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Theresa Heinrich

Road Congestion
How a Gondola up Little Cottonwood Canyon will never work

I live at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon. I have lived here for 23 years. I am very familiar with the traffic in the canyon. I head out my door & walk from my home to the Cottonwood Heights rec center. Itâ€™s about a 6 mile journey. As I walk along the road I observe the ski traffic heading up canyon. Sometimes the traffic is bumper to bumper & traveling at 5 mph. A lot of the time the cars are backed up all the way to Big Cottonwood Canyon. Also on occasion when I am traveling in the opposite direction I notice the cars are is a steady slow stream all the way to the freeway. There is a plan to increase lanes on Wasatch Blvd along the corridor in Cottonwood Heights. If they widen the road & increase the lanes I feel it is important to make sure there is a lane for express buses. These buses could pick up skiers & take them directly to Snowbird & Alta. We need to find a way to decrease traffic. My observation is that there is usually 1 person in each car. People need to car pool. The ski resorts could implement a fee to park unless there is more than 1 person per car. Unfortunately everyone loves their cars. They like to be on their own schedule & drive up to ski when they want. This brings me to another point, the plan to put a gondola at the LaCaille property. Imagine if you will that you live in Sugarhouse. You get up in the morning at 8am. You load your skis boots poles & snowboard into your car. You get on the freeway & get off at Knudsenâ€™s Corner. You head up Wasatch Blvd & the traffic is very slow because it snowed the night before. As you approach Big Cottonwood Canyon the road turns into more lanes. Now you get to the La Caille turn off & everything bottle necks. The traffic up canyon is moving very slowly. You decide to try the gondola. You finally get to LaCaille. There is a 1500 place parking lot. You park your car & get all your equipment & stand in line to get on the gondola. Now you travel up the canyon to the resort on the gondola. Then you get out of the gondola & get ready to ski. How long do you think this will take you from the time you leave your house to get your first run in? This process may be fun for a family staying at a hotel downtown. But it is not feasible for the everyday skier who lives in Utah. This is why we need an alternative way to reduce the cars & congestion in Little Cottonwood Canyon & along Wasatch Blvd. through Cottonwood Heights. The emissions & pollution from our cars needs to be reduced also.
Alternative ideas:
Express buses that depart frequently with their own designated lanes. UTA could utilize existing parking areas that are already in place. For example Hillside Plaza & the Shopko lot. Both of those parking lots are empty because Reams & Shopko have both closed. Charge for parking at Alta & Snowbird. It could be tiered as to how many people are in each car. One rider pays $20.00 to park, 2 riders pay $ 10.00.

Carol Swenson

Our canyons cannot accommodate any more people, that is THE problem. Building a gondola is not a solution nor is it the solution for trying to put more people somewhere they can't fit. If we build the gondola, that leads to tremendous parking structure needs and infrastructure needs to get people from the valley up to those structures. We may as well pave the entire valley. Use the money on what the city needs, not what the tourists want to see (or what elected officials think is cool). More buses, ensuring protection of our only water supply, better education for our kids, homelessness...not a gondola!

Marcus Hall

A Gondola would be expensive, and offer little flexibility to adjust to different daily and monthly capacity needs: in effect, it would be turned on 18 hours each day, running mostly empty much of the time. The bottleneck produced by this Gondola (taking twice as long as a car to get up Little Cottonwood Canyon) will produce an overload at Big Cottonwood Canyon. Both canyon transportation challenges need to be addressed at the same time. As a Big Cottonwood Canyon resident, I fear the effects of a Gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon. A much better, simpler, and more flexible solution to BOTH canyon transport challenges is efficient, electric, quiet buses, with multi-story (or underground) parking facilities built at the bottoms of both canyons. A $5 tax per ski ticket sold at all four resorts should be levied on all ski passes to help subsidize the buses and extra parking. Over ten years, the system would pay for itself. Canyon users should cover a majority of expenses for their canyon transport. Lastly, the long-range and spectacular solution (in 10 years from now) would be an electric train-system up one canyon, through a tunnel and down the other. Cars would be severely limited. This is how they do it in the Alps, which face much bigger crowding issues than the Wasatch. Thank you.

