To: Central Wasatch Commission Transportation Committee

Chair, Mayor Mike Peterson

Mayor Andy Beerman

Mayor Dan Knopp

From: Central Wasatch Commission Staff

Date: May 1st. 2020

Subject: Staff report on prioritization process of attributes and objectives with recommendations

During the April 6th Central Wasatch Commission board meeting, Commission members unanimously approved the Mountain Transportation System Public Comment & Recommendations Report. This report included recommendations on geographic scope, attributes, and objectives of a Mountain Transportation System for the Central Wasatch Mountains and the region. Commission members requested that the approved attributes and objectives go through a prioritization process. This memo outlines the prioritization process, data results, and recommendations.

An initial survey was created and sent to the Stakeholders Council asking each participant to assign a value of 1-7 for each attributes and objectives: 1 being not at all important, and 7 being most important. The goal of this exercise was to quantify the level of importance for each attribute and objective. Each attribute and objective had an average score value and was ranked accordingly with that value. Approximately 21 members from the Stakeholders Council participated in the survey. Results were shared and discussed at the Stakeholders Council meeting during the April Stakeholders Council meeting.

A second survey was created specifically for the CWC Transportation Committee and committee participants. This survey requested participants to identify their top four attributes and objectives. This survey was different from the Stakeholders Council value exercise as participants had to eliminate some of the attributes and objectives in order to identify their top four attributes and objectives. Approximately 10 people participated in this exercise.

Results from each survey were compiled, compared, and analyzed. The graphs below show the combined results from the CWC Transportation Committee survey and the Stakeholders Council survey, one each for attributes and objectives. The first column indicates the attributes and objectives. The next column shows how many times that attribute, or objective was identified as one of the four most important attributes and objectives in the CWC Transportation Committee. The third column shows the average value from the Stakeholders Council survey. At the bottom of each column, the average response for each of the surveys is displayed.

The following graph represents the results for **attributes** from both the Stakeholders Council survey and CWC Transportation Committee and are ordered from highest to lowest according to the number of times it was identified as a top 4 priority:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTES** | **Number of times marked as top 4 priority (Trans Comm)** | **Average score in SHC survey (1-7)** |
| Ability of moving people efficiently to desired destinations | 8 | 5.94 |
| Effect on the quality of recreational opportunities are protected | 5 | 5.72 |
| Safety | 4 | 6.22 |
| Reliability during all mountain conditions | 4 | 6 |
| Convenient | 3 | 6.39 |
| Year-round access | 3 | 5.83 |
| Economical/Cost effective | 3 | 5.56 |
| Equitable access | 3 | 5.33 |
| Adequate frequency | 2 | 6.44 |
| Reduces air pollution | 2 | 5.83 |
| Sensitivity to ridgelines | 2 | 5.39 |
| Affordable/free transit | 1 | 5.22 |
|  | 3.333333333 | 5.8225 |

The following graph represents the results for **objectives** from both the Stakeholders Council survey and CWC Transportation Committee and are ordered from highest to lowest according to the number of times it was identified as a top 4 priority:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVES** | **Number of times marked as a top 4 priority (Trans Comm)** | **Average score in SHC survey (1-7)** |
| Reduce traffic congestion | 9 | 6 |
| Increase use and incentivize mass transit | 7 | 6.33 |
| Protection of watershed/wilderness/visual quality | 6 | 6.39 |
| Emergency egress | 4 | 5 |
| Disincentivize vehicles | 4 | 5.61 |
| Evaluate mix of private and public funding to fund a potential Mountain Transportation System | 3 | 5.17 |
| Provide better ski resort connections | 3 | 4.61 |
| Improve trail heads and ensure year-round access | 2 | 5.34 |
| Evaluate carrying capacity/visitor management | 2 | 5.44 |
|  | 4.444444444 | 5.543333333 |

Based off results from each of the surveys, a tiered format may be the best approach when prioritizing the attributes and objectives. The list below represents the various tiers of attributes and objectives. Tiers are based off the scores from the surveys for each attributes and objectives and how those scores compared to the average score. Tier 1 attributes and objectives had both scores (Stakeholders Council and Transportation Committee) higher than the overall average. Tier 2 attributes and objectives only one of the scores exceeded the overall average score. Scores for both Tier 3 and 4 attributes and objectives fell below the overall average.

The following graph shows a recommended tiered approach to prioritizing the **attributes** of a Mountain Transportation System:



The following graph shows a recommended tiered approach to prioritizing the **objectives** of a Mountain Transportation System:



The full Commission will discuss and seek consensus on the prioritization of Attributes and Objectives at their meeting on May 4, 2020.