in spats. The question is: how: without full partnership of UDOT (who has their own transportation who has jurisdiction of the roads and resigned from the CWC: and the USFS who has effectively walked away from the CWC: can this vision be realized? Can it really be worth more than the paper it is printed on? We hope that it can be: but honestly we have seen far too many good plans: great efforts: wither on the vine. As the saying goes, fooled once shame on you: fooled twice: shame on me. We genuinely seek to collaborate and believe the jurisdictions and stakeholders of the CWC do our concern is that those entities to want to do it their way... or the highway(skyway), quite literally.

Comment I-209-5

Impacts Measured by "footprint"

We implore the CWC to do more than assess the impacts of the footprint of proposed transportation alternatives. The 2003 Revised USFS Plan for this area predicted the challenges we are now living: "Providing quality recreation opportunities within the framework of watershed protection will be an increasing challenge as the Wasatch front population and national and international destination use of the area continues to grow _ : ' Salt Lake County's General Plan for the areas puts it even more bluntly: "The Wasatch Canyons and foothills are under increasing pressure from visitation: development: traffic: and other factors. These areas are in danger of being "loved to death" It is good that it appears there is consensus that human impact is the most significant impact to many of the environmental values in the Wasatch. As such, we need to do more than assess the impact of the footprint of transportation and better understand the impact of the visitation the seeks to increase. One of the stated goals of the CWC process is to "Increase use and incentivize transit" Other documents are suggesting increasing use is an ' 'increasing challenge" and being to death" _ How does the CWC anticipate: meaningfully addressing these significant impacts? Looking at the footprint is assessing the point source pollutants, however: there is much documentation that suggests the non-point source pollution is the most significant, and this is what you are proposing to, knowingly or unknowingly, increase. You must do more to address and avoid the impacts driven by increasing non-point source pollutants and the ripple effects created by induced and increased visitation The importance of this issue is not captured in this effort, in any meaningful or quantifiable way

Comment I-209-6

If our communities don't agree with your metrics, we won't be able to believe and support your outcomes because they will be superficial: at best. We have found it difficult to favor one mode over the other because this analysis is total absent from the decision making process.

Strategies for managing visitation need to be discussed in conjunction with your alternatives: otherwise we, like Zion National Park did when it moved from auto

oriented to a shuttle system: will experience unprecedented resource damage. Don't mistake us: we moving from an auto based system: but the auto based system is the current control on visitation. If you remove the control, with no discussion of what the new control will be, one can only expect chaos will ensue.

Comment I-209-7

Climate Change

The impacts of climate change need to be considered in a variety of ways. First: understanding the impact that climate change will have on the ecology and health of the forest: watershed and wildlife based on climate models for the area. Second: we need to understand the impacts of climate change in terms of the snow sports and how this might alter behaviors. Will a truncated ski season create more or less skiers? Will the ski season be what it is in 10 - 30 years. Sure: people will still come to the Wasatch: but the surrounding it might change: or might need to change: based on a variety of factors.

Comment I-209-8

Third: we should look at the emissions impacts of various modes: or futures: and reconcile it with the impact to the place. Emissions reductions for example: may not be worth the ecological impact

Comment I-209-9

Prior Comments

We are attaching our latest round of comments on the UDOT EIS Alternatives Analysis. Many of the issues/concerns we identified in those comments are relevant to the project being considered by the CWC in this MTS. Issues like parking, gondolas, snow sheds, impacts, are discussed there and warrant your review _

Alternative 1 - Comprehensive Bus

Of all the concepts proposed: we favor this option most for the following reasons:

- It utilizes existing infrastructure: namely roads, that are already in place.
- It doesn't force transfers and mode shifts which are one of the most significant disincentives to using transit.
- You can use combinations of express and local buses: scaled to serve the variations in use: location: season and demand.
- Electric buses can be integrated: reducing emissions, which was at one time a reason to not use buses.
- It is a 'one-size: fits all solution that works for resorts, dispersed recreation, business and canyon residents.

Comment I-209-10

The element of this proposal that we don't support is snow sheds. UDOT's EIS showed

that snow sheds only take us from about 10 days of closure to 6 days of closure. These structures are massive intrusions to a glacially carved canyon. It would significantly diminish road cycling experience and just don't fit in our canyons. Further: snow sheds alter the hydrology: hence the erosive and health of the streams in our watersheds.

Comment I-209-11

The element of this proposal that we don't support is snow sheds. UDOT's EIS showed that snow sheds only take us from about 10 days of closure to 6 days of closure. These structures are massive intrusions to a glacially carved canyon. It would significantly diminish road cycling experience and just don't fit in our canyons. Further: snow sheds alter the hydrology: hence the erosive and health of the streams in our watersheds.

Comment I-209-12

The element of this proposal that we don't support is snow sheds. UDOT's EIS showed that snow sheds only take us from about 10 days of closure to 6 days of closure. These structures are massive intrusions to a glacially carved canyon. It would significantly diminish road cycling experience and just don't fit in our canyons. Further: snow sheds alter the hydrology: hence the erosive and health of the streams in our watersheds.

Comment I-209-13

MTS Draft 2 (Bus/Gond01a)

This is our least favored of all the options. It is the most obtrusive, for sure, yet serves the fewest destinations. It wouldn't effectively serve Big Cottonwood Resorts, either. Not an even more and displacing ski interconnect: which would tear like a hangnail from Little through the heart of the Wasatch onto the condos of Summit County: severing habitat and diminishing the wilds of the Wasatch for the majority of its users: visitors and appreciators. Suffice to say: we loathe the idea of ski interconnects: and this option is a step in the direction of wanton destruction of what is cherished about the Wasatch
topic: against aerial subtopic: doesn't serve dispersed recreation, impacts on wildlife

Comment I-209-14

MTS Draft 2 (Bus/Gond01a)

This is our least favored of all the options. It is the most obtrusive, for sure, yet serves the fewest destinations. It wouldn't effectively serve Big Cottonwood Resorts, either. Not an even more and displacing ski interconnect: which would tear like a hangnail from Little through the heart of the Wasatch onto the condos of Summit County: severing habitat and diminishing the wilds of the Wasatch for the majority of its users: visitors and appreciators. Suffice to say: we loathe the idea of ski interconnects: and this option is a step in the direction of wanton destruction of what is cherished about the Wasatch
topic: against aerial subtopic: doesn't serve dispersed recreation, impacts on wildlife

Comment I-209-15

Anyone not so privileged as to ride or afford the gondola (or skiing at a resort for that matter): yet has to at it: pay for it: live it: even though there is little: if any, to the broader public, would have to ride the bus. The stench of elitism is strong with this one. UDOT's gondola proposal resulted in SR-210 being closed for about 20 additional days each winter. It isn't clear if this would also be the case in this CWC alternative. Doing so disenfranchises and alienates the local public: who simply seeks a connection with nature: with the wilds. It further tips the scales for resorts: furthers inequities: diminishes access, places additional pressures on other canyons, and is generally, undesirable.

Comment I-209-16

Finally: the gondola is reliant on a bus shuttle from parking areas to the gondola base. This forces transfers and immediately becomes a disincentive to use, particularly if you are riding a bus from your home where other transfers would be expected. The impact of parking garage at the base should also be a consideration. They will undoubtedly cause massive traffic jams. Further: you will need to have a lot of parking built: even more if there is to be an interconnect serving all 4 (6?) resorts. 5,000 stalls is a lot of parking in that area, it is also about half of what you'd need to address today's problem: because remember: you're also going to need to allow non-resort patrons who take the bus to parking access to transit.