Pete Malen

What I think the gondola (and other) options currently under consideration fail to consider is what the quality of the 'experience' will be once the user arrives at his or her destination up the canyon. All the options presently on the table are focused on how to get the same amount - or more - people up the canyon more efficiently. However, the end result for all options will be the same - huge crowds at the top of the canyon - the options now on the table will not contribute to in improvement in the user experience, they will just enable users to get to their crowded destination faster . Its not clear how that is a win. Isn't the experience at the end of the journey the reason people go into the mountains in the first place? What is the benefit of getting up the canyons more quickly if what awaits at the end is a packed ski resort? Putting a gondola station on/near Wasatch boulevard solves nothing - all it does is help push the traffic problem down the canyon and into cottonwood heights. Where are gondola riders going to park? Wherever it is, there will be a traffic jam at that spot. I can't imagine that people who live in the neighborhood near the gondola station will be thrilled about that. Make no mistake - the gondola option is a boondoggle that will no doubt line some pockets but will do little or nothing to improve the experience at the top of the canyon. One politician recently touted the notion that the gondola might itself be a tourist attraction - isn't the purpose of the gondola to help alleviate traffic problems, rather than contribute to them? The answer, I think, lies in limiting access to the canyon - no doubt this would be a tough pill to swallow for the ski resorts, but I would hasten to point out that the ski resorts exist because of the canyon, not vice versa. Further, at the point that skiing at the resorts becomes too onerous, people may stop skiing - I know of some who have. Speaking only for myself, I would rather backcountry/resort ski only once a week (for example), but without a huge crowd to contend with, than be able to drive up the canyon anytime but be elbow to elbow with thousands of others. There are probably any number of ways to limit access - one might be to use an IR scanner to scan stickers on cars driving up to make sure they're authorized to go up that day - unauthorized cars might not be stopped, but could be fined an amount significant enough to disincentivize a repeat offense. As well, limiting access could be implemented relatively quickly and inexpensively since only minimal infrastructure changes would likely be needed. Limiting access is a fundamentally different approach than what is on the table now - and I realize there are political and financial interests pushing hard for one or more of the current options, but if you care about the canyon, and you care about the user experience, I urge you to consider development and implementation of a plan to limit access up the canyon. I would be happy to volunteer time to help with this if you decide to seriously consider this approach.

Blake Ingraham

NO GONDOLA! What a bad idea for those of us who also enjoy LCC on days other than ski days, and for the Canyon it's self. This is industrial overkill. And did you folks have a better look at how much usage UTA trains actually get? Most days and times those trains are fairly empty. And most of the time, the vast majority of the time, in Little Cottonwood there are no problems getting up that road. If you force everyone onto trains, you not only degrade or ruin the hiking quality in the canyons, you make it a whole different experience to go for hike. More of an urban herd experience. It's not all about skiing up there..... Please think year round. This supposedly fix seems to be all about skiing and nothing else. And big infrastructure.
First? Buses!!! Please get this right. Thank you.

Da Yang

NO GONDOLA

Richard Steiner

I am concerned that the gondola concept does not address the following: 1) non ski area access. Stops by request at the ice climbing TH and at White Pine should be included in the planning. 2) Unless an individual is traveling by him/herself the cost of the gondola will leave families defaulting to a car. Presently people are parking up to at least half a mile away to avoid the parking fee at Solitude. Even a nominal gondola fee of $5 is barely break even for a single rider, leave alone a family. 3) Congestion at the gondola parking structure and on the roads leading to the parking just moves the problem. If the parking is indeed at the La Caille restaurant area, Wasatch Blvd will still be a traffic nightmare. I do not view any of these concerns as "deal breakers" but hope that measures are developed to mitigate them. I wonder why "no action" is one of the alternatives being considered. In a state where the politics favor free market solutions to problems it seems to me that when the drive times get to be too long people will stop going. The solutions being proposed are actually addressing the issue of getting more people to the ski areas than to solving a year round traffic issue.

