



**Central Wasatch Commission
Mountain Transportation System Summit
Facilitator's Report**

December 2, 2020

BACKGROUND

The Central Wasatch Commission (CWC) is an interlocal government agency formed in 2017, with an intention to carry out the tasks outlined in the Mountain Accord charter.

One of the four areas of focus within the Mountain Accord charter involves transportation. As a result, CWC is responsible for proposing and reaching consensus toward a viable Mountain Transportation System (MTS) in the Central Wasatch Mountain region. CWC leads this collaborative process, involving jurisdictions, stakeholders and the public throughout this effort.

Note: While transportation is the focus of this particular initiative, it's helpful to be aware of the link between transportation and other CWC charges, which include land protections (federal legislation and the Central Wasatch National Conservation and Recreation Area Act -- both in process) as well as environmental protections (Environmental Dashboard underway).

Leading up to the MTS Summit in November, CWC has demonstrated, at direction from the board of commissioners, a dedicated focus on transportation throughout 2020, having accomplished the following:

- Initial Scoping Process and Public Comment (early 2020)
- MTS Draft Alternatives and Public Comment (Fall 2020)
- MTS Expert Panel (September 2020)

This report, as requested in the request for proposal, focuses on the MTS Summit, and the learning that took place leading up to that event. The Summit held on November 13th and 14th, 2020, was designed to deepen the dialogue between CWC Commissioners, Stakeholders and members of the public.

Ultimately, the learnings from all stages of this iterative process will inform the CWC board as they meet in December and January, to face the task of forming recommendations for next steps toward a Mountain Transportation System.

OVERVIEW OF PROCESS

The facilitation process for the MTS Summit involved two distinct phases:

1. The first phase involved preparatory research that included interviews with CWC Commissioners and Stakeholders.
2. The second phase encompassed the Summit itself, which took place over two days.

Each phase is described in detail below, outlining the process, objectives and learnings from each.

PHASE ONE: INTERVIEWS AMONG STAKEHOLDERS AND CWC COMMISSIONERS

In preparation for the Summit, I conducted a series of interviews among CWC Commissioners and Stakeholders.

Interview Objectives

The purpose of the interviews was two-fold:

- To understand the history, opinions, concerns, and desires among the Stakeholders and Commissioners.
- To help shape the design and content of the Summit, in order to support the learning and decision-making process ahead.

Interview Methodology

Interviews were conducted via Zoom between September 25th - Nov 11th, 2020 among the following:

- CWC Commissioners:
 - Chair: Councilor Chris Robinson, Summit County
 - Mike Reberg, Associate Deputy Mayor representing Co-Chair: Mayor Jenny Wilson, Salt Lake County
 - Mayor Mike Peterson, Cottonwood Heights
 - Mayor Erin Mendenhall, Salt Lake City
 - Councilor Jim Bradley and Senior Policy Advisor Bobby Sampson, Salt Lake County
 - Mayor Andy Beerman, Park City
 - Mayor Dan Knopp, Town of Brighton
 - Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Millcreek City
 - Mayor Harris Sondak, Alta Town
 - Councilor Marci Houseman, Sandy City
 - Ex-Officio Member: Carlton Christensen, Chair of the UTA Board of Trustees
- 34 individual Stakeholders, representing the following groups/organizations:
 - Watershed Managers (Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities, Sandy City Public Utilities, Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy)
 - Wasatch Back (Summit County, Recycle Utah)
 - Forest Service
 - Conservations Groups (Save Our Canyons, Wasatch Backcountry Alliance, Wasatch Mountain Club, Sierra Club, Friends of Alta)
 - Recreation Groups (Trails Utah, Salt Lake Climbers Alliance, Salt Lake Valley Trails Society)
 - Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, University of Utah
 - Private Property Owners (Big Cottonwood Community Council, Granite Community Council, Cardiff Canyon Owners Association)

- Ski Resorts (Brighton, Solitude, Snowbird, Alta, Park City Mountain, Ski Utah)
- Utah Transit Authority
- Stadler Rail
- CW Management Corporation

Interview Learnings

1. Findings from Commissioner Interviews

Commissioners expressed strong interest in maintaining neutrality and curiosity throughout the Summit process. There was a unanimous desire for the Summit to be facilitated with an approach that would be inclusive, thorough, while allowing each mode to be reviewed fairly.