Comment I-209-17

It is way past time for the gondola idea to be squashed: we request the CWC does it once and for all. As a marketing ploy, it makes sense, but practically, this alternative is non-sensical: and riddled with flaws. We believe the wild majesty of the Wasatch, which this proposal threatens: is more than draw enough. Visitation numbers in comparison to our national parks corroborate that

Comment I-209-18

MTS Draft 3 (Bus/Rail)

We believe that a train and vehicles is the doomsday scenario for the canyons. However, if a train were to replace the roadway: allowing for roadside recreation and emergency vehicle access and deliveries: it may be worth investigating further.

Comment I-209-19

We also are very concerned about how a train would 1) increase development pressures and that land use policies on both private and public land: are not strong enough (and lacking political will) to stand against these pressures and topic: rail subtopic: concerned about development

2) pressures for connecting with a tunnel would enhance these pressures: and create new economic corridors that will jeopardize the wildness and beauty of the Wasatch while further displacing dispersed recreationists and their strong land ethic: in pursuit of money Canyon communities: for example: can't deal with the impacts of AirBnB issues: existing visitor impacts: let alone what pressures a train could bring

Comment I-209-20

Parking garages and forced transfers are also an issue with the train as discussed in the gondola section above. However the train option does better travel times, year round utilization: and the ability to service multiple users. Cost of ridership is also an important issue as there are numerous issues surrounding equity issues when pursuing these other modes. In the CWC's presentation kicking off

the MTS. the panelists representing train and gondola talked about how much money private entities were making off these systems. We fundamentally disagree with the monetization of transportation, and believe that an equitable and fair, fare system should be understood.

Comment I-209-21

Parking garages and forced transfers are also an issue with the train as discussed in the gondola section above. However the train option does better travel times, year round utilization: and the ability to service multiple users. Cost of ridership is also an important issue as there are numerous issues surrounding equity issues when pursuing these other modes. In the CWC's presentation kicking off

the MTS. the panelists representing train and gondola talked about how much money private entities were making off these systems. We fundamentally disagree with the monetization of transportation, and believe that an equitable and fair, fare system should be understood.

Comment I-209-22

Building on this: not having an Environmental Dashboard to aid in evaluation of impacts and desired ecological conditions of the Wasatch is a real short coming of the analysis. Again, the choices are being made solely for their economic and visitation benefits and mitigating impacts to our environment: which in many instances, may not be able to be mitigated any further than they have been. The environment of the Wasatch is what is at risk, not the economy: perhaps we would all be better served to focus on enhancing the environmental characteristics of place and mitigating impacts to the economy. Why can you propose to convert wild places into new transportation corridors, but not look at repurposing existing ski runs, for example, for transit corridors to better protect the environment

Comment I-209-23

Getting agreement on transportation, requires getting agreement on what the future of the Wasatch should be. Whether it becomes a tourist attraction or maintains a high and wild integrity that prioritizes health of wildlife and other natural qualities: where amenities should be placed and not placed: what should be developed and what should be protected. All land managing jurisdictions need to provide certainty, where today there is a cloud of uncertainty. _ Actually: it is worse than uncertainty: there is a transportation arms race: an interconnect rush: for the sake of those modes, with little consideration about the actual impacts: or the culture they bring. Does building more transportation bring thousand upon thousands of more units of development? You can't simply say "it's limited by water" water will continue to be challenged, just as protection of watersheds is. Just as the right to develop seems to be given more credence than the right to protect wildlife and water quality: values that many Utahns place higher than development. With stakes as high as they are for the Wasatch, we need multiple lines of defense to protect against the growing pressures. We aren't supportive of any connections Big Cottonwood: Little Cottonwood and Summit or Wasatch Counties. As a matter of fact, many of our supporters would like reconsideration of decommissioning some of the connections that are currently in existence. Our preferred means of connecting is by foot, hand, bike, ski, etc as has been done for generations. It is an important legacy to protect a legacy shared by first people, pioneers, locals, transplants, tourists, and wildlife, alike. We hope these comments help you understand our concerns and help to influence your processes by which you arrive at a decision. We hope to continue working with you to address the issues before us.

Carl Fisher
Executive Director
Save Our Canyons

I-210: Lisa Sun**Comment I-210-1**

No transportation hub should be created or maintained at the inverted V intersection at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon for four reasons that are not clearly articulated in the pros and cons of the alternatives.

First, the land at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon was given by the Whitmore family with the specific intent that it would be preserved in its natural state and they were promised that no development would occur on that land. The people who managed that contribution for the Whitmore family are still alive to testify to the facts surrounding this contribution. Any land received from the Whitmore family must be preserved in perpetuity and not be used for parking lots, parking ramps, gondola or train terminals, etc.

Second, the Temple Quarry Trail and Park at the mouth of the Little Cottonwood Canyon is one of the most visited historic sites in all of Utah and is used every day by large numbers of hikers, mountain bikers, and other recreation enthusiasts. It was funded by

donors with the belief it would not be tampered with or destroyed. There is no other location that would provide the same historic value and preserve the legacy of those who over several decades quarried the granite blocks for the Salt Lake Temple. Developing the mouth of the Canyon on or around the Quarry should not be permitted.

Third, the Tier 1 Objectives should include not only protecting the visual quality of the Canyon experience, but also protecting other key qualitative aspects of that experience, including specifically, preventing the impact of noise and vibration. Unlike Switzerland, where trains travel to Murrin and other high Alpine locations by climbing the face of the Jungfrau, a train up Little Cottonwood Canyon would operate in the bottom of a narrow canyon with high walls and would create an echo chamber effect exacerbating the train noise and

vibration. This noise and vibration would significantly impact not only residents living near or in the Canyon, but also degrade the recreational experience of all Canyon users.

Fourth, any solution that focuses traffic to the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon will continue to significantly degrade air quality for residents in the Triangle and other nearby neighborhoods. When traffic is held up at various locations at or near the mouth of the Canyon, thousands of cars and buses idle on all three sides of the Triangle. This produces a cloud of exhaust containing CO, NOX, SOX, and PM 2.5. This noxious cloud is very potent and can be smelled by all nearby residents. There is little question that the air being breathed on these mornings is very unhealthy for the residents, the skiers, and the first responders and exceeds federal clean air standards. An analysis of the proposed alternatives must consider the impact on local air quality. Bad local air quality (pockets of unhealthy air near plants, refineries, rail yards, freeways, congested urban centers, etc.) is the next frontier for air quality

science and regulation to protect public health and needs to be modeled and fully taken into account in evaluating the proposed alternatives.

The information about the alternatives is insufficient for the public to make wise choices. Little is disclosed about the environmental damage from the extensive cutting and filling necessary to create the bed for a train up the Canyon. More information please. Preventing environmental damage is a top-listed objective but the information to evaluate these alternatives is lacking.

All three alternatives and their variations would just pack more people up the Canyons to benefit the ski resorts. Where is the NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE that keeps Canyon visitation at the current level by charging a significant variable toll at the mouths of the Canyons and ramps up bus service as personal car use declines? The ski resorts could subsidize the bus transit alternative for their customers.