Mike Maneli

Need to use solution with parking at base of gondola La Caille solution. Capacity of the Gondola needs to be more 1050 per hour. Base facility show have dining/lockers etc

Robert Myers

The Tramway would be built to benefit and only cater to patrons and resorts property owners at Snowbird and Alta. It does not address the private and business needs to drive their vehicles in Little Cottonwood canyon. This is a â€œState giftâ€ to private businesses at tax payers expense. It does not solve transportation problems.

Suzanne Stensaas

I have looked at the proposals and at this point both a cog rain and gondola do NOT appear to be the best options for both moving people and protecting the canyon.

Jan Baker Kennington

We need a transportation system for ALL seasons not just "SKI" season. If the resorts who want the GONDOLA ( as they benefit greatly from it) they should pay for it. If tax payers are footing the cost then a mountian transportation system should benefit ALL canyons. That system would be a bus or shuttle system that can meet the needs of skiers, hikers, picnickers, climbers, bikers, runners ect. Spend this high cost gondola money on housing and services for the less fortunate which has grown with the pandemic. Please use MY tax dollars so that all may benefit NOT just those going to Snowbird and Alta.

Gandhi Zapata

We need more buses specially before or around 7am more parking at mouth of canyons before making a decision to have a gondola for canyons

Ellen Birrell

My name is Ellen Birrell. I reside near the High-T intersection of SR 210, sometimes called the La Caille intersection. I represent a 620-member community coalition called Save Not Pave (SNP) seeking logical solutions that serve ALL stakeholders. The Garaventa Doppelmyer proposal does not meet UDOT's stated LCC EIS purpose of reducing congestion on SR 210 between mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to Alta. It does nothing to alleviate urban section of SR 210/Wasatch Blvd. The associated parking garage induces vehicular traffic on SR 210/Wasatch Blvd and does not solve the bottlenecking issue for peak ski mornings, adding car exhaust to the already polluted air shed. For the gondola to be considered, the costs and impacts of the limited service that the gondola can provide to all LCC users needs to be considered. Residents' concerns have not been addressed. The Garaventa Doppelmyer proposal fails to address:
UDOT's LCC EIS stated goal to reduce traffic from mouth of BCC to Alta. How the gondola interfaces within a Regional Transportation System. It doesn't. It pushes car traffic from within the seven miles of canyon road into foothills and valley of Salt Lake.

Proposal does not address how the 1500-stall parking garage located in an isolated location along the eastern edge of the La Caille property will induce vehicular traffic and associated noise, air and light pollution into bedroom communities of Granite, Sandy and Cottonwood Heights.
Does not address affordability for local riders. The proposal touts driving revenue year round. Only 7% of Utahns are Alpine skiers. A gondola that only offers service to two commercial ski resorts does not meet the needs of non-skiers, hikers, backcountry enthusiasts.
Does not address how riders will offload or re-board the gondola at end of ski day at either Alta or Snowbird.
Since gondola proposal indicates it is more cost effective than bussing, it will have to carry the financial burden of shuttling non-skiers/non-resort goers to the trailheads, climbing and scenic areas. This cost is not reflected in the current analysis.
How can the state of Utah afford to spend $5.6M to only alleviate traffic in LCC and not include Big Cottonwood Canyon nor the regional needs of all stakeholders within Salt Lake Valley? The proposal implies that the gondola "solves the problem". UDOT's stated goal for transit is to only 'reduce vehicular traffic within SR 210 by 30%'. Thus, the full cost of maintaining road and buses within LCC remains, as well as the ongoing regional congestion on SR 210 and the Southeast Quadrand of SL Valley.
The environmental analysis compares only diesel buses to gondola. It is feasible for UTA to build a fleet of non-carbon emitting buses which then negates the statistics reflected in the Garaventa Doppelmyer analysis.