Many Commissioners articulated a desire to approach transportation in conjunction with federal legislation, and with attention to protecting the environment and watershed.

Few Commissioners stated any preference when it came to the high capacity transportation modes (bus/rail/aerial). Rather, they stressed the importance of a neutral information-gathering process.

To that end, Commissioners requested the following priorities be considered in the planning of the MTS Summit:

- Inclusion (year-round, dispersed users as well as skiers, providing access to all community members)
- Unbiased, thorough analysis of all transportation elements (including “no action”)
- Consideration of environmental/watershed concerns and visitor management
- Shared understanding of the need for emergency egress

2. Findings from Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholders expressed a shared acknowledgement of increased congestion in the canyons that is taking place year-round.

Many articulated a desire for transportation challenges to be addressed in conjunction with visitor use management and environmental concerns. A number of Stakeholders expressed a longing for a visitor use study (and some mentioned the need to incorporate climate change predictions within the study). Some felt the study should take place before decisions are made surrounding high capacity/investment transit options.

Stakeholders are longing for transportation solutions that:

- Lead to fewer cars
- Serve all residents, dispersed users, year-round
- Take into account who will pay vs. who will benefit

Opinions surrounding specific MTS elements included the following:

- Widespread support for expanded bus service (along with mass transit connections). At the same time, there are some watershed concerns related to significant bus expansion
- Support for tolling to disincentivize cars (although some concern over social justice implications of tolling)
- Mixed opinions about snow sheds. Some question the cost and visual impact in relation to the frequency of need; some watershed concerns related to fire suppression chemicals
- Regarding other alternatives: mixed opinions (including some who express no preference, some who reject all options)
 - Rail:
 - Upside: multiple stops (supporting dispersed users)
 - Downsides: large footprint, high cost, need for snow removal, questions about base area, concerns about impact of significant increase in visitors
 - Aerial:
 - Upsides: smaller footprint, less environmental impact, bypasses avalanche risk
 - Downsides: only serves ski resorts (vs. dispersed users), high cost, questions about base area, concerns about impact of significant increase in visitors
- Regarding possible connections between canyons (aerial, tunnel):
 - Aerial: appeal for resort skiers (on-trend with multi-resort passes), concerns about cost, impact on viewshed and protection of backcountry ski areas
 - Tunnel: environmental, cost concerns

Lastly, Stakeholders expressed appreciation for CWC's regional approach to transportation.

PHASE TWO: MOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM SUMMIT

MTS Summit Objectives

The objectives of the Mountain Transportation System Summit were as follows:

- To review CWC's MTS Draft Alternatives and updates, in context of overall CWC goals, including learnings from the "Build Your Own MTS" online tool, public comment, and the October Stakeholders Council meeting
- To conduct dialogue among Stakeholders, members of the public, CWC Commissioners and staff in order to:
 - Fully understand all elements of the Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies
 - Address questions
 - Gather feedback
 - Reach consensus where possible
 - Identify framework for further consensus-building by CWC Board

Ultimately, the learnings from the Summit will aim to support the CWC Board in identifying next steps toward creating a Mountain Transportation System for the Central Wasatch Mountain region.

MTS Summit Approach

The two-day Summit took place on the following dates:

- Friday, November 13th, 2020 from 12pm - 5pm
- Saturday, November 14th from 8am - 1pm

The Summit took place over Zoom, with between 95 and 110 participants in attendance (plus 69 viewers on Facebook), including:

- CWC staff
- CWC Commissioners
- Stakeholders
- Members of the public

The Summit agenda included the following:

- Opening remarks by CWC Chair, Chris Robinson and Transportation Committee Chair, Mayor Dan Knopp
- Review of Summit objectives, logistics and ground rules
- Presentations including:
 - Ralph Becker, CWC Executive Director, presenting CWC updates:
 - From Mountain Accord to today - primary elements of Agreement