Either the train or and gondola alternative will cost billions in construction, maintenance, and operation. Indeed, as much as the capital cost of UTA's entire system of commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, and bus rapid transit. Spending billions on one of these Canyon transit alternatives must be balanced against using this money to expand and upgrade UTA's current

transit system. Improving the current system would benefit the two million Wasatch Front residents who live in the valleys and not primarily the ski resorts and their customers.

We need flexible, „no regrets,“ strategies for managing canyon traffic.

The significant traffic problems at the mouth of Little Cottonwood canyon need to be addressed, but we should do so in a scalable, flexible, and reversible way that does the least harm to the sensitive canyon environment. While the traffic problems are significant, they occur on only a few days a year, so we shouldn't adopt a solution that is permanent and year-

round, especially when the benefits are really only felt on a handful of days and primarily by skiers and the ski resorts. A gondola that serves the two ski resorts will do little, if anything, for summer recreation or for any kind of winter recreation that occurs outside resort limits. An additional lane is really only useful on those few very busy ski days. Additionally, road widening will cause significant environmental damage in the canyon and to the watershed and will hurt access to smaller trailheads and climbing spots and funnel people into larger parking lots by the most popular trailheads. Those trailheads will suffer from that overuse.

We should focus on enhanced bus service combined with significant tolls for private cars (without multiple passengers). This solution will allow us to manage the traffic problem without doing additional damage to the canyon. There is no reason to jump to a destructive, infrastructure-heavy solution without trying solutions that don't require significant building

in the canyon, with the monetary and environmental costs that building would necessarily entail. We should adopt a "no regrets" strategy where we test different patterns of bus service

and tolls for private vehicles before moving to any solution that requires additional built infrastructure.

Adopting a "no regrets," first-do-no-harm solution is particularly important given that climate

change may make ski resorts and skiing less and less viable over time. While we certainly hope that climate change doesn't have a significant effect on snowfall in Utah, there is good reason

to think that it will. Building permanent infrastructure that damages the canyon and that is primarily designed to manage ski resort traffic is short-sighted given the risks that climate change poses to the viability of the ski industry over the next several decades and beyond.

Losing the greatest snow on earth would be a terrible tragedy--and one that we shouldn't compound by additional damage to our canyons through unnecessary built infrastructure. We should choose a solution that helps solve our current problems without committing us to damaging infrastructure that may not be necessary in the future.

Additionally, the point of this process is not to allow the ski resorts to get as many people into the canyon every day as they deem possible and preferable. Ski resort capacity is necessarily constrained, not just by space on the hills at the resort itself, but also by how many people can reasonably be moved up a narrow canyon on any given day. We shouldn't

allow the resorts to insist that they be able to maximize the number of people on their hills when that will entail significant environmental damage. Moreover, whatever solution is chosen, should be funded--at least in part--by the ski resorts that will benefit the most from increased capacity to move skiers up the canyon. Moreover, detailed studies about the carrying capacity of the canyon--both for winter and summer recreation--should be conducted before we adopt solutions that increase the number of people who can be transported through the canyon. We shouldn't increase transportation capacity without considering how much use the canyon can sustainably support.

Building infrastructure like a gondola or additional lane that damages the canyon today also creates significant issues of intergenerational equity. We need to preserve the canyon for future generations, rather than maximizing ski resort profits today.

Moreover, if a gondola is built, the base station should not be right at the entrance to the canyon. Over time, there will be significant pressure to build large parking lots at that base station, even if the current plan is to funnel people through mobility hubs off-site.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

I-211: John Knoblock

Comment I-211-1

Hi Blake, Ralph, and Lindsey- I was discussing the MTS with Tom Diegel who pointed out that there are typically only 21 days with a foot or more of snowfall. The implication is that the road isn't often impacted by snowfall.

I did a little research looking at the nice historic snowfall data on Alta's web site. In the six months of our snow season, typically between a third and half of the days have an inch or more of snowfall. That makes between 60 to 90 days with snow at some point in time in the canyons. Anyone who frequents our mountain roads can observe that even just one inch of snow on the road can lead to problems. Sometimes the small snowfalls are the problematic ones because UPD does not check vehicles headed up the canyons, and there's the Ford Escort with bald tires spinning out on a curve.

Half the time it is not snowing in the morning so UPD doesn't check vehicles and then snow hits mid-day and traffic trying to leave the canyon is a disaster due to someone driving too fast with two inches of snow on the road has an accident. And often it may be snowing without even buildup on the road but someone is driving 5 MPH white-knuckled because visibility is bad on the steep curvy mountain road.

And as I said in my previous comments, just one inch of snow on the road makes all the white lines on the road disappear. Areas where there are two lanes of traffic in a direction become a single lane for safety. One excessively slow driver, accident, or stuck vehicle and the road is a

disaster. A separate bus lane sounds good in theory but I doubt it will work as planned in the real world.

Similarly, there is a lot of focus on avalanches and protecting the road or reducing the time to complete avalanche control with snowsheds. There are just not that many days when the road is closed for avalanche control or avalanches hitting the road (but people love to focus on the extreme events). Of course, during heavy snowfall, everyone decides to head up to the slopes! However, the road has problems a lot more days than just those large snowfall days.

Thanks for all of your hard work trying to solve this problem, and read, analyze, and answer all of the comments!

John Knoblock
801-274-0566
801-884-8987 cel
4475 S. Zarahemla Dr.
Millcreek, UT 84124

I-212: Sandy City Public Utilities,

Comment I-212-1

To the Central Wasatch Commission,
Sandy City Public Utilities respectfully submits the following comments in response to the Mountain Transportation Study Draft Alternatives. We appreciate the opportunity to comment, as well as the thought and hard work that is going into addressing and resolving the challenges and concerns associated with protecting and enhancing the Central Wasatch mountain access corridor. This correspondence provides comments regarding the City's drinking water supply source protection interests, as well as related concerns we anticipate and appreciate being addressed with the proposed projects. As the city that rests at the base of Little Cottonwood Canyon, and as a water provider for over 100,000 Utah citizens, Sandy City relies heavily upon its high quality and reliable water supply from Little Cottonwood Canyon [LCC]. Sandy has significant water rights in Little Cottonwood Creek and has invested over \$150M in the water supply assets and infrastructure in this area. As a City of the first class, Sandy retains source protection authority over its drinking water supply. We are grateful for the ongoing work of the CWC, to assure continued protection of the quality of water supply in

the Cottonwood Canyons by addressing the risks of roadway and other pollutants to our water supply. Each of the proposed options have potential to be designed and constructed in a way that

appropriately addresses and improves water quality protections. Likewise, each option could be implemented in a way that causes unacceptable and potentially irreversible negative impacts on

public health and reliable water supply. Since the water in Little Cottonwood Creek takes as little

as a few minutes to reach the drinking water treatment plant intake, and its contamination could

cause severe and costly impacts to public health and the sustainability of our water supply, we appreciate the extra consideration for source water protection in the Canyons.

Please assure the alternatives analysis and each of the proposed transportation alternatives address important water quality issues for the Canyons, notably including:

,ÄÇ The risk and impacts of vehicle accidents in the canyon. Accidents can discharge fluids, including gas, oils and any harmful materials being transported.

