**Addressing Conflicting Provisions in Scoping Report**

**Regarding Connecting Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon**

In Executive Summary, the Report states that the Staff recommends a system that connects Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. (P. 2) This conflicts with the map that shows a “potential new transit connection” between Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. (P. 5 and P. 23)

In the full report, the summary of public comment on the geographic scope reflected that the public clearly wanted to address the connections with a regional transportation system and the geographic scope that included the Salt Lake Valley, Cottonwood Canyons, and Wasatch Back – highest number of comments.

Comments on the Objectives and Attributes of a Mountain Transportation System also relate to the topic of connecting Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon. There was a clear desire to have a transit solution and not a vehicular solution to transportation issues in the Central Wasatch Mountains.

The Staff Recommendation stated that a Mountain Transportation System “connect” Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon and further investigate the connection from the Cottonwood Canyons to the Wasatch Back. (P. 22) The Staff recommendation also included the statement that the Scope “analyze” the connections between the Cottonwood Canyons and Wasatch Back. (P. 24) The map in the Staff recommendations states that these connections are “potential.” (P. 23) And, the Staff recommendation said that those connections be evaluated against the Objectives and Attributes of a successful Mountain Transportation System.

Upon receiving questions and concerns about this provision, the Central Wasatch Commission staff recommends that the language be clarified to state consistently that the Geographic Scope analyze the connections without stating definitively stating that a connection between Little Cottonwood Canyon and Big Cottonwood Canyon be accomplished.