- Primary CWC initiatives
 - Where CWC goes from here
 - Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director, presenting MTS Process updates:
 - Why did CWC start the MTS process?
 - Process to date
 - Objectives and attributes
 - Overview of Draft Alternatives
 - Learnings from “Build Your Own MTS” online tool, public comment, and October Stakeholders Council meeting
 - Laura Briefer, Director, Salt Lake City Dept of Public Utilities:
 - Relating Watershed Protection Objectives to Transportation Objectives
- Group discussion of Summit “problem statement” and decision-making criteria
 - Our problem statement: In what ways might we explore regional, year-round transportation solutions that minimize congestions and improve safety, while addressing environmental concerns, and incorporating input from all of you here at the Summit?
 - Our decision-making criteria (that included input from participants):
 - Minimizes congestion in the adjacent neighborhoods and in the canyons
 - Provides emergency egress
 - Addresses the needs of resort visitors and year-round dispersed recreation users
 - Takes into account the needs of canyon residents, property owners, employees and businesses
 - Protects the environment, wilderness and watershed
 - Preserves the quality of the user experience and feel of a natural setting
 - Minimizes congestion as one recreates and utilizes the canyons
 - Includes the viewpoints of Summit participants
- Detailed discussion of Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies
 - Blake Perez, CWC Deputy Director presenting and incorporating additional learnings and questions
 - For each element, facilitated discussion that included:
 - Clarifying questions
 - Reactions
 - Polling (assessing favor, opposition, need for additional information and in some cases, preferences between options)
- Closing that included review of learnings throughout the two days.

MTS Summit Learnings

The primary focus of the Summit involved a methodical discussion of each of the Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies for each of the main corridors.

For each element, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez presented key information, including:

- What objective/attribute does the element meet?
- Key details of the plan
- Cost/funding
- Established pros/cons (gathered from public comment and facilitator interviews)
- Any additional commentary by experts/affiliates

Below you will find key learnings (poll results, pros and cons) for each of the transportation elements under consideration, and organized by corridor.

Notes about polling: Stakeholders and members of the public were invited to participate in polls. Commissioners and individuals representing companies (e.g. rail, aerial) were asked to refrain from participating in polling. It should be noted that the data from polling should not be considered statistically significant, and represents the views of Summit participants only (and not the public at large).

1. Salt Lake Valley Connections

Regarding Salt Lake Valley Connections, several elements were discussed -- each presented below in order of degree of favor, and outlined with pros, cons and any outstanding concerns/questions:

- Salt Lake Valley Connections: Enhanced Current Transit System
 - 78% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Cost effective; builds off the regional transit system; flexibility of service to multiple destinations; aligns with current UTA short-term plans; reduces need for mobility hubs near canyons
 - Cons: Less convenient (at least one transfer required); funding for increased bus service (operation and capital); additional roadway improvements
- Salt Lake Valley Connections: Regional Transit Hubs
 - 56% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Augments for reduced parking in canyons; regional and convenient transit connections; multimodal connections
 - Cons: High capital investment; quality of economic benefit (consider mix use, does it have year-round utility?); induces car demand/large hubs do not function to disincentive auto use; will other roads fail?

- Outstanding concerns/questions: Consider multiple, smaller mobility hubs/dispersed parking with transfers taking place regionally (vs. bottle-necking at the base of the canyons)
- Salt Lake Valley Connections: High Capacity Transit Along 9400 South
 - 53% of Summit participants “In Favor”
 - Pros: High-capacity regional connections (access to dispersed parking); ability to meet current and future demand; reduces traffic congestion
 - Cons: High capital investment (who pays and who benefits?); potential for road widening with impacts to accommodate improvements; potential mode transfer
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Depreciating asset? (in light of climate change)
- Salt Lake Valley Connections: Year-Round Bus Service from Various Economic Hubs
 - 51% of Summit participants “In Favor”
 - Pros: Convenient; reduces car travel to canyons; reduces need for mobility hubs near mouths of canyons
 - Cons: Economical/cost efficiency; high cost for potentially low impact; reduces congestion; low ridership; finding new funding for UTA; ability to meet current and future demand; buses getting stuck in roadway conditions
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: What are the barriers to running canyon-compatible express buses from more hubs, farther from the mouths of the canyon? Does the bus option align with ski sentiment?
- Salt Lake Valley Connections: No Action
 - 59% of Summit participants “Opposed”
 - Pros: No major capital projects
 - Cons: Continued growing traffic congestion; increased vehicle access