2.11.21 Zoom Chat Questions and Comments

**From Brian Hutchinson to Everyone: 10:30 AM**

# parking spaces at Swiss and German locations?

**From brendaruthizer to Everyone: 10:31 AM**

Where would the main station be located (I.e parking garage location?)

**From Ellen Birrell SaveNotPave.org to Everyone: 10:35 AM**

“Vehicle-free canyon” is not UDOT’s goal. UDOT stated goal: 30% less vehicles in LCC by 2050.

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 10:36 AM**

How does this get you to a vehicle free LCC when it only provides access to where approximately 30% of the visitors are going (ie. 2 resorts)?

**From Brian Hutchinson to Everyone: 10:36 AM**

# of turns (towers)? Stops at trailheads? Costs of deep valley transit integration costs (replace all cars)?

**From Ellen Birrell SaveNotPave.org to Everyone: 10:36 AM**

When Doppelmyer states cost:revenue, on what round-trip fare are you basing that projected positive year-round revenue?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:37 AM**

Seems as though it would be nice to have options if the community wanted to try to achieve that goal or at least decrease the number of vehicles below that of the 30th percentile mentioned by UDOT.

**From Susie Albertson to Everyone: 10:37 AM**

Does this go over any homes?

**From ed2 to Everyone: 10:39 AM**

What is the total time from LaCaille to Alta?

**From Dennis Goreham, Was Mtn Club to Everyone: 10:39 AM**

How high is the tallest tower? Where all will it be visible from? Has anyone done the visual impact analysis required by NEPA?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:40 AM**

The LaCaille Base Station and gondola option has the capacity to relieve the surface vehicle transportation by over 1400 vehicles per hour from day one. This relief will free up the available surface transportation and thus benefit those who need to drive up the canyon. Second, it’s been recommended that a bus route be created (using gondola revenues) to take dispersed recreationists to specific locations such as Lisa Falls, White Pine and Tanners and, the bus will not stop at Snowbird or Alta. In addition, it’s also been recommended that the canyon toll for personal vehicles not begin until after the Gate Buttress gate allowing financially challenged visitors to use a portion of the canyon without a paying a toll.

**From Ellen Birrell SaveNotPave.org to Everyone: 10:40 AM**

Egress/Ingress of garage location, which is located on northeast-side of the La Caille property which induces car traffic through bedroom neighborhoods of Granite, Sandy and Cottonwood Hts.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:40 AM**

is there parking or a passenger station at the top of the V at the mouth of the canyon?

**From Harris Sondak to Everyone: 10:41 AM**

Can you load a cabin with 30 people in 30 seconds?

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 10:41 AM**

So... dispersed rec can be stuck in road closures but not resort rec. Vehicle free is no really a reality. 👍

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:42 AM**

The LaCaille Base Station has had a complete traffic impact study completed by Hales Engineering and all the Highway 210 access points from the base station will operate at a level of service of A through the year 2050! This is a highly qualified science-based analysis and not based upon emotionally driven assumptions. In the end, this solution solves the problem.

**From brendaruthizer to Everyone: 10:42 AM**

Will there be a per person cost to ride the gondola ? If so, Andy estimates

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:43 AM**

what about mouth of canyon access? parking?

**From ed2 to Everyone: 10:43 AM**

How are you going to get people to ride in the gondolas instead of in their cars? It will not be mandatory right? Locals probably won’t use it. They will still drive up LCC.