,ÄÇ The risk and impacts of increased recreation in the canyon. More people require improved management of persons and their waste (trash, bathrooms, soil erosion, etc.), as well as the minimization of concentrated and untreated runoff from contamination areas (roadway drainage, sediment loads, parking structures, restroom facilities, etc.).

,ÄÇ The importance of Best Management Practice facilities along with ongoing monitoring and treatment of water. These plans should require provisions to ensure that the water quality from UDOT roadway and related facilities (storm drain inlets, parking lots, structures, construction sites, etc.) are monitored and treated prior to discharge to perennial and ephemeral tributaries with appropriate storm water and drinking water source protection best management practices (BMP). We request inclusion of erosion control, oil/water separators, dispersed treatment (infiltration at roadway shoulders prior to flow concentration, etc.) away from and prior to entering the stream, as well as culvert capacity and stabilization improvements for heavy rainfall events similar to those that resulted in debris flows that resulted in extensive damage and extended closures of the UDOT roadway and Little Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant in 2019.

,ÄÇ The necessity to minimize and contain the risks of fire. Ignition sources, fuels, and suppression during construction and long-term maintenance of transportation and recreation facilities in the canyon can create increased fire hazards. The transportation plan should contemplate and facilitate a healthy forest and fire fuel management.

,ÄÇ The importance of water-specific operation and maintenance plans. These will be needed to monitor and keep facilities clean and prevent contaminated discharges, as well as to monitor potential impacts.

,ÄÇ The risk and impact of continued use of road salts and other chemicals on roadways. The use of these chemicals will need to remain a highly managed and monitored

practice to prevent impacts to the water supply, as well as canyon vegetation (a natural erosion and water treatment resource). Each alternative should be evaluated with best management practice goal, and the the potential requirement that road salts and other chemical de-icing agents are prohibited in the future. Many other similar watersheds have had to eliminate and prohibit use of chemicals (salts, etc.) for snow removal due to impacts upon the watershed vegetation and water quality under Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and local drinking water source protection requirements.

„Ä“ The importance of developing solutions that minimize the potential risk and impacts of dispersed and concentrated water pollution for the long term. These solutions should be a priority. Notably, addressing the issues identified above should fit into the alternative selection, and more important the physical and operational improvements to be contemplated. Objectives should include minimization of car accidents [and their impact when they do occur], monitoring and treatment of roadway pollutants, improved management of persons and their waste in the canyon, etc.

„Ä“ The overall short and long-term health of the watershed. The solutions and alternatives evaluated, and the final selection, should consider the long-range implications to watershed health in tandem with recreation and transportation management.

Short- and Long-Term Regional Transportation Plan for traffic thru Sandy. We recognize that each transportation option has advantages and disadvantages for transportation in the Canyons.

Ultimately, we hope the option selected also looks beyond the Canyons and addresses the huge number of visitors to the Canyons who originate from all three directions, the south (along Wasatch Blvd and Dimple Dell Road), the west (extreme congestion that results from 9400 South and Highland), and the north (along Wasatch Boulevard through Cottonwood Heights). We would

like to see a Transportation Plan that will result in more than just a shift in how vehicles move up

the Canyons; we would like to see a solution that results in long-lasting improvements to historic

congestion that funnels in all directions through Sandy. We hope this change is large enough in scale to entirely change the thinking about mountain transportation among visitors to the canyons, as well as a change that will carry improved water protections.

Thank you again for your attention to these issues to assure the continued delivery and availability

of high quality and sustainable water for Sandy, its water quality partners, and the more than 500,000 persons who can drink the water from Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Tom Ward, P.E.

Director of Public Utilities

CC: Marci Houseman/Sandy Council, Matt Huish/Sandy CAO, Ryan Kump/Sandy City Engineer

I-213: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints,

Comment I-213-1

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints

50 East North Temple Street, 2WW

Salt Lake City, UT 84150

Ralph Becker

Executive Director

Central Wasatch Commission

41 North Rio Grande Street, Suite 102

Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Email: comments@cw.utah.gov

Re: Comments on Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report

Dear Executive Director Becker:

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, a Utah corporation sole (the „Church Corporation,“), has received and reviewed the Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report, dated September 18, 2020, prepared by the Central Wasatch Commission („CWC,“) and recently circulated for comment. We are pleased to submit this letter to CWC in the spirit of cooperation to help improve the planning process.

As you know, Church Corporation owns a sizeable parcel of property near the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon, consisting of approximately 133 acres (the „Church Parcel,“). The property includes a storage facility, offices and related parking, access roads and security features, and is regularly staffed by approximately 55 year-round employees. Thus, we are an active member of the canyon community and vitally interested in (and impacted by) the issues being addressed.

While we understand the financial and other interests of various stakeholders in the Central Wasatch area, we are concerned that the Church Parcel will be significantly and negatively affected by certain of the proposals for increased public access to that area. We believe it is important to share our concerns with CWC so that they may be carefully considered and addressed during the planning process. To that end, we have prepared the attached summary of the impacts the various alternatives will have on the Church Parcel, and we invite you to take them into account in selecting recommended solutions, and related mitigation measures.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with CWC and others during the planning process. Our comments are necessarily somewhat brief in nature, and we would be pleased to elaborate as needed. In any event, we must reserve our rights to make further comments and express additional concerns as current or new proposals are advanced and developed.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at any time with questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Marty Stephens

Director, Government and Community Relations

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED RELATING TO CHURCH PARCEL

October 16, 2020

ROAD WIDENING/BUS ALTERNATIVE

Church Corporation does not oppose this approach as a method of mitigating traffic concerns, so long as the numerous related impacts, engineering issues, costs and expenses, and land values as they relate to any eminent domain actions, are addressed to the satisfactions of Church Corporation, including but not limited to:

– Any road expansion on the north side of SR 210 will adversely affect the Church Parcel, and thus

- o The entry road to the Church Parcel will need to be reconstructed to address impacts from a shortened and steepened approach, especially to accommodate winter travel.
- o The security gate is within the road widening envelope and will need to be relocated.
- o The subjacent and lateral support for the entry road will need to be addressed as it will be undermined.
- o New snow disposal locations will need to be created.
- o Wider roads will encourage more illegal parking that will need to be addressed to eliminate safety and security concerns.
- o Significant amounts of rubble fill and large rocks will need to be shored up during construction.
- Σ The current access road to the Rocky Mountain power pole on the Church Parcel will need to be reconfigured.
- Σ A left turn lane into the Church Parcel will need to be retained.
- Σ Half the parking at the Gate Buttress parking lot would be eliminated, heavily impacting recreational use. New parking will need to be identified and created.
- Σ Road widening will eliminate several boulders cherished by the climbing community. Mitigation or alternatives may be warranted.

GONDOLA ALTERNATIVE

Church Corporation is fundamentally opposed to the Gondola Alternative in its current location. This alternative will heavily impact the Church Parcel in ways that, in many cases, cannot be mitigated:

- Σ Close proximity of gondola cabins to the Church Parcel parking lot and buildings may lead to potential harm and vandalism, and exposure of employees to harm and harassment.