2. [Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-80](#)

Regarding transportation between the Wasatch Front and the Wasatch Back via I-80, the one element under consideration was:

- Improve frequency of the SLC-PC Connect
 - 66% of Summit participants “In Favor”
 - Pros: Improves convenience; improves ski resort connections; improves regional connectivity; serves multiple users
 - Con: Funding
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Who pays for capital and operational costs? Would buses stop at hotels? Transfer point around Wasatch foothill?

3. Big Cottonwood Canyon

Regarding Big Cottonwood Canyon, a range of elements were discussed -- each presented below in order of degree of favor, and outlined with pros, cons and any outstanding concerns/questions:

- Big Cottonwood Canyon: Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
 - 78% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Safety
 - Cons: N/A
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Bike lanes in both directions? Scheduled pedestrian days/hours? Reducing speed limit to help cyclists/pedestrians? Placing parking on the same side as attraction?
- Big Cottonwood Canyon: Year-Round Local Bus
 - 77% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Year-round; serves dispersed recreation users and service to trailheads; reduces traffic congestion and on-road parking
 - Cons: Adequate frequency and capacity to keep up with growing demand; cost of financing new transit service; any additional roadway improvements to accommodate transit in canyons; possible resource damage if capacity/visitation is unmanaged
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Will there be stops and pick up on-demand to accommodate Creekside users? On-demand microtransit should be considered
- Big Cottonwood Canyon: Seasonal Express Buses to Resorts
 - 74% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Reduces congestion; increases transit use; convenience
 - Cons: Year-round access; economical/cost effective; consider O&M and lifecycle costs; funding source unknown; question about need for dedicated bus/transit lane to be effective; capacity to handle short and long-term
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Longing to first identify the capacity in the canyon before planning transportation; questions about passing lanes; bus priority between Silver Fork and the top
- Big Cottonwood Canyon: Variable Tolling
 - 72% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Disincentivizes vehicles; incentivizes transit use; potential new revenue source; reduces traffic congestion and car use; therefore improves air quality
 - Cons: Equitable access; cost and maintenance of setting up system; possible need for policy changes to accommodate need for wider range of uses of toll revenues

- Outstanding concerns/questions: Is this a fee-based toll or an occupancy-based toll? Can we toll the user type? Carpooling and pick-up lanes? Toll resort users and not dispersed users?
- Big Cottonwood Canyon: Reduced On-Road Parking
 - 67% of Summit participants “In Favor”
 - Pros: Disincentivizes vehicles; improves safety; protects water quality; gives road shoulders behind the fog line back cyclists and runners
 - Cons: Equitable access; provides better ski resort connections; tied to other transit improvements (?)
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Is it possible to enforce? What will fill the breach? Signage at the canyon mouth could announce the available parking in real-time (if a driver sees that a lot is full then they won't drive to that lot)
- Big Cottonwood Canyon: Paid Parking at Resorts
 - 67% of Summit participants “In Favor”
 - Pros: Disincentivizes vehicles; reduces congestion; new revenue to offset transit costs; encourages carpooling
 - Cons: Additional cost to user; affordable equitable fare structure
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Questions about how the revenue generated will be spent, and who controls the use of these funds. Could there be a special district set up to ensure that monies benefit the canyon? Would resorts be asked to contribute parking revenue to improvements in the canyon? Exceptions for hunters?
- Big Cottonwood Canyon: No Action
 - 4% of Summit participants “In Favor”
 - Pros: No major construction impacts on watershed; avoids the risk of doing something that will be antiquated; crowding is a deterrent
 - Cons: Continued and growing traffic congestion impacts; limited mobility; no year-round transit service; road shoulder impacts to stream and vegetation

5. Little Cottonwood Canyon

Regarding Little Cottonwood Canyon, a range of elements were discussed -- presented below in two sections: Non High-Capacity Elements and High-Capacity Elements.