**From Harris Sondak to Everyone: 10:43 AM**

Can you zoom into the alignments past the Wasatch Resort, Snowbird, and Alta, please.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:44 AM**

The cost to ride will be subsidized by the resorts. For example, Alta and Snowbird have both made the commitment that their season pass holders (15,000) and the employees (2200) will ride the gondola without a charge to them. The resorts will then pay the gondola operator for the individual costs that is estimated to be up to $2.5 million on-going every year. In addition, both Snowbird and Alta have made the commitment to record a conservation easement on the hundreds and hundreds of acreages north of Highway 210 precluding and development on their property. So, the resorts are paying for their share of the costs. The question is, with the on going increases in back country activity, how do we get that group to pay their fair share of the costs of transportation and parking expenses?

**From Deborah Case to Everyone: 10:44 AM**

Can you create a mid mountain stop for hikers and other recreation?

**From iPad (2) Mike Peterson to Everyone: 10:45 AM**

What would be the proposed footprint size (terminal and storage ) at the La Caille station?

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:45 AM**

what about the mouth of canyon? parking ramps?

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 10:45 AM**

The vast majority of LCC users go to Alta and Snowbird. Even hikers and bikers, and White Pine is only 1 mile from Snowbird. An 1/3 mile trail connector could connect Snowbird existing trail to the mid-White Pine Trail.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:46 AM**

The preliminary design of the LaCaille Base Station has a footprint using both private property and UDOT ROW of about 4 acres.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:46 AM**

so the La Caille option does not avoid parking ramps at the mouth?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:47 AM**

The LaCaille Station does eliminate the ramps at the mouth of the Canyon although the Hales Traffic Impact Study calls for the Y intersection to be lighted in the future regardless of the transportation solution.

**From Ellen Birrell SaveNotPave.org to Everyone: 10:47 AM**

Are we talking about $9 round trip like a bus ticket?

**From Catherine Kanter - SLCO to Everyone: 10:48 AM**

Would you please zoom in on the map to the portion of 210 between the La Caille station and the base of LCC? How many towers are in that path? Is it 2? What are the heights of the towers? Are they located along the North or South side of the road?

**From ed2 to Everyone: 10:48 AM**

How will the traffic decrease? there will still be a bottleneck at the LaCaille turnoff.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:48 AM**

Chris, is that for sure?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:49 AM**

Nothing is for sure, but that works as it relates to the work we have done, including the TIS done by Hales Engineering.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:52 AM**

what is being done to protect the historic quarry site at the mouth of the canyon? the bike and hiker access?

how many towers have drives that make noise? just the angle stations?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:52 AM**

The LaCaille Gondola option leaves the quarry site and other trails intact.

**From Dennis Goreham, Was Mtn Club to Everyone: 10:53 AM**

Will the towers have lights on them? Will the gondola cars be lit? What will be done to mitigate light pollution in the night sky?

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:54 AM**

we need a quarantine that the mouth station will not become a major entrance and parking location

that’s guarantee?

can we get the slide deck posted with the alignment and heights of towers?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:55 AM**

From our group, we completely agree. It should remain as undisturbed as possible.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:57 AM**

we need others onboard. the temptation to use that station may benefit overwhelming someday and biker/ hiker access and the historic sit may be sacrificed for skier access

become not benifit

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 10:58 AM**

That would be unfortunate.

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 10:59 AM**

that’s just it. this is designed from the skier perspective. It reduces these canyons to a singular use at the expense of dozens of other uses and values, that see more harm than benefit. The Wasatch is not solely for resort skiers.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 10:59 AM**

hi Carl.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:00 AM**

Carl, perhaps we should get together and discuss options and ideas. I do have a differing point of view on a couple of the thoughts and perhaps we can improve the plan.

**From Blake Perez to Everyone: 11:01 AM**

Slides will be posted on the CWC after meeting. Thanks!

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 11:02 AM**

could the straight line from the canyon take the base to somewhere else on LaCaille like down to Wasatch blvd and not have a station no prion at the mouth of the canyon?