- Σ Two gondola towers will be sited on the Church Parcel, requiring frequent maintenance and inspection by unauthorized personnel at a secure site.
- Σ Much of the site consists of unstable rubble and the sitting of towers could create instability for the existing Church Corporation structures as well as risk to the gondola towers from falling rock and debris as well as rockslides.
- Σ The presence of gondola cabins, towers and cables increases the risk of damage and harm from falling ice and snow.
- Σ The presence of the gondola increased security risks for the site.
- Σ Tower vibrations may damage buildings, structures and parking facilities.
- Σ The gondola will adversely impact rock climbing, hiking and other recreational opportunities on the greater Church Parcel, currently authorized by lease between Church Corporation and the Salt Lake Climbers Alliance. Easement obligations will need to be reviewed in this regard.
- Σ Canyon views will be impaired, impacting the enjoyment and value of the Church Parcel.

COG RAIL ALTERNATIVE

- Σ The cog rail alternative is not included in the UDOT EIS, and the CWC Report does not include sufficient detail for Church Corporation to provide meaningful comment.
- Σ To the extent the cog rail alternative follows a route similar to the proposed gondola, it would heavily, and adversely, impact the Church Parcel.

DYNAMIC TOLLING

- Σ Any tolling regime would have to be equitably implemented as applied to Church Corporation employees, who utilize Little Cottonwood Canyon Road for only a short distance in each direction.

O-1: Salt Lake Climbers Alliance,

Comment O-1-1

O-2: Wasatch Mountain Club,

Comment O-2-1

Wasatch Mountain Club Mountain Transportation System comment

To: Central Wasatch Commission

Date: 10/16/2020

The Wasatch Mountain Club (WMC) is pleased to participate in the Central Wasatch Commission's (CWC) Mountain Transportation System (MTS) initiative process, and to provide our comments to the MTS Draft Alternatives Report. We have over 1,100 paid members of the WMC and most of them recreate in the Wasatch. The WMC has a special interest in our mountains and in preserving their beauty and recreation opportunities for future generations.

We commend the Central Wasatch Commission's progress in developing recommendations for a regional mountain transportation system: namely, "a regional mountain transportation system should be efficient, safe, and reliable while reducing traffic congestion, incentivizing transit use, and protecting the watershed, wilderness, and viewshed". Although we feel this statement is admirable, we recognize it is missing any mention of equitability and affordability.

Although we support the Central Wasatch Commission's effort to further develop transportation recommendations, the WMC is very concerned with some of the MTS alternatives. Options that allow for MTS that enable visual and environmental impairments could ruin the natural character of the canyons. Options that allow for connections between resorts could have devastating visual impacts and environmental consequences.

We believe any mountain transportation system must follow current alignment of major roads and stay within current rights of way to the extent possible. Any mountain transportation system must fit within these corridors, with the allowed adjustment. No new corridors should be created.

Any option must protect environmentally sensitive areas. Any option should also protect view sheds.

Any transportation option must not result in loss of access to existing opportunities for dispersed recreation. The WMC supports proposals to improve parking at trail heads and other road-side locations to enhance safety, allow additional recreational opportunities, and protect

the environment. There is currently a critical need to expand and improve parking and facilities at trailheads to support users. All new or modified parking areas must include bus stops.

Although we believe the long-term solution to traffic in the Canyons involves less cars and more buses, there currently is, and will continue to be, a requirement for more and better facilities at trailheads. Until any mass transit can get users to major trailheads and dispersed recreation points from 6:00 am to 8:00 pm all year around, cars must remain part of the transportation solution.

Mass transit requirements need to be implemented soon to alleviate traffic on weekends, holidays, and ski days. In the short to intermediate time frame, cars should be allowed to access trailheads and dispersed areas, especially during mid-week and off-peak times.

We recognize the need for dispersed recreation users to have access to areas well away from formal parking areas. There must continue to be a way for users to park along the roadside where necessary in order to recreate in these areas. These are legitimate legal uses that must be accommodated with some sort of parking, and in the future, mass transit options. Transit and parking solutions must not inhibit access to hiking, climbing, fishing and other dispersed activities.

Increased implementation of buses certainly makes the most sense to ensure recreation users can continue to get to any of the roadside access points they currently use. Neither aerial or rail solutions would allow the many stops required to satisfy these dispersed requirements.

At this point, our comments are focused on two primary issues and our preferred alternative.

- Ensuring that any alternative accommodates dispersed recreation in all areas of the Wasatch

- Ensuring that any alternative preserves the natural resources of the Wasatch including the visual quality of the environment

- Year-round buses

We believe the long-term transportation solution for the Wasatch must focus on mass transit for all our mountain users to the maximum extent possible. A solution must be developed to not only meet the needs of the ski resorts but also the needs of dispersed recreation users throughout the Wasatch. This is a year-round issue and transportation solutions should not just address winter ski area concerns. This transportation system process must address this holistic approach.

We believe there are short and intermediate steps that will accommodate current needs and ensure easy implementation of a long-term solution. Any solution must include bus stops at the proposed improved trailhead parking areas. Current use demonstrates the need for year-round buses to trailheads and other dispersed recreation locations.

CWC is making plans for future transportation, parking and recreational needs without even knowing what the current use is (for example on Saturday June 27, 2020, there were over 200 cars parked along the road near the White Pine trailhead). This process is trying to develop a solution without even knowing what the current or future use is. There is no comprehensive information on capacity of trails, off-trail backcountry use, or roadside and creek-side use.

We believe efforts to determine carrying capacity of the Wasatch mountains needs to be accelerated, especially of back county and undeveloped areas. This must be done to sustain that type of recreation, and transportation solutions must enable these uses. This information is an important variable in the development of a workable transportation system.

Some solutions will bring even more visitors. With improved transportation and facilities, there could even be more people in the mountains. Is this sustainable? Has the CWC determined how many more users different transportation alternatives will bring?

None of this report focuses on how climate change will affect the future of recreation and other uses of our mountains. With the uncertain future of water, snow, and temperature how can we develop something so expensive. This is not a time for business as usual. This is a time to forecast what will be the reality of the mountains in the future. This is a time for an incremental approach that can be added to as we go.

The other concern we have is to make sure we protect the scenic environment of the Wasatch for future generations. The WMC believes it is important to maintain the visible quality of the viewshed contained in our mountains.

A Visual Impact Assessment must be completed now. It most likely would disqualify the aerial gondola. An aerial gondola would not only affect the aesthetics of canyons where constructed with significant cumulative impacts, but would also be visible from much of our Wilderness Areas.

According to Transportation Research Board (TRB) documents "NEPA requires that visual impacts be considered for transportation projects". So, when will this be done? This must be done for any design or mitigation processes and therefore should be done immediately.

The TRB identifies a number of foundational concepts for Visual Impact Assessments. The first two are:

- 1) Perception of visual quality is an interaction between people and their environment. (this is absolutely true and the EIS process should talk to users of LCC, especially those involved in dispersed recreation who care about the aesthetics of the canyon).
- 2) It is important that the public be directly involved in defining existing visual quality and visual quality management goals and determining visual impact (this has certainly not been done)

The CWC must involve users immediately to establish what viewers value in our mountains; what views could be affected by any of the alternatives and how those alternatives will affect

the views in the canyon. Doing these simple things immediately will help meet NEPA's aesthetic mandate.