Little Cottonwood Canyon -- Non High-Capacity Elements

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Bicycle and pedestrian improvements
 - 82% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Safety
 - Cons: N/A
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Bike lanes in both directions? Schedule pedestrian days/hours? Reducing speed limit to help cyclists/pedestrians? Put parking on the same side as attraction? Could we extend the Quarry Trail up LCC and pave it to get cyclists off the highway? Dedicated bike lanes would protect against auto-bike accidents since the road is narrow, especially during early/late hours when bikes are less visible with glare

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Year-Round Local Bus
 - 80% of Summit participants "In Favor"
 - Pros: Year-round access; moves people efficiently to desired locations; increases transit use; serves dispersed recreation users and service to trailheads; reduces traffic congestion and on-road parking
 - Cons: High lifecycle costs; labor; ability to meet growing demand

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Variable Tolling
 - (No polling conducted for BCC. However, 72% of Summit participants "In Favor" of "Variable Tolling" for LCC).
 - Pros: Disincentivizes vehicles; incentivizes transit use; potential new revenue source; reduces traffic congestion and car use; improves air quality
 - Cons: Equitable access; cost and maintenance of setting up system; possible need for policy changes to accommodate need for wider range of uses of toll revenues
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Is this a fee-based toll or an occupancy-based toll? Can we toll the user type? Carpooling and pick-up lanes? Toll resort users and not dispersed users? Where does the tolling begin? (upper vs. lower)

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Reduced On-Road Parking
 - (No polling conducted for BCC. However, 67% of Summit participants “In Favor” of “Reduced On-Road Parking” for LCC).
 - Pros: Disincentivizes vehicles; improves safety; protects water quality; minimizes expanded shoulder lanes for parking, runoff
 - Cons: Equitable access; provides better ski resort connections
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Is it possible to enforce? What will fill the breach? Signage at the canyon mouth could announce the available parking in real-time (if a driver sees that a lot is full then they won't drive to that lot)

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Paid Parking at Resorts
 - (No polling conducted for BCC. However, 67% of Summit participants “In Favor” of “Paid Parking at Resorts” for LCC).
 - Pros: Disincentivizes vehicles; reduces congestion; new revenue to offset transit costs; encourages carpooling
 - Cons: Additional cost to user; affordable equitable fare structure
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Questions about how the revenue generated will be spent, and who controls the use of these funds. Could there be a special district set up to ensure that monies benefit the canyon? Would resorts be asked to contribute parking revenue to improvements in the canyon? Exceptions for hunters?

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: Snow Sheds
 - 35% of Summit participants “In Favor” and 44% “Oppose”
 - Pros: Reduces congestion; improves safety and emergency egress; provides better ski resort connections; improves reliability
 - Cons: Economical/cost effective; major investment for a relative benefit (¼ of crashes are related to snow); impacts to watershed; does not disincentivize vehicles; impacts on bike lane; visual impact
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: Would snow sheds reduce the cost of current avalanche control measures? How do we value reliability? For those of us who can't make it without stopping, would pull-outs be included?

- Little Cottonwood Canyon: No action
 - (No polling conducted for BCC. However, 4% of Summit participants “In Favor” of “No Action” for LCC).
 - Pros: No major construction impacts on watershed
 - Cons: Continued growing traffic congestion impacts; on-road safety conflicts; no year-round transit service

Little Cottonwood Canyon -- High-Capacity Alternatives

This section of this report focuses on three different high-capacity alternatives for Little Cottonwood Canyon: Enhanced Bus, Aerial, and Rail. After discussions of each alternative, we polled Summit participants for preferences among the range (including No Action). Poll results were as follows, indicating strongest preference for Enhanced Bus.

- Prefer Enhanced Bus: 47%
- Prefer Aerial: 25%
- Prefer Rail: 18%
- Prefer No Action: 10%

Each alternative (and some sub-alternatives) are discussed in detail below.