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:02 AM**

Carl- Have you seen the thousands of people that hike and bike at Alta and Snowbird in the summer, and backcountry skiers that head up from Alta in the winter?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:03 AM**

It would be nice if somebody would talk about the large land conservation easement offered by Alta and Snowbird on the north side of LCC Road for the Gondola option.

**From Ellen Birrell SaveNotPave.org to Everyone: 11:04 AM**

But, it does bring up the concern… are skiers really going to want to ride inside a gondola car for twice as long as any existing 3S in the world? Why should Utah be so sure that this long gondola ride with only 24 out of the 32-35 people in each car being able to sit down?

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 11:05 AM**

Also talk about the needed avalanche sheds and bus service which are factors in the UDOT cost.

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 11:05 AM**

after all the cost and work to build a gondola, why not just connect Big Cottonwood Canyon and Park City?

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:05 AM**

Note that each gondola car has as many seats as a bus.

**From Glenn Eurick to Everyone: 11:06 AM**

FAA lighting requirements for towers?

**From Ellen Birrell SaveNotPave.org to Everyone: 11:07 AM**

Cottonwood Heights has Dark Skies ordinance. The Canyon Centre has been a bane for residents on east side of Wasatch Blvd. The huge structure and lighting within the Granite, CH and Sandy residential area is a huge concern.

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 11:07 AM**

.... and we already have a road and could actually fit more people on each electric bus that leaves every 30s, remove 95% of cars off the road and not expand the infrastructure foot print of the canyon.

with a faster travel time

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:07 AM**

LCC canyon was essentially closed last Saturday as was BCC. We were turned around at Deer Valley and finally headed back to Brighton and got there about 2PM. Left the Brighton at 4PM and got the mouth of BCC at 6PM. We travelled for 7.5 hours to ski for two. Would I ride a gondola for 36 minutes to get their without the hassle of the present traffic congestion - absolutely!

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:07 AM**

A smooth steady ride would make standing much more tolerable. And the beautiful views will improve the public's desire to use the gondola, compared to a train, bus, or car.

**From Blake Perez to Everyone: 11:08 AM**

Carl, would snowsheds be necessary to move those buses reliably?

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:09 AM**

What about noise pollution? The Gondola is incredibly quiet by comparison to the other options. The stated headway options for surface transportation will be as much as every five minutes. Try to imagine the noise of a train or a bus, every few minutes rumbling up and down the canyon and having the sounds amplified by the granite canyon walls.

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 11:09 AM**

Reliability is not a consensus objective, found nowhere in the Mountain Accord.

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:10 AM**

The thousands of people are already using the canyon, and we need to deal with the cars and traffic jams.

Reliability is clearly a key objective.

**From Laura Briefer to Everyone: 11:11 AM**

Good presentation. Similar to other mode presentations, the information is not quite the same as is being evaluated in the UDOT EIS. Also, management of the system is key to mitigate impacts.

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 11:12 AM**

and I guess reliability for who. it certainly doesn’t improve reliability on clean drinking water when a growing 70% is stuck using cars and parking. It doesn’t improve reliability for me to get to trailheads, bouldering, etc. Reliability for skiers is not a shared objective

**From Dave Fields to Everyone: 11:12 AM**

Last Friday we had thousands of cars and buses stuck in the canyon due to traction and avalanche conditions. Skiers spent 2-5 hours stuck in their cars. I do not believe rubber-tired vehicles are the long-term solution to transportation in the canyon.

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:15 AM**

I my be wrong, but I doubt climbers going only one or two miles up the canyon will ever embrace using transit rather than driving personal vehicles.

**From Carl Fisher to Everyone: 11:18 AM**

Close the canyon to everyone but resort visitors.

**From Catherine Kanter - SLCO to Everyone: 11:19 AM**

To expand upon a question raised by Laura Briefer...this presentation states that snow sheds are not necessary with this alternative. But snow sheds are contemplated as part of all of the alternatives in the UDOT EIS draft. Please explain discrepancy.