In addition to the TRBs methodology the Federal Highway Administration has Guidelines for Visual Impact Assessment that must be followed. Here are just two of FHWA requirements:

1.1 "Community acceptance of a proposed transportation project is frequently influenced by the extent of its visual impacts. Anticipating and responding appropriately to these impacts avoids unnecessary delay in delivering needed transportation improvements."

2.2 NEPA was established, in part, to "assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings" Sec. 101 [42 U.S.C. -§ 4331]. NEPA is the primary governing rule that established the country's national environmental policy. NEPA requires Federal agencies to undertake an assessment of the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making decisions. Visual impacts are included among those environmental effects."

Obviously, a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) must be done and should have been done already. Defining alternatives and developing even general plans, should have had the outcome of the VIA in hand. The CWC MTS Report contains a section on Watershed Management, which is appropriate, but it should also include a section on viewshed management.

Utah is fortunate in having high quality digital elevation model (DEM) data for this entire area. CWC certainly has access to GIS experts that could do the line of sight analysis in a few minutes and make those maps available to the public to determine visual quality affected areas.

The aerial gondola alternative will have the greatest visual quality impact. Earlier presentations indicated that some towers will have to be up to 250 feet tall. These will be visible from many scenic view points and sensitive areas. Also, the cables and gondola cars will obstruct views. No one enjoying our mountains will be able to fix an image in their mind or take a photo without seeing these gondolas, towers and cables.

Although rail would have less visual impact, it would have problems of its own. There is a history of rail in Little Cottonwood Canyon, but the old rail right of way runs under the existing road. According to the utahrails.net website, the old rail right of way was turned over for the road in the 1930s. Rail would now have to exist within the road right of way. The WMC would oppose any new right of way for rail.

Most of the alternatives CWC included in this report are not at all what is needed. And all are way too expensive. Spending nearly \$500,000,000 (or likely more) to get skiers to resorts is irresponsible. Much more needs to be done to alleviate traffic and at the same time provide access to all recreation in the canyon.

There must be some consideration given to equitability and affordability. Both gondola and rail would serve only the ski resorts. A solution that only provides transportation to and from the ski areas is simply an exercise in corporate welfare. These solutions would basically just be a

hand out to private businesses. The CWC needs to make sure the solution makes sense for everyone. What is the return on investment? What value is put on a visitor experience without having to see a gondola devastate an otherwise beautiful view? What value is put on getting people to trail heads and dispersed recreation areas?

For a fraction of the cost of the proposed alternatives, and very little adverse environmental impact; year-around bus routes from various feeder locations to hubs that serve the resorts, trailheads, and dispersed users, makes the most sense.

We ask the CWC to consider these three criteria in developing a mountain transportation system:

- 1) Does it meet everyone's year around needs?
- 2) Does it have the least negative environmental impact?
- 3) Is it the most affordable?

The Wasatch Mountain Club will oppose any mountain transportation system that will degrade the character and aesthetics of our mountains.

Dennis Goreham
Conservation Director
Wasatch Mountain Club
1390 S. 1100 E., #103
Salt Lake City, UT 84105
conservationdirector@wasatchmountainclub.org
801-550-5169

O-3: Utah Chapter Sierra Club,

Comment O-3-1

SIERRA CLUB
UTAH CHAPTER
Will McCarvill
Executive Committee Chair, Utah Sierra Club
423 W 800 S SteA 103
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
801467_9294
October 18, 2020
Blake Perez
Deputy Director
Central Wasatch Commission

The Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the Central Wasatch

Commission Transportation Committee Mountain Transportation System Alternatives In reviewing this and

many other previous studies including the UDOT Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS an emerging critical issue has been missed. California serves as an early warning on the effects of climate

change on our western landscapes. We cannot ignore what is going on there. The Wasatch will not be

spared. The specific effects are not known, but general trends and outcomes are known (1) The west will

become hotter and drier and snow levels will rise. Our transportation modeling ignores climate warming

and assumes that the future Wasatch climate will be the same as it is today. It will be very different and will

greatly affect the recreation that we now enjoy. By not considering this issue we will make huge unjustified

investments. The Wasatch will be warmer in both winter and summer with a slight increase in precipitation

(2). The shift from snow in the winter to rain will shorten ski area season and reduce snowpack (3)

This we know or can anticipate:

Topic: impacts of climate change

The population in Salt Lake and Summit counties will continue to rise, placing huge burdens on air quality

and water supplies. The protection of water that we get from the Wasatch will become even more critical as

our mountains produce less____

topic: attributes and objectives subtopic: watershed protection

Recreation demand will increase. Higher temperatures will allow more recreation in the foothills during the

winter, likely reducing it during the summer heat. More people will want to escape the heat of the valley by

going up into the mountains. Our mountain ecosystems will be more fragile. The impacts of recreation on

them will increase.

topic: increased recreation demand

The snow line will rise threatening the ski resorts. Forecasts indicate that the ski industry in Utah will
gone or greatly reduced by 2050 (4,5)_ This means that large capital investments should be avoided and

those that are made should meet multiple needs. An example is investing in better mass transportation
across the valley.

SIERRA CLUB

UTAH CHAPTER

Reversing climate change will not happen in a short time, if ever.

What we don't know:

How fast will dramatic negative changes happen? How much of an effect will it have on our water. How

much will a hotter, drier Wasatch have on its ability to provide recreation opportunities in a more fragile

environment. What are the investments we should make mitigating problems associated with the ski

industry and dispersed recreation?

What should we do?

Climate modeling needs to part of the transportation studies to predict our weather future. The effects of

these changes on recreation impacts also needs review. These will provide better guidance on what our

transportation needs really are. We cannot plan like the future climate of Utah will not change for the worse.

The alternative we chose should minimize capital expenditures. It needs to be flexible to meet changing

needs. It also needs to be a tool by which we can manage visitor use and impacts. If this decision is incorrect we will erect mountain monuments to match our pumps on the west side of the Great

Salt Lake, except at greater cost We favor the bus alternative as it appears to be more flexible and will

serve ski area and dispersed recreation needs

Sincerely,

Will McCarvill,

Chair, Executive Committee, Utah Sierra Club

Carly Ferro

Chapter Director, Utah Sierra Club

2.

Assessment of Watershed Vulnerability to Climate Change for the Uinta-wasatch-Cache and Ashley

National Forest Rice et al. US Department of Agriculture, General Technical Report RMRS-6TR-362 June 2007

Fine-scale climate projections for Utah from statistical downscaling of global climate models
By Thomas Reichler Department of Atmospheric Sciences, U. of Utah

3.

5.

SIERRA CLUB

UTAH CHAPTER

Projected Climate Change Impacts on Skiing and Snowmobiling: A case Study of the US, Global Environmental Change, Volume 45, July 2017 pages 1-14.

www.climate.gov/news-features/climate-and/climate-skiing Nov 19, 2018

<https://hazards.utah.gov/climate-change/>

B-1: Doppelmayr USA, Inc,

Comment B-1-1

@Doppelmayrg

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report. The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation, technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines including engineering, technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics. Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group. With more than 3,000 employees worldwide, Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15,100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are aerial gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountain area. Aerial ropeway systems were

originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable ,Ä in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months

Economical ,Ä especially "hen cnmpared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway

Environmentally friendly 'Mth little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation

Efficient ,Ä power consumption is dependent on load and 'Mnen the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e_g people riding down at the end of day), the power IS harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable ,Ä system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe ,Ä statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable ,Ä spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortab e ,Ä quiet and smooth 'Mth available options like heated seats

Accessible ,Ä level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayrg

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocab e gondola ,Ä capacity up to 4 400 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16 66 mph)

as gondola ,Ä capacity up to 5,6W pphpd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mphb

Among Doppelmayr's proudest assvñiations is our partnership 'Mth the Olympic Games.

Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in

particular we 'Msh to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the SVñhi Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant ac.vñss

to the alpine competition sitee Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie high at the end of a canyon which is acvñssed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked

to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate

automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the

viability of a 2nd W nter O ympics in our state

Finally, and most mportantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor

automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines. After an easy boarding process, the passengers will enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment. Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic windows. No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road. And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and implementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our canyons as well. Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtually eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little our canyon roads. That will be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads. In closing, we at Doppelmayr look forward to continued collaboration. With CWC on this exciting project. We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavun Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:
2

Comment B-1-2

@Doppelmayrg
Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Alternatives
Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation
To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report. The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation, technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines including engineering: technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics. Our

SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group 'Mth more than 3,000 employees worldwide To Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15, 100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are a gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountaine Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable ,Ä in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months

Economical ,Ä especially ""hen cnmpared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway

Environmentally friendly 'Mth little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation

Efficient ,Ä power consumption is dependent on load and 'Mnen the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e_g people riding down at the end of day), the power IS harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable ,Ä system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe ,Ä statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable ,Ä spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortab e ,Ä quiet and smooth 'Mth available options like heated seats

Accessible ,Ä level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayrg

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola ,Ä capacity up to 4 400 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16 66 mph)

as gondola ,Ä capacity up to 5,6W pphpd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mphb

Among Doppelmayr's proudest assvñiations is our partnership 'Mth the Olympic Games.

Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in particular we 'Msh to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the SVñhi Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant ac.vñss to the alpine competition sitee Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie high at the end of a canyon which is acvñssed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked

to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the viability of a 2nd Winter Olympics in our state

Finally, and most importantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines. After an easy boarding process, the passengers will enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment. Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic windows. No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road. And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and implementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our canyons as well. Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtually eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little Cottonwood Canyon roads. That will be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads. In closing, we at Doppelmayr look forward to continued collaboration with CWC on this exciting project. We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavonn Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:
2

Comment B-1-3

@Doppelmayrg
Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Alternatives
Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation
To Whom It May Concern,
We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the

Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report
The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines including engineering: technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics. Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group. With more than 3,000 employees worldwide, Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15,100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountain. Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable, in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months

Economical, especially when compared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway

Environmentally friendly, with little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation

Efficient, power consumption is dependent on load and when the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e.g. people riding down at the end of day), the power is harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable, system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe, statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable, spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortable, quiet and smooth, with available options like heated seats

Accessible, level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayr

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola, capacity up to 4,400 passengers per hour per direction

(pphpd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16 66 mph)
as gondola ,Ä capacity up to 5,6W pphpd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mphb
Among Doppelmayr's proudest assvñiations is our partnership 'Mth the Olympic Games.
Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics While we have
provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in
particular we 'Msh to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the SVññhi
Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant ac.vññss
to the alpine competition sitee Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie
high at the end of a canyon which is acvññssed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked
to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve
this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate
automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood
Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the
viability of a 2nd W nter O ympics in our state

Finally, and most mportantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from
a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor
automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement
eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines After an
easy boarding provññss, the passengers vill enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola
cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment Then comes the smooth flight through
the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic 'Mnd0'v'u'8 No
rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a
winding canyon road And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the
proper planning and mplementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our
canyons as well Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated
freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola
stations could virtual y eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little our canyon
roads. That 'Mll be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons,
including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads
In closing, we at Doppelmayr look fopuard to continued cnllaborating With CWC on this
exciting project We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavuqn Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales

Page:

Comment B-1-4

@Doppelmayrg

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report. The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation, technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines including engineering: technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics. Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group. With more than 3,000 employees worldwide, Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15,100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountains. Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable, in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months

Economical, especially when compared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway

Environmentally friendly. With little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation

Efficient, power consumption is dependent on load and when the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e.g. people riding down at the end of day), the power is harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable, system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe, statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable, spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortable, quiet and smooth. With available options like heated seats

Accessible, level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and

wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayr

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola, capacity up to 4,400 passengers per hour per direction (pphd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16.66 mph)

Asynchronous gondola, capacity up to 5,600 pphd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mph)

Among Doppelmayr's proudest associations is our partnership with the Olympic Games.

Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics. While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in particular we wish to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the Sochi Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant access to the alpine competition site. Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie high at the end of a canyon which is accessed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the viability of a 2nd Winter Olympics in our state.

Finally, and most importantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines. After an easy boarding process, the passengers will enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment. Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic windows. No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road. And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and implementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our canyons as well. Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtually eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along our canyon roads. That will be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads. In closing, we at Doppelmayr look forward to continued collaboration with CWC on this exciting project. We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavugn Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:
2

Comment B-1-5

@Doppelmayrg
Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Alternatives
Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation
To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report. The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation, technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines including engineering: technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics. Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group. With more than 3,000 employees worldwide, Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15,100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountains. Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable, in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months.

Economical, especially when compared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway.

Environmentally friendly. With little ground disturbance, only towers and stations.

require excavation

Efficient ,Ä power consumption is dependent on load and 'Mnen the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e_g people riding down at the end of day), the power IS harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable ,Ä system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe ,Ä statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable ,Ä spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortable ,Ä quiet and smooth 'Mth available options like heated seats

Accessible ,Ä level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayrg

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola ,Ä capacity up to 4 400 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16 66 mph)

as gondola ,Ä capacity up to 5,6W pphpd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mphb

Among Doppelmayr's proudest associations is our partnership 'Mth the Olympic Games.

Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in

particular we 'Msh to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the SV¶hi Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant ac.V¶ss

to the alpine competition sitee Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie high at the end of a canyon which is acV¶ssed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked

to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate

automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood

Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the viability of a 2nd W nter O ympics in our state

Finally, and most importantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines After an easy boarding prov¶ss, the passengers vill enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic 'Mnd0'v'u'8 No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and mplementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our

canyons as well Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtual y eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little our canyon roads. That 'Mll be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads
In closing, we at Doppelmayr look fopuard to continued cnllaborating With CWC on this exciting project We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavugn Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:
2

Comment B-1-6

@Doppelmayrg
Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Alternatives
Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation
To Whom It May Concern,
We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report
The team at Doppelmayr IS available and happy to provide documentation technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake Cit'" We employ more than 200 people lvqally in various disciplines including engineering: technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group 'Mth more than 3,000 employees worldwide To Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15, 100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are a gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the

transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountain Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable, in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months

Economical, especially when compared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway

Environmentally friendly with little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation

Efficient, power consumption is dependent on load and when the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e.g. people riding down at the end of day), the power is harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable, system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe, statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable, spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortable, quiet and smooth with available options like heated seats

Accessible, level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayr

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola, capacity up to 4 400 passengers per hour per direction (pphd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16.66 mph)

as gondola, capacity up to 5,600 pphd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mph)

Among Doppelmayr's proudest associations is our partnership with the Olympic Games.

Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics. While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in

particular we wish to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the Sochi Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant access

to the alpine competition site. Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie high at the end of a canyon which is accessed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked

to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate

automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the

viability of a 2nd Winter Olympics in our state

Finally, and most importantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from

a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines. After an easy boarding process, the passengers will enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment. Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic windows. No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road. And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and implementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our canyons as well. Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtually eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little our canyon roads. That will be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads. In closing, we at Doppelmayr look forward to continued collaboration with CWC on this exciting project. We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavawn Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:
2

Comment B-1-7

@Doppelmayrg
Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Alternatives
Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation
To Whom It May Concern,
We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report. The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation, technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines.

including engineering: technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group 'Mth more than 3,000 employees worldwide To Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15, 100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are a gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountain Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

Buildable ,Ä in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months

Economical ,Ä especially "hen cnmpared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway

Environmentally friendly 'Mth little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation

Efficient ,Ä power consumption is dependent on load and 'Mnen the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e_g people riding down at the end of day), the power IS harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid

Scalable ,Ä system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand

Safe ,Ä statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport

Reliable ,Ä spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms

Comfortab e ,Ä quiet and smooth 'Mth available options like heated seats

Accessible ,Ä level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayrg

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola ,Ä capacity up to 4 400 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16 66 mph)

as gondola ,Ä capacity up to 5,6W pphpd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mphb

Among Doppelmayr's proudest assvñiations is our partnership 'Mth the Olympic Games.

Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in particular we 'Msh to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the SVññhi

Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant ac.Vññss to the alpine competition sitee Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie

high at the end of a canyon which is accessed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the viability of a 2nd Winter Olympics in our state

Finally, and most importantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines. After an easy boarding process, the passengers will enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment. Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic windows. No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road. And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and implementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our canyons as well. Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtually eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little Cottonwood Canyon roads. That will be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads. In closing, we at Doppelmayr look forward to continued collaboration with CWC on this exciting project. We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavawn Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:
2

Comment B-1-8

@Doppelmayrg
Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Alternatives
Public Comment in support of Aerial Ropeway Transportation
To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing in support of the aerial gondola transportation systems as outlined in the Central Wasatch Commission Mountain Transportation System Draft Alternatives Report. The team at Doppelmayr is available and happy to provide documentation, technical details, and data to support CWC and the pursuit to provide the best transportation solutions in our Wasatch mountains.

Doppelmayr is the leader in aerial transport technology and our USA subsidiary is located here in Salt Lake City. We employ more than 200 people locally in various disciplines including engineering, technical support, fabrication, construction, and logistics. Our SLC team is an integral part of the Doppelmayr / Garaventa group. With more than 3,000 employees worldwide, Doppelmayr / Garaventa has built more than 15,100 installations for customers in 96 countries. We are committed to providing the best transport solutions now and for the future and would gladly share reference data from our extensive portfolio of projects.

Not only are gondola transit systems realistic, they offer the best possible solutions for the transportation challenges within the Wasatch mountains. Aerial ropeway systems were originally designed to operate within harsh mountain environments. A gondola system is:

- Buildable, in a short period of time, most projects are executed in less than 24 months
- Economical, especially when compared to widening roads, building snow sheds, or installing railway
- Environmentally friendly, with little ground disturbance, only towers and stations require excavation
- Efficient, power consumption is dependent on load and when the downhill load exceeds the uphill load (e.g. people riding down at the end of day), the power is harnessed and regenerated back to the utility grid
- Scalable, system capacity can be quickly adjusted to meet current demand
- Safe, statistically proven to be safer than car, bus, or train transport
- Reliable, spans avalanche paths and can operate during storms
- Comfortable, quiet and smooth, with available options like heated seats
- Accessible, level walk in cabin floor allows for easy boarding even for strollers and wheelchairs

Page:

@Doppelmayr

Central Wasatch Commission

Mountain Transportation System Alternatives

Key figures associated with our latest gondola technologies:

Monocable gondola, Â capacity up to 4 400 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) with maximum speed 7 m/s (16 66 mph)
as gondola, Â capacity up to 5,6W pphpd with maximum speed 8.5 m/s (19 mphb
Among Doppelmayr's proudest associations is our partnership with the Olympic Games. Utah's future is bright with the possibility of hosting another Winter Olympics While we have provided many aerial systems for the Olympic Games (chairlifts, gondolas, etc), in particular we wish to point out a unique 3S gondola system which was installed for the Sochi Olympics. The organizers faced a challenge in the requirement for providing constant access to the alpine competition site Much like Little Cottonwood Canyon, the venues in Sochi lie high at the end of a canyon which is accessed by one two-lane road. The organizers looked to Doppelmayr to provide a second means of access. The 3S system was selected to solve this complex issue: the system was designed to move people and even to evacuate automobiles in case of a catastrophic road closure. A similar gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon would complement the transit requirements for Utah's bid and further strengthen the viability of a 2nd Winter Olympics in our state

Finally, and most importantly, the public citizens and passengers stand to benefit most from a gondola solution. When it comes to passenger experience: neither buses, trains, nor automobiles can compare with that of a modern gondola. Continuous cabin movement eliminates the frustrations associated with conventional mass transit waiting lines After an easy boarding process, the passengers will enjoy a spacious and comfortable gondola cabin with dedicated racks for their sports equipment Then comes the smooth flight through the canyon, taking in the breathtaking views through floor to ceiling panoramic windows No rocking side to side or experiencing the uncomfortable lateral g-forces associated with a winding canyon road And lastly a gondola can be more than just a people mover. With the proper planning and implementation, it could reduce the volume of transport trucks in our canyons as well Freight deliveries and trash hauling can be accomplished with dedicated freight and trash gondola carriers. Well-conceived distribution centers at the gondola stations could virtually eliminate delivery and trash trucks traveling along Little Cottonwood Canyon roads. That will be an advantage for our environment and for all users within the canyons, including those who might be traveling to one of the trailheads
In closing, we at Doppelmayr look forward to continued collaboration With CWC on this exciting project We remain available and ready to support.

Sincerely,
Katharina Schmitz
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
President
Shavoun Marquardt
Doppelmayr USA, Inc.
Vice President - Sales
Page:

B-2: CW Management,

Comment B-2-1

Dear Central Wasatch Commission,

Please accept the attached comments from our firm as detailed and explained in the attached documents. There are three documents.

Document Number One: Please incorporate our submittal as originally delivered to the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) as it relates to a request to amend their Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) Alternative #3 of the proposed options for transportation solutions for Little Cottonwood Road.

Document Number Two: This is an update and a summary of what we feel needs to happen as a modification to our submittal mentioned above for Little Cottonwood Canyon.

Document Number three: Is a longer version of Document Number two detailing some recommendations and ideas for LCC/Highway 210 after reading and analyzing all 6521 comments submitted to UDOT as part of the EIS LCC process.

Lastly, thank you for all the hard work you are doing on this very important topic of Canyons planning. Our comments are primarily made as it relates to the Little Cottonwood Canyon issues and we acknowledge that the CWC is providing a larger regional planning effort and we applaud your actions.

Sincerely,

CW Management Corporation
Chris McCandless, President