A. Enhanced Bus With and Without Road Widening

When presented with two options related to Enhanced Bus, polling results revealed a preference for Enhanced Bus Without Road Widening:

- Prefer Enhanced Bus Without Road Widening: 56%
- Prefer Enhanced Bus With Road Widening: 21%
- Need More Information: 16%
- Prefer No Action: 7%

The two Enhanced Bus options are discussed in detail below:

- Enhanced Bus Without Road Widening:
 - Pros: Reduces congestion; increases transit use; protects watershed, wilderness and visual quality; improves ski resorts connections
 - Cons: Year-round access; ability to meet future demand; limitation is that canyon is still shut down by one bad driver/accident
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: How do we incentivize out-of-state visitors with rental cars to use the bus? Is there a commitment to exploring electric buses?
- Enhanced Bus with Roadway Widening
 - Pros: Improved convenience; improved reliability; incentivizes transit; reduces congestion
 - Cons: Roadway widening presents risk of negative impacts on watershed; costs (O&M, lifecycle)

B. Rail: On-Road, At-Grade UDOT vs. Existing Right of Way

When presented with two options related to Rail, polling results revealed mixed opinions about both options:

- Rail: On-Road, At-Grade UDOT: 22% "In Favor" vs. 41% "Opposed" vs. 33% "Need More Information"
- Rail: Existing Rail Right of Way: 27% "In Favor" vs. 40% "Opposed" vs. 29% "Need More Information"

During this exploration of Rail, we asked a third question assessing participants' interest in conducting further research into Rail:

- 62% were "In Favor" of conducting further research into Rail in LCC
- 31% were "Opposed" to conducting further research into Rail in LCC

The Rail option is discussed in further detail below:

- Rail
 - Pros: Reduces traffic congestion; increases transit use; improves emergency egress/ingress; connection to regional transit system; safety and reliability; sensitivity to ridgelines; accommodates future demand; life cycle costs; moves people efficiently to desired locations
 - Cons: High capital cost; exposed to roadway conditions (snow, avalanche); disruption to dispersed use, parking areas, elimination of climbing assets; impacts to stream/water source during construction (post construction mitigation, existing rail ROW is adjacent to Little Cottonwood stream); noise; displaces dispersed recreation, large footprint; huge investment if snow is gone with climate change
 - Outstanding concerns/questions:
 - What would be the fare per person, and is there a way to factor equitable access?
 - How would construction at the mouth of the canyon impact Quarry Park area?
 - If current trails were chosen, what impacts would rail have on LCC creek and water quality?
 - Can the train make the curves?
 - Pros and cons will depend on the route.
 - Whistle stop locations would add to costs (not currently specified)
 - Is there a budget that defines the costs to make the train capacity reach 3,000 passengers per hour?
 - Can we expect a similar escalation of costs with Rail?

- Longing for elaboration on the disparity in rail costs between UDOT's EIS and Stadler?
- What is the opinion of the Granite Community Council on the cog rail option?
- If cars and buses are using SR 210 and the Rail is located in old railroad grade, won't snow sheds still be needed?
- Longing to assess the risk a railway poses for potential wildfire
- Can the train cars have "sunroofs?"

C. Aerial: UDOT Alternative vs. La Caille Station Option

When presented with two options related to Aerial, polling results revealed mixed opinions about both options:

- Aerial: UDOT Alternative: 18% "In Favor" vs. 53% "Opposed" vs. 25% "Need More Information"
- Aerial: La Caille Station Option: 30% "In Favor" vs. 46% "Opposed" vs. 21% "Need More Information"

During this exploration of Aerial, we asked a third question assessing participants' interest in conducting further research into Aerial:

- 50% were "In Favor" of conducting further research into Aerial in LCC
- 41% were "Opposed" to conducting further research into Aerial in LCC

The Aerial option is discussed in further detail below:

- Aerial:
 - Pros: Reduces traffic congestion; increases transit use; improves emergency egress/ingress; safe and reliable during mountain conditions; reduces air pollution; ability to move high amounts of people; low O&M, lifecycle costs; small footprint
 - Cons: More transfers = less convenient; impacts to viewshed and view quality; seasonal service; limited by bus ability to deliver passengers; bus operations challenges (headways, seasonal labor, facilities)
- Aerial: La Caille Station Option:
 - Pros: Can move more people per hour than EIS alternative; reduces more cars in LCC; land preservation and easements in upper LCC
 - Cons: Parking structure at La Caille base station could potentially have negative impacts on traffic along Wasatch Boulevard; impacts to viewshed