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:19 AM**

And backcountry skiers can clearly use the gondola to access Grizzly, White Pine, and Flafstaff.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:21 AM**

I think we should all share in the solution to the problems we all create and have access to the canyon we all love. Some days I love the backcountry, somedays I climb and other days, I ski at the resort. Are we not all part of the problem and therefore should not all of us be part of the solution?

**From Robert Grow to Everyone: 11:21 AM**

perhaps the single most important feasibility issue is the public willingness to drive a car to a lot, transfer to a bus, and the transfer to the gondola? transit experts generally consider a 50 percent loss of potential ridership at each transfer. is this being studied?

**From Susie Albertson to Everyone: 11:21 AM**

The top avalanche experts in the world. Think that Snow Sheds are necessary for this Canyon.

**From Laura Briefer to Everyone: 11:21 AM**

Can Snowbird talk about what lands they and Alta Ski Lifts would commit to preserving?

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:21 AM**

Excellent question Katherine!

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:23 AM**

Snow sheds for the road are probably needed, but they are not needed for the gondola option.

**From Dave Fields to Everyone: 11:23 AM**

Laura, Snowbird has put in writing we are willing to put the lands originally envisioned to be part of the land exchange (approx. 1,100 acres) if gondola is chosen as a transportation solution for LCC. This is Mt. Superior up to Alta, as well as the land on the Red Pine/White Pine Ridge and some lands in BCC. We have a mixture of surface and mineral and, in some cases, both.

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:24 AM**

Robert- What makes this different is that when you get off the bus you immediately get onto a gondola car that is always there and moving. That is opposed to transferring from one bus to another or to a train car where you have to wait for some period of time before the next bus or train arrives.

**From Dave Fields to Everyone: 11:24 AM**

Mike Maughan would have to explain the exact lands they envision including in this.

**From Laura Briefer to Everyone: 11:25 AM**

Thank you Dave. I have a concern about how this alternative might encourage additional ski area development and expansion/interconnect, so that would be useful to know.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:25 AM**

I have a letter from Alta with regards to the lands they have committed to preserving and will send a copy to Blake after the meeting.

**From Brian Hutchinson to Everyone: 11:26 AM**

Need to focus on the stress to the environment of this additional load on the canyon. Unless the system replaces cars it simply represents more ski resort receipts . What % of users would be from the valley, other counties, non-residents? The general public and the canyon deserve and need a system that is integrated with the larger valley transit system, and restores environmental goals of Mtn Accord.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:28 AM**

We should move forward with a capacity study or at least a human based LCC use study. But if we wait until the study is completed (it could take up to 10 years), we will have lost the opportunity to solve the transportation problems that plague us today. We should solve todays and tomorrow’s canyon congestion problems and provide a solution to the future canyon transportation needs (2050) and, come up with an answer to the capacity question separately. The result is that when the capacity question is answered, we will have the transportation tools to limit access into the canyon by simply stop loading people on the gondola (or train) and close the Buttress gates to uphill vehicle travel when the human capacity as defined in the canyon has been reached.

**From Marci Houseman to Everyone: 11:30 AM**

Is it accurate to say that a transfer at the mouth of the canyon will be necessary regardless of the mode selected? In other words, despite the way in which visitors arrive to the mouth of the canyon, a transfer will be necessary (from bus to rail, bus to gondola, rail to rail, rail to gondola) will still be necessary.

**From Chris McCandless to Everyone: 11:31 AM**

Using todays technology, we believe that is correct. A single source concept is not really an option.

Deborah Case: Thank you for a wonderful discussion.

**From John Knoblock to Everyone: 11:31 AM**

Exactly, when full gondola car capacity of 4000 people per hour is in place then snowsheds on the road are not needed. Some of course will argue to the contrary in part to shoot this option down.