6. Cottonwood Canyon Connection

Regarding possible connections between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon, the following options were discussed -- each presented below in order of preference, and outlined with pros, cons and any outstanding concerns/questions:

- Cottonwood Canyon Connections: No Action
 - Preferred by 50% of Summit participants
 - Pros: No impact on wetlands; no impacts to dispersed recreation
 - Cons: No emergency egress when Guardsmans Pass is closed

- Cottonwood Canyon Connections: Aerial (Brighton to Alta Gondola)
 - Preferred by 23% of Summit participants
 - Pros: Improves emergency egress/ingress; improves connections between resorts
 - Cons: High capital costs; potential impacts on sensitive ecosystem, watershed and hydrology; negative impacts on viewshed; impacts on recreators
 - Outstanding concerns/questions: What is user demand? How important is this to resorts in both canyons, and are the resorts interested in a public/private partnership with shared costs? What importance do we attach to safety?

- Cottonwood Canyon Connections: Transit Tunnel (Rail or Bus)
 - Preferred by 14% of Summit participants
 - Pros: Improve emergency egress/ingress; improves connections between resorts; (buses would disincentivize vehicles)
 - Cons: High capital costs; potential impacts on ecosystem, watershed and hydrology, legacy mining

- Note: 14% of Summit participants did not express a preference between the three options, but rather answered "Need More Information."

8. Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City Connection

Regarding possible connection between Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City, two options were discussed -- each presented below in order of preference, and outlined with pros, cons and any outstanding concerns/questions:

- Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City Connection: No Action
 - Preferred by 47% of Summit participants
 - Pros: No impact on dispersed recreation
 - Cons: No emergency egress/ingress; continued increase of vehicle traffic between Wasatch Front and Wasatch Back

- Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City Connection: Aerial
 - Preferred by 36% of Summit participants
 - Pros: Provides emergency egress/ingress; reduces congestion; improves connections between resorts
 - Cons: High capital costs; potential impacts on sensitive ecosystem, visual impacts and ridgelines; potential negative impacts on watershed and hydrology; impacts on dispersed recreation users

- Note: 16% of Summit participants did not express a preference between the two options, but rather answered "Need More Information." Moreover, an additional 2% gave "No Answer."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- I believe we successfully accomplished the objectives set out for this Summit through inclusive and thorough dialogue over the course of the two-day event. We were able to discuss the full range of Draft Alternatives and Demand Management Strategies and gather significant input and feedback.
- We received directional feedback in these areas:
 - Strong support for the following:
 - Enhanced Current Transit System within Salt Lake Valley Connections
 - Improved Frequency of the Salt Lake City-Park City Connect
 - In Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons:
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
 - Year-Round Local Bus
 - Seasonal Express Buses to Resorts (BCC)
 - Variable Tolling
 - Reduced On-Road Parking
 - Paid Parking at Resorts
 - Moderate support for the following:
 - Regarding Salt Lake Valley Connections:
 - Regional Transit Hubs (Note: expressed interest in considering multiple, smaller mobility hubs/dispersed parking with transfers taking place regionally)
 - High Capacity Transit Along 9400 South
 - Year-Round Bus Service from Various Economic Hubs
 - Considerable reservations around the following:
 - Snow Sheds in Little Cottonwood Canyon
 - Connections between Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City
- With regard to the high capacity alternatives under consideration in Little Cottonwood Canyon, the learnings were less conclusive. Despite the lack of directional input, the dialogue that took place helped to clarify a number of fundamental, unanswered questions, including:
 - What is the visitor capacity in the canyons? Is there alignment among decision-makers to prioritize learnings from a Visitor Management Study to inform decisions about a high capacity mode? From a timing standpoint, is that even an option?

- Is it possible to establish a shared understanding of climate change predictions and how/when those will impact the ski industry? Is there shared willingness to factor this information into the decision-making process?
- Is there shared understanding about the relationship between transportation and federal legislation? Is there sufficient trust in place to take action on transportation next steps while federal legislation is unfolding within a different timeline? Is it possible to construct a set of agreements to pave the way for next steps to take place with a sense of trust?
- Is the priority to provide transportation to ski resorts only? Or is the priority to serve dispersed recreation users and choose a mode that makes multiple stops? Is it firmly determined that aerial cannot make stops outside of resorts? Can rail make stops? And if so, what are the timing/cost implications?
- There is a strong, shared goal of reducing cars in LCC. How do the various modes support this objective? Is it conceivable/desirable to eliminate cars entirely? And how would the different modes support this concept?
- Summit participants exhibited strongest favor for Enhanced Bus (47% compared to 25% for Aerial and 18% for Rail). Can enhanced buses really solve the demand challenges? What is the likelihood and are there cost/timing implications associated with going “electric” thereby avoiding environmental concerns associated with increased buses?

My recommendation would be to explore these questions as a starting point for further discussions around the high capacity modes for Little Cottonwood Canyon.

ADDENDUM: SUMMIT POLL RESULTS

The following grids capture results from Zoom polls conducted in relation to specific Draft Alternative Modes and Demand Management Strategies, captured by corridor.

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Need more information</u>	<u>No answer</u>
1. Salt Lake Valley Connections	Regional transit hubs	56%	14%	21%	9%
	High capacity transit along 9400 South	53%	14%	29%	5%
	Year-round bus service from various economic hubs	51%	20%	23%	7%
	Enhanced current transit system	78%	11%	5%	5%
	No action	15%	69%	11%	6%

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Need more information</u>	<u>No answer</u>
2. Wasatch Front/Wasatch Back via I-80	Improve frequency of the SLC-PC Connect	66%	6%	17%	11%

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Need more information</u>	<u>No answer</u>
3. Big Cottonwood Canyon	Seasonal express buses to resorts	74%	6%	14%	6%
	Bicycle and pedestrian improvements	78%	8%	12%	2%
	Variable tolling	72%	8%	18%	2%
	Year-round local bus	77%	6%	6%	11%
	Reduced on-road parking	67%	17%	13%	2%
	Paid parking at resorts	67%	13%	13%	7%
	No action	4%	76%	14%	6%

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Need more information</u>	<u>No answer</u>
4. Little Cottonwood Canyon	Snowsheds	35%	44%	17%	4%
	Bicycle and pedestrian improvements	82%	9%	7%	2%
	Rail: on-road, at-grade UDOT	22%	41%	33%	3%
	Rail: existing rail right of way	27%	40%	29%	4%
	Rail: opinion of further research	62%	31%	5%	2%
	Aerial: UDOT alternative	18%	53%	25%	4%
	Aerial: La Caille station option	30%	46%	21%	4%
	Aerial: opinion of further research	50%	41%	6%	4%
	Variable tolling	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Enhanced bus	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Reduced on-road parking	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Year-round local bus	80%	6%	12%	2%
	Paid parking at resorts	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Enhanced bus with road widening	See below	See below	See below	See below
	No action	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Prefer enhanced bus without road widening</u>	<u>Prefer enhanced bus with road widening</u>	<u>Need More information</u>	<u>Prefer no action</u>
4. Little Cottonwood Canyon - Enhanced Bus with or without road widening	56%	21%	16%	7%

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Prefer rail</u>	<u>Prefer aerial</u>	<u>Prefer enhanced bus</u>	<u>Prefer no action</u>
4. Little Cottonwood Canyon	18%	25%	47%	10%

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Need more information</u>	<u>No answer</u>
5. Cottonwood Canyon Connections	Aerial	41%	37%	15%	7%
	No action	40%	37%	19%	5%
	Rail tunnel	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Bus tunnel	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Prefer aerial</u>	<u>Prefer transit tunnel</u>	<u>Prefer no action</u>	<u>Need more information</u>
5. Cottonwood Canyon Connections	23%	14%	50%	14%

<u>Corridor</u>	<u>Prefer aerial</u>	<u>Prefer no action</u>	<u>Need more info</u>	<u>No answer</u>
6. Big Cottonwood Canyon to Park City Corridor	36%	47%	16%	